APPENDIX.

APPENDIX

TO THE

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Financial Bill.

It must not be forgotten, Mr. Chairman, that there are borrowers as well as lenders in this country.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES T. McCLEARY,

OF MINNESOTA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, December 14, 1899.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 1) entitled "A bill to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes"—

Mr. McCLEARY said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The bill now under discussion has two general purposes, namely, the unequivocal legal recognition of the gold standard in this country and the liberalization of our system of bank-note issues. With both of these purposes I am in hearty sympathy.

Before beginning the discussion of certain facts and principles embodied in the bill, I can not forbear expressing my surprise at the change which I see in the actions of our friends on the other side of the main aisle. I well remember that in other Congresses whenever the question of money was under consideration they were eager and anxious to substitute for any pending measure a proposition for "the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1." They charged down the aisle with fire in their eyes and determination in their movements. Thus far in this discussion I have heard only four of them express any interest in the proposition formerly so ardently advocated. Let me name the illustrious four: Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri, Mr. OTEY of Virginia, Mr. SULZER of New York, and Mr. TERRY of Arkansas. Others may have undertaken to uphold the Chicago platform, but if so, it has not been my fortune to hear them. What means this change? Is it to be taken as an indication that the once devout Free Silverites are beginning to waver in the faith?

THEY MUST ADHERE TO 16 TO 1 OR SURRENDER THEIR CASE.

It is rumored, Mr. Chairman, that our friends on the other side are trying to reorganize their shattered forces under a banner emblazoned with the single word "bimetallism." It is understood that doubt has been expressed by persons high in their councils as to the absolute sacredness of the ratio of 16 to 1. But, Mr. Chairman, I wish to warn our friends that the moment they abandon the ratio of 16 to 1 they practically abandon their whole case.

SILVER HAS NOT BEEN DEMONETIZED.

As I said before, Mr. Chairman, our friends on the other side seem to be reluctant to discuss the question of the standard. I am curious to see what kind of an argument they could make in the light of the experience of recent years. For the purpose of provoking such discussion I now boldly declare that in the proper sense of the term silver has not been demonetized in this country.

Mr. SULZER. We deny that.

Mr. McCLEARY. You enter a general denial?

Mr. SULZER. We enter a specific denial, and call your attention to the act of 1873.

Mr. McCLEARY. My attention has been called to that act at least two or three times before. [Laughter on the Republican side.] I shall have occasion to refer to it again in the course of my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, an aphorism often carries more weight than an argument. A single phrase may become the shibboleth of a campaign. Thus, for years the rallying cry of the Free Silverites has been the so-called "demonetization of silver." That cry has been woefully misleading. It has aroused the resentment of untold thousands of good people and has secured for the advocates of a change in our system of coining silver innumerable votes which they never could have secured had the real facts been fully understood.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, I know that good writers on both sides of the controversy have spoken of silver as having been "demonetized." I understand, too, that the truth of my statement rests upon the definition of that term. I have no disposition to quibble over words. It is for the purpose of calling attention sharply to the actual facts in the case that I make the statement that silver has not been demonetized.

To "demonetize" means to put out of use as money. Wampum and tobacco were at one time used in this country as money. They are not so used now. Of wampum and tobacco, therefore, it may properly be said that they have been demonetized. But one needs only to look into his purse to see that silver is still used as money; hence my statement that silver has not been demonetized.

SILVER IS NOW COINED ON GOVERNMENT ACCOUNT.

To illustrate in another way what I mean, Mr. Chairman, by saying that silver has not been demonetized in this country, I will cite the practice which now prevails in grinding wheat into flour, as compared with the practice which formerly prevailed. Fifty years ago nearly all of the flour mills of the country were what were known as "custom mills." The old-fashioned gristmill was built by the side of a stream, to be run by water power. It cost little to build such a mill or to operate it. To that mill any farmer living in the neighborhood might bring his wheat, in large or small quantities, to be ground into flour and handed back to him in that form. If no one brought a grist, the mill remained idle. The mill was run on the policy of grinding for individuals who desired to have their wheat converted into flour.

In recent years a different policy has been adopted. A milling property is now a very expensive thing—expensive to build and requiring a large number of employees to operate it. The owners of the property can not without loss allow it to stand idle. They can not afford to wait for this, that, and the other man to bring a grist for grinding. The mill must be kept in operation all of the time. That fact has necessitated a change in the policy of running the mill. In order that they may have wheat on hand at all times for grinding, the owners of such a mill must go out into the market and buy wheat and store it in their own warehouses. The wheat that is ground belongs to the milling company, as does the flour that is made from it. If to such a mill you take some wheat to be ground into flour for you, you will meet with refusal. The mill is closed to the individual; it is open only to the company. Such a mill we call a "merchant mill."

Similarly, Mr. Chairman, there are two policies of coinage. The Government may follow in its coinage either the policy of the custom miller or that of the merchant miller. If, on the one hand, the Government accepts, from every man who has a money metal, that metal and converts it into the form of coin for him, handing back to him the actual coin made out of his own metal—that is, if the Government follows the policy of the custom miller and makes coin for anyone who has the metal out of which to make it—coinage is said to be "on private account." But if, on the other hand, the Government adopts the policy of going into the market and itself buying such amounts of money metal as it deems proper and converting it into coin at such times and in such amounts as it deems best in the interest of the public—that is, if the Government follows the practice of the merchant miller and coins only metal belonging to itself—coinage is said to be "on Government account."

Now, Mr. Chairman, is there a person within the sound of my voice who would say that because the mills are no longer open to the grinding of wheat for individuals that wheat has been "defoodized?" I trow not. Though ground in merchant mills on

company account, flour is still used for food and used in larger quantities than ever before.

Silver in this country has for many years been coined only on Government account, but silver is used in this country as money in immensely larger quantities than when it was coined on private account. And the Government holds itself ready to provide all the silver coin that the people of this country can use in their commercial transactions. Hence I say it is both improper and misleading to say that silver has been demonetized.

It may be noted, parenthetically, that we are doing this coining of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, and of course "without asking the aid or consent of any other nation on earth."

Mr. RIDGELY. Will the gentleman allow an interruption just there?

Mr. McCLEARY. Certainly.

Mr. RIDGELY. Does the gentleman propose to permit the owner of silver to have it coined on his own account when he takes it to the mill as a grist, or must he wait and take his chance of getting it coined when the miller chooses to do so?

A POPULIST CAN NOT FAVOR "FREE COINAGE" OF SILVER.

Mr. McCLEARY. Why, Mr. Chairman, I have just stated that for many years the coinage of silver in this country has been on Government account. The Government controls the volume of silver coined. We favor the continuance of that policy.

My friend from Kansas [Mr. RIDGELY] is a Populist. To him, therefore, since he has interposed a question, I desire to submit a proposition.

The Populist party was the first in this country to declare for the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. And yet, Mr. Chairman, strange as it may seem, a Populist can not be a Free Silverite without either denying the foundations of his faith or throwing logic to the dogs.

Mr. RIDGELY. That is your opinion.

Mr. McCLEARY. Let me show the truth of my statement. The fundamental proposition of Populism is that "the making of money is one of the sovereign prerogatives of government, and the volume of money should be controlled by the Government."

The so-called "free coinage" of silver means the coinage of silver on private account. That is, to be more explicit, "free and unlimited coinage" of silver means that silver is to be coined for individuals, in such quantities as they may wish, and without charge for mintage.

Under a "free-coinage" policy the owner of silver bullion could take the silver to the mint for coinage and use it as money, or he could refrain from doing so, just as he saw fit. That is, the volume of silver coin in the country would be absolutely under the control of the men who own the silver bullion. That is, the control of the volume of silver coin would be transferred from the hands of the Government, where it now is, to the hands of individuals.

But Populists declare as the foundation of their faith that such control should be in the hands of the Government. Therefore they can not favor a proposition to turn such control over to individuals; that is, Mr. Chairman, they can not logically be Free Silverites.

But the free-silver proposition has been the most prominent plank in their platform. So I am forced to the conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that Populists either do not know what this so-called "free coinage" of silver really means or else that they are not very logical after all.

Mr. RIDGELY. Will the gentleman permit me to reply?

Mr. McCLEARY. Certainly; but not in my time. It is too brief to permit further interruptions on this point. The gentleman will have time of his own. But I venture the prediction now that when my friend considers my proposition with care he will see that it is true and will not undertake to refute it. And in good conscience the Populist party, if such still exists, should abandon its "demand" for free silver coinage.

IN ALL THIS CENTURY WE HAVE NOT COINED A SINGLE SILVER DOLLAR ON PRIVATE ACCOUNT FOR USE AS MONEY.

Mr. Chairman, when I made the statement a short time ago that silver has not been demonetized in this country, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER] interrupted me with a denial of my statement and referred me to the act of February 12, 1873. I promised him then that I would say a few words more about that act. What did the act of 1873 provide in relation to silver? Let it be remembered, sir, that it continued the coinage of subsidiary silver without any change whatsoever except that for the silver half dime was substituted the nickel 5-cent piece. The whole outcry which has in recent years been raised against the act of 1873 is based upon the fact that it definitely discontinued the coinage of the silver dollar of 412.5 grains of standard silver on private account.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in order to appreciate the importance of this omission, the awfulness of the "crime" thus committed, I desire the special attention of our friends on the other side of the Chamber to the fact that during all the years of this century before 1873, during that period which they point to as the period when the mints of the United States were "open to the free and unlimited coinage of silver"—during all that period, Mr. Chairman, *not one solitary silver dollar piece was coined in the United States for use as money!* This statement seems to be startling to our friends, but it is nevertheless true. In order that I may show the truth of the statement, it will be necessary for me to give a brief history of coinage in the United States.

THE COINAGE ACT OF 1792.

The Constitution of the United States, which went into operation in 1789, authorizes Congress (Article I, section 8)—

To coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures.

In the tenth section of the same article the power to coin money (which under the Articles of Confederation had been exercised by the States as well as by the United States) is taken from the several States in the following language:

No State shall * * * coin money; emit bills of credit; make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts.

From the above it will be seen that by the Constitution the power to coin money is vested exclusively in the United States, under regulations to be prescribed by Congress. Congress has sole power over the matter. "Congress shall have power to coin money." *There is absolutely no constitutional limitation on that power.* Congress can decree what metals the coins shall be made of and can determine whether the coinage should be on private account or on Government account, and from its decision there is no appeal.

In all the chief commercial countries, when the Constitution was adopted, the principal coins were of gold and silver, and the coinage of both was on private account. Naturally this young country followed the example of the older countries.

When it was determined to establish a mint, one of the first questions was, What should be the unit of value? Should it be the pound sterling, with its divisions into shillings and pence, or should some other unit be selected? American practical sense decided the matter. The pound sterling is divided into 20 shillings, each shilling into 12 pence, and each penny into 4 farthings. Because of this irregular scale, computation in English money is difficult. The founders of the Republic determined to select a different unit, divide it into ten equal parts, and each of these parts into ten equal parts, so that the notation of our money system should conform to the ordinary decimal notation, to the end that computations involving money should be easily performed.

But what should the unit be? The name and its physical embodiment should both be familiar, because people are reluctant to accept money that is unfamiliar in name or appearance. Circulating in all of the thirteen States was the "old Spanish milled dollar." When fresh from the mint it contained about 376 grains of pure silver. But the coins which were circulating in this country were more or less worn. It was finally determined that the unit should be called a "dollar" and that it should be of the *average* value of the Spanish milled dollars then in circulation.

Everyone understood in those days, Mr. Chairman, that the value of a coin made on private account was exactly that of the metal in the coin. To determine the average, therefore, of the Spanish silver dollars then current, it was determined to collect a number of them indiscriminately, some being much worn and some little worn, put them into a scale and weigh them, and then divide the aggregate weight by the number of coins in the scale. The result of this experiment was to show that on the average the Spanish silver dollars then current contained 371¼ grains of pure silver. Thus was determined the size of the silver dollar. In the language of the act of 1792 there were to be coined—

Dollars or units, each to be of the value of a Spanish milled dollar as the same is now current and to contain three hundred and seventy-one grains and four-sixteenths part of a grain of pure, or four hundred and sixteen grains of standard, silver.

HOW THE RATIO WAS ESTABLISHED.

But gold was to be coined also. And the next question that arose was, How large should the gold dollar be? This, of course, depended on how valuable gold was as compared with silver. How was the relative value or ratio to be determined? Hamilton's view was that the ratio for coinage purposes should be the commercial ratio of the two metals. "There can," he said, "hardly be a better rule in any country for the legal than the market proportion." With this view Jefferson concurred, saying:

Just principles will lead us to inquire into the market price of gold in the several countries with which we shall be connected in commerce, and to take an average from them.

Upon investigation it was found that at that time the commercial ratio of gold to silver was 15 to 1. This was adopted as the legal ratio, section 11 of the mintage act of April 2, 1792, providing as follows:

SEC. 11. *And be it further enacted*, That the proportional value of gold to silver in all coins which shall by law be current as money within the United States shall be as fifteen to one, according to quantity in weight of pure gold or pure silver; that is to say, every fifteen pounds weight of pure silver shall be of equal value in all payments with one pound weight of pure gold, and so in proportion as to any greater or less quantities of the respective metals.

The size of a silver dollar having been fixed at 371.25 grains of pure silver and the coinage ratio at 15 to 1, the number of grains of pure gold to the gold dollar was, of course, determined by dividing 371.25 by 15. The quotient, 24.75, was the number of grains of pure gold to the gold dollar.

Hamilton was in favor of coining the $1 gold piece, "in order to have a sensible object in that metal as well as in silver to express the unit;" but after some discussion of the matter it was concluded that a gold dollar piece was too small a coin for practical money uses. It was decided to coin the eagle or $10 gold piece, to contain ten times 24.75 grains of pure gold, or in the language of the act of 1792—

> Eagles, each to be of the value of ten dollars or units and to contain two hundred and forty-seven and four-eighths grains of pure or two hundred and seventy grains of standard gold.

Half eagles and quarter eagles—to contain, respectively, one-half and one-quarter the amount of gold contained in the eagle—were also provided for.

Provision was also made for the coinage of half dollars, quarters, dimes, and half dimes of silver. These coins were to be exactly one-half, one-fourth, one-tenth, and one-twentieth the weight of the one-dollar silver piece, respectively, and were to be of the same degree of fineness as that coin.

All of the above-named coins provided for were to be a full legal tender at their face value, if of full weight, section 16 of the act of 1792 reading as follows:

> SEC. 16. *And be it further enacted*, That all the gold and silver coins which shall have been struck at and issued from the said mint shall be a lawful tender in all payments whatsoever, those of full weight according to the respective values hereinbefore declared, and those of less than full weight at values proportional to their respective weight.

Evidently, Mr. Chairman, the fathers of the Republic did not believe in the modern Popocratic theory that "it is the stamp of the Government that gives value to the coin," but believed as we do now that the value of the coin, when made on private account, was derived from the value of the metal in the coin and was proportional to its weight; for the law provided that worn or abraded coins, though still plainly bearing the stamp of the Government, were to be a legal tender, not at their full face value, but at such proportion of that value as the weight of the abraded coin bore to its weight when fresh from the mint.

OUR FIRST EFFORT AT "BIMETALLISM."

Thus we see, Mr. Chairman, that our fathers started out with the idea of having both gold and silver used as money—gold for the large transactions and silver for the small transactions. The mints were open to the coinage of both gold and silver on private account. There was to be no charge for mintage; coinage was to be "free." There was to be no limit on the amount which any person could have coined except his ability to provide the metal; coinage was to be "unlimited." The coinage ratio conformed to the market ratio. They put $5 worth of silver into 5 silver dollars and $5 worth of gold into the $5 gold piece. Legally and commercially the 5 silver dollars were exactly equal in value to the $5 gold piece.

After thus taking every precaution that human foresight could suggest to secure that end, our fathers had a right to expect that both gold and silver would be brought to the mint to be coined and used as money. But in that expectation they were disappointed. How did this come about?

For reasons that need not be detailed here the commercial value of silver soon fell slightly, so that the silver in 5 silver dollars was worth a little less in the market than the gold in a half eagle. Men found it profitable to sell gold and buy silver and take it to the mints to be coined and used in the payment of their obligations. Silver became the money of business, and gold refused to circulate as money. Nominally we had two standards, but practically we had only one. That one was silver. Measured by the standard of silver the gold in an eagle was worth more than $10. That being true, men would not pass it out as $10. The two things that I desire to emphasize at this point are:

First. That silver soon became the actual standard of values.

Second. That gold, though a little was coined each year, did not circulate to any great extent as money, and soon ceased to circulate at all.

That is, Mr. Chairman, while in law we had bimetallism, in practical fact we had silver monometallism, both as to the actual standard and the actual currency.

THE PERIOD OF SILVER MONOMETALLISM.

In the early part of this century our people had comparatively little use for money. Not only were they poor, but each family tried so far as possible to produce everything that it consumed. They made few exchanges and hence had little use for instruments of exchange. But as the people grew in wealth, in taste and in the ability to gratify their tastes, "homemade" things were gradually discarded and industry began to differentiate. Then arose the necessity for exchanging products, and with that came the necessity for more and better instruments of exchange, more and better money. In the days of poverty and "homemade" goods silver served the purposes of the people very well. But as early as 1819 the question began to be agitated, "Why do we not have gold in circulation?" On February 2, 1821, the Committee on Currency submitted a report to this House, saying, among other things:

> On inquiry they find that gold coins, both foreign and of the United States, have, in a great measure, disappeared; and from the best calculation that can be made there is reason to apprehend they will be wholly banished from circulation, and it ought not to be a matter of surprise, under our present regulations, that this should be the case. * * * There have been coined at the Mint of the United States nearly $6,000,000 in gold. It is doubtful whether any considerable portion of it can at this time be found within the United States.

The demand for gold coins continued to grow. The business men of the country urged upon Congress the necessity of getting gold coins into circulation. About 1830 a Select Committee on Coins was appointed by the Speaker to investigate this subject. In 1831 this committee made a report through Hon. Campbell P. White, expressing its judgment in the following very significant language:

> That there are inherent and incurable defects in the system which regulates the standard of value in both gold and silver; its instability as a measure of contracts and mutability as the practical currency of a particular nation are serious imperfections, while the impossibility of maintaining both a metals in concurrent, simultaneous, or promiscuous circulation appears to be as clearly ascertained.
>
> That the standard being fixed in one metal is the nearest approach to invariableness and precludes the necessity of further legislative interference.

In 1832 the Select Committee on Coins submitted another report, from which report I take the following statements:

> The committee think that the desideratum in the monetary system is the standard of uniform value; they can not ascertain that both metals have ever circulated simultaneously, concurrently, and indiscriminately in any country, * * * and they entertain the conviction that the nearest approach to an invariable standard is its establishment in one metal.

The purport of these words, Mr. Chairman, can not be misunderstood. They show that as early as 1830 some, at least, of the people had begun to see that with coinage of both metals on private account at a fixed ratio there was "impossibility of maintaining both metals in concurrent, simultaneous, or promiscuous circulation." But the thought had not yet been fully worked out; the true policy whereby this concurrent circulation could be secured had not yet been discovered.

Mr. Ingham, Secretary of the Treasury, recognizing that in the nature of things there can be but one standard of value, proposed to adopt definitely, by legal enactment, the single silver standard. But the business men of the country were wiser than he and demanded that gold coin should be introduced. How to get them into use became the problem.

WHY THE COINAGE RATIO WAS CHANGED IN 1834.

Thought began to take about this form: "Our actual everyday standard of value is 371.25 grains of pure silver. Measured in that standard the gold bullion required to make the coin called the eagle is worth more than $10; and so it is with the other gold coins. The gold required to make one of the coins is worth more as bullion than it will pass for as coin. This is why gold is not brought to the mint for coinage and use as money. This is why even the small amount of gold which is coined from time to time is soon sold by weight, the only use of the Government stamp being to certify the fineness of the metal. The trouble, then, is that we ask the owners to put more gold into the coins than they can afford, and the obvious remedy is to reduce the amount of gold required to the level of the silver standard under which we have so long operated and in terms of which all existing contracts are understood to be expressed; that is, we must cut down the requirements to the point where the gold in a $10 gold piece shall be as nearly as possible equal in value to the silver in 10 silver dollars; that is, we must change the coinage ratio to conform as nearly as possible to the commercial ratio."

By the year 1833 the commercial ratio of silver to gold had fallen to 15.93. Expecting a still further fall, Congress, in 1834, changed the coinage ratio from 15 to 15.98, which is commonly spoken of as "16 to 1," the ratio of which we have all heard so much; that is, under act of June 28, 1834, gold was to be coined at the rate of 23.2 grains of pure gold to the dollar (changed in 1837 to 23.22 grains to the dollar) instead of at the rate of 24.75 grains to the dollar, as provided for in the act of 1792.

Mr. Chairman, it is worthy of special notice that *the gold coinage was made to conform to the silver values*, not the silver coin to the gold valuation. Why was this? Simply because 371.25 grains of silver had for years been the sole standard in fact, though there were nominally two standards in law. All values, *including the value of gold*, had for years been expressed in silver. I repeat it, sir, because it is important to note and remember, that while from 1792 to 1834 we nominally and in law had two standards of value we practically and in fact had but one, and that one was silver, as is evidenced by the fact that when the coinage ratio was changed in 1834 the change was made in the gold coins, which were reduced in size so that their values would conform to the values of the silver coins.

OUR SECOND EFFORT AT "BIMETALLISM."

And now in 1834 began our second effort at securing the concurrent use of both gold and silver by coining both on private account at a fixed legal ratio. It will be observed, Mr. Chairman, that again, as in 1792, every precaution that human foresight could suggest to render the experiment a success was adopted.

The change of ratio defrauded no man, for the gold coins were reduced in size to conform in value to the silver coins, in terms of which all existing contracts were expressed. So, Mr. Chairman, the experiment started with honesty of purpose. Moreover, Mr. Chairman, it was started with intelligence. The word "dollar," whether expressed in gold or in silver, had exactly the same commercial value; that is, the 232 grains of pure gold required to make a ten-dollar gold piece had exactly the same value in the metal market as the 3,712.5 grains of pure silver required to make 10 silver dollars. Neither gold nor silver was "at a premium."

Our fathers hoped, and had some right to expect, that with this careful adjustment of their relative values both gold and silver would be brought to the mint to be coined for use as money. But in that expectation they were, as they soon discovered, to be disappointed.

As I said before, by 1833 silver had fallen to the point where it required 15.98 ounces of pure silver in the metal market to equal in value 1 ounce in pure gold. The coinage ratio of 16 to 1 was selected on the theory that silver would probably fall a little farther. But the ratio had hardly been established when silver began to rise in value. By 1839 silver had so risen in value that it required only 15.62 ounces of pure silver to equal in value 1 ounce of pure gold. But at the mint it would require 16 ounces of pure silver to be equal in value to an ounce of pure gold. This being true, the owners of silver, naturally taking it where they could dispose of it most advantageously to themselves, sold their silver as bullion instead of having it coined for use as money.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, silver coin *as measured in gold* was soon at a premium. As a consequence, not only did the owners of silver bullion decline to bring it to the mint for coinage and use as money, but even the silver coin that had been made began to be gathered up and sold by weight. It soon became manifest that this second attempt at securing the concurrent use of gold and silver by authorizing the coinage of both on private account at a fixed ratio was doomed to failure. Silver gradually retired from circulation, as has been said, and business men became more and more troubled by the lack of small change. In many places it became necessary for business men to make and use paper or cardboard checks for change.

Mr. LACEY. Will the gentleman allow me a suggestion right there?

Mr. McCLEARY. Certainly, Mr. Chairman. I am always pleased to yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. LACEY. Will the gentleman from Minnesota kindly explain to the Democratic brethren why it was that at that time, with the mints open to the "free and unlimited" coinage of gold, such free coinage did not bring gold up to the par with silver?

Mr. McCLEARY. Mr. Chairman, the question of my talented friend from Iowa is evidently not really intended for me. It is evidently presented as a nut for our friends on the other side to crack, and I pass it on to those for whom it was intended. As is usual when my friend speaks, this question goes to the heart of the general controversy.

Mr. CARMACK. Will the gentleman from Minnesota allow me a question at this point?

Mr. McCLEARY. Certainly, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CARMACK. Is it not true that at the time we were coining at the ratio of 16 to 1 under the act of 1834 France was coining at the rate of 15.5 to 1?

Mr. McCLEARY. That is true.

Mr. CARMACK. And is it not also true that the fact that France put a higher value on silver than we did was the cause of our losing our silver coins?

Mr. McCLEARY. Mr. Chairman, the inference of the gentleman from Tennessee is no doubt correct, partly at least. But I submit to the gentleman himself that the fact which he cites completely disposes of the proposed action of his party to coin silver on private account without regard to the action of any other country. He himself has just pointed out where such a course failed when tried before.

In 1849 Congress authorized the coinage of the one-dollar gold piece. This was done for two reasons. In the first place, it provided a physical embodiment of that which had for years been recognized as the actual standard of value—the gold dollar of 23.22 grains of pure gold or 25.8 grains of standard gold. And in the second place, it was Uncle Sam's response to the demand for small change. He made a smaller coin than had theretofore been made out of the only metal which came to the mint for coinage for use as money—namely, gold.

The little gold dollar pieces were warmly welcomed, but it was soon discovered that while they were very pretty as curiosities and ornaments—ladies collected them to make bangles of—these one-dollar gold pieces were entirely too small for practical use as money. The people thus learned by experiment that gold is as entirely unfitted for use in small transactions as silver is for use in large transactions, and the cry went up to Congress for silver coin to be used as change.

A SAMPLE PETITION.

The following petition will serve as a sample of those sent in to Congress. It was signed by the governor of New Jersey and by nearly all of the members of the legislature. It reveals the straits to which the people were being driven by reason of the almost total disappearance of silver coin. It is worth while to note particularly the first two paragraphs and the closing sentence of the fourth.

This petition is printed in the Congressional Globe, Volume XXVI, page 629, second session of the Thirty-second Congress, where it appears incorporated in the speech of Mr. Skelton, of New Jersey, made February 15, 1853:

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

The memorial of the subscribers respectfully represents that the greatly increased value of silver compared with that of gold as regulated by law at the Mint of the United States has almost wholly withdrawn all the silver coins of proper weight from circulation as a currency. *They are no longer a standard of value in payment and are only used as an article of commerce.*

Your honorable bodies are fully aware that the ordinary business of the community, comprising probably ninety-nine hundredths of all individual transactions, can not be conducted without small coins or paper tokens to settle small balances, and however repugnant the use of such paper trash may be to public opinion or discreditable to the Government and nation, the indispensable necessity for it will, as your memorialists seriously apprehend, soon force it upon the whole country, unless Congress shall during the present session provide an efficient remedy.

Your memorialists believe that such a remedy may be found in the passage of a bill that passed the Senate of the United States at their last session which proposes a silver coinage about 7 per cent lighter than the present coin, comprising all the existing denominations less than $1, and making these new coins a legal tender only for payments not exceeding $5.

Your memorialists believe that this measure will remove all difficulty as soon as the proposed coins can be minted in sufficient numbers and distributed, and in the meantime it will entirely prevent the exportation or melting of silver coins, as these will become more valuable for recoinage than for any other purpose. Nor can it in the slightest degree disturb the monetary affairs of the nation *or infringe existing rights in contracts.*

Your memorialists forbear to occupy your time with further argument in favor of such a coinage. It has been fully discussed in an able report of a committee of the Senate and so long under consideration that it must be fully understood.

Your memorialists will therefore only remark, further, that, *except those engaged in buying or melting silver coin,* every individual in the United States who uses money must be interested in having relief from the increasing embarrassment arising from the want of a permanent regulation of the small silver coin.

That your honorable body will determine to act upon this subject at the present session is the earnest prayer of your memorialists.

TRENTON, N. J., *February 4, 1853.*

THE THIRD ATTEMPT AT BIMETALLISM SUCCESSFUL.

In the early fifties business had become actually embarrassed by the lack of small change. Petitions like the one given above were presented to Congress in great number urging that action be taken to furnish the channels of trade with the small change so imperatively needed. The people said, however:

"Do not trifle with us, Uncle Sam. In the early thirties we were clamoring for gold in our circulation. The act of 1834 gave us the gold, but in some way it robbed us of our silver. We are now clamoring for silver. Do not trifle with us and give us a law whereby in getting silver for use as change we shall lose our gold. What we want is the concurrent use of both gold and silver. The problem is a hard one to solve, but we believe you capable of solving it."

And Uncle Sam did solve it. The method of his solution is well worthy of our attention at this time. He said:

"My people are calling for silver. They need silver coins in their daily business. The whole policy of coinage they have placed in my hands, so the responsibility is on me. In my efforts to provide the necessary silver coin I have been saying to the men who own silver, 'Bring your silver to the mint and I will convert it into coin for you in quantities large or small, as suits your convenience, and without making any charge for my services.'

"But the men who own the silver seem deaf to the cries of my people. They do not bring their silver to be coined for use as money. On thinking it over, I do not know that I blame them. The trouble is that I have been asking them to put more silver into the coin than it will pass for as money after it has been coined. I have been asking them to put about 52 cents of silver into a half-dollar piece and then pass it out as 50 cents. Very naturally they would not do so. They would not bring their silver to be coined for use as money because it was not profitable for them to do so. I do not blame them, *but I will not depend on them any longer.*

"My people expect me to see that they are provided with a sufficient supply of silver coin with which to transact business, and I shall see to it that they are not disappointed. Heretofore I have been depending upon the owners of silver bullion to come forward voluntarily and supply the need for silver coin. Hereafter I shall

myself see to it that there is sufficient silver coin provided for all the demands of business."

How was Uncle Sam to secure the silver with which to make the coins? There was only one honest way. He could not steal the silver, nor did he have any right to demand that its owners should give it to him without recompense. There was only one thing for him to do, and that was to go into the market and buy the silver at the market price and in such quantities as he deemed necessary, and out of the silver thus bought make silver coin in such quantities and of such denominations as would meet the business demands for such coin. This policy Uncle Sam then resolved upon.

That is, Mr. Chairman, in 1853 was adopted in this country the policy of the coinage of silver on Government account, which has been continued ever since, and for which the advocates of this bill still contend.

Uncle Sam was shrewd, too. He said: "Heretofore I have been requiring that silver worth, on a gold valuation, 52 cents should be used in making the 50-cent piece. That is why the men who own the silver have not brought it to be coined and used as money. And that is why the silver coins that have been made have not gone into circulation but have been sold by weight. And if, out of the silver which I propose to buy, I should make coins in such a way that there would be 52 cents' worth of silver in a half dollar, the coins would not be allowed to circulate. There would be 4 per cent profit in collecting them and selling them by weight. The object which I have in mind would not be attained. I am not blaming men for being selfish, but in making my plans I will remember that they are selfish. I will remove temptation from them. Instead of putting 52 cents' worth of silver into a half dollar, I will put in only 49 cents' worth. And I know men well enough to know that then the coins will be allowed to circulate, for there would be 2 per cent loss in selling them by weight."

That is, Mr. Chairman, under the act of 1853 the coinage of silver was not only to be on Government account, but the ratio of coinage was to be so changed that the value of the silver in each coin, measured in gold, would be slightly less than the nominal value of the coin.

Not only was Uncle Sam shrewd, Mr. Chairman, but he was also kind and just. He said, in planning this act of February 21, 1853: "My people live in houses. Houses may burn. If a house occupied by one of my people and having in it some of this silver coin should burn and the coin be melted into bullion, the owner would suffer some loss by reason of the policy which I am now planning. In order that no one may be called upon to take more than a small amount of risk on account of this policy; in order that no man, however rich or powerful, may be able to compel any other man, however poor or weak, to take more than a fair share of the risk involved in this policy, I shall make it impossible for anyone to force upon another in the payment of an obligation more than a reasonable amount of this kind of coin. Now, what is that reasonable amount?"

After thinking it over Uncle Sam concluded that, inasmuch as the silver which he was providing for was to be used for change or pocket money and that the maximum amount of silver which a person is willing to carry in his pocket is about $5, $5 would be the "reasonable amount" which he had been looking for.

HOW THE ACT OF 1853 ACCOMPLISHED THE PURPOSE INTENDED.

Putting the foregoing propositions, Mr. Chairman, into technical language, the act of 1853 provided:

1. That the silver coins proposed to be made under it—namely, half dollars, quarter dollars, dimes, and half dimes—should be coined on Government account only.

2. That the silver in each coin should be worth slightly less than the nominal value of the coin, the silver in the half dollar being reduced from 206.25 grains of standard silver to 192 grains of standard silver, and the smaller coins in proportion.

3. That the silver coins thus made should be limited in the legal-tender quality to $5.

4. That the coins thus made could be obtained by anyone at any time "in exchange for gold coins at par in sums of not less than $100."

Inasmuch as these coins could always be obtained in exchange for gold, it is clear that provision had been made for supplying the channels of trade with all the silver coin needed therein; and, inasmuch as these silver coins could be had only for gold coins, their parity with gold was secured. That is, Mr. Chairman, under the act of 1853 an arrangement was perfected whereby the volume of silver coin was regulated so as to meet automatically the exact demands of trade, while at the same time the purchasing power of these coins was maintained at an exact parity with gold.

In this way, sir, was solved the problem of having gold and silver coins in actual concurrent circulation, each serving the purpose which it can best serve—the gold for the large transactions and the silver for the small transactions. And, Mr. Chairman, the policy adopted in 1853 is the only one ever yet devised by the wit of man which safely and surely accomplishes that end. That policy, Mr. Chairman, is to leave gold to be coined on private account, but to have silver coined on Government account. That has been our policy ever since 1853, and in my judgment will continue to be our policy through all the years of the future. [Applause on the Republican side.]

WHY THE COINAGE ACT OF 1853 MADE NO MENTION OF THE SILVER DOLLAR.

The coinage act of February 21, 1853, the prime object of which was to make sure that the American people should have an ample supply of silver coin for their business needs, made no mention whatever of the silver dollar piece. Why was this, Mr. Chairman? The answer is significant. The omission was caused by the fact that *the American silver dollar piece was an unknown coin to the people of that day.* Nobody then doing business had ever used one as money. And as this act of 1853 secured to the people the actual use of half dollars and the smaller pieces, any payment (say $5) desired to be made in silver could be made with the coins provided. This was what the people wanted, and *all* that they wanted, of silver coins.

Why, Mr. Chairman, in more than half a century there had not been coined in the United States one solitary silver dollar piece for use as money. I will go further, Mr. Chairman, and make a statement which our friends on the other side may challenge or admit as they see fit. The statement is this, and it strikes right at the root of their whole contention in this matter: *During all of this century, sir, there has not been coined in the United States mints one solitary silver dollar piece on private account for use as money in this country.*

Mr. SULZER. Well, we deny that.

Mr. McCLEARY. I do not wonder, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman enters a denial, for it is apparent to all that if my assertion be true, all the clamor that has been raised about the act of 1873 is simply "as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal." Inasmuch as the correctness or the incorrectness of this assertion is so vital, I propose now to establish beyond peradventure the truthfulness of my statement.

On May 1, 1806, an order was issued by the then President of the United States, Thomas Jefferson, who is reputed to have been something of a Democrat himself, directing the discontinuance of the coinage of silver dollars at the United States mint. During the remainder of his Administration not a single silver dollar was coined. His successor was James Madison, another pretty good type of old-fashioned Democrat. He continued the order in force, and during the eight years of his Administration not a single silver dollar piece was coined at our mint.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Will the gentleman allow an interruption just there?

Mr. McCLEARY. Let me finish my statement first. My friend from Mississippi is so uniformly courteous, Mr. Chairman, that I shall be perfectly willing to yield to him as soon as I conclude the statement that I have started to make.

The next President was James Monroe, another pretty good type of old-fashioned Democrat. He continued the same policy, and during the eight years of his Administration not a single silver dollar was coined at our Mint.

Mr. SULZER. Madison succeeded Jefferson, not Monroe.

Mr. McCLEARY. The gentleman from New York is behind the times, as usual. I had already passed Madison. [Laughter.]

The next President was John Quincy Adams. During the four years of his Administration we did not coin a solitary silver dollar. Then came Andrew Jackson, another pretty good type of old-fashioned Democrat. During seven of the eight years that he was in the Presidential chair not a solitary silver dollar was coined in the United States Mint.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, during the thirty years from 1805 to 1835, as will be seen by the Report of the Director of the Mint for 1898, page 301, not one solitary silver dollar piece was coined in the United States.

THE REASON FOR JEFFERSON'S ORDER.

As I said, Mr. Chairman, President Jefferson in 1806 ordered the Director of the Mint to discontinue the coinage of the silver dollar piece. Why did he issue that order? Let the order speak for itself, sir. Here it is:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, *May 1, 1806.*

SIR: In consequence of a representation from the director of the Bank of the United States that considerable purchases have been made of dollars coined at the Mint for the purpose of exporting them, and as it is probable further purchases and exportations will be made, the President directs that all the silver to be coined at the Mint shall be of small denominations, so that the value of the largest pieces shall not exceed half a dollar.

I am, etc.,

JAMES MADISON.

ROBERT PATTERSON, Esq.,
Director of the Mint.

The text of the order itself, Mr. Chairman, shows that it was issued because the silver dollar pieces made at our mint were being exported and not used for monetary purposes in this country. In other words, the United States mint was being operated, so far as the silver dollars, at least, were concerned, for private profit and

not for the usual and proper uses of the people. It will be remembered that the size of the American silver dollar piece was that of the *average* Spanish milled dollar current in 1791. This implies that a large number of the Spanish dollars were heavier than the American silver dollar. These were taken to the mint by money brokers and converted into American silver dollars at a profit.

These American silver dollars were then carried by traders to the West Indies and elsewhere, where they were accepted as the equivalent of a Spanish dollar. There they were exchanged for the heavier Spanish dollars, which were brought back to the United States, melted, and taken to the United States mint to be converted into American silver dollars, at a profit, and the process was repeated again and again. As Professor Laughlin says:

> This process kept the mint busy without the effect of filling the circulation with our own coins. The mint, therefore, was a useless expense to the nation, but a source of profit to the money brokers.

This process would hardly be advertised by those who were profiting by it. It undoubtedly was in operation for quite a number of years before the authorities became aware of it. It is perfectly safe to say that it covered the five years of the century preceding the issuance of the order.

THE SILVER DOLLARS COINED BETWEEN 1834 AND 1873 WERE NOT COINED FOR USE AS MONEY.

In 1836, Mr. Chairman, just 1,000 silver dollars were coined. In 1837 and 1838 not one was coined. In 1839 just 300 were coined. In all of the years between 1834 and 1873, inclusive, there were coined in the United States mints about six and a half million silver dollars. *But, Mr. Chairman, not one of the pieces so coined was coined for the purpose of use as money.* They were coined for sale, not for circulation. This will be seen by the fact that much of this coinage was done during the civil war and the years following it, when there was no coin of any kind in circulation.

What is meant by saying that the coinage was done for the purposes of sale and not for the purposes of circulation? After the change in ratio in 1834 the pure silver (371.25 grains) required to make a dollar piece was worth more than $1 in the then recognized standard, gold. During all the period from 1834 to 1873 silver dollars were "at a premium" ranging from 2 to 4 per cent. measured in gold. The men who owned the silver, as was said earlier, would not put a dollar and three cents' worth of silver into the form of a dollar and then pass it out as a hundred cents. Why, then, did they have their silver coined at all? Simply, Mr. Chairman, to secure the Government's certificate of fineness as evidenced by the fact of the coinage, it being generally known that American silver dollars were uniformly nine-tenths pure silver. The coining saved the owner of the silver the expense of securing in another way, through private sources, the certificate of fineness required in order to sell his silver.

Let me illustrate. When a farmer brings a load of wheat to the elevator the first thing to determine is the grade or quality of the wheat. The buyer at the elevator gets up on the load, opens a sack, takes out some of the wheat, looks it over carefully, pinches it between his fingers, tries it between his teeth, and perhaps tests it by weighing a small portion of it. What is all this trouble for? To determine the quality of the wheat. This being determined, he ties up the sack and tells the farmer to drive up on the scales, where the load is weighed. The quality and the quantity of the wheat being determined and the market price being known, the value of the load of wheat is ascertained by a simple arithmetical process.

Similarly, a man who has silver to sell must first of all establish to the satisfaction of the buyer the fineness or quality of the silver. United States silver dollars after 1837 were made nine-tenths pure. So that if a man who had silver to sell could have it converted into the form of silver dollars, he would thereby establish the fineness or quality of his silver to the entire satisfaction of any prospective buyer. Not only that, Mr. Chairman, but if the coins were sold before being used as money, not only would the quality of the silver be determined by the coinage, but its weight also. Hence it was important that those having the silver to sell should, after having it converted into the form of silver dollars, sell them at once, without allowing them to be abraded in any way by use.

A SUMMARY.

To summarize, Mr. Chairman, the silver dollars coined in the United States mint during the first five or six years of this century were coined for exportation to the West Indies and elsewhere and not for use as money in this country. During the thirty years up to and including 1835 no silver dollars were coined in the United States mint for any purpose whatsoever. The silver dollars coined from 1834 to 1873 were coined not to be used as money, but to facilitate the sale of the silver. Hence the truth of my original proposition, Mr. Chairman, that there were no silver dollars coined in this century before 1873 for use as money. Probably neither your father nor your grandfather ever saw one except as a curiosity.

Mr. SULZER. And if your policy is continued, my grandchildren will never see one. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. McCLEARY. Well, perhaps. The gentleman knows best. A good deal depends upon the actions of the proposed grandfather. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman's grandchildren fail, under the policy which we stand for, to see and use American silver dollars, it will not be because there are not American silver dollars in abundance to be seen and used. In 1878 we resumed the coinage of the silver dollar. Since then over 400,000,000 of these dollars have been coined for use as money in this country, and they are in monetary use to-day, either directly as coins or indirectly through silver certificates. And this bill continues them in use, giving to them and to the subsidiary silver the whole field of pocket-money service. But it is to be observed, Mr. Chairman, that *the silver to which I am now referring has been coined on Government account* and not on private account. And my general statement still holds good that during all of this century there has not been coined on private account one solitary silver dollar for use as money in this country.

Not even the coinage of the trade dollars, under the act of 1873, is an exception to my proposition. Though coined on private account, they were not intended for use as money in this country, being coined for use in our trade with China and other countries of the Orient.

Mr. SIMS. In that connection, is it not a fact that the reason why silver was not coined on private account to be used as money was because the silver bullion that it took to make a silver coin was worth, measured in gold, more than the silver coin when made?

Mr. McCLEARY. "I thank thee, Roderick, for the word." It nails two facts beyond dispute by high Democratic authority. First, the gentleman admits by his question, and the gentleman is too honorable not to admit the truth, that there were no silver dollars coined on private account in this country for use as money. Second, the question implies that, "measured in gold," the silver coins that were made were "at a premium," and hence would not circulate. This, Mr. Chairman, means that *gold had become the standard.* I answer my friend, sir, that he is exactly correct both in his fact and in his reason for it.

Mr. OTEY. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. McCLEARY. Certainly, I will yield to my friend from Virginia.

Mr. OTEY. You say that under the order of Thomas Jefferson there was not a silver dollar coined from 1805 up to what time?

Mr. McCLEARY. The order was continued under succeeding Administrations, and no silver dollars were coined up to and including 1835.

Mr. OTEY. Was it not a fact that every silver piece that was coined was a full legal tender, and that up to 1853 there was as great a coinage of silver as of gold?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. In the shape of halves and quarters?

Mr. OTEY. Yes. Did not every fifty-cent piece and every quarter and every dime and half dime have full legal-tender power?

Mr. McCLEARY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia has asked two questions. They are questions of fact, not questions of judgment. As questions of historic fact, the answers to which can easily be verified, I will consider them in their order.

First. Was not the total coinage of silver equal in volume to the total coinage of gold up to 1853—or 1873?—I am not quite sure which the gentleman said. To that question the answer is emphatically, No. The gold coinage of the two years 1851 and 1852 alone far exceeded in volume the total silver coinage up to 1853, and even up to and including 1873.

But the gentleman must not attempt to divert attention from the fact that my assertion, made earlier in the course of these remarks, had reference to the silver dollar piece. Of these there were none coined for use as money.

Mr. CARMACK. How many gold dollars were coined?

Mr. McCLEARY. No provision was made for the coinage of the one-dollar gold piece before 1849, and the coinage of the one-dollar gold piece was discontinued by law in 1890.

Mr. CARMACK. Put that beside the statement that no silver dollars were coined.

Mr. McCLEARY. Certainly, sir; with pleasure.

But, Mr. Chairman, though no one-dollar gold pieces were coined before 1849 and none have been coined since 1890, the value of the gold in a gold dollar piece was our standard of value long before 1849, as it has been up to and since 1890; and we have never complained that, because of this noncoinage of gold dollars, gold had been "demonetized."

THE STANDARD UNIT NEED NOT ITSELF BE COINED.

The question of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. CARMACK] suggests a thought which is pertinent in this connection. As was well stated by my distinguished friend from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] in the opening speech on this bill, it is not necessary that the unit of value should be embodied in the form of a coin.

But, on the other hand, Mr. Chairman, it is essential that, if not so expressed, the unit of value shall be embodied in one or more coins which are either divisors or multiples of that unit.

Thus, while from 1805 to 1835 the actual standard of value in this country was that of 371.25 grains of pure silver, the amount prescribed by law for the silver dollar, the silver-dollar piece itself was not coined. But, Mr. Chairman, it must be remembered that the unit of value was embodied in the form of half dollars, quarters, dimes, and half dimes, so that two half dollars or four quarter dollars could be used in making a payment, say $5, as the exact equivalent of the one-dollar piece.

And while the standard of value since 1834 has been that of 25.8 grains of standard gold, this quantity of gold was not put into the form of a dollar coin up to 1849, as has been stated, and the coinage of the one-dollar gold piece was discontinued in 1890. But through all the period since 1834 we have had multiples of the gold dollar of 25.8 grains of standard gold in the form of eagles, half eagles, and quarter eagles. So that if at any time a person desired to make a payment in gold, say of $1,000, he could do so with the coins named.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I want to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. McCLEARY. Mr. Chairman, I take pleasure in yielding now to the gentleman from Mississippi, as I promised to do some time ago. I yield for a question.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I will ask the gentleman, in the face of the country, if he does not think that when he stands here with a full knowledge of the true history of the period of the time of which he speaks, when half dollars and quarters were being coined as full legal tender and full weight at the ratio—is he not quibbling with the country when he comes to the mere question of the dollar pieces coined? Is it not true that you can quibble about gold just the same and say that no dollar in gold was coined because there were only two-and-a-half-dollar, five-dollar, and ten-dollar pieces? During the period of which you speak, is it not true that, although silver was not coined in the shape of silver dollar pieces, it was coined as ultimate, self-redeeming, full legal-tender, full-weight, standard money, in the form of half dollars and quarters?

HOW ABOUT MINOR SILVER COINS?

Mr. McCLEARY. Mr. Chairman, I did not yield to the gentleman to permit him to inject a speech into my remarks. I yielded for a question. I am a little surprised, too, Mr. Chairman, that my friend from Mississippi, who is usually so courteous and straightforward, should have lowered his usual tone in the asking of his question. Men whose own motives are right, Mr. Chairman, rarely impute to others motives not proper. My friend is an attorney. I understand that attorneys sometimes, when they have a bad case, find it convenient to attack opposing counsel. I must assume, Mr. Chairman, that the lowering of my friend's tone from his usual standard is due to the fact that he recognizes that his case is a weak one.

It will be noted, however, that the gentleman admits the truth of my statement that there have not been any silver dollars coined in our mint on private account for use as money.

Now to the gentleman's question. It is practically the same question as that asked by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. OTEY], which I was about to answer when interrupted. Both of these gentlemen, who are rightly eminent in their party, set great store on the fact that silver halves, quarters, etc., were coined and were a full legal tender. Let us see how much real comfort for them this fact contains. They will find that they have been leaning pretty heavily on a broken reed.

It is true, Mr. Chairman, that up to 1853 the silver half dollars, quarters, dimes, and half dimes were coined on exactly the same ratio as was provided for the one dollar silver piece. That is, the half dollar contained exactly half the amount of silver contained in the dollar piece, and the quarter, dime, and half dime in like proportion. It is also true, Mr. Chairman, that all of these coins were a full legal tender, if of full weight.

But, Mr. Chairman, *up to 1834 few of these coins, and after 1834 practically none of them, were coined for use as money.*

Anyone who will examine the report of the Director of the Mint, where it shows year by year from the foundation of our Government the number of gold and silver coins of each kind and denomination issued annually, will notice that from 1805 to 1835, when our mint was closed to the coinage of one-dollar silver pieces, about 90 per cent of the coinage of silver was in the form of half dollars. In some years no other silver coins were made. Why was this? There were two reasons for it.

In the first place, the men who had been using the United States mint for their own private profit, whose plans Jefferson's order had been intended to thwart, *got around the order by having their silver coined into half-dollar pieces.* The only change that the order actually made in the operations of the money dealers was to cause them a little more trouble in disposing of their half-dollar pieces in the West Indies than they had previously had in disposing of their one-dollar pieces. During these years, then, much (no one knows exactly how much) of the coinage of silver into half dollars was for the purpose of exporting the coins at a profit.

In the second place, the real monetary standard of the country from 1792 to 1834, as I said before, was the silver dollar (the gold coins, measured in it, being at a premium), and it was regarded as desirable and necessary to have a physical embodiment of that standard. The coinage of the silver dollar having been prohibited, the people used two half dollars—which contained the same amount of silver and were full legal tender—as the exact equivalent of and the most convenient substitute for the silver dollar.

After 1834 practically all the silver coins—*including the halves and quarters* about which our friends have been inquiring so solicitously—being (like the dollar piece) at a premium measured in gold, were coined chiefly for the purpose of sale and not for the purpose of circulation. And even those that were put into circulation were gradually gathered up and sold by weight at a profit. *That was exactly what drove Uncle Sam in 1853 to cease depending on having silver coined on private account* and to undertake himself the task of supplying the needs of the country for such coins.

Thus we see, Mr. Chairman, how exceedingly little there was for my friend from Mississippi to get excited over. Can it be, sir, that the gentleman did not know the facts which I have just recited? If he knew them, what ground was there for his asking his question as he did? I would be justified, Mr. Chairman, in retorting in kind, but I have no temptation to do so. I do not claim to be any better man than my friend from Mississippi, but, having a better case, I can afford to keep my temper.

WE HAVE HAD THE GOLD STANDARD SINCE 1834.

A good many people, Mr. Chairman, seem to be under the impression that the gold standard is a new thing in this country. The simple economic and historic fact is that the gold dollar of 25.8 grains of standard gold has been the unit for measuring value in this country for more than two generations; that is, since 1834. I was very much surprised to hear my talented friend from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] attempt to deny this. Of course I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, the importance of such a denial to the opponents of this bill. But I hardly expected a gentleman so well informed as my friend undoubtedly is to be the vehicle of that denial.

What is meant by a standard? It is simply that with which other things are habitually compared and by which they are measured.

In 1792 our fathers provided by law that the standard in this country should be a dollar. This dollar they undertook to embody in two forms, namely, 371.25 grains of pure silver and 24.75 grains of pure gold. As we have seen, people soon ceased to think of the 24.75 grains of gold as the standard, and used as the actual standard of value the 371.25 grains of pure silver. It is uniformly admitted that from 1792 to 1834 gold coins were "at a premium."

"At a premium" measured in what, Mr. Chairman? A thing can not be longer or shorter, heavier or lighter, more or less valuable than itself. When spoken of as being "at a premium," the gold coins could not have been compared with themselves, nor with the gold unit of 24.75 grains of pure gold. They must have been compared with something else. That something else, whatever it might be, was the standard. The gold coins were at a premium *as compared with the silver unit* of 371.25 grains of pure silver. That is, Mr. Chairman, the silver unit of 371.25 grains of pure silver was the actual standard of value in this country from 1792 to 1834. By it the value of everything, *including gold*, was measured.

On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, after 1834, as has been shown both by my historical résumé and by the question of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS], the silver coins were at a premium as measured in gold. That was why, Mr. Chairman, silver retired from circulation. That was why the act of 1853 was necessary.

WHAT WAS SAID IN 1853.

In discussing the coinage act of February 21, 1853, above referred to, when it was pending before the House, Representative Skelton, of New Jersey, said, among other things:

Gold is the only standard of value by which all property is now measured; it is virtually the only currency of the country.—*Congressional Globe*, Volume XXVI, second session Thirty-second Congress, page 629.

Representative Dunham, of Indiana, who had the measure in charge in the House, speaking on the same point, said:

We intend to do what the best writers on political economy have approved, what experience, where the experiment has been tried, has demonstrated to be best, and what the committee believe to be necessary and proper—to make but one standard of currency and to make all others subservient to it. *We mean to make the gold the standard coin.*—*Congressional Globe*, Volume XXVII, page 190.

In another part of the same speech Mr. Dunham said:

Another objection urged against this proposed change is that it gives us a standard of gold only. * * * What advantage is to be obtained by a standard of the two metals, which is not as well, if not much better, attained by a single standard, I am unable to perceive; while there are very great disadvantages resulting from it, as the experience of every nation which has attempted to maintain it has proved. * * * Indeed, it is utterly impossible that you should long at a time maintain a double standard. * * * Gentlemen talk about a double standard of gold and silver as a thing that exists and

that we propose to change. We have had but a single standard for the last three or four years. *That has been and now is gold. We propose to let it remain so and to adapt silver to it; to regulate it by it.*—*Congressional Globe*, Volume XXVII, page 192.

And, as showing that the intention expressed by Mr. Dunham was actually enacted, we note that section 4 of the act itself contains this provision:

SEC. 4. *And be it further enacted*, That such coins shall be paid out at the mint, in exchange *for gold coins* at par, in sums not less than $100.

From the above, Mr. Chairman, it will readily be seen what was regarded as the standard of value in 1853. Mr. Dunham's statement that we had had the gold standard "for the last three or four years" had reference to the period during which—from 1849 on—we had the actual physical embodiment of the standard in the form of the one-dollar gold piece. But, as I have shown, this physical embodiment was not necessary to fix the fact of the gold dollar being the standard. It had then, in fact, been the standard for fifteen years. The coinage of the gold dollar was the recognition of the preexisting fact.

GOLD THE ACTUAL STANDARD EVEN DURING THE CIVIL WAR.

And, Mr. Chairman, even during the civil war and the years following it, when we had only paper currency, gold was the actual measure of value, the actual standard. The paper in circulation did not even pretend to be money. On its very face it was only a promise to pay money. A measure of length must have length, a measure of weight must have weight, and a measure of value must itself have value. That paper currency, having in itself no value, could not be a standard or measure of value. Whenever people wanted to know what this paper currency was worth, what did they ask? They never asked, Mr. Chairman, how much it was worth *in silver*. No one ever dreamed of such a question. The question always was, How much is the currency worth *in gold*?

"COIN" BONDS HAVE ALWAYS BEEN GOLD BONDS.

The act of 1853 completely justified the expectations of its advocates by furnishing to the country all the coin, both of gold and of silver, that the business of the country needed. This became so evident that on the fourth anniversary of its passage—on February 21, 1857—an act was passed repealing all acts giving foreign coins legal-tender quality, and providing that foreign coins received at the Treasury should be recoined on the plan provided in the act of 1853.

Thus, at the breaking out of the civil war we had a purely American coinage, gold being the standard and being coined on private account, the only silver coins in use being the subsidiary coins made on Government account, which by the act of 1853, as stated by Mr. Dunham, were adapted in value to and regulated by gold.

When, therefore, on February 25, 1862, an act was passed for the issue of $500,000,000 of 5-20 bonds, the faith of the Government being pledged to pay them, principal and interest, in coin, that word "coin" meant and could mean only gold coin. We had only, as has been shown, gold coin and subsidiary silver. The silver dollar piece was not even a memory. It would be ridiculous to suppose that Congress meant that a lot of subsidiary silver was to be gathered up with which to pay the bonds. It would be worse than ridiculous, for in the act of 1853 providing for these silver coins it was expressly provided that they should be a legal tender only to the extent of $5.

This act of February 25, 1862, also authorized the first issue of the greenback. It is worth while, therefore, to note its exact language on the matter of paying the bonds. It is as follows:

SEC. 5. That all duties on imported goods shall be paid in coin, and the coin so paid shall be set apart as a special fund and shall be applied as follows:

First. To the payment in coin of the interest on the bonds and notes of the United States.

Second. To the purchase or payment of 1 per cent of the entire debt of the United States to be made within each fiscal year after the 1st day of July, 1862.

The understanding of the officers of the Government charged with the execution of the law is seen in the fact that they collected all duties on imports in *gold* coin, except sums less than $5, which could be paid in the subsidiary silver.

Speaking on the bill which authorized these bonds, Thaddeus Stevens, of Pennsylvania, said:

A dollar in a miser's safe, unproductive, is a sore disturbance. Where could they invest it? In United States loans at 6 per cent, redeemable in gold in twenty years—the best and most valuable investment that could be desired. * * * I pity no one who has his money invested in United States bonds, payable in gold in twenty years, with interest semiannually.—*Congressional Globe*, Volume XLVI, page 668.

It is plain, therefore, that, though "not so nominated in the bond," these bonds were to be paid, principal and interest, in gold coin.

WHAT LINCOLN UNDERSTOOD TO BE THE STANDARD.

In the fall of 1862 the twenty-year bonds issued in 1842 matured. Although they contained no proviso as to the kind of money they were to be paid in, and although at that time we had in our ordinary business "suspended specie payments," the duty of the country was plain, and these bonds were paid in gold. This shows that Abraham Lincoln and his advisers recognized not only that gold was then the standard, but also that it had been the standard back even to 1842.

WHAT PRESIDENT GRANT SAID IN 1869.

In Volume VII of the admirable compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents made by our colleague from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON], the distinguished leader on the other side of the House, I find, beginning on page 27, the first annual message of President Grant. It is dated December 6, 1869. On page 29 I find two paragraphs which are interesting in this connection as showing what President Grant, in common with everybody else, then understood by "specie" or "coin." He said:

Among the evils growing out of the rebellion and not yet referred to is that of an irredeemable currency. It is an evil which I hope will receive your most earnest attention. It is a duty and one of the highest duties of government to secure to the citizen a medium of exchange of fixed, unvarying value. This implies a return to a specie basis, and no substitute for it can be devised. It should be commenced now and reached at the earliest practicable moment consistent with a fair regard to the interests of the debtor class. Immediate resumption, if practicable, would not be desirable. It would compel the debtor class to pay beyond their contracts the premium *on gold* at the date of their purchase, and would bring bankruptcy and ruin to thousands. Fluctuation, however, in the paper value of *the measure of all values* (*gold*) is detrimental to the interests of trade. It makes the man of business an involuntary gambler, for in all sales where future payment is to be made both parties speculate as to what will be the value of the currency to be paid and received. I earnestly recommend to you, then, such legislation as will insure a gradual return to specie payments and put an immediate stop to fluctuations in the value of currency.

The methods to secure the former of these results are as numerous as are the speculators on political economy. To secure the latter I see but one way, and that is to authorize the Treasury to redeem its own paper, at a fixed price, whenever presented, and to withhold from circulation all currency so redeemed until sold again *for gold*.

WHAT WAS UNDERSTOOD IN 1869 TO 1873.

When in latter part of 1869 the first draft of what afterwards became the much-discussed act of 1873 was sent by Comptroller of the Currency Knox to the Director of the Mint, Dr. Linderman, it contained provision for the coinage of a silver dollar of 384 grains, which was exactly the weight of two of the half dollars, and like them it was to be coined on Government account and to have a legal-tender power of $5.

Commenting on this feature of the proposed measure, Dr. Linderman, said:

Section 11 reduces the weight of the silver dollar from 412½ to 384 grains. I can see no good reason for the proposed reduction in the weight of this coin. It would be better, in my opinion, to discontinue its issue altogether. *The gold dollar is really the legal unit and measure of value.* Having a higher value as bullion than its nominal value, the silver dollar long ago ceased to be a coin of circulation, and, being of no practical use whatever, its issue should be discontinued.

At that same time Mr. J. Ross Snowden, superintendent of the mint at Philadelphia, in discussing the same point, said:

It is quite true that the silver dollar, being more valuable than two half dollars or four quarter dollars, will not be used as a circulating medium, but only for cabinets, and perhaps to supply some occasional or local demand; yet I think there is no necessity for so considerable a piece as the dollar to be struck from the metal which is only worth 94 cents.

On January 9, 1872, in discussing the mintage act then pending, and of which he had charge, Representative Hooper said on this floor:

The silver dollar of 412½ grains, by reason of its bullion or intrinsic value being greater than its nominal value, long since ceased to be a coin of circulation, and is melted by manufacturers of silverware. It does not circulate now in commercial transactions with any country, and the convenience of these manufacturers in this respect can better be met by supplying small stamped bars of the same standard, avoiding the useless expense of coining the dollar for that purpose.

And on the same day, in discussing the same bill, Representative Kelley, of Pennsylvania, said:

Every coin that is not gold is subsidiary. I repeat it, sir. Every coin that is not gold is subsidiary.

We may note, further, that the "reserve" which was accumulated for the resumption of "specie" payments in 1879 was a gold reserve, and that has been its character ever since.

It would seem unnecessary, Mr. Chairman, to produce further evidence, though it could easily be greatly multiplied, to show that through all the years since 1834 "coin" and "specie" have both meant *gold*.

The money received for the outstanding obligations of the Government was gold coin of the present standard weight and fineness, or its equivalent, and in simple honesty we should make payment in the same kind of money. This is the expressed purpose of the pending measure.

WHY THE GOLD STANDARD IS REAFFIRMED.

Section 1 of the bill provides that "the standard unit of value shall, as now, be the dollar, and shall consist of 25.8 grains of gold nine-tenths fine, or 23.22 grains of pure gold, being the one-tenth part of the eagle." Section 2 provides that all obligations of the Government for the payment of money, now existing or hereafter to be entered into, shall be payable in gold coin of the United States as defined in section 1.

In view of the fact that ever since 1834, as we have seen, our

actual standard of value has been 25.8 grains of standard gold "nine-tenths fine," the question may be asked why the declarations in sections 1 and 2 are made. Our answer is that the declarations are made with the view of putting beyond cavil or question the integrity of the nation's purpose.

But, since the nation has always dealt honorably with its creditors, why should any declaration of honorable purpose now be necessary? The declaration is deemed to be necessary by reason of the fact that a large number of our citizens, including members of both Houses of Congress, seem to believe that it would be honorable to resume the coinage of silver dollars on private account and with the dollars thus made pay the outstanding obligations of the Government.

About four years ago a resolution to that effect, known as the Teller resolution, received a large number of votes in both Houses; and undoubtedly most of those votes were cast by men who sincerely believed that in so voting they were doing right. Many of those men are both able and honorable. They feel that it should be contended for in the future. It is worth while, therefore, for us to examine candidly the argument by which they justify their action to themselves and to the world.

THE ARGUMENT FOR THE TELLER RESOLUTION.

I shall endeavor to state fully and fairly, though briefly, the argument of those who believe that the action proposed in the Teller resolution would have been honorable then and would be just and honorable now. They say that—

1. Practically all of the outstanding interest-bearing obligations of the Government have been issued under the authority of the act of Congress approved July 14, 1870, known as the refunding act.

2. The language of that act is that the obligations therein authorized are "redeemable in coin of the present standard value."

3. At the time of the passage of the refunding act the one-dollar silver piece could still lawfully be coined on private account.

4. Therefore, they say, it would be in accordance with the law under which these obligations have been issued, and therefore right and honorable, to resume the coinage of silver dollars on private account and with the dollars thus coined pay these obligations.

5. The correctness of this conclusion, they say, is shown by the fact that when, in February, 1895, President Cleveland recommended the issuance of bonds payable specifically in gold coin, whereby there would be a saving in interest, the proposition was defeated in the House by a vote of 167 to 120.

It is true, Mr. Chairman, that practically all of the interest-bearing obligations of the Government now outstanding, even those issued in 1895, were issued under authority granted by the refunding act of 1870. It is true that the obligations authorized by that act were by its terms "redeemable in coin of the present standard value." It is true that at the time of the passage of the refunding act the mints of the United States could still be used for the coinage of silver dollars on private account. It is also true that in 1895 this House voted down a proposition to authorize the issuance of United States bonds specifically payable in gold coin.

The truth of the allegations in paragraphs 1, 2, 3, and 5 above being admitted, the argument of our friends on the other side would seem on casual examination to be unanswerable and their conclusion, as expressed in paragraph 4, to be correct. It is right here, sir, in the apparent conclusiveness of their argument and the seeming righteousness of their conclusion, that the necessity for and the justification of our proposed action lies. If their argument were less likely to mislead, the necessity for our action would be less great. It is little wonder, sir, that an argument seemingly so well grounded in fact should have misled men who are both able and honest. Herein is the necessity for stating the real truth and putting the duty and purpose of the country beyond all possibility of question; so that at any time in the future, unless a change should be made in the law itself, no matter what party may control the executive department, the good name of the Government may be preserved.

THE FALLACY OF THE TELLER ARGUMENT.

The fundamental trouble with our friends and their argument is that *they do not distinguish between form and fact*. As a matter of legal form, silver dollars *might*, in 1870, have been coined on private account for use as money; but, as a matter of actual fact, they had not been so coined for nearly three-quarters of a century. As we have seen, the silver dollar had long since ceased to be even a memory. When men spoke of "coin," they did not at that time think of the silver dollar.

In order to find authority for the coinage of the silver dollar on private account, our friends must hark back to the original coinage act under the Constitution, approved April 2, 1792. Here is an extract from an act almost as old, one approved May 8, 1792:

Every able-bodied citizen of the respective States, resident therein, who is of the age of 18 years and under the age of 45 years, shall be enrolled in the militia.

Every citizen shall, after notice of his enrollment, be constantly provided with a good musket or firelock, of a bore sufficient for balls of the eighteenth part of a pound, a sufficient bayonet and belt, two spare flints and a knapsack, a pouch with a box therein to contain not less than 24 cartridges, suited to the bore of his musket or firelock, each cartridge to contain a proper quantity of powder and ball.

It would be interesting, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House of Representatives, to know how many of us have, at any time in our lives, complied with the plain provision of law requiring us to be "constantly provided with a good musket or firelock, * * * two flints," etc. If arraigned for disobedience to the law, probably nine hundred and ninety-nine out of every thousand of our citizens, no matter how well informed they may be as to things in general, would unhesitatingly and somewhat resentfully say, "Why that law was repealed long, long ago, and I am justified in not heeding it. As a matter of fact, I never heard of it before." And yet, Mr. Chairman, *it has never been repealed* and is to-day one of the laws of the United States, as any one can see by consulting the Revised Statutes of the United States, sections 1625 and part of 1628 of which I have just read you.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what would anyone think of the justice of our Government if it should undertake to enforce that law now and punish anyone for disobedience to it? Though every one of us has failed to comply with the provision of law referred to, every one of us is morally and legally absolved from wrongdoing by reason of the fact that long before we were born that part of the law had fallen into "innocuous desuetude." When enacted it met, as understood by Congress, a public need. It then possessed real vitality. But in process of time and the progress of events we outgrew it; and, although it was never formally repealed, it passed from the memory of men and ceased to have vitality or legal force.

The only provision of law ever enacted in this country authorizing the coinage of the silver dollar on private account was that contained in the mintage act of April 2, 1792. At the time of its enactment that provision met what Congress understood to be a public need. But, like the provision of the militia act above referred to, in the process of time and the progress of events, as detailed fully earlier in my remarks, it fell completely into disuse.

In 1870 the act of 1792 authorizing the coinage of the silver dollar on private account for use as money had no more vitality than had that other act of 1792 which required every citizen of a certain age to be constantly provided with a firelock and two flints. When the refunding act of 1870 was passed there had not been for more than two generations, as we have seen, any silver dollars coined on private account for use as money. Men then old had never used nor seen used an American silver dollar. Although the silver-dollar provision of the act of April 2, 1792, had not been formally repealed, it had long since ceased to serve its purpose, and had fallen out of the memory of practically all men, except the few who, in the language of the petition above given, were "engaged in buying or melting silver coin."

It is right and proper, morally and legally, that the refunding act of 1870, like any other law, should be construed in accordance with the evident intention of those who enacted it. And it is beyond a peradventure that when the word "coin" was used in that act it was not the intention of Congress to include therein the silver dollar piece. Hence there is no ground for the contention that it would now be just and honorable to resume the coinage of the silver dollar on private account and with the dollars thus coined pay the outstanding interest-bearing obligations of the Government.

On the other hand, it is expressly declared in the refunding act of 1870 that all the obligations of the Government issued under its authority should be "redeemable in coin of the present standard value."

What was the coin then recognized as "of standard value?" When talking without this special point in mind our friends on the other side do not even claim that the silver dollar was then at par or that it was the standard. Over and over again we have heard them claim that at that time every silver dollar then in existence was worth 103 cents, that the silver dollar was "at a premium" of 3 cents. At a premium measured in what, Mr. Chairman? When we have answered that question, we have determined what was the real standard of value at that time.

There is only one answer, Mr. Chairman. No one contends that there can be any other. The answer is that the silver dollar was at a premium as *measured by the gold dollar of 25.8 grains of standard gold*.

Thus by their own testimony, Mr. Chairman, do we establish the fact that in 1870, when the refunding act was passed, the "coin of present standard value" was gold coin made at the rate of 25.8 grains of standard gold or 23.22 grains of pure gold to the dollar. It is in that coin or its equivalent, sir, that we are bound both morally and legally to pay the outstanding obligations of the Government.

That coin or its equivalent, Mr. Chairman. For, as a matter of fact, any and all kinds of money now in circulation in the United

States may be used and are used in making these payments, because under our present system all of our money is kept at a parity with the gold coin above described. And the meaning of the bill now pending is that all of the obligations of the Government shall be paid, in the future as in the past, in gold coin or its equivalent, in that which was in 1870 understood by all men to be "coin of the present standard value." [Applause on the Republican side.]

As to the defeat in 1895 of the proposition to authorize the issue of bonds specifically payable in gold coin, it is sufficient to say that nearly all of those on our side of the House who voted against the proposition did so because, holding that *all* our bonds are payable in gold coin or its equivalent, it did not seem wise to do anything which might be construed as permitting a question to be raised as to the character of payment due on the other obligations then outstanding.

"THE LAST BATTLE."

After the campaign of 1896, Mr. Chairman, the gifted leader of the "free silver" forces, a gentleman for whom I have only kind personal regard, published or furnished the material for a book entitled "The First Battle." In all human probability, sir, he will again be the standard bearer of his party. With him as the leader the platform will be of little consequence. He is his own platform. Under his leadership "free silver" can hardly fail to be a prominent issue, however much his counselors may endeavor to keep it in the background, for with that issue his name and fame are inextricably associated.

It is always risky, sir, to enter the field of prophecy. But I venture the prediction now that next winter the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska will not be burdened with public duties or responsibilities. He will have an abundance of time at his disposal and an abundance of materials in his possession for another book, an appropriate title for which would be "The Last Battle." For, sir, history shows that a nation having so far advanced in civilization as to adopt definitely the gold standard never abandons it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

After another and even more crushing defeat on the question of the standard, in the battle between honesty and dishonesty—for, sir, that after all is the real issue involved—it would not surprise me if our Democratic brethren would take time enough to think the matter over. On recovering from their hysteria they may upon reflection recall the fact that the gold standard, which we are now defending, was given to the country in 1834 by the Democratic party under the leadership of a man who had no sympathy with either dishonesty or disorder—Andrew Jackson. They may, on further reading of their country's history, discover that when the coinage act of 1853 was passed, whereby this country adopted the policy of coining silver on Government account, the Democratic party was in control of both Houses of Congress, and that impartial history credits to the Democratic party the solution of the problem of getting gold and silver to circulate side by side in the channels of trade. What the Democratic party most needs at this time, sir, is an increase in proper party pride to guide it out of the Populistic slough into which it has been led.

THE PRESENT NATIONAL-BANK SYSTEM NOT AN IDEAL ONE.

Turning now to the banking feature of the bill, I regret that the short time remaining at my disposal will not allow me to do more than touch upon a few fundamental principles. I shall not in this part of my remarks, as I did not in those thus far made, attempt to discuss the details of the bill. That field was most admirably covered by my friend from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET].

I do not, Mr. Chairman, regard our present national-bank system as an ideally good one. My reasons for thinking so were given in my report on H. R. 10289 in the last Congress and need not be repeated in extenso here. We expect as a nation to pay our outstanding obligations. With the disappearance of our bonded indebtedness, if not sooner, will come the necessity for a complete revision of our banking system. I believe that a better one can be devised. But the present system has certain transcendent merits which must not be lost sight of or allowed to lapse. It is advisable on many accounts that the transition to a better system shall be a gradual one, taking its beginning in what we have. I believe that in the interest of the people our system of bank-note issues should be carefully and prudently liberalized. Because this bill moves in that direction, even though very slightly, I am in favor of it.

Though I do not regard the present banking system as an ideal one, as I have said, I can not forbear defending it from one charge that has been and probably will again be brought against it. Though apparently unimportant this charge has really had much influence on the mind of people unfamiliar with the subject.

THE NOTE-ISSUE IS NOT A LOAN BY THE GOVERNMENT TO THE BANKS.

Some years ago, Mr. Chairman, an old friend of mine said to me: "I am against the national-bank system because it provides a way whereby the banks can make a profit of 900 per cent a year at the expense of the Government." Wondering at his statement, but knowing that he had some reason that was satisfactory to himself at least for making it, I asked him to explain. In answer he said: "The Government lends money to the banks by giving them notes to circulate as money. On this money the Government charges a tax or interest of 1 per cent per annum. The banks lend these notes, getting for their use 10 per cent per annum. So for what costs them $1 they get $10, and that you know is a profit of 900 per cent."

I had supposed, sir, that such notions were buried years ago with the old subtreasury scheme of the Populists. But from statements recently heard on this floor I judge that even some members of Congress still entertain notions akin to those of my old friend. Inasmuch as the national banking system will be under discussion somewhat in the coming campaign, it may not be amiss, as above stated, to correct what appears to be a misapprehension. A plain statement of the truth can do no harm, and may do good.

If one of us should go to a printing office and get a bunch of blank promissory notes to be filled out, signed, and used whenever we wish to buy a horse or other piece of property, which we can not then pay for, would it ever occur to us to say that the printer had given or loaned us money? Hardly. No more than if we wrote the note on a piece of blank paper purchased from him. The note issued is our note. It is to be paid at maturity, not by the printer, but by us.

Would it alter the case any if there were only one printer who could print blank notes and he required every person getting blank notes from him to leave with him sufficient property to guarantee that the notes would be paid when due? No; because the printer would then become simply the trustee or custodian of the property furnished by us to secure our own notes. But under such circumstances the printer would probably print on the face of the note a statement to the effect that it was secured by property held by him; and then to protect his own good name he would find it necessary to print on each note the amount promised by it, so that the people to whom the note blanks might be issued could be prevented from filling them in with amounts greater than the property held in trust for their payment would justify.

The Government is the printer of the blank notes for the national banks. The promise to pay is the promise of the bank, not the promise of the Government. The bank, not the Government, must furnish the means of payment. The Government is also the custodian of the property of the bank, which is held in trust for payment in case the bank should fail to pay out of its other money or property. What the Government hands out to the bank is simply the blank note of the bank—the bank's promise to pay—which, on being signed by the proper officers of the bank, becomes the obligation of the bank.

It is apparent, therefore, that the note issue is not in any sense a loan by the Government to the banks.

WHY THE GOVERNMENT PRINTS THE NATIONAL-BANK NOTES.

But why does the Government do the engraving and printing of the notes of the bank? And who pays the expense of such engraving and printing?

The answer takes us back to the origin of national banks. In the midst of the civil war the credit of the Government had sunk so low that it became necessary to take extraordinary steps to increase its credit and create a market for its bonds. With this object in view an act was passed that banks issuing circulating notes should be taxed at the rate of 10 per cent per annum of the face of such notes. But provision was made that circulating notes might be issued with a tax of 1 per cent if the issuing bank would comply with certain conditions, the most important of which, in connection with our present inquiry, was that each bank desiring to issue notes should buy Government bonds and deposit them with the Treasurer of the United States as security for the payment of the notes issued. Upon the deposit of bonds, as aforesaid, the bank was authorized to issue notes not to exceed in amount 90 per cent of the face value of the bonds deposited. With this brief and incomplete statement before us, we are in position to answer the questions proposed above.

Why does the Government engrave and print the national-bank notes? There are at least three good reasons for that course:

1. Under our system of bond-secured notes it is necessary for the Government to have charge of the engraving and printing of the notes in order to control the volume of their issue. On the face of each national-bank note is the statement that it is secured by the deposit of United States bonds with the Treasurer of the United States. If the Government could not control the volume of notes issued by each bank it would be possible for the banks to issue more notes than the deposit of bonds would justify. The first and great reason, then, why the Government engraves and prints the national-bank notes is to be sure to *keep the issue of each bank within the bounds prescribed by law.*

2. An incidental gain in having the notes all printed at one place is that thereby is secured to all the notes *uniformity of appearance.* Instead of having to become acquainted with a thousand different forms of such currency, people have to learn to recognize only one.

3. Another incidental gain in having the Government do the engraving and printing of the notes is that in that way we secure always the very best of engraving, and thereby *the danger of counterfeiting is reduced to a minimum.*

All the expense of engraving and printing is paid for by the banks, respectively, each paying the expense connected with the issue of its own notes.

As to the alleged profit in issuing national-bank notes, it will suffice here to say that after buying its bonds at a premium and paying the expenses incident to the note issue the national banks find little or no profit in the note issue. Their principal profit in organizing as national banks comes from the fact that the very title "national bank" gives them a certain prestige in the community, whereby they increase their business.

THE ISSUE OF PAPER CURRENCY IS NOT A GOVERNMENT FUNCTION.

Many good and honest people sincerely believe that the issue of paper currency is a Government function. Indeed, my talented friend from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], for whom I have great admiration, surprised me the other day by saying in his speech that he entertained that opinion. I am sorry that my friend is not here this afternoon, for I would like to ask him a question. But perhaps some other strong man on that side of the House will answer it.

The question is this: If it is the function and duty of the Government to issue the paper currency, why, during all the years before the civil war, when the Democratic party for so long controlled the Government—why, I say, was no Government paper currency then issued? And if it be good Democratic doctrine that the Government should issue the paper currency, why did the Democratic party oppose the issue of the greenbacks? Are the utterances which we hear, Mr. Chairman, to be taken as further evidence that the Democratic party of to-day is denying the faith of the fathers of the party?

A distinguished son of Connecticut, Mr. Jacob L. Greene, in an address before the Hartford Board of Trade on November 23, 1897, put this matter so admirably that I can not forbear quoting a part of his address. Mr. Greene said:

CREDIT CURRENCY BUT AN INSTRUMENT OF TRADE.

No statement can be more apparently trite and unnecessary than this: That the distinguishing characteristic of a paper currency, because its only source of value, is that it is a credit currency; that it is not money in any accurate sense, for it is not the substance of value—that is, property itself; that it simply represents either the metal money it promises or some other actual property substance of a value expressed in terms of that money, which money or value have not yet passed to the possession of the credit holder, but are promised him thereby; that it is but a title deed to property purchased, but yet to be delivered; that its value as currency depends entirely on the existence of and its control over the money or other property the right to which it conveys. But this simple, but oft forgotten, distinguishing fact bears directly on and determines three points, viz: (*a*) Who should utter such a credit—that is, who should be a borrower, emitting a currency evidencing his debt and promising its payment to bearer at sight, expecting it to be commonly and unhesitatingly received? (*b*) Where is the property, whence derived, and by whom held which is to liquidate the promise? (*c*) How is that property secured to the performance of the promise?

Another fundamental fact with a like definitive and limited bearing is this: Money and those other forms of currency which are not money themselves, but which promise it, are but the instruments of trade, have no use or existence apart from it, are developed out of, and in their nature and incidents are properly determined by, the exigencies and convenience of trade, which is the exchange of properties by their owners for mutual advantage, one property for another property, either of which may be actual money, or some other form of property substance or of service, measured in quantity by its value in such money. Money is useful and valuable only as it is or can be employed in trade and commerce. The credit currency is truthful and useful only as it has behind it the actual money or other property convertible into money, which it professes to promise or to represent, ready to be produced as properly demanded.

A third equally trite but fundamental and determining fact is this: Government is the organized instrument of a people in their political capacity only, and for the accomplishment of political purposes. Trade is not a political act or matter. The properties in exchanges are not owned by political bodies, but by private persons; they are not exchanged by governments, but by the citizens of governments; and the ownership and exchange of properties, whether material substances or valuable services, by the citizens of a government are not by virtue of their political relationship nor in their capacity as citizens, whether under one political form or another, but by virtue of the purely natural, economic, mutual relations of persons, each of whom has something the others need and needs something the others have. Every relation of trade, of need and supply, of production and consumption, of possession and want, as well as as every incident of the complex machinery whereby each most effectively answers the call or meets the offer of the other, is purely personal, individual, and nonpolitical; personal, individual, and nonpolitical in the need; personal, individual, and nonpolitical in the possession and exercise of the talent and faculty which can make response.

GOVERNMENT UNFITTED TO ISSUE CREDIT CURRENCY.

Two main propositions grow inevitably out of these facts as they bear upon the matter of a credit currency—the one by necessary exclusion, the other by necessary inference and as the only alternative:

First. The government, not being in trade, being neither buyer nor seller, producing and owning none of the properties which enter into trade, and having no property or resources whatever, except such as it takes from its citizens through taxation for its expenses of administration of whatever character, has no natural relation to the creation of a credit currency except to provide proper and effective legal remedies to safeguard it, and is not the proper party to issue it. Such an act is wholly foreign to its political functions of which commercial operations are no part in theory or fact. Moreover, government can not issue a credit currency and get it in circulation except by borrowing the amount for which the issue is made, nor can it make such a borrowing for such a purpose anything other than a forced loan unless it pays interest on its currency issues and sells it for what it will bring on its interest basis. It has no property with which to redeem, and only by taxation of its citizens can pay its debt to them, which act would extinguish the currency itself.

Manifestly, a government can not be an issuer of a legitimate and permanent credit currency. It can, by coinage, certify the quantity and quality of the money metals brought to it for that purpose by its citizens, and provide the proper remedies and machinery for the enforcement of the many commercial contracts made by them. These are its proper political acts respecting the commerce and business of its citizens. But it has no other natural or permanent relations with trade, the properties involved in and constituting which are the foundation and only source of all true credits—that is, of credits with existing property behind them for their solvency. For property precedes and creates credit. Credit which precedes property is speculation.

* * * * * * * *

It is a common assertion that a currency issued by government or one founded upon other debts of the government has the whole wealth of the nation behind it for its solvency—a promise to the ear which has been broken to the hope through all history. A government currency, no matter what its name or form, has behind it only that margin of the wealth of the country which can be extorted by taxation for the purpose of currency redemption. The question of the solvency of a currency in anywise representing a government debt is the question of how much taxation the people will stand in order to pay the debt. Our own colonial and Revolutionary history alone has been full of answers upon that question, fatal to the truth of the theory. The wealth of the country is actually available for such a purpose in only a very small part.

THE MAKING OF NOTES IS A PERSONAL RIGHT.

If a farmer needs a team of horses to put in his crop but has not at the time the means to pay for the team, and if a neighbor has a team which fills the bill and which he is willing to let the farmer have on his written promise to pay at a specified time in the future, whose permission would you deem it necessary for the farmer to ask before giving his note and closing the deal? Does anyone believe that the permission of any public officer should first be secured? Does anyone need to be told that the right to issue that note is an inherent personal right of the farmer?

Suppose that three or four farmers conclude that they would like to buy and operate a threshing machine, but have not the means at hand to pay for one. Suppose that the threshing machine company is willing to let the men have the machine, to be paid for later, taking in the meantime their written promise to pay. Whose consent should those men be required to get before giving their joint note? Is there anything necessary except that they give the note voluntarily and that with equal freedom of choice the machine company accepts it?

Take the case of a cooperative creamery company which needs a new piece of machinery which it can not at the time pay for. Suppose that a company which manufactures such machinery is willing to let the creamery company have the machine, taking its note, properly signed by the officers of the company, whose business is it? Whose consent is needed other than that of the creamery company and that of the machinery company?

Suppose that the farmer who in the first illustration sold the team, taking the farmer's note, wishes to buy a flock of sheep from a third party and that third party is willing to accept in payment the note of the farmer given for the horses. Whose permission should be asked before the trade is made? Is it not evident that the note could be passed on from one person to another as a means of effecting exchanges, the condition being that each party to each transaction proffered or accepted the note of his own free will?

Would it alter the case any if the note were one payable on demand instead of at a future time? Certainly not. Would it alter the conclusion if the note were issued by several people jointly and payable on demand? Most assuredly not. Would it invalidate our conclusion as to the inherent right of note issue if the note were made payable on demand and were issued by a company, say by a creamery company? Certainly not. Would it be considered a detriment to the note or an objection to its issue if the company issuing it kept itself at all times ready to pay on demand, as promised? Hardly. But the only kind of a company which, in the nature of things, can keep itself at all times ready to meet its demand obligations is a bank. Therefore what?

It will be found upon examination, sir, that legislation in relation to banks does not confer privileges, but restricts natural rights.

THE EFFICIENCY OF BANK CURRENCY.

Bank checks and drafts and bank notes constitute by far the most important part of our currency. For example, on January 1, 1898, the total volume of our currency was as follows:

Gold coin and certificates	$584,126,049
Silver coin and certificates	503,906,973
Government demand notes	409,239,863
Total Government currency	1,497,272,885
National-bank notes	223,827,755
Deposits subject to check	3,210,705,758
Total bank currency	3,434,533,513

In the above table the "deposits subject to check" are those in national, State, and private banks. This does not include deposits in savings banks or other deposits not subject to check.

The volume of bank currency, therefore, is more than double that of government currency. Moreover, it does an immensely larger proportion of the actual work of commerce. The last investigation of the Comptroller of the Currency to determine the relative usefulness of our various forms of money and currency, made July 1, 1896, showed that of every $100 of business transacted through the banks the several forms were used in the following proportions: Gold, 60 cents; silver, 50 cents; greenbacks, silver certificates, Treasury notes, and national-bank notes, $6.30; bank checks, drafts, etc., $92.50. The clearing-house returns of the country show that the bank checks and drafts constitute a currency which annually performs exchanges of property to the amount of over $50,000,000,000; and a great many checks, estimated at $20,000,000,000, are used as currency every year which do not go through the clearing houses.

WHY THERE ARE LIMITATIONS ON BANK-NOTE ISSUES.

No one would think of objecting to a bank's receiving deposits payable on demand on presentation of checks. But the bank note is simply a demand obligation of the bank, essentially like the check. Why, then, should the public interfere with the issue of bank notes? Why should the Government limit the right of the bank to issue its demand obligations in the form of notes, which for some of its customers may be a more serviceable form than the check? The purpose is not primarily to protect the holder of the note from loss, because he accepts the note voluntarily, and has his legal remedy as when he takes any other note. The bank note has no legal-tender quality as between individuals, and of course should have none. *No note should be of compulsory acceptance.* No one should be *compelled* to accept a promise, no matter by whom made, as the fulfilment of an obligatton.

Until well along in this century the issuing of notes was regarded, and is still in certain sense regarded, as inherent in the nature of a bank. The reason for the regulation of bank-note issues was exceptionally well expressed by former Secretary of the Treasury Hon. Charles S. Fairchild in his statement before the Committee on Banking and Currency in January, 1898. He said:

I conceive that the way Government gets its right to interfere as to these demand obligations is this: They were found to be a most useful instrument in transferring property and services from man to man. To attain their highest usefulness, however, it was necessary that they should have great rapidity of movement, and in order to attain that rapidity of movement the receiver of them must be saved the necessity of looking to the credit of the issuing party, whoever he might be.

Therefore Government properly came in and devised a system by which they shall be issued and then certifies that they are issued under that system. So that a man who takes a note, if he knows how good the system is, can know how good the note is, and he does not have to stop to look further. He has to know one large thing instead of a vast number of smaller things.

Now, that is the same service exactly that the Government performs when it coins pieces of bullion. In the case of silver another service is performed, because with the silver dollars the Government has put a certain degree of promise behind them; but take a piece of gold—and it would be the same way with silver if we had the free coinage of silver with no Government credit behind it—and what the Government does in that instance is simply to take the piece of bullion from the owner of it and put it in a certain form and certify that it is such a quantity and of such a quality. The Government does not contribute any capital; it does not put anything into the bullion transaction; it does not confer much benefit upon the owner of the bullion, because he could put the weight and the quality on it if the Government did not do that, but it does confer a very great benefit upon the people who want to use that bullion for the transfer of their property and services, in that it saves them the trouble of assaying and weighing.

The Government does the same thing with a bank note. It does not put any capital into it. It does not give it any credit, except that it provides a system and certifies that it is issued under that system. The Government performs a great service in that way, of course, to the people who want to use bank notes, and in both cases it performs a great service to the whole community in that it diminishes the amount of bullion and the number of bank notes necessary to carry on the transactions of the community, because it gives them both greater rapidity of movement and causes less of them to be required for the same volume of transactions.

If that is a true statement of the Government's functions in regard to bank notes, it has always seemed to me we should approach the subject with the fact in view that the duty of Government is not to repress these things, but to go on in the direction of the principle, the philosophy, which has given it its right to interfere at all, and simply provide for the greatest facility of movement, that being dependent on the goodness of the system that it devised, and, having done that, leave the people to take care of themselves.

Mr. CLAYTON of New York. Mr. Chairman, in view of what the gentleman from Minnesota has said, I would like to ask him if he would favor a return to the issue of State-bank notes?

Mr. McCLEARY. My dear friend, the memory of years gone by admonishes me that there is a place where the police power of the Government had better be exercised. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

Many years ago a man running a steamboat down the Missouri River found that he was almost out of wood. He kept watching the shore line to find some. You know the Missouri River is not prolific of wood piles throughout its whole length. He finally came to a clump of trees, and right on the bank was a pile of wood. He said, "Ahoy there!" No answer. Again he said, "Ahoy there!" Pretty soon a man came out and said, "Well, what do you want?" "Is that wood for sale?" "Yes; what do you think I piled it up here for? Just for fun?" "Will you take State-bank notes for it?" "Why, certainly." "How?" "Even up, cord for cord!" [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] That, sir, indicates what my answer to the gentleman's question might be.

Seriously, however, Mr. Chairman, the odium attached to many of the State-bank systems does not apply to all. The systems of Massachusetts, New York, Ohio, Indiana, and Louisiana were all safe and performed an exceedingly valuable service. They are well worthy of our study to-day.

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman permit another question?

Mr. McCLEARY. Certainly, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SIMS. Would it not, in your opinion, be better to redeem the greenbacks and destroy them utterly than to treat them as you people are treating them in this bill?

Mr. McCLEARY. As the gentleman says, this bill does not in any way point to the retirement of the greenbacks. It simply makes provision against what has come to be known as "the endless chain."

On my own responsibility as a man and as a Representative, and disclaiming any right or purpose to speak for anyone else, I am perfectly willing to say to the gentleman, since he asks my opinion, that in my judgment it would be the wise thing for the Government to keep its promise, gradually and prudently pay the greenbacks, put them into the fire and burn them up, or otherwise retire them from circulation, just as you or I would do with our promissory notes. [Applause on the Republican side.] This view I have expressed to my constituents on numerous occasions; and while some of them honestly differ with me on this point, they expect me to speak the truth and express my convictions here or elsewhere.

It is to be understood, sir, that what I have just said is said on my personal responsibility. I do not presume to speak for anyone else.

Mr. HILL. Count me in.

Mr. RIDGELY. I hope that the Official Reporter will note the applause on the Republican side of the House in response to the proposition to burn the greenbacks.

Mr. McCLEARY. The proposition to retire the greenbacks should be met with approval by Democrats, for in the national Democratic platform of 1876 there is a plank "denouncing" the "failure, for all these eleven years of peace, to make good the promise of the legal-tender notes, * * * the nonpayment of which is a disregard of the plighted faith of the nation."

Mr. CARMACK. I understand the gentleman to say that he thinks that will eventually be done.

Mr. McCLEARY. I am not a prophet nor the son of a prophet, sir. I am merely saying what I should like to see done, because I believe in my heart of hearts that it is the wise thing for the people of the United States to do.

WHY THE GREENBACKS SHOULD BE RETIRED.

And now, Mr. Chairman, since the subject has come up, let me give one or two of my reasons for thinking that the greenbacks should be retired. This will divert a little from the course of my remarks, but the diversion may not be amiss.

Mr. HILL. It is a good diversion.

Mr. McCLEARY. My time has almost expired, and I must be very brief. Moreover, I discussed the subject at length in House Report No. 1575, Fifty-fifth Congress, second session.

In the first place, they should be retired because national honor demands it. When these notes were issued, the action was justified only by the necessities of the nation. Their issue was believed to be necessary to the carrying on of the war for the preservation of the Union. But it was expressly stated and understood that as soon as possible after the necessity had been met they should be paid and, of course, canceled and retired.

And no sentiment of gratitude can here weigh in the minds of those who believe that "the greenbacks saved the Union;" for even if that were granted, which it is not, the sentiment could only apply to those particular notes which were in circulation during the war, and they were all canceled and destroyed long ago. Those now in use had nothing to do with the war. Their continued use must be defended as part of a system if it can be defended at all.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ALLEN of Maine). The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. McCLEARY. I should like about ten minutes more.

Mr. SIMS. I hope the gentleman from Minnesota will get the extension of time. You could not give it to a gentleman who would handle the subject better on your side.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have ten minutes more.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I suppose that is to be charged to your side?

Mr. OVERSTREET. Charged to this side.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLEARY. I thank the committee for its courtesy, and shall try not to trespass on its patience.

As I was about to say when the Chairman very properly interrupted me, I shall not attempt to discuss the matter in all its phases or try to present all of the many reasons for the retirement of the greenbacks.

One great reason for retiring them—one that has not, so far as I know, been clearly brought out—is that, being a credit instrument in form and partly in substance, they yet fail to perform and stand in the way of the performance of the chief function of a credit instrument, namely, to effect a reduction of interest rates. It must not be forgotten, Mr. Chairman, that there are borrowers as well as lenders in this country. A proper system of credit instruments and agencies helps to lower interest rates. Let me illustrate.

CREDIT CAN BE LOANED CHEAPER THAN CASH.

The corner stone of my argument on this point is the proposition that credit can be loaned cheaper than cash.

Suppose that I own a farm with a nice meadow and a good stream of water. It is a fine farm for fattening cattle, but I have few to feed. A short distance away lives a man who has bought a lot of cattle only to find that he lacks the faculty and his farm the facilities for handling cattle successfully. He offers his cattle for sale. I come to you and lay before you this proposition: "I can buy the drove for $500. Having plenty of pasturage, I can fatten the cattle in a few months and turn them off at a profit. I ask you to lend me the $500."

You inquire why the man owning the cattle wishes to sell them and I tell you that he owes the $500 to Mr. Blank. You say, "I know Mr. Blank. He does not need the money. He has simply become afraid to trust the other man. He and I have done business together for years. I will tell you what I will do. Instead of lending you the money, I will indorse your note. The man with the cattle will accept your note with my indorsement, because he can soon find out, if he does not already know, that Mr. Blank will gladly accept that note and discharge the obligation of the man who has the cattle."

Now, I ask which you could afford to do for me at least expense to me—go down into your pocket and let me have $500 in cash, every dollar of which cost you a hundred cents' worth of labor or property, or let me have the use of your good name; that is, your credit? There is no room for doubt as to the answer. Credit can be loaned so cheap that we often loan it to a friend without making any charge. That, of course, is friendship, not business, but it illustrates what I desire to impress—that credit can be loaned cheaper than cash.

In the case cited, after fattening and marketing the cattle I could pay the note which you indorsed for me and have a good profit left. This profit was made possible by reason of your kindness in loaning me your credit or insuring mine. By insuring my credit you rendered me a valuable service, for which I could well afford to pay you a reasonable sum.

THE FUNCTION OF BANKS.

If you should go into the business of insuring credits for others as you did for me, guaranteeing the credit of any man of good character engaged in legitimate business, like that in the illustration, it would not need any proof to show that you would be performing a valuable public service.

But that is precisely the function of banks—to insure the credits of people engaged in business. Originally the banker simply indorsed the note to be insured, as in the illustration. Later he kept the note and gave his own instead, exchanging his well-known credit for the less-known credit of his customer. Later still, he gave his customer a credit on his books and authorized him to check against it.

The banker should be able to effect this exchange of credit in the way that will best accommodate his customer. In places that are thickly populated, so that the people have convenient access to the banks, the form of bank credit usually preferred is the book credit to be checked against. But in the country districts the form preferred is the note or "bill," because it can be used by simply passing from one person to the other.

BANK NOTES VERSUS GREENBACKS.

The true bank note is just like your note or mine in that it comes forth when needed and retires when its work is done.

In the illustration above, where the cattle were bought, my note was brought into existence by the purchase of the cattle. It remained out, and passed on to the hands of a third party, performing the function of currency in satisfying a debt, and finally was paid and canceled when I sold the cattle. It was just as important to me to have it retire when its work was done as it was to have it promptly usable when I needed it. Speaking of that note as part of the currency, we notice that it was created in the process of producing something to satisfy man's needs, and was canceled in the process of consumption. Similarly, a true bank note comes forth when needed in business, circulates from hand to hand while there is work for it to do, and then when it is no longer needed it goes back into the bank.

The important thing to note is this: *While the bank note is in the till of the bank it is costing the community little or nothing*, because it costs the bank practically nothing to keep it in its till, just as it would cost you nothing to write a note payable on demand and then put it away in a safe place without using it.

But if the bank lends greenbacks *the community must pay for them, not only while it is using them, but also while they are in the vault of the bank*, because to the bank they are property which contains an investment of a hundred cents to the dollar.

Did you ever stop at a "summer hotel?" Did you ever wonder why the rates are higher than at a regular commercial hotel, open the year round, giving the same quality of service? You can readily figure out the reason. The "summer hotel" is open and earning money only two or three months of the year. But the owners have their money invested in it the whole year round. So those who go to the "summer hotel" must pay in the few weeks enough to give a return on the investment for the whole year. Hence the rates must be high.

Those who stay at the hotel must pay not only for what they get while there but also a share of the cost of carrying the property during the season when it is earning nothing.

Let us see how this illustration applies in the case of banking. If the bank can lend only gold, silver, and greenbacks or Treasury notes, each of which costs it a hundred cents on the dollar to get hold of, it must charge interest sufficient to cover not only the time that its funds are loaned out, but also for the time when they are lying in the till of the bank unloaned. Like the hotel, they are property, and must be earning returns not only while the community is getting the use of them but also while the bank is holding them in readiness for the community to use.

But suppose that the bank can issue, under a system which will make them absolutely safe in the hands of the people, true bank notes. The notes go out and serve the community, and for that service the community pays. The cattle buyer takes the notes or bills out into the country and buys cattle. The farmer uses part of them to pay his men. The men use them to buy goods with. The merchant deposits them and takes a credit on the books of the bank, to be checked against as he wishes. The notes have gone the round and served their purpose and are now back in the vaults of the bank. While lying in the vault of the bank they are not costing the bank anything, unlike the greenback under similar circumstances, and consequently the bank does not have to charge up to the community anything for carrying them.

In other words, *the community must pay for the use of the greenbacks all of the time, whether it uses them or not*, while it has to pay for the use of the bank notes only while it is using them. Change "community" to "country" and you will have the truth as applied to the country as a whole, namely, that the use of the greenback costs the country a great deal more than the same service through bank notes would cost. The interests of the country, therefore, are those which demand the retirement of the greenback.

It is evident that my argument is in the interest, not of the banker, but of the borrower; not of a class even, but of the country.

As I said before, this bill does not look to the retirement of the greenbacks. It looks only to rendering their existence as little dangerous as possible; and there is little likelihood that in the immediate future the question of their disposition will have serious consideration. But I submit that it is quite possible that in the not very distant future the question of the currency, whether it shall be issued by the Government or by the banks, may become a matter of controversy in this country. And it behooves every man, especially every man who is in responsible public position, to give some thought to this question lest, as so many did in the silver question, he commit himself to a view which careful study will show to be untenable.

Personally, after considerable study of the subject, I am firmly of the opinion that we should move away from a political currency toward a business currency; away from an inelastic and unresponsive currency toward one which is elastic and which responds promptly to the demands of business; away from the expensive currency which necessitates high interest rates to the currency which will give us, as a people, the best interest rates in the world. At some proper time in the future I expect to discuss more fully the question of this paper currency. Time permits me now only to touch upon it.

While this bill goes only a little way toward liberalizing the bank-note issues, it probably goes as far as public opinion will now justify. The provisions which it contains are substantially those, so far as they go, which were contained in the bill reported by the Banking and Currency Committee last year. While this bill does not move as far as that bill did, it moves in the right direction, and therefore I shall vote for it.

WHAT ABOUT SILVER IN THE BILL?

Mr. SIMS. As the gentleman is always so kind in yielding to questions and so frank in answering them, I would like to ask him whether, from his point of view, it would not be better to call in the silver dollars and sell them as bullion than to attempt to keep them at a parity in the way provided in this bill?

Mr. McCLEARY. Mr. Chairman, the bill gives to silver, either as coin or as silver certificates, the entire work of pocket money. It is believed that in this way all the tremendous amount of silver which the Government has bought can be safely used and that none need be sold.

Answering my friend's question, I would say—again on my own personal responsibility, and binding no one but myself thereby—that since we are coining silver on Government account, the Government owes it to the people to see that they are supplied with all the silver coins that they need for business purposes and that the denominations of the coins should be those which they find most convenient. The quantity of silver bought should be determined wholly by this consideration. The Government has a right to buy silver for just one purpose, namely, to meet the demands of business for silver coin. It should buy silver on exactly the same principle as that on which it buys oats for its cavalry horses. It buys the oats to feed the horses, not to please the man who has oats to sell, and the amount of its purchases of oats should be determined by the needs of the horses and not by the urgency of the owner of the oats. If at any time the Government finds that, judging by the demands for silver coin, it needs more silver, it should buy enough to serve its purpose. If at any time it concludes that it has been prevailed upon to make an overpurchase, it should unhesitatingly sell the surplus.

CONCLUSION.

At some proper time in the future, as I have said, I hope to state at length what I conceive to be the ideal toward which our efforts in currency reform should be directed. But for the present I have trespassed long enough on the indulgence of the committee.

We are nearing the close of the nineteenth century. How rich in memories of national achievement is that century! How splendid the glories of its sunset! Ere its close the people of the United States will again have spoken. Their verdict will be a vote of confidence in that party whose wisdom and patriotism they have never depended on in vain. Again will they place in the White House the far-seeing statesman and courtly gentleman who now adorns it. And the radiance of the present will shine far out over the years of the coming century! [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Analysis of Bill H. R. 1.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JESSE OVERSTREET,

OF INDIANA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, December 11, 1899,

On the bill (H. R. 1) entitled "A bill to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes."

Mr. OVERSTREET said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The most urgent subject of the proposed bill is the question of a monetary standard and provision for its maintenance. The strengthening of the public credit, by the removal of all doubt concerning the policy and practice of the Government relative to the unit of value, is of paramount importance. To effect this result by a complete guarantee of the quality and parity of all our money, without any disturbance by change in the quantity or kind, is the chief purpose of the legislation proposed.

The other provisions are such as will meet the demand for an increased supply of subsidiary coin and small notes, required for change in the daily business transactions of the country, and provision for utilizing the full loanable capital of banks and its proper distribution in the simplest manner.

The single remaining provision, viz, the repeal of the tax upon bank circulation and the substitution of a tax upon bank franchises, is for the purpose of removing restrictions against the full use of bank circulation and for the purpose of equalizing the taxes upon all national banks.

SUMMARY AND ARGUMENT.

The bill is drawn in eleven sections. Sections 1, 2, 3, and 4 provide for the establishment and maintenance of the gold standard.

Sections 5 and 6 provide for the coinage of subsidiary coin and worn and uncurrent coins, and the repeal of the statute limiting the issue of subsidiary coin and fractional currency to $50,000,000.

Section 7 provides for the issue of United States notes and Treasury notes in such denominations, not less than $1, as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, and also for the issue of silver certificates in denominations only of $1, $2, and $5.

Sections 8 and 9 provide for the issue of national-bank note circulation to the par value of the bonds deposited for their security.

Section 10 provides for the repeal of the tax upon national-bank note circulation and the substitution of a tax of one-fifth of 1 per cent upon the franchises of national banks as measured by their capital, surplus, and undivided profits.

Section 11 authorizes the organization of national banks with a capital stock of $25,000 in towns having a population of 2,000 inhabitants or less.

THE GOLD STANDARD.

The first and most important feature of the proposed bill, as contained in the first four sections, is the establishment of the gold standard in law. The element of value is just as essential to a standard of value as the element of weight to a standard of weight, or of length to a standard of measurement. Firmness, stability, and constancy are characteristics which any standard must possess if it shall meet the demand upon it by universal use for honest and true measurement, whether of value, weight, or length; firmness in adherence to the principle and purpose to which it is dedicated; stability in its individual strength, and constancy in its character to preserve its integrity. Adaptability to the uses of trade, simplicity of terms to meet the requirements of small transactions equally with large concerns, and uniformity of reputation are qualities necessary to the successful operation of any standard.

There can be but one standard of a given measurement at one time. An attempt to couple two standards differing in any degree in essential characteristics will shift the standard to the weaker link. If the basis of a standard of value should be two metals, each possessing characteristics essential to true measurement, there would still be, in effect, but one standard. Value is determined by such a multitude of circumstances, bearing such complex relations to each other, influenced by supply and demand, utility, durability, human desire, and other causes without number, that exchanges of property can be easily effected only by the common use of a variety of mediums of exchange, each representing accurately the units of value as measured in the standard into which it can be converted on demand.

Voluntary and universal exchanges in coppers, nickels, silver and gold, bank notes, greenbacks, and certificates mark the true test of a standard into which each can be converted with ease. Law does not create this condition. It merely recognizes it and operates as a check against its disturbance. All efforts to effect, by law, a double standard of value have been futile; and the laws of trade and commerce, indifferent to statute law, have universally and consistently recognized as the standard that metal the intrinsic value of which has been most stable and most free from fluctuations. A bimetallic currency is feasible and practicable. Two metals will circulate with ease, but the measure of value must be a single standard. The immutable laws of trade, which control such condition, would suffer no more by a statute than an effort to change the tides by a royal edict. To dispel all lingering doubts from the minds of the public, and to give clear expression to the nation's purpose relative to financial obligations, is the object of the legislation proposed.

When the standard shall be permanently established and all doubt of its stability removed, the parity of all our money will be fully recognized, and the kind of money in which payments shall be made will rarely, if ever, be the subject of dispute. When certainty shall take the place of doubt, and the integrity of our credit be as fixed as the honor of the nation, the national debt can be readily refunded at lower interest rates, and future loans negotiated with ease upon better terms than ever before. The rapid development of American trade, and its vast expansion, bringing our people into closer relations with the leading nations of the world, makes it imperative that the standard of value in which settlements are made shall be the best known to the highest civilization, and shall safely appeal to intelligent and successful experience.

Recent events, shaped by causes beyond our control, bearing obligations which national honor requires shall be courageously discharged, open new fields for American statesmanship. Channels of trade yet unknown to American enterprise and avenues of commerce yet to welcome American products will surely result. Such conditions emphasize the necessity for a standard of value which shall remain firm throughout the vicissitudes of competitive trade. Its permanency and stability should be above suspicion. Its security should be absolute. Some question of expediency might be raised if the proposition were new or we were assuming a position at variance with other nations. But the gold

standard is recognized by all leading nations, and the statute proposed merely reaffirms the policy followed by us for over sixty years, so reenforced and plainly expressed that the question will be placed forever beyond dispute.

Such are the general conditions of trade, as well as the condition of the National Treasury, that no disturbance whatever can possibly be caused by the legislation proposed. The volume and variety of our interstate and foreign trade has never before been equaled. The supply of labor fails to meet the demand offered for employment. Bountiful harvests and the output of manufactories strain the means of transportation. Vast enterprises for extension of shipping facilities by land and sea are in progress. No clouds yet appear to cast a shadow upon our prosperity. The national revenues have been abundant and satisfactory notwithstanding the expense incident to the war with Spain, which has been concluded with success and honor, nor the expenses incurred by the insurrection in the Philippines. The taxes imposed by the Government to meet the increased expenditures are being patriotically borne by our people without a murmur. The Government has been able to meet its obligations with ease and has declared its willingness to anticipate its interest payments so as to quickly return the money to the channels of trade.

The net gold in the Treasury on the 2d day of October, 1899, was $254,328,820. There is more gold in the United States now than ever before. The world's product of gold in 1898 was the greatest in history and exceeded the product of 1897 by $48,616,600 and of 1896 by $85,177,600. The product of gold from the mines in the United States in 1898 was the greatest in the history of the country, exceeding the product of 1897 by $7,100,000 and of 1896 by $11,375,000. The output of gold, both of the world's product and the product from American mines, has increased annually since 1890. The output of silver for the same period has varied in different years, but its value per ounce has had a uniform tendency downward, declining to 59 cents per ounce in 1898, its lowest register.

The present conditions are most favorable and the time most opportune for the clear and unequivocal adoption of the gold standard. Prior to the year 1896 the gold standard had been legally adopted by the following countries, viz: Austria-Hungary, Brazil, British Honduras, Chile, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, Germany, Great Britain, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, and Turkey, and since 1896 the gold standard has been adopted by Costa Rica, Japan, Peru, and Russia. The coinage of silver on private account was suspended (prior to 1896) by the United States, Belgium, France, Holland, Italy, Spain, India, Switzerland, Greece, and Venezuela, thus effectually, although not absolutely, fixing their status as gold-standard countries.

If under all these conditions the United States shall clearly by law adopt the gold standard, it will pass to the new condition with even less friction than was experienced by the resumption of specie payment. The Government is fortunate in being able to act in so important a matter under such favorable circumstances. The general policy of the Government and such declarations as have been made by Congress are entirely consistent with this proposition.

The law of February 22, 1873, specifying the one-dollar piece at the standard weight of 25.8 grains of gold as the unit of value, sought to legalize what had, for a great many years, been the policy of the Government relative to the standard of value. While no subsequent law has deviated from this interpretation, yet the quantity of our silver money so largely increased under the operation of the laws of February 28, 1878, and July 14, 1890, and the value of silver bullion so depreciated that the ability of the Government to maintain the parity of gold and silver was seriously doubted. From the moment that doubt arose our monetary standard was weakened, and it has since been called the "limping standard."

Although the further increase of silver money was stopped by the repeal of the coinage feature of the laws of February 28, 1878, and July 14, 1890, the doubt continued, and the danger to the credit of the Government assumed grave proportions. An effort to reenforce the nation's credit was made on November 1, 1893, when Congress declared its purpose to maintain its gold and silver money "of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value, such equality to be secured through international agreement or by such safeguards of legislation as will insure the maintenance of the parity in value of the two metals and the equal power of every dollar at all times in the markets and in the payment of debts."

By the first and second sections of the bill it is sought to legalize the gold standard by a plain and definite statute which shall remove the question from all doubt, and so establish the standard that it can be changed only by Congressional action, in this way giving "the people's purpose the vitality of public law."

In declaring gold to be the standard of value the bill clearly states that we are already operating under such standard. The first provision is, "That the standard unit of value shall, as now, be the dollar, and shall consist of 25.8 grains of gold, nine-tenths fine, or 23.22 grains of pure gold, being the one-tenth part of the eagle." While claiming that gold is now the standard, its reenactment acts as a reaffirmation and dispels all doubt which may have arisen in the public mind.

The plain declaration fixing the gold standard would be impracticable except for the provision of payment of Government obligations in that standard and providing for all obligations, both public and private, for the payment of money to be performed in conformity with the standard so established. Such provision in nowise interferes with the legal-tender quality of the present forms of legal-tender money, nor prohibits payment of a different character especially provided by contract. It merely seeks to make full provision for the proper operation of the standard of value as fixed by statute. Private obligations shall be performed, not by payment necessarily in gold, but in conformity with the standard; that is, in money equal to gold in value.

The recognition of the standard is reflected in the method pursued by the Government in the payment of its obligations. Mere statutory declaration would be idle unless the conduct of the nation toward its own debts were consistent with the statute. Law and conduct both must be free from ambiguity. National honor and national credit are closely allied. In the discharge of its debts the Government has always followed the practice of making payment in money equivalent to the best money known at the time. Every dollar received by the Government, for which its credit has been pledged, has been as good as gold, and the discharge of such debt in money of less value would be repudiation.

Section 3, providing for the creation of a division of issue and redemption in the Treasury Department, requires the Department to keep separate from the fiscal operations of the Government the coin and bullion especially designated as a redemption fund and the deposits pledged for the payment of specific notes outstanding, and prohibits the use of the same except for the purposes to which they shall be especially dedicated. The provision in this section for the retention in such division of an amount of gold equal to 25 per cent of the amount both of United States notes and Treasury notes issued under the act of July 14, 1890, outstanding, to operate as a reserve fund to meet the demand for the redemption of greenbacks and Treasury notes when presented, is based upon the well-established practice of the Government providing for the redemption of these two Government obligations.

There is now no specific law authorizing any particular sum to be held as a reserve to meet the redemption of the greenbacks, unless it is contained in the provision of the law relating to the issue of gold certificates, directing that no more gold certificates shall be issued whenever the gold in the Treasury falls below $100,000,000. Such practice should be legalized and based upon a specific statute. A reserve fund of one-fourth of such notes outstanding is deemed sufficient to guard against any sudden demand of holders for the redemption of these obligations. Especially is it thought that such sum is sufficient in view of the provision contained in section 4 of the bill, wherein it is stipulated that all notes and certificates, when redeemed or exchanged, shall be held, and not be withdrawn nor disbursed, except in exchange for an equivalent amount of the coin in which said notes or certificates were redeemed or exchanged, save only when transferred by the Secretary of the Treasury from one fund to another.

The different funds which would by this section be referred to such division of the Treasury, together with the respective amounts, on the 30th day of September, 1899, are as follows:

1. Gold coin and bullion, represented by outstanding gold certificates	$135,591,119
2. United States notes, represented by outstanding currency certificates	16,100,000
3. Silver dollars, represented by outstanding silver certificates	405,197,504
4. Silver bullion, represented by outstanding Treasury notes	91,167,280
5. Gold coin and bullion equal to one-fourth of the United States notes ($346,681,016) and Treasury notes ($91,167,280) outstanding	109,462,074

The first four items enumerate the special deposits dedicated to specific payments. As these obligations are met the deposits are correspondingly reduced.

In the absence of a law providing protection to the gold reserve, it is always subject to encroachment in expenditures to meet the general expenses of the Government. Whenever such encroachment seems probable, a fear has arisen that the Government may not be able to meet its demand obligations, and a run upon the reserve for the redemption of the demand notes has followed. This situation is responsible for the so-called "endless chain." By separating the reserve fund from the general fund and prohibiting its use, except for redemption of United States notes and Treasury notes, the dangers to which it has been so greatly subjected will be removed. These demand notes are being redeemed in gold now and always have been, and no additional burden is imposed upon the Government. It is sought to simplify and legalize the practice, and create a division in the Treasury where

the whole business of issuing and redeeming notes may be transacted, and to establish complete confidence in the redemption of our demand obligations.

Section 4 of the bill seeks to provide a complete safeguard to guarantee the permanent maintenance of the gold standard by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury, whenever it is necessary for such maintenance, to issue and sell bonds of the United States, payable in gold coin, and for the exchange of gold coin for any other money issued or coined by the United States, should the Secretary of the Treasury deem such exchange necessary in order to maintain the parity and equal value of all the money of the United States. The legalizing of the gold standard and provision for the equality of all forms of money at a parity with the standard will so remove all doubt of the soundness and integrity of our money that there will be little occasion for the exchange of one kind of money for another.

And yet, in order to make complete guaranty against any contingency which may arise, authority to the Secretary of the Treasury to meet such emergencies, should they arise, by the sale of bonds or the exchange of any money issued or coined by the United States, is deemed advisable. The provision in this section that no note or certificate, once redeemed or exchanged, shall be withdrawn, except in exchange for an equivalent amount of the coin in which said note or certificate was redeemed or exchanged, save only when the Secretary of the Treasury shall direct the transfer from one fund to another, will forever put an end to the so-called "endless chain," which has so embarrassed the Government in the ever-recurring redemption of the greenback. There can be no contraction of the currency under this system, for the reason that either the note is in circulation, or, if redeemed, its equivalent is in circulation.

Where the revenues fail to equal the expenditures, the Government has no other recourse to obtain money except the sale of bonds. This section advances no new proposition. It clearly defines the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury toward the protection of the gold reserve, and provides for the issue of bonds at a lower rate of interest than at present authorized by law.

The maintenance of the parity of all our money is fully guaranteed by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange gold for any other money, should he deem such exchange necessary. If such an emergency shall arise, it is best that the duty of the Government shall be clear. This will not increase the responsibility beyond the burden which now rests upon the Government. It will discharge the duty directly which is now met indirectly. Indeed, it is confidently believed that less embarrassment will follow from the direct method. The demand for such exchange will be reduced in proportion as the certainty of the exchange is made manifest.

Furthermore, the bill contains two provisions which will prove great obstacles against the presentation of any considerable sum for exchange at one time. First, any note or certificate, once redeemed or exchanged, shall be held in the Treasury and not be withdrawn nor disbursed except in exchange for an equivalent amount of the coin in which such exchange was first made, except as before set out. Second, the breaking up of the silver certificates above $5 in denomination will distribute the silver, either in coin or certificates, for use in the small transactions of everyday trade. The expense of transportation of the dollar piece will retard such movement, while the distribution of the certificates, as well as the dollar pieces, will render it extremely difficult to collect a sufficient amount to make their presentation dangerous or even embarrassing.

A few bills of large denominations, aggregating a very considerable sum, might be readily obtained, but it would be difficult to gather and transport a million silver-dollar pieces and very troublesome to withdraw from the channels of daily trade any considerable sum of certificates of denominations of one, two, and five dollars. With the absolute assurance of the Government's intention to maintain the parity of all our money, with authority of law to sell bonds to procure sufficient gold in which full exchange will be made, it is confidently believed that no necessity for such exchange will ever arise.

SUBSIDIARY COINS.

Sections 5 and 6 provide for the coinage of subsidiary silver coin from any silver bullion in the Treasury purchased under the act of July 14, 1890, and the recoinage of worn and uncurrent coins, and the repeal of the present law, which limits the amount of subsidiary coin and fractional currency to $50,000,000. The great demand for small change in the everyday transactions of business makes it necessary to remove the limitation which the present law fixes upon subsidiary coin and fractional currency. While the present law limits this issue to $50,000,000, the demand has been so great that the law has been necessarily disregarded, and the issue has so increased that on September 30, 1899, the total amount was $76,523,333.

The issue in excess of the limitation should be legalized. Owing to the growth of population and the great volume of small transactions, a further increase of subsidiary coin will be quickly absorbed. The silver bullion in the Treasury pledged to the redemption of the Treasury notes of 1890 is a practical source from which to obtain an additional supply of subsidiary coin. The law authorizing the issue of the Treasury notes provides for their cancellation as rapidly as the bullion purchased under said law should be coined and used for the redemption of said notes. Experience has shown that a greater number of silver dollars have been coined by the Government than the people care to accept. They fail to be absorbed by general trade, and are largely used as a pledge for the issue of silver certificates, which are preferred.

Of the total number of silver dollars coined by the Government up to September 30, 1899, viz, $490,388,614, there were deposited in the Treasury $405,197,504, upon which certificates were issued, leaving but $85,191,110 in circulation, $5,023,285 of which were, on that date, in the Treasury, unrepresented by certificates outstanding. In other words, on September 30, 1899, there were in actual circulation only 80,167,825 silver dollars. It seems that a part of the silver bullion purchased under the law of 1890 could be coined into subsidiary coin without embarrassment and Treasury notes corresponding in amount canceled. The only authority of law for the recoinage of worn and uncurrent coins is the provision in the annual appropriation bills. So important a matter should be made the subject of a statute more permanent in its effect. As soon as a coin becomes so worn as to render it uncurrent, it is promptly returned to the Treasury for redemption. Frequently the amount on hand aggregates several millions of dollars, and unless provision for recoinage and return to trade is made, the shortage in small coins becomes embarrassing to business.

SILVER CERTIFICATES.

Section 7 gives authority to the Secretary of the Treasury to issue or reissue United States notes or Treasury notes, in denominations not less than $1, as he may prescribe, and provides that all silver certificates hereafter issued or paid out shall be in denominations only of $1, $2, and $5.

Two objects are sought by this section: First, to empower the Secretary of the Treasury with discretion for the supply of small notes to meet the demands of the business world as the same shall arise. This necessity has been prominent of late on account of the vastly increased business of the country, requiring change in small transactions. Under the present law the Secretary of the Treasury does not possess this discretion, but is required to reissue such notes in the same denominations as redeemed, and the rigid enforcement of the law greatly embarrasses general business where such demand for small notes exists.

While provision is made in this section for the issue of United States notes and Treasury notes of such denominations not less than $1, as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, yet it is presumed that such discretion will be exercised by the Secretary of the Treasury only for the purpose of meeting an urgent demand for small notes, and that, in the absence of such emergency, silver certificates will largely comprise the note issue of the Government under $10. Rather than operate as a restriction of the note issues under $10, such provision will afford a relief by an increase of circulation of small notes.

The second object of the section is to break up the large silver certificates. The breaking up of the large silver certificates will place upon silver, either in the dollar or in the certificates representing the silver dollars, a great proportion of the burden of daily business transactions, and thus so scatter the certificates that, even if an effort were made to embarrass the Treasury by their presentation for exchange, the difficulty of procuring them would, very largely, if not completely, defeat such effort.

The total amount in silver certificates on September 30, 1899, was $405,197,504, of which $175,064,553 was in denominations of one, two, and five dollars, and $230,132,951 was in denominations over $5. The total number of silver dollars coined up to September 30, 1899, was 490,388,614, so that on that date there were outstanding 85,191,110 silver dollars. Of this last sum there were held by the Treasury, unrepresented by certificates, $5,023,285, leaving but $80,167,825 actually in circulation. If the field of daily business transactions, or the "pocket trade," shall be given over to silver, it would be quickly absorbed, and once distributed would become the permanent medium of exchange in small transactions among our people. It could fill no greater nor more honorable use.

The total amount of our money on September 30, 1899, in denominations under $10 (except the fractional currency, subsidiary coin, and gold dollars) was $470,830,791, divided as follows:

Silver dollars unrepresented by silver certificates	$85,191,110
Silver certificates	175,064,553
Greenbacks	82,289,173
Treasury notes of 1890	52,295,450
National-bank notes	75,990,505

The breaking up of the silver certificates over $5 would increase the money in denominations under $10 by $230,132,951. But the discretionary power given the Secretary of the Treasury concerning the issue of greenbacks and Treasury notes in denominations under $10 renders possible the withdrawal from circulation of such denominations of the greenback and Treasury note, aggregating $134,584,623, and their reissue in larger denominations. Hence the minimum of increase of small notes would be the difference between the total amount of silver certificates over $5, or $230,132,951, and the aggregate of the greenbacks and Treasury notes under $10, or $134,584,623, which is $95,548,328. If the national-bank notes under $10 should be converted into larger denominations, the minimum increase of small notes would be but $19,557,823. The demand for money of small denominations has been most urgent and it is believed that the cash transactions of the people will give employment to the increase here provided without increasing the strain upon the Treasury.

BANK-NOTE CIRCULATION.

Sections 8 and 9 merely amend sections of existing law so as to permit the issue of bank circulation to the par value of the bonds deposited for their security, and in this way allow the full use of the loanable capital of the bank. The law as originally drawn, limiting the note issue to 90 per cent of the bonds, was so drawn for the reason that Government bonds at that date were not worth par. The amendment of this law as herein provided has been urged by five Secretaries of the Treasury and four Presidents, and there seems to be no good reason why the amendments should not be made.

TAX UPON BANK FRANCHISES.

Section 10 seeks to repeal the tax of 1 per cent upon bank circulation and to substitute therefor a tax of one-tenth of 1 per cent each half year on franchises of national banks as measured by their capital, surplus, and undivided profits. Under the present law the tax falls unequally upon small banks, while the larger banks, and especially those which do not issue note circulation, escape the burden of the tax. A bank of small capital stock nearly exhausts its capital in the purchase of bonds required by law and the creation of its reserve funds, and realizes the necessity of the issue of circulation to provide a sufficient loanable fund. A bank of $50,000 capital must purchase $12,500 in bonds, an amount equal to one-fourth of its capital. And when a premium is exacted and the reserve funds required by law are established the tax of 1 per cent upon the circulation it may issue becomes a burden. The large city banks, having better chances for deposits, do not feel the need of issuing circulation. Furthermore, no matter how large the capital of a bank of over $200,000, it is required to purchase no more than $50,000 in bonds, or one-fourth of $200,000. The investment of $50,000 in bonds will embarrass a bank of $1,000,000 capital much less than an investment of $12,500 by a bank of $50,000 capital. Not feeling the need of adding to its loanable fund by the issue of circulation, it escapes the tax entirely.

By the removal of this tax upon note circulation all restrictions will be removed against such issue, and the full power of bank-note circulation will be gained, thus increasing the loanable capital of the country. The substitution of the tax upon the franchise of the bank is for the purpose of equalizing the burden upon all banks in proportion to their ability to bear the burden. The per cent fixed is such that the amount of tax received by the Government from this source will be about the same as realized from the present tax, any difference being in favor of rather than against the Government. The tax under existing law for five years ending June 30, 1899, was $9,469,948.39. The tax under the proposed bill for the same period would have been $9,778,858.12.

Provision is also made in this section fixing a penalty for the failure of any bank to make the proper report, so as to show its liability under this act, and providing for the information to be obtained by the Secretary of the Treasury in the event any bank should fail or refuse to comply with the law.

SMALL BANKS.

Section 11 amends section 5138, United States Revised Statutes, so as to authorize the organization of banks of $25,000 capital in communities of 2,000 inhabitants. The growing demand in the sparsely settled districts of the country for banking accommodations, so as to create distributing points for the loanable capital of the country, is met most easily by permitting the organization of banks of small capital and thereby creating money centers of small degree in various localities where the convenience of the system will greatly aid in the moving of crops at the season of year when, under the present methods, the procuring of money for short-time loans is difficult.

As a proper restriction against a possible danger of too far an extension of the system, a limit is placed upon the capital of such banks, as well as upon the population of the communities in which they may be organized. A careful examination of the subject seems to lead to the conclusion that limitation upon the capital to $25,000 and upon the population to 2,000 inhabitants will effect a reasonable and safe adjustment of the demand.

Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. J. M. QUARLES,

OF VIRGINIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, January 17, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 6237) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, and for prior years, and for other purposes—

Mr. QUARLES said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am heartily in favor of that provision in the bill under consideration which makes an appropriation for rural free delivery. This system of mail delivery is a matter that deeply concerns and affects the welfare of the farmer. The benefits that must come to him from its general adoption throughout the country are varied and can not well be overestimated.

We learn from the reports of the Postmaster-General and his First Assistant that rural free delivery is now shown to be a success and is receiving the approval of the people wherever it has been properly tried. The Postmaster-General tells us that—

The free delivery of mails in the rural districts has proved to be one of the most important among recent developments of the postal service, and presents in its possibilities a question of the largest proportions. The results already attained have been of a significant character, and the practical evidences bearing upon the feasibility of the system, upon the degree of its self-support, and upon the effect and the sentiment in the communities where it has been tried deserve the most careful consideration. How far the system shall be extended is submitted for the determination of Congress, with a full presentation of facts upon which to base a conclusion.

The Postmaster-General further informs us that "it is the opinion of the officers having it in charge that the experimental stage has been passed," and in that view he says that he "coincides." We further learn from the Postmaster-General that the system is now in successful operation from 630 distributing points, scattered among 40 States and 1 Territory, giving service to 452,735 people, at an average cost of 66 cents per capita.

The tests that have been made of this service have demonstrated the fact that the postal receipts will be increased wherever it is fairly and judiciously extended. Many of the new deliveries in this country upon being established became almost immediately self-sustaining. In Great Britain, where an extension of rural free delivery on a broader scale has been in operation since 1897, the number of additional letters mailed because of additional facilities afforded is estimated at 50,000,000 for the present year. It may be fairly assumed from what has already been seen that the postal receipts in this country will so grow by a reasonable extension of the service that it would not be long before it would be self-supporting.

I would impress upon the House the great and beneficial results that will accrue to the agriculturists from an extension of this service. Among them may be enumerated the enhancement of the value of farm lands and better prices obtained for farm products by prompter communication with the markets; the improvement of the highways made necessary to facilitate free delivery; higher educational influences, broader circulation of the means of public intelligence, and closer daily contact with the business world.

The farmer, Mr. Chairman, is a business man and should be brought as close to the business world as conditions can be made to admit of. His daily mail delivered to him will keep him informed as to prices and values and all that is transpiring affecting his interests.

I am astonished that there is anyone in this House opposed to rural free delivery. Instead of $150,000 being appropriated, it should be ten times that amount, which should be distributed equally among the States and Territories in proportion to the rural population. Millions of dollars have been expended in the past and are being expended every year by the Government out of the Treasury in the erection of fine and costly post-office buildings in cities and for free delivery there, and it seems to me that it is now time that so large a class of the taxpayers as the farmers are should begin to receive a bestowal of their share of the public favors and funds in the direction of better mail facilities and free mail delivery.

Mr. Chairman, the stability and future of this Republic depend upon the farmers. The great Daniel Webster once said:

When tillage begins other arts follow. The farmers, therefore, are the founders of human civilization.

And it may be truly said that they are the founders of republics and the preservers of human liberty. When defense of home and country is needed, the farmer is always ready to make the sacrifice in blood and treasure. "The agricultural population," says

Cato, "produces the bravest men, the most valiant soldiers, and a class of citizens the least given of all to evil designs." Keep them posted and in touch with the affairs of the country, and the Republic will continue to live and the liberties of the people will be safe. Edmund Burke said:

The people never give up their liberties but under a delusion.

While the farmer is so important a factor in the development of this country materially and the preservation of our institutions, he has not been fairly dealt with in recent years by Congress in its legislation. They have, in the main, been legislated against. Mr. McKinley, when he was looking forward to the Presidency and paving the way to that high office, seems to have been, judging from his speeches, watchful of their rights and interests, as he understood them. In February, 1891, at Toledo, Ohio, in criticising ex-President Cleveland's opposition to silver, he said:

During all these years at the head of the Government he was dishonoring one of our precious metals, one of our own great products, discrediting silver and enhancing the price of gold. He endeavored even before his inauguration to office to stop the coinage of silver dollars, and afterwards, and to the end of his administration, persistently used his power to that end. He was determined to contract the circulating medium and demonetize one of the terms of commerce, limit the volume of money among the people, make money scarce, and therefore dear.

He would have increased the value of money and decreased the value of everything else—money the master, and everything else the servant. He was not thinking of the "poor" then. He had left their side. He was not standing forth in their defense. Cheap coats, cheap labor, and dear money; the sponsor and promoter of these, professing to stand guard over the poor and lowly. Was there more glaring inconsistency or reckless assumption? He believes that poverty is a blessing to be promoted and encouraged, and that a shrinkage in the value of everything but money is a national benediction.

At that time Mr. McKinley appeared to think much of "the poor and lowly" and talked much about them. But a few years thereafter he became President, and what a change came over him. He "doth protest too much." He, too, left their side. He is not standing forth in their defense. His administration is doing the bidding of the trusts, banks, and syndicates. These great powers are molding, shaping, and directing his administration to suit their base and sordid purposes.

During the campaign of 1896 the Democrats charged that the trusts, banks, and syndicates were furnishing money to influence and to purchase the election of Mr. McKinley. His election was secured and the accumulated evidence convinced every fair-minded man that it was carried by the corrupt use of money and by intimidation. Why need then anyone be surprised that the trusts, syndicates, and banks direct the policies of the administration? Did not the consideration pass from them, and must not the administration carry out its part of the agreement as made for it by the Republican party? The administration has been faithful to the trust imposed and has yielded to every demand made by the trusts, banks, and syndicates.

Hardly had Mr. McKinley taken his seat as President before he called an extra session of Congress for the purpose of having a high protective tariff law enacted. This law, known as the "Dingley tariff law," was passed by the Republican party, and it was made to suit the demands of the trusts and manufacturers and in disregard of the interests of the people. It has proven to be more than a protection to manufacturers; it is a fosterer of trusts. This was the first return, Mr. Chairman, made by the Republican party for the aid rendered by the trusts in the election of 1896. Under this tariff law in the last two years more trusts, in amount of capital, have been formed than were formed in all the years that preceded that period. This fact distinguishes the present administration from all other administrations. It stands out as the great friend of the trusts. It may be appropriately termed a trust administration, and will doubtless be known as such in history.

Mr. Chairman, the trust system is the product of Republican legislation. The tariff, originally intended to protect infant industries, has been made and used by the Republican party so as to give birth to, foster, and protect the trusts. We have it from a distinguished Republican, the head of the sugar trust, Mr. Havemeyer, who knew what he was talking about, that "the tariff is the mother of all trusts." And what is a trust? It is a conspiracy for enriching the few by despoiling the many; it destroys healthful and natural competition and extorts unjust profits; it reduces wages to a minimum, while it puts up prices to a maximum. It deprives thousands of people of employment, enslaves labor, and all are made to pay unjust tribute.

We know much of the trusts by actual experience. "By their fruits ye shall know them." We have seen the wage-earner by the trusts turned out to tramp and to starve, and yet they were secure in controlling the market as to their respective manufactures. We have seen in the last eighteen months or two years nearly all of the great staples controlled by the trusts arbitrarily put up in prices to a rise from about 25 to 200 per cent, and with an average rise of at least 50 per cent, and the farmers are compelled to buy at these exorbitant prices, while what they have to sell, with few exceptions, is as low as when Mr. McKinley was elected President. And I call particular attention to this fact, that the rise in the prices of the staples controlled by the trusts came with the destruction of competition.

It would seem that war at home, foreign wars, and famine in foreign lands would stimulate the prices of farm products, but these evils have not blessed us. The old Republican argument that the starting up of industries and the giving of employment to laborers increase consumption, and in that way always increase the prices of farm products, is refuted by the present condition of affairs. The industries under the trust system have started up, trust prices have risen until they are oppressive, but the prices of farm products generally remain low. And this is true though we have an army greater by 75,000 than we had before the Spanish-American war, all of whom are consumers and contribute nothing toward production. Mr. Chairman, the trust prices are evidently artificial—they are fixed by the trust magnates without restraint and without mercy.

The enactment of the Dingley tariff bill into law was not the only obligation incurred by the Republican party in the Presidential election of 1896.

The banks furnished their quota of the campaign fund for the election of Mr. McKinley. This was believed and charged during the campaign. They now claim and demand from the Republican party compensatory legislation in return for what they contributed toward the success of that party in 1896 and for what they are to do in the future. This demand is that the currency bill now pending before Congress shall become a law. This bill, conceived and framed by the banks for the banks, if it shall pass Congress, will create one of the greatest banking trusts the world ever saw.

In the first place, this currency bill makes every debt, public and private, payable in gold. When the gold in this country is hoarded or withdrawn to foreign countries, as may be the case, to the extent of making it scarce, as it was in 1896, how will the debtor be able to pay his debt in gold without suffering a loss that may bring distress and want? When all the legal-tender money is retired as may and will occur, except gold, and that has either fled the country or is hoarded by the banks, I again ask, what will the debtor do when called on to pay in gold? Many a creditor may not wish to oppress, but many will oppress, and will not a state of things be created that the indulgent and forbearing creditor will not desire?

This feature of the bill should condemn it in the judgment of all good citizens. This currency bill does not present the question whether we shall have it as a law or 16 to 1, but whether we shall have a law producing a new financial system or continue the present system; whether the proposed new system is better than the present system. There is another feature of this bill more objectionable than the one I have just discussed. It is this: The effect of the proposed law will be to retire all of the redemption money but gold, and the banks, having the right to issue notes to the full face value of the bonds they will deposit in the Treasury, will have full and complete control of the volume of the credit money, and with such control it will be in the power of the banks to control and determine the values and prices of property.

This will be the inevitable result flowing from the enactment of this currency bill into law. It is an established principle in political economy that the quantity of money in use determines the general level of prices. This proposition applies in general to primary money, yet it is said to apply also to credit money, for a time at least. Certain it is that the banks, having full control over the credit money—the bank notes—and holding most of the gold in this country in their vaults, would have the power to shrink or expand the currency to suit their purposes. So, Mr. Chairman, the sovereign power of the Government to control the money and its volume is to be abdicated to the banks, and they, with one great head bank directing affairs, will manipulate the money market, will swell the volume of money and raise prices, or will contract it and depress prices, as may suit their sordid and wicked purposes. They will be the masters and the people the slaves.

This currency bill brings before the people a great question. It is, Who shall control the volume of the money? Shall it be done by the banks or the Government? This question means much to the American people. If the people are turned over to the banks, where is the power that will save them from the greed and avarice of the banks?

Not only will the banks under the proposed currency law have control of the volume of the currency, but they will possess the power of forcing an issue of bonds whenever they may so desire; and instead of the endless chain we will have an endless issue of bonds, and the banks, with the Republican party in power, will be the favored purchasers.

The Republican party is in a hurry about passing this currency bill. The campaign understanding with the banks must be carried out. Another Presidential campaign is at hand, and more money will be needed by the Republican party for campaign purposes. The people and their interests are not considered; they are

ignored. Burdened already by the taxes incident to the prosecution of an unholy war, declared in violation of law by the President against the Filipinos and which is being waged in violation of every tradition, policy, and principle of our Republic, and subjected, too, to the robbery now being perpetrated upon them by the trusts, still this is not enough for the people to bear. The Republican party would increase the burdens and distress of the people by delivering them over to the banks by the enactment of a most audacious and iniquitous scheme into a law.

The Republican party, very early after the election and inauguration of Mr. McKinley as President began, through Secretary Gage, to fulfill its obligations to the Standard Oil Trust magnates. The directory of the National City Bank of New York consists of the Standard Oil Trust representatives and other great trust representatives, and the correspondence between Stillman and Hepburn, president and vice-president, respectively, of the National City Bank, and Secretary Gage, sent by Secretary Gage to Congress in compliance with its request, discloses transactions between this bank and the Government which amount to a national shame. The Standard Oil magnates contributed money toward the election of the Republican nominee for President in 1896, and on June 5, 1897, three months after the inauguration of the President, these magnates, through the vice-president of their bank, sent in their "bill" to Secretary Gage for payment, which reads as follows:

NEW YORK, *June 5, 1897.*

MY DEAR MR. GAGE: The National City Bank of this city, of which I recently became vice-president through the consolidation of the business of the Third National with it, is one of the banks designated as a United States depository, and I write to request that in any change which may be made under the Administration we may not be disturbed in this respect. We should like to remain a United States depository, as at present. Of course the bank is very strong, and if you will take the pains to look at our list of directors you will see that we also have very great political claims, in view of what was done during the canvass last year.

Yours, very truly,

A. B. HEPBURN.

Hon. LYMAN J. GAGE,
United States Treasury, Washington, D. C.

What did Secretary Gage do? When requested to confer special favors upon the Standard Oil bank because of "very great political claims," did he rebuke Hepburn? Did he ignore his letter? Did he refuse to use the people's money in a way to satisfy the political claims of the Standard Oil magnates? No; he proceeded to pay the "bill." Let us see how he responded to this letter. On May 14, 1897, before Secretary Gage received the Hepburn letter, the Government had on deposit in the Standard Oil National City Bank $200,000, and after the date of the Hepburn letter, in 1897, the same bank received of the $58,000,000 in settlement of the Union Pacific debt $24,000,000. On the 14th of July, 1898, the balance of Government money deposited without interest in the National City Bank was $19,576,000, and on September 20, 1899, the balance was $29,000,000.

In the floating of the war loan of $200,000,000, in June, 1898, in which 318 banks participated, the National City Bank received $14,000,000, and on January 7, 1899, the Government balance in the National City Bank was $20,565,000. On July 8, 1899, the balance in that bank was $10,500,000, showing that the bank had the free use of over $10,000,000 for six months. It will be observed that the Government deposits rose suddenly from $200,000 to millions, and averaged $10,000,000 through six months. There was other correspondence which goes far to establish the charge of the partnership relation existing between the Government in the hands of the Republican party and the Standard Oil magnates. I call special attention to certain extracts from letters of Secretary Gage to the officers of the National City Bank, Stillman, president, and Hepburn, vice-president, and Mr. Stillman's reply to him of October 30, 1897, as furnishing convincing proof of favoritism shown to that bank:

OCTOBER 28, 1897.

DEAR SIR: * * *. I have expressed a preference for your institution as the original recipient and distributor of the fund.

In reply to your inquiry, or rather expression of hope that a suitable portion of the fund will be left with the bank for a sufficient length of time to offer a reasonable profit, * * * I can only say that while we can make no specific promises in that direction, the purpose we have in using depository banks for the fund * * * will induce us to practice wise discretion in covering the money into the Treasury proper. There probably will be no disbursements from the fund until January 1 * * *

L. J. GAGE, *Secretary.*

Mr. A. B. HEPBURN.

OCTOBER 30, 1897.

DEAR SIR: * * *. I note with pleasure the contents of your letter, received this morning, with reference to the length of time which these deposits will be allowed to remain. * * *.

JAMES STILLMAN,
President National City Bank.

Hon. LYMAN J. GAGE.

Secretary Gage makes further settlement:

NOVEMBER 10, 1897.

SIR: In compliance with the request contained in your letter of the 29th ultimo, and by virtue of the authority conferred upon me, * * * the National City Bank of New York is hereby designated a depository of public moneys, especially to receive deposits only on account of proceeds of the sale of the Union Pacific Railroad. * * *.

L. J. GAGE, *Secretary.*

VICE-PRESIDENT NATIONAL CITY BANK.

Secretary Gage succumbs again:

APRIL 11, 1898.

SIR: I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 8th instant, in which is expressed a wish that the remainder of the deposits on account of purchase of the Union Pacific Railroad be allowed to be held by the special depository banks in New York City until July, and to inform you that due notice will be given you as to time and amount of the proposed withdrawals, should any be required before the time mentioncd in your letter.

L. J. GAGE, *Secretary.*

VICE-PRESIDENT NATIONAL CITY BANK.

After more than fifty weeks of delay:

DECEMBER 21, 1898.

SIR: This is to advise you that it is the intention of the Department to close the special account of the Treasurer of the United States on account of proceeds of the sale of the Union Pacific Railroad with the several depositories in your city. * * * Accordingly, the Treasurer will draw on your bank each week for that amount, * * * beginning Wednesday, December 28, 1898. * * *.

O. L. SPAULDING,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

CASHIER NATIONAL CITY BANK.

I now call attention to a new favor which Secretary Gage arranges:

FEBRUARY 25, 1899.

DEAR MR. STILLMAN: It is probable that by the 15th of March the Treasury Department will realize an advance payment of $12,000,000 or thereabouts on account of the Central Pacific Railway, * * * in view of your suggestion that you would qualify to take any deposits on that account that the Department might see fit to make with you, I now write to inquire whether you would be disposed to put up the bonds required and accept the deposit * * *

LYMAN J. GAGE.

Furthermore, on the 3d day of July, 1899, Secretary Gage sold the custom-house property in New York City to this same Standard Oil bank (National City Bank) for $3,265,000, and the bank simply gave the Government credit for $3,215,000, leaving $50,000 unpaid. The Government received a certificate of deposit for $3,215,000, and the bank retained that amount of money on deposit, without interest, and besides collected from the Government rent amounting to about 4 per cent interest on the deposit of $3,215,000; and this transaction was so made that it saved to the bank the taxes on the property, to wit, about $75,000, the title being withheld by the Government for that purpose.

Mr. Chairman, this jugglery in respect to the sale of the custom-house property deserves especial condemnation, though it exhibits only a part of the favoritism shown this bank, because it involved a violation of law, since the statute under which the sale was made directed expressly the purchase money to be paid into the United States Treasury.

These special favors to the Standard Oil bank were conferred by reason of "very great political claims," and evidence what reckless disregard the administration has for right, justice, and duty.

I have faith in the integrity and patriotism of the people of this country, and I can not believe such gross, flagrant, and wanton abuse of power by the Republican party will by them be long endured. Such prostitution of power to the service of the trusts, syndicates, and banks will surely have "an avenging day," and that day, I confidently believe, is not far distant—it will come with the first opportunity the American people will have—it will be the 6th day of November next. [Applause.]

The Late Hon. William L. Greene.

REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. STARK,

OF NEBRASKA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, January 10, 1900,

On the following resolutions:

"*Resolved*, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. WILLIAM L. GREENE, late a Representative from the State of Nebraska.

"*Resolved*, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the business of the House be now suspended to enable his associates to pay proper tribute of regard to his high character and distinguished public services.

"*Resolved*, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

"*Resolved*, That as an additional mark of respect the House, at the conclusion of these ceremonies, do adjourn"—

Mr. STARK said:

Mr. SPEAKER: This hour is set apart by special order of the House as a mark of respect for our deceased colleague, late a Representative from the State of Nebraska, and to enable his associates to point to some useful lesson that may be learned from a review of his life and public services.

I first met him at Hastings, Nebr., at a political meeting held in 1884, and was greatly interested in his speech, which impressed me as being unique in its treatment of the issues of the day, and

which was full of quaint sayings. His illustrations were taken from the Scriptures. He announced that he was a "soft-money Democrat;" that Peter Cooper had made the best use of his wealth in founding the Cooper Institute and had taught the best system of finance, and that "he had glued himself to that school."

I met him frequently after that, and recall that he once tried a case in my court. In the early days of Nebraska, whenever a jury trial was in progress it attracted much attention. The people seemed to enjoy the legal tournament, and many would become so engrossed that they would stay for hours to hear the verdict. When the jury were ready to report, the sheriff would hunt up the judge, court would be convened, and the verdict would be read in a stillness that could almost be felt. Then followed a heated discussion as to the merits of the case, and soon you would hear the swish of the quirt as the citizen loped his pony across the prairie to his home. While this was some time ago, it seems but yesterday that judge, sheriff, and spectators were "all cluttered up" in the judge's office, the majority of the men smoking corncob pipes in a fierce sort of way, while Lawyer GREENE for as much as three hours told Indian stories that so interested the audience that when the jury came in everybody looked displeased, as though they feared that meant the end of the entertainment.

When the People's Independent party put up a ticket in our State (1890) Mr. GREENE was one of its leaders and strongest stumpers. In 1893, when the fusion forces had a majority in the legislature, he was a preferred candidate for United States Senator, but not all of the fusionists would vote for him. Factional feeling ran so high that it appeared very doubtful whether an election would result. Mr. GREENE finally succeeded in getting the other candidates together and made them a talk along the line that the cause was greater than any man, and that it was the duty of all to get out of the way so that a new name might be presented which would prove unobjectionable to everybody. He then announced his withdrawal from the race, although he lacked but a few votes, and his counsel and example resulted in the first representation ever secured by the Populists of Nebraska in the United States Senate.

Shortly after this he was elected as one of the district judges of our State, and in that capacity made a most enviable record. In 1896 he was nominated by the People's Independent and Democratic parties for Congressman from the Sixth district of Nebraska, consisting of 33 counties (larger than some States of the Union), and the principal industry of which is cattle raising. It is a hard district to campaign because of its immense area and the scarcity of railroads. Judge GREENE covered this district. I believe he went to every county. Sometimes his evening meeting was 30 or 40 miles from his afternoon appointment and the only way to get there was across the rough and broken country by pony express—that is, in a stout spring wagon, with some half-broken broncbos as the motive power. He was just as much at home standing on a branding shute backed up against a sod corral out on the range as some gentlemen are in making a political speech in an opera house with brass band and torchlight accompaniment, reenforced by a glee club and numerous vice-presidents and applause starters.

Some time ago I noticed in the Judge a picture of a dirty ruffian with a big revolver sitting in a saloon. Upon the bar was placed sixteen glasses in a row and underneath was a printed statement to the effect that "Nimble-toed Mattox from Nebraska would bet anybody $20 to $5 that he could knock the whole row down with one shot." No such incident ever happened in the State of Nebraska and never will, and it is a matter of astonishment to a Western man what fools some Eastern mortals are on the subject of alleged happenings in the West. The stockman of Nebraska is one of our best types. He dresses in accordance with his business, but his person is clean and presentable. He is usually fairly well educated in books and holds a college degree in the teachings of nature. They are law-abiding, self-reliant, with muscles of iron and nerves of steel. The stockman is hospitable to a fault, tries to treat everybody right, and expects fair, square treatment in return.

When a man makes a political speech in that country, he is expected to talk from his heart, to advance nothing but sound argument, and be decent. Their way, when a speech consists principally of abuse of the other side, or when the speaker gets in the attitude of throwing bouquets at himself, is to get up and go away. They regard that man as "trying to run a whizzer on them." Perhaps this is the reason so many Eastern men fail as political speakers in the West. This may seem out of the ordinary in passing a eulogy on a deceased colleague, but I simply describe his environments to call attention to the fact that he lived in a community where worth and sincerity are appreciated, and this explains why, when the news went over the district that Congressman GREENE was dead, the eyes of strong men filled with tears, because they knew that he had been faithful to them everywhere and in every place. They were proud of his oratorical ability. They knew he had faults, but they measured his life not by the weakest link in the chain, but by the sum of his accomplishments; by what he had succeeded, not what he had failed in doing. They knew that he was neither an aristocrat nor a pharisee.

Neither saintly nor selfish, he was not a perfect man. Perfect men are scarce in this world of ours, and those who approximate perfection are not always pleasant companions. He had his faults and would be the last person to desire that a friend should maunder over his memory or seek to attribute to him virtues that he did not possess. He was what he was—robust of mind, big of heart, a kind husband, a loving father, and a man that stayed by his friends. His soul was always in harmony with the heart beat of humanity. I am convinced that the citizenship of Nebraska is on higher ground because of being brought in contact with his life—a genuine life, no veneer, open as the day. I believe that you gentlemen who knew him only in an official capacity have profited by association with his better attributes. So the lesson I learn from the life and public services of this manly man is that it brings the highest measure of success in all fiduciary relations to be genuine, honest, and faithful to those you serve.

Sleep on, brave soul, in the prairies of the State we love so well. You have acted well your part. You have quitted yourself like a man.

At the request of Mrs. Greene, I include in my remarks the funeral sermon on the late Hon. WILLIAM L. GREENE, of Nebraska, Tuesday, March 14, 1899, delivered by Rev. Idell H. Wood, pastor of the First Baptist Church, Kearney, Nebr.:

"Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him; for he knoweth our frame, he remembereth that we are dust."—Psalms ciii, 13, 14.

The silver cord is loosed; the golden bowl is broken; the pitcher is broken at the fountain and the wheel at the cistern; man has gone to his long home and the mourners have gone about the streets. It is not for us to measure the length of the cord, or to tell the capacity of the bowl, or to determine the drawing power of the wheel. He who holds the water in the hollow of His hand, and metes out heaven with a span, and weighs the mountains in scales and the hills in a balance, now has the soul in His own keeping. We may not replace the pieces and say: This was the man. God alone can put the fragments together and estimate their worth.

It is not for the speaker this afternoon to value his place in this community, or to call up memories of his career since boyhood, or to say exactly what was his strength or his weakness. Let me rather stand as one would who felt that in the casket was his own father carved in the marble of death, and it were his own mother that wept, and this was his brother and these were his own afflicted sisters, and this congregation were friends who knew and loved.

God knows our frame, He remembers our frailty, and therefore He pities us as a father his children.

God knows. A skillful instrument maker best knows the qualities of the product of his brain and fingers. He understands its strong points and its weak ones, for he is the creator of it all. So there is One who knows precisely where in our nature we are at fault, where the sweet, loving deeds arise, where tension is strongest, and where resistance can least be made.

He knows the body best because He fashioned it. He is fully aware of all that is involved as a result of such creation. Friends can not appreciate us; they can not rightly measure the good that we possess; they judge from the outward appearance; they do not see behind the result the great motive; they fail to realize that what we do is but a small proportion of what we really are. Friends may say to-day they regard his talents aright, but do they fathom the deeps from which the deed springs? Do they appreciate the outpush of his ambition, the splendid hopes he entertained for the future? We see the bud cut off from the plant and stop with the thought that there is only a bud. Another with better vision has already seen the beauty and the radiance of the flower that is to be. We see the bud of a life; we say that is all; but there is One above who sees the promise of fruitage, knowing what twenty or thirty years more of activity can accomplish. We see the bud; God sees the flower.

Least of all may our opponents judge us. They exaggerate defects, obscure or even forget excellences, are prejudiced, unable to give an impartial verdict. Even a good reputation may be beaten by the scandalous flail of abuse. Nor may we know ourselves. We live for the moment; we are in a maze; we can not summon ourselves to see ourselves. We are a bundle of energies. "The soul is the enigma" to itself. What we are in the depths of our being we can not fathom. The only solution is God.

God knew the frame of our friend. He saw there the struggle which is the heritage of mankind. Anyone who is perfect here will not understand it. Everyone else knows of that battle in the arena of the soul. Everyone else at some time cries out, "Wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death?"

And when the good rises triumphant he exclaims, "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me." With some the contest is not on the surface, and yet it is going on. With others, as the black angel of evil locks shields with the white angel of good, the world sees the conflict and is a spectator of the immediate issue. God knows how hard it all is. He sees the good we long to accomplish, the evil that we wrestle against. Often we stumble and are weary, but we know that the contest will be again renewed.

He knows your sorrows, you who mourn. The heart of the Eternal is most wonderfully kind. He loves with an everlasting love. He knows the heartache and the agony. He knows, too, the kindly deeds of your loved one. Many here will never be informed of all the little acts of kindness, tokens of a forgiving spirit, which were almost forgotten at the time; the desire for the welfare of others. But not so with the Heavenly Father. As you treasure up sacredly the memory of the departed, God is aware of how many tender chords are moving and throbbing.

God remembers. He remembers that we are dust. It is our frailty that appeals to Him. He recalls all the good that has been planned and wrought. He remembers how in yonder room, with genuine sorrow for his fall, he pleaded the forgiveness of this church and won it. And shall the good God be outdone in forgiving power by his sinful creatures? He remembered when he stood and as a preacher of the gospel besought even with tears men should strive after Christ and salvation and hope and all that should prove true and abiding. At the closing of Congress, when others thought only of patriotic songs, his voice started the grand old doxology, and the inspiration passed from one to another until the Hall of Representatives thrilled with the rhythm of that devout hymn of praise, and men who were not supposed to be religious came to him and expressed their appreciation of the lofty sentiment of the time-mellowed strains. Let his friends and his family to-day,

even while their eyelids are bedewed with fast-falling tears, try to join their trembling voices, as he would have had them, and repeat:

"Praise God, from whom all blessings flow;
Praise Him, all creatures here below;
Praise Him above, ye heavenly host;
Praise Father, Son, and Holy Ghost."

That scene is not forgotten by the Heavenly Father, nor is anything that is noble and forgiving and patriotic and honest and manly and Christ like and talented and lovable in him. During the last week of his public career he fought for his constituency in favor of one bill and as earnestly labored for their sake against another.

He stood for his district; he purposed having their wishes regarded. There was nothing personal in it. The people he loved had rights that must be respected. Those weary days and protracted nights of indefatigable exertion exhausted his frame. But his honest efforts after a clean record as a Representative will not be forgotten.

The Father of Spirits, to whom he has gone, understood his love for his family. How he was idolized by his friends, respected by his political antagonists, and almost worshiped by his adherents; how he had no enemies, and how he toiled and sacrificed to hasten back with laurels of honest triumph to the place he loved to call his home. "He will not have allowed his faults to be forgotten," some one says. No; the Almighty is just; but He has seen down within the inner circle of the man the great struggle, the fight carried on against his particular sins. You do not know how he suffered and how earnestly he prayed and how fervently he hoped and how strong his convictions were that—

"My mistakes His free grace will cover;
My sins He will wash away,
And the feet that shrink and falter
Shall walk through the gates of day."

That secret is hidden with himself and the One who has all along remembered that He was dealing with the dust.

God pities. He might know us through and through. He might remember every trait and word and act, and it would be little satisfaction for us. But after his thought and remembrance He pities—as the father pities his child, only infinitely more; as the mother her infant, but with surpassingly greater tenderness. So that He invites the widow to leave her fatherless ones in His care and He will be as kind as a husband to her.

The pity of God! It shone forth in the face of His Son as He went forth on His mission. As Jesus wept at the grave of His friend, so God weeps. As when the Saviour said while they drove the iron into His quivering nerves, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do," so God pities His offspring even when in their blindness they oppose His will. God is affected by every tear that stains the cheek, at every moan. He aches in every heartache. He agonizes in each struggle. He loves in every noble emotion. He says, "When thou passeth through the waters, I will be with thee, and through the rivers, they shall not overflow thee." Bring your grief and your sorrow to Him, for He cares for you. Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear Him, for He knoweth our frame, He remembereth that we are dust.

He died suddenly. Quick comes the call summoning the soul into the presence of the Creator. It says, "Perhaps thy turn will be the next." Are we ready? You whose hair is whitening fast, have you made wise preparation for the great change?

He labored for the people. What he was to city, district, State, and nation we shall discover more fully when his work is tested by time. How much he was to his family you may surmise, but they alone know.

He would have had me say, "Forgive your enemies. Be charitable, be generous, be brotherly. Wherein I was strong and good and manly, emulate my strength. Where I was weak, be very strong. Honor God and revere His name. Turn your hope to Christ. Behold the Lamb of God."

Representative-Elect from Utah.

SPEECH

OF

HON. WALTER P. BROWNLOW,

OF TENNESSEE,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, January 25, 1900,

On the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That under the facts and circumstances of this case, Brigham H. Roberts, Representative-elect from the State of Utah, ought not to have or hold a seat in the House of Representatives, and that the seat to which he was elected is hereby declared vacant."

Mr. BROWNLOW said:

Mr. SPEAKER: It is a condition, and not a theory, which confronts this honorable and deliberate body. Were it the latter it could be disposed of readily without prolonged discussion, excitement, apprehension, or detriment to any public interest. Theories play no part in shaping events and molding destinies until they ripen into actual and living facts.

Stripped of all quibbling, evasions, sentimental rubbish, and legal technicalities, the question is, Should Brigham H. Roberts, bearing the regular and required credentials of election, be admitted to this floor as the Representative of the State of Utah?

The law bearing on this case and all the relevancies growing out of it has been exhaustively presented pro and con, and if there be any member of this House who is not thoroughly enlightened upon its legal features he has certainly turned a deaf ear to a brilliant, learned, and profitable discussion or has not the mental capacity to understand the English language. To add anything, were I able, to the array of arguments presented by those wise and skilled in law would be a wearisome work of supererogation.

Owing to the tyranny of circumstances my law education was woefully neglected in the rosy and exuberant days of youth. From necessity as well as from choice, I was manufacturing cups, wash pans, dippers, cake pans, coffeepots, and butter and lard cans in a tin shop, or stoking wood on or manipulating the throttle of a railroad engine, when I might have been adsorbing the juicy and refreshing literature of legal tomes. With this disadvantage in early life it can not be reasonably expected that I am such a prodigy as to be able to fathom the profound depths, thread the intricacies, and solve the knotty problems of the law nor determine where the hairsplitting discriminations properly and artistically come in, yet I felicitate myself upon the self-assumption that I can understand a legal proposition that is good common sense and is advanced to protect virtue and honor, manhood and womanhood; to defend and uphold the principles of common honesty and enforce the faithful and complete performance of contracts and obligations.

There is a higher law than that written in constitutions and legislative enactments. It is written on the tablet of every man's heart, and the silent monitor within him is its priest. Individuals are amenable to it first. It is of binding force in every part of God's inhabited universe, Utah, the infant of the Republic, blighted, cursed, and rotten with the moral leprosy of Mormonism, not excepted.

The Decalogue, graved on tables of stone by the hand of God and delivered to the Lawgiver of Israel on the summit of storm-swept and thunder-riven Sinai for the government of all people to "the last syllable of recorded time," gives it simple form and terse and forceful expression.

"Thou shall not commit adultery" is a command direct from the lips of Jehovah and the parliament of heaven. This divine statute against beastly lust and social pollution—against the daring crime and terrific evil of "more wives than one"—is the angelic spirit of the leading feature of moral renovation and the most puissant force of a pure and true civilization. It is the chief corner stone of the social fabric. It setteth the solitary in families; it ennobles and purifies manhood; it honors and glorifies womanhood, and with flaming sword guards its most precious jewel—virtue; it solemnizes and sanctifies the marriage vow; it sacredizes the altar of home and makes its temple shrine the white citadel of purity.

Individuals who brazenly and persistently violate this law sink to the level of brutish instincts and passions, lose all sense of shame and decency and become ultimately the helpless, unpitied, and shunned pariahs of society. In the degradation and pollution of unbridled lust man is no better than a brute, and woman, the angel all gone out of her soul, is as bad as a fiend. The nation that tolerates or patronizes licentiousness, whether the serpent trails the dens, dives, and slums, or shows its eye of fire, tongue of flame, and fang of death amid the tawdry mockeries of religious fanacticism, must forfeit its own instinctive self-respect and abandon all claim to the recognition of the civilized world. In time, however, strong and firmly intrenched, its bulwarks will crumble, its pillars shatter, and it will be forced on the grim registry of wasted powers and decayed glories; it will be swept, small or massive, into the flaming vortex of God's unrestrained wrath.

Years ago this abomination of lechery and moral death known by the sacrilegious name of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints was organized at Nauvoo, Ill. Joseph Smith, the fraud and pretender, who set claim to an immediate revelation of the Divine will engraved on metallic plates, found just where he and some other villainous libertine had placed them, was at its head. It dared and defied God in claiming that polygamy was His express injunction, and that his hot displeasure would rest upon those who refused to obey it. Its creed was the charter of social crime and its adherents shamed the world by their revolting practices. This nightshade of moral poison and death grew in a region where nature spread her royal bounties in forests and level plains of exhaustless fertility and where the inland sea of the Republic afforded unrestricted opportunities for travel and commerce. The impiousness of Mormonism, sinking its infatuated devotees to the level of brutish instincts and passions, flourished as all crime flourishes where there is no sentiment of moral purity and rectitude to arrest its revolting excesses and to resist its daring aggressions.

No doubt Joseph Smith, the revelator and the prophet and the priest of this abomination, fancied that he was secure in his infernal deceptions and the temple of lust which he had built and dedicated to the degradation of the people he was leading to ruin would last at least until he was forced to retire from the service by the infirmities of age.

But Joseph Smith did not know that the consecrated and courageous ambassador of God, that holy character upon whom the polygamist is always ready to vent his implacable hate and impotent rage, was seeking out this plague spot with the Bible in

one hand and the standard of a pure civilization and true freedom in the other. The pioneers, who had come from the staid and sturdy communities of the old States and were building home altars in the surrounding regions and who still retained vivid impressions of their moral training in Sunday schools, churches, and in associations with the pure and undefiled, were aroused.

A resistless tornado of public execration assailed this den of libertines and harlots, and Joseph Smith, its presiding deity and genius, was swept from his intrenchments. It was an upheaval, with its counterpart in the earthquake, that shook and sank the fertile stretches of this plague spot. Jo Smith was slaughtered by the outraged and infuriated defenders of a pure home and a pure womanhood, and went in a flash and straight as an arrow to the Mormon's home in the bosom of his Satanic majesty. Righteous retribution!

But the serpent of Mormonism was not killed, only scotched. It could no longer crawl and coil in its filthy slime; no longer hiss and strike in the place of its conception and nativity, and sought and found a new den in a sweet valley in the shadow of the Rockies, near 2,000 miles from the abodes of civilization. Here were fertile plains, crystal waters, all varieties of climate, and a health-insuring altitude. Here were landscapes reposing in the soft silences of dreaming nature. Here were scenic grandeurs that fascinated the beholder by their fantastic and ever-changing forms and awed him by their aspects of terribleness.

Mountain summits hooded with eternal snow sent down the invigorating ozone to the warm plains undulating with the rank luxuriance of perennial grasses, whilst summer evoked every wild flower from the generous soil and spread her green livery over the forests. Snow-fed streams coursed their silvery way in idle beauty. Here was a treasure house with an exhaustless plenitude of material wealth. Here was a paradise for the invalid, farmer, miner, artisan, architect, shepherd, and stock raiser.

After a tramp of hundreds of miles through a trackless wilderness, their harems and bastard progeny along with them, the polygamists, driven from the pale of decent society, here halted, settled, and built their gorgeous palaces of sin and prostitution and their shrines of impious irreligion. Under the peculiar creed and institution of Mormonism the population multiplied like the frogs and flies in Egypt—with the fecundity of maggots in a rotting carcass. They assured and comforted themselves with the dream that, sequestered in these solitudes and hundreds of miles from the borders of a malignant civilization and the persecutions of implacable foes, the edicts of brutal courts, the decisions of bloody juries, and the oppressions of ruffian law officers could never interfere with the largest exercise of their personal liberties; that they could preach and practice the pollutions of Mormonism and build up an empire on its creed and institutions without let or hindrance.

The chiefs of this polygamist enterprise, the sovereigns of the harems, the priests who officiated in the Tabernacle and officered the Endowment House, were not slow in discovering that they had struck "pay dirt," and were not any slower in appropriating for their own special enjoyment and the delectation of their courtesans the advantages and opportunities of their new environment. They projected industrial enterprises and compelled the common trash, whom they held in thrall and fear, to do the menial work without compensation. The libertines and prostitutes led the gayest of lives, the cares and burdens of a multitudinous bastard offspring they placed on others, while they fared sumptuously every day and whiled away the dreamy hours in the elegant leisure, pomp, and glorious circumstance of royal sovereignty. Everything went on swimmingly for Brigham and his favorites; they were kings and queens to all intents and purposes, and their sole occupation was an unbroken revel in the damning sensualism they impiously apotheosized as "the religion and service of Jesus Christ." Orchards, gardens, farms, and stately architecture where the wilderness had been embellished the perfect work of nature. The mountains were full of the finest timber, granite, and the precious metals and were starred with the fires of mining camps. The thrifty Mormon mixed business and the unpaid toil of the ignorant, deluded, and oppressed common class with degrading pollutions and sensualities.

By and by the gentile brother, in his migratory search for better fortune and larger opportunities, penetrated this El Dorado, and was charmed with its beauty, promise, and natural wealth. The panorama unrolling before his astounded vision enchanted him with its strange and varied loveliness, and he pitched his tent for a permanent residence. He had brought with him aspirations for a higher, broader, and worthy life, the civilization of his old home, a robust reverence for the cardinal virtues and the true religion, and the unyielding determination to be a Christian and a gentleman, even among libertines, prostitutes, and savages.

The Mormon chiefs did not welcome this invasion. They regarded the daring and ambitious gentile as an interloper, trespasser, and an emissary of evil, and his coming as "criminal aggression." With a keen remembrance of the bloody scenes at Nauvoo and the slaughter of their chief in fraud and immorality, they saw in it an element of danger—a most perilous menace to their creed, institutions, and practices. Nemesis had tracked polygamy to its lair in the heart of the wilderness, and her pioneer column had come to seek the best positions of offense and defense and mark out the battle line. The Latter-Day Saints fixed on the gentile invader, who never winced nor flinched, the scrutinizing glare of suspicion's keen and watchful eye, and hounded, badgered, ridiculed, and ostracized him, and tried in every conceivable way to harass and defeat him in his plans and enterprises and drive him from the country. But he only thrived and multiplied the more. He nourished and cultivated the elements of "benevolent assimilation" within him. The rapidity of his increase, the prosperity of his undertakings, the courage of his convictions, and his fierce and valorous denunciations of the modern Babylon struck terror to the king of lust enthroned in this fair domain of God.

The apostles conceived and organized a perfect system of oppressions and persecutions, including arson and slaughter, as the midnight burning of gentile homes and the Mountain Meadows massacre will testify to all the ages. The conflict for supremacy then began in terrible earnestness. It was the tiger of polygamy against the lamb of purity, and a corrupt and lecherous priesthood against morality and Christianity. It was the home against the brothel. The gentiles were courageously aggressive and unyielding. The faith and fortitude of the missionary was their inspiration. The "saints" resorted to every excess of desperation to hold and defend their lodge, knowing that driven from it they could find no place of secure seclusion. The people were aroused and realized what a venomous and deadly serpent the nation was holding in its bosom. The Government was forced to take a hand in the conflict. Through the machinery of its Territorial courts it brought the Mormon leaders into apparent subjection, and apparent only. Under the Edmunds Act of 1882 they were indicted, tried, and convicted of adulterous practices and sentenced to the penitentiary, and the very man Brigham H. Roberts, named for the Beelzebub of the Mormon priesthood, and who comes here to insult this body and affront the whole country by his insolent and shameless demand for admission into Congress, was one, and a prominent one, of this infamous layout.

Under Territorial conditions the polygamists could no longer hold their liaisons with their plural prostitutes in the open, and they were compelled to seek the covert for the gratification of their hellish passions. And this is the reason, and the only reason, for such an absorbing desire for Utah to become a star on the flag. After repeated efforts and failures, statehood was only granted on the express condition that the chief feature of the Mormon creed should be relinquished and the occupation of the Mormon chiefs abandoned. They gave this promise, in the form of official sanction and solemnity, to induce the President to turn their convicted felons out of their prison cells. Every Mormon party to this compact was the head devil of a harem and the father of a numerous bastard offspring. These polygamists have no more regard for this compact than for the clouds which sail over Salt Lake City. They are faithful only to their "league with hell and covenant with the devil." They only wanted statehood to escape the condign punishment of the Federal courts and that they might intrench their defiant and sacrilegious creed in the statutes of the State. Polygamy is as rampant in Utah, but only hidden, as it was in the palmy days of Brigham Young.

That the infant of the Republic is in the grip of the whoremonger and swaddled in the scarlet robe of harlotry is fully evidenced in sending to this body a notorious and self-confessed polygamist, a penitentiary bird with at least two concubines and the unshamed father of a bastard offspring, to represent its interests and maintain the charter of its statehood. The State of Mormonism sought admission into the Union to escape the heavy penalties of the Federal courts. This admission was accomplished by deliberate fraud, misrepresentation, and moral perjury, and its statehood rests on a pledge and covenant which is a web of woven wind, openly disregarded and defiantly violated since she, a bedizened and painted prostitute, entered into the pure sisterhood of the States.

Utah, reeking in her immoralities and where the devil of lust is the legislator and the court, has forfeited every right she may have had under the flag and in the council halls of the nation, and now is the time, the set time, for the American people to give emphasis and force to this fact.

If there are no polygamists in Utah, if polygamy has been abandoned as a church creed and a church practice, then there is no slum in any American city but what is a shrine of purity, virtue, and morality.

Brigham H. Roberts may be a man of integrity in the business world; outside of his adulterous life he may be a clean man; he may have the necessary qualification of intelligence; but this only makes his case the more inexcusable and the insolence of his demand to become an integral part of the lawmaking power of the country, under the warrant and commission of the Mormon Church, the more reproachable.

What a disgusting spectacle, what a shock to every feeling of refinement and every elevating sentiment of purity, would a Congress of polygamists be! Can a Congress tolerating, patronizing, and condoning this "sum of all villainy," with all its frightful adjuncts of depravity and soul blight, and according honor and recognition to one who practices and defends this unutterable crime under the unhallowed sanction of religious cant, bigotry, and fanaticism, be morally any better?

I have no feeling of bitterness and hostility toward Mr. Roberts. He is not the head and front of this offending. But in voting against his admission I feel and I know that I am striking a blow at the foul system of immorality of which he is the exponent, representative, and defender. I would not have this great Republic, whose laws we should obey, whose institutions we should cherish, and whose flag we should love and uphold, chained to the monster of Mormonism as the Roman prisoner was chained to a body of death. I would not have the world to know, as it is entering upon the mission of redeeming and renovating other lands, its civilization is tainted with the pollutions of free love and sexual degradation.

I know that Congress is not, and never was designed to be, a Sunday school or a theological seminary, and perhaps will not compare favorably in religious consecration and moral sentiment and practice with a Presbyterian synod, a Methodist conference, a Baptist association, or a convocation of Roman Catholic prelates; yet it should ever stand, as the tribunal of the people, for the nobility of man, the honor and glory of womanhood, and the virtue and purity of the American home. And to this duty I most cheerfully and eagerly give my heart, voice, and vote in shielding my country, its virtue-loving and God-fearing people, this House, and myself as well from the shame and humiliation that the admission of Roberts would bring with the same certainty that disease and age brings death.

Representative-Elect from Utah.

SPEECH

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. McCALL,

OF MASSACHUSETTS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, January 25, 1900,

On the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That under the facts and circumstances of this case, Brigham H. Roberts, Representative-elect from the State of Utah, ought not to have or hold a seat in the House of Representatives, and that the seat to which he was elected is hereby declared vacant."

Mr. McCALL said:

Mr. SPEAKER: Deeming the constitutional questions involved in the case of the member from Utah of grave importance, I desire to avail myself of the general leave which the House has granted and put upon the record a brief expression of my views.

Both the majority and the minority of the special committee to which this case was referred found that Roberts was legally elected to this House by the people of Utah, that he has been for seven years a citizen of the United States, and possesses the other constitutional qualifications for the office. They find also that he is a polygamist, and the majority reports a resolution excluding him from the House without permitting him to take the oath, and declaring his seat vacant. I find myself unable to accept such a conclusion. The right of representation lies at the very basis of our institutions. It is the one right which we should expect to find guarded by the Constitution.

The proposition to exclude a legally elected and qualified Representative for any cause which a bare majority of the House may at any time see fit to assign is the proposition put forth by the majority of the committee. If that is a sound proposition, then the right of a State to representation is indeed limited. The choice by a constituency is made subject to ratification by a majority of the members of the House. It requires no argument to show that if the House can set up the test proposed in this case it can set up any test. It can exclude a man, if it sees fit, because he has no property, or because he is rich, or on account of the color of his hair. The will of a majority of the House is set above the law and the Constitution. I believe that such a power, in the highest degree in derogation of the rights of the individual constituency, should have a clear warrant in the Constitution.

So far, however, from being clearly in favor of this proposition, the clause of the Constitution relied upon by the majority can not fairly bear any such construction. That clause is as follows:

Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own members.

Under this provision has it ever been seriously urged, even in the most partisan contested-election cases, that under the pretext of judging of the elections and returns the House could hold an election of members in its Hall and make returns? I imagine that no such idea has ever entered into the mind of any man. But that would be as rational as the contention that the power given the House to judge of the qualifications of its members gives it the authority to create new qualifications.

The power given in each case is not that of electing or of creating qualifications, but simply of judging. What qualifications is the House to judge of? Any arbitrary ones that it may see fit to set up after an election has been held and which the constituencies never heard of, and to which, therefore, they could not conform? Clearly it is to judge whether those qualifications exist which are set forth in that very article of the Constitution. Having enumerated qualifications upon a matter of fundamental right, the Constitution did not leave it open to the whim of the Legislature, much less to the whim of the House, to add or take from these qualifications.

To my mind, the phraseology of the Constitution is clear, and I do not think any extraneous help is needed for the purposes of construction; but if we go outside the instrument and consider those things which are usually considered in construing doubtful provisions, the meaning of the clause in question is emphasized. It was urged by those who opposed inserting qualifications for Representatives in the Constitution that if they were set forth in that instrument the Legislature would have its hands tied and could impose no new ones. No one even then thought, apparently, that the House alone could prescribe them. But those who favored an enumeration of qualifications prevailed in the convention. Madison said that—

Qualifications of electors and elected were fundamental articles in a republican government and ought to be fixed by the Constitution. If the Legislature could regulate those of either, it can by degrees subvert the Constitution.

The Federalist, which is the great contemporary interpreter of the Constitution, declared that the qualifications of Representatives had been fixed and were unalterable by the Legislature. Take, then, the fundamental character of the right which we should expect to find rooted in a constitution establishing a popular government, the words themselves of that instrument, the debates in the convention, the most authoritative contemporary construction, and add the opinion of the great writers upon the Constitution, like Story and Cooley, and can there be any reasonable doubt as to the construction?

This view is further strengthened by another consideration. The Constitution requires a two-thirds vote to expel a member. If the right of the people to be represented by the man of their choice was so dear and cherished a right in the eyes of the framers of the Constitution that a member might assault the Speaker, might by violence stop the House in the transaction of its business, and might bring it into reproach by the vilest conduct, and yet could be expelled only by a two-thirds vote, how monstrous is this present contention that, although a Representative were unanimously chosen and had every qualification set forth by law, a bare majority of the House can exclude him for any cause it sees fit to assign. How inefficient and nugatory is the safeguard of the two-thirds vote when a bare majority can exclude.

But we are told the precedents sustain the claim that the power of exclusion exists. This House has never shown a great veneration for precedents in election cases, and it rarely decides such a case in which it does not overrule precedents, but in my opinion the condition of the precedents is damaging to the majority proposition. With but a single exception, every one of them which has been adduced was based upon the alleged treason of the member-elect and arose during and just after the civil war, when the Government was struggling for its life or so far as possible to secure by the laws the future of the country against the recurrence of so tremendous a struggle. It was at a time when the Constitution was strained, if not broken, in every part, and necessarily so, in the supreme effort to save the Union.

The precedent I have excepted is found in the case of Whittemore, who had resigned to escape expulsion, and, having secured a reelection, returned to that very House and at the same session. The House apparently treated the proceeding as an attempt to evade its authority and met him at the threshold by an adverse vote. The debate, too, shows that the question now at issue was hardly alluded to, and it was not such a debate as should have preceded the settlement of a great constitutional right. These precedents all arose in the ten years during and following the war. For the other one hundred years of the history of this House not a solitary precedent has been produced. It is hardly conceivable that during that century there have not been men of all kinds of character and reputation elected to the House; men who were notoriously guilty of violating the laws. The fact that in all that time there has arisen no case in which the House attempted to pass on the character of a man whom a constituency had chosen is a pretty strong circumstance and tends to show that there was no general belief in the existence of the power.

It can as strongly be argued that a bench of judges has the inherent power to exclude from its membership any man who

should be chosen to it who, in the opinion of the majority of the court, was not fit to be a member, and who, by his character, might bring reproach upon the bench. The members of the court are chosen by the President and Senate, but the members of the House are chosen by the people, who, in theory at least, are the superiors of every one of their official agents, however chosen. An unworthy judge can be removed in impeachment proceedings by two-thirds of the Senate, but an unworthy member can be removed in expulsion proceedings by two-thirds of the House. In my opinion the proposition of the majority involves a clear and flagrant usurpation of power, and is a blow aimed at one of the most fundamental of all the rights of the people under our Constitution.

But it is said that the homes must be protected. However important that may be, it can not justify this proposed proceeding. Our homes can not be in the long run protected by the destruction of our institutions. As the gentleman from Missouri aptly said, those who urge this argument as a justification for overriding the Constitution "stand with a rope in their hands." The proposition involves the very essence of lynch law. If we are to set aside the Constitution in one case, however flagrant it may be, we will soon be called upon to set it aside in another case, possibly for base partisan motives. Our only safety lies in following the straight path. Macaulay, in the following passage from one of his essays, very well illustrates the advantage to a nation of adhering, even in extreme cases, to the maxims of a well-ordered liberty:

> Ariosto tells a pretty story of a fairy, who, by some mysterious law of her nature, was condemned to appear at certain seasons in the form of a foul and poisonous snake. Those who injured her during the period of her disguise were forever excluded from participation in the blessings which she bestowed. But to those who, in spite of her loathsome aspect, pitied and protected her, she afterwards revealed herself in the beautiful and celestial form which was natural to her, accompanied their steps, granted all their wishes, filled their houses with wealth, made them happy in love and victorious in war. Such a spirit is Liberty. At times she takes the form of a hateful reptile. She grovels, she hisses, she stings. But woe to those who in disgust shall venture to crush her! And happy are those who, having dared to receive her in her degraded and frightful shape, shall at length be rewarded by her in the time of her beauty and her glory.

The House has a very clear power for its protection. The Constitution gives it the power of expulsion. By a singular process of mind those who are so free in their interpretation of the Constitution as to imply or imagine the far-reaching power of exclusion, limit the meaning of its plain language with reference to expulsion. The power of expulsion is expressed, and is in the broadest possible terms. The House can exercise it for any cause which may seem good to two-thirds of its members. The committee has found that Roberts is now a polygamist. There can be no doubt of the power of the House to expel him. I believe that the power of expulsion should be exercised with great caution and for no slight cause, but to my mind the cause in this case is sufficient. The power, at least, is clear. There would be no usurpation. I would far rather follow that course than the dangerous procedure which is proposed, and which, if followed, will create the only deliberately established precedent in our history in time of peace, a precedent that will very likely be applied hereafter to the great detriment of the country.

The Late Garret A. Hobart.

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. GARDNER,
OF NEW JERSEY,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Friday, January 26, 1900.

The House having under consideration the following resolutions:

"*Resolved*, That the House has received with profound sorrow the intelligence of the death of GARRET A. HOBART, late Vice-President of the United States.

"*Resolved*, That the business of the House be suspended in order that the public services and private virtues of the deceased may be appropriately commemorated.

"*Resolved*, That the Clerk of the House be directed to communicate these resolutions to the Senate"—

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey said:

Mr. SPEAKER: The frequency with which this body is called upon to pay the last sad tribute to the memory of the eminent dead is a most forceful reminder of man's mortality. Verily, "He cometh forth like a flower and is cut down." The generations appear like the leaves of spring and flourish for a season only, then, smitten by the breath of the Destroyer, fall, even as the leaves that wither and scatter in autumn's searing blasts. But the earth itself, the abode of man, shall perish; the visible heavens shall pass away; for there is nothing permanent but the law and the love and the kingdom of God.

We pause in our labors to-day to do homage to the memory of one who was not a member of this House, but who, in his high office, represented the suffrage and the majesty of the great Republic.

GARRET A. HOBART had, from his early manhood, been singled out by common consent in his own State as the personality most abounding in promise of great service and future honor to his State; but he was greater perhaps than we knew, for when he rose to a commanding position among the nation's lights, it was seen that he was in his sphere; and when he died, all knew that a luminary of great power had fallen from the national sky.

The career of Mr. HOBART is another of those oft-recurring lessons of the opportunities offered to young American manhood, and demonstrated that energy, integrity, and courage, if seconded by real ability, may conquer all the weary paths that lie between the lowly and the highest estate and lead triumphantly to the most exalted station; for he rose with no aid but his merit, with no friend but his deserts, and with no claim to recognition but his fitness.

GARRET AUGUSTUS HOBART was born on a farm near Long Branch, N. J., in 1844, of New England and New Jersey ancestry which ran back to the English and the Dutch.

Quickness of perception and comprehension, energy, physical and mental stamina, fidelity to duty, high courage, and an entire veracity of mind were his by inheritance and were ineradicable. It is difficult to believe he ever had a vice to overcome.

Young HOBART was educated in the common schools and by his father, until he entered Rutgers College, from which he was graduated in 1863, before he was 19 years of age. After a brief period as an educator he began the study of law in Paterson, N. J., under the tutelage of his father's friend, also of New England stock, Socrates Tuttle, a gentleman of great ability, fine attainments, and splendid character. He was graduated from Mr. Tuttle's office, and admitted to the bar of New Jersey; then began his real career.

Mr. HOBART later was united in marriage with Miss Jennie Tuttle, daughter of his legal preceptor. Of that union I shall speak but briefly now, for to dwell upon it would seem like the mingling of notes of discord with the funeral dirge, and an unpardonable rudeness to her who did so much to hedge round his life with happy environment and to crown his days with joy. Let it suffice to say that the story of their wedded life and home in Paterson, when told, will be "A sweet savor wherever happy homes are recognized as the citadel of virtue and the hope of the world."

Mr. HOBART grew at once in professional and in public esteem. Had his abilities been entirely and continuously devoted to his profession, he would have attained the very first rank among its masters, for his great talents were legal and judicial to the last degree. In all his business life he never had use for any lawyer but a "close lawyer." But the public and the great business interests would not allow Mr. HOBART to practice his profession as he would then have desired. He was ever pursued with offers of office and of business. He was sought with proffers of opportunity which other gifted men strove for in vain.

Before he was 27 years of age he had been the legal counsel of his city and his county and was being asked to go to the legislature to mold the laws. He was elected to the assembly and afterwards to the senate of New Jersey. Whatever political body Mr. HOBART entered, he was placed at its head. The New Jersey assembly made him its presiding officer; the New Jersey senate made him its president; the State Republican executive committee made him its chairman, in which capacity he conducted many of our most important campaigns. He also represented New Jersey in the national Republican committee for many years, and nobody ever thought of a successor.

Whatever Mr. HOBART did was so well done that opportunity, as I have said, was ever seeking him. I have never heard a criticism of his management of a business matter. Governments and courts felt secure in the management of their charges when in his hands. His great capacity and integrity, winning universal confidence, must have, as they did, rewarded his business efforts and discretion with affluence.

nI the career of Mr. HOBART there was nothing sensational or episodical. He never sought but rather shunned notoriety. His aims were definite; his purpose steady as the granite hills; his efforts as sustained as the motions of the planet. To every task he brought the energy of a splendid hope. With him all objects were specific and every duty great, and to his conviction of duty, his definite aims, his tireless energy, and steady purpose, quietly pursued, are largely due the success and honors that crowned his life.

He was a man of most magnificent courage, never more composed and hopeful than in the hour of defeat. When he had given to the service of his party all his splendid abilities during one campaign after another, closing with apparent disaster, he could regret without being cast down, deplore and be not discouraged; and even in that campaign in his State when he sought to realize

the political ambition of his life, and when success had seemed assured until the last days of the contest, when the tides changed and new forces overwhelmed him; and his hosts of loyal friends were downcast and discouraged, he appeared as a rock left by a melting shore, which still lifts its head in majesty above the waters and forms a headland about which the yielding currents must eddy and rebuild the broken line.

So, too, in that sad day when he returned to his country leaving his beloved daughter, in a foreign soil, dead on the threshold of womanhood; though his heart was bleeding, he turned the same pleasant face to the world, and, while a little drawn perhaps, the old smile was there. And at the last, conscious of his own approaching dissolution, when the soul makes the awful query that most affects all that live and die, he smiled with the fortitude and hope and confidence of a hero and a Christian martyr.

Mr. HOBART was endowed with more admirable and enviable qualities than any one man I ever knew. All men agree that his was a most lovable personality. Informed men spoke of his acquirements; churchmen, of his rectitude and deep religious convictions; the philanthropist, of his unostentatious charity; business men marveled at his business judgment; politicians wondered at his clear perception of the character and the value of issues; statesmen, at his wide and ready knowledge of national and international affairs; and all alike, at his ready powers of solution, readily mastering problems, however weighty and however intricate. His sympathy was as broad as the field of human struggle, and all classes felt its touch, so that when the dreaded message of his departure flashed over the country, the bitter tear fell at every hearthstone, for all alike felt the loss of a friend.

When Mr. HOBART was nominated for the Vice-Presidency, factions in New Jersey at once lost their identity and party lines became confused. Regard for policies largely gave way to confidence in the man. What part of the 89,000 majority the State gave in that election was due to the personality of Mr. HOBART and the esteem in which he was held as a man can never be accurately stated, but it may be safely stated the result was a magnificent tribute from the citizenship of New Jersey to her gifted son—an expression of confidence in his patriotism, abilities, and exalted character.

His example has been a beneficent influence in the community in which he lived and died, in the State which he served and honored, in the nation which came to know and honor him, and to the civilized world which has now heard of him and his life, which, in its business energy and integrity, private Christian purity, and fidelity to every trust imposed, is a model for all men in all countries. He adorned society, lent a dignity to common affairs, and elevated every office he filled.

He died as the Christian dies, and he will be remembered here; therefore he has triumphed over death "in time and eternity."

The Late Garret A. Hobart.

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSHUA S. SALMON,
OF NEW JERSEY,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Friday, January 26, 1900.

The House having under consideration the following resolutions:

"*Resolved*, That the House has received with profound sorrow the intelligence of the death of GARRET A. HOBART, late Vice-President of the United States.

"*Resolved*, That the business of the House be suspended in order that the public services and private virtues of the deceased may be appropriately commemorated.

"*Resolved*, That the Clerk of the House be directed to communicate these resolutions to the Senate"—

Mr. SALMON said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I would not attempt at this time to add to what has been so well said in the Senate and in this House upon the life of our lamented Vice-President, were it not that his home was so near my own and my acquaintance with him had been so pleasant. It is natural for men to value an acquaintance with one who has risen to a position of honor and distinction. The memory of such acquaintance is inspiring and encouraging.

I first met Mr. HOBART in 1878, when he was a member of the New Jersey senate and I of the house of assembly. I well remember his quiet, genial manner, and his smooth yet decided way in dealing with matters requiring his attention. He never impressed his partisanship upon those who differed with him, while at the same time he was earnest and strong in his efforts to secure his object. I met him occasionally between our first acquaintance and his election as Vice-President, and he always exhibited the same genial manner and courteous dignity.

Mr. HOBART had a comprehensive mind with quick perception, and he was thoroughly executive in character. He wielded his power not by physical force or menacing threats, but by an irresistible force of reason and persuasion that so rarely accompanies the strong will and determined purpose. His tact in leading others to accept his conclusions was more than ordinary.

Goethe said, "The difference between great and little men is in the amount of energy applied to their undertakings." Mr. HOBART was a hard worker. He applied his mind closely and incessantly to his business. I know of his expressing weariness and a lack of satisfaction in mere business success before his election to the Vice-Presidency. His soul was too great to be satisfied by the mere accumulation of wealth. Though it may not be said that he made opportunities, yet by his fortunate location opportunities were offered, and he had the grasp and energy of mind to take advantage of and develop them.

The city of Paterson, to which, from his native county of Monmouth, he came when a young man, has been progressive beyond most Eastern cities. Since the civil war it has grown from a mere town to a city of about 100,000 people. It is a thoroughly manufacturing city. Its industries are and always have been varied. Its iron manufactories and silk mills are extensive. Because of the great number and varied character of its silk factories it has been called the "Lyons" of America. With this enterprising people Mr. HOBART made his home when a young man, and there he found opportunities for the employment of his rare energy and tact.

The lessons taught by his life are different from those taught by the lives of most men whose names are honored in our country's annals. Few indeed are they who, having gained high political station as well as eminent business success, retain the esteem and love of their fellow-men to the time of their death as he did.

Mr. HOBART has been called from this life at an age when he might reasonably have been expected to be in the vigor of health and mental activity. He was but little past 55 years old at the time of his death.

> He gave his honors to the world again,
> His blessed part to heaven, and slept in peace.

The years he lived fell far short of the allotted length of man's life; yet if we measure life by what is accomplished, there have been few in our country who have lived as long as he lived.

If any are discouraged and feel that they can not succeed, they will find in the history of his life an inspiration to hope and persevere; if any are inclined to believe that kindness and courtesy are not proper elements in the character of the strong and successful man, they should recall the scene at the funeral of the deceased Vice-President, where thousands gathered and with bowed heads attested their sorrow because of his untimely demise.

> Patriots have toiled, and in their country's cause
> Bled nobly; and their deeds, as they deserve,
> Receive proud recompense. We give in charge
> Their names to the sweet lyre. The historic Muse,
> Proud of the treasure, marches with it down
> To latest times; and Sculpture, in her turn,
> Gives bond in stone and ever-during brass
> To guard them, and to immortalize her trust.

The Late Hon. Lorenzo Danford.

REMARKS
OF
HON. R. B. GORDON,
OF OHIO,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Saturday, January 20, 1900.

The House having under consideration the following resolutions:

"*Resolved*, That the business of the House be now suspended, that opportunity may be given for paying tributes to the memory of Hon. LORENZO DANFORD, late a member of the House of Representatives from the State of Ohio.

"*Resolved*, That, as a particular mark of respect to the memory of the deceased and in recognition of his eminent abilities as a distinguished public servant, the House at the conclusion of these memorial proceedings shall stand adjourned.

"*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the family of the deceased.

"*Ordered*, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate"—

Mr. GORDON said:

Mr. SPEAKER: After an active life, an eventful career, Hon. LORENZO DANFORD, crowned with military laurels and civic honors, passed into the great hereafter. Gentlemen who served with him in the House of Representatives and knew him intimately have portrayed in fitting language his personal qualities and public services. They have detailed his birth in Ohio, his admission to the bar and subsequent practice of his profession, his military duty, wherein conspicuous bravery brought promotion, and his Congressional service.

In speaking of the dead, intimate association alone qualifies one to discuss those attributes of personality which, after all, make the man as we know him. I regret that fortune did not favor me with such relationship to Mr. DANFORD. But his public worth as a soldier, a citizen, and statesman is known of men, and I wish to place on record my tribute to one who was prominent in many walks of life, and each illumined by his purity of purpose and deed and his consecrated devotion to duty. His was a well-rounded life, and when the inexorable summons came it found him in the service of his State and country.

Mr. Speaker, it is a wise course which the Federal Congress pursues in suspending its strict legislative functions to review the lives and public services of Senators and Representatives who die while in the discharge of their official duties. In honoring them honor is reflected upon itself. It furnishes to the youth of the country lessons in patriotism and public and private virtue which are all the more forceful in that they are examples rather than precept. The study of such lives gives inspiration to many toiling beneath oppressive burdens and directs the efforts of the living generation, as it will of generations to come, to higher and nobler aims.

Especially is this true in a country having the institutions of our own, where titles of nobility and hereditary rank are unknown. In repudiating the divine right of kings, the wise forefathers also disavowed the superiority of selected strains of blood. And so the life of everyone who, from the ranks of what the immortal Lincoln termed the common people, rose to eminence in public life or private station stimulates to better endeavor the youth of our country. In this category Mr. DANFORD'S life stands preeminent.

Mr. Speaker, death affords a vast field for philosophic study and historical research. It is a subject so infinite that the finite mind, whether endowed in abundance or favored in less fortunate degree, has never reached a conclusion which dissipated doubt. But with the faith that is in us, it is sweet to believe that on some favored shore the hosts assemble in eternal peace.

LORENZO DANFORD lived a Christian life and died a Christian death. In every relation of life he did his duty as an enlightened judgment dictated and a quickened judgment approved. On the anniversary of his birthday, when he had attained the three-score and ten years allotted to man, he fell asleep.

"Well done, thou good and faithful servant; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

On the Late Garret A. Hobart.

OF

HON. MARTIN H. GLYNN,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, January 26, 1900.

The House having under consideration the following resolutions:

"*Resolved*, That the House has received with profound sorrow the intelligence of the death of GARRET A. HOBART, late Vice-President of the United States.

"*Resolved*, That the business of the House be suspended in order that the public services and private virtues of the deceased may be appropriately commemorated.

"*Resolved*, That the Clerk of the House be directed to communicate these resolutions to the Senate."—

Mr. GLYNN said:

Mr. SPEAKER: In behalf of a number of my fellow-Democratic Congressmen from New York State, I lay a laurel wreath at the door of the tomb of GARRET A. HOBART. My words but echo their thoughts; their thoughts but reflect the feelings of their hearts; their heart-feelings but mirror forth the opinions and beliefs of the American people. Mine was not the pleasure of a personal acquaintance with the distinguished statesman whose memory we revere to-day. Had it been, I would feel myself better qualified to speak the eulogy which I am about to utter, but public men live in their works as authors live in their books and as artists abide in their pictures—there to be the subject forever of discussion at the pens of writers, the tongues of speakers, and the minds of critics. No one living to-day had a personal acquaintance with Jefferson, Shakespeare, or Michael Angelo, yet who living to-day in this broad land can be said to be unacquainted with Angelo, Shakespeare, and Jefferson, who live, though dead? In the analogy of this thought lies my reason for uttering the following sentiments of respect, shared in common by my Democratic conferees.

To voice a proper description of GARRET A. HOBART would be to delineate the last four years of the political history of the United States, to epitomize the political incidents of the State of New Jersey for a decade at least, and to narrate many chapters in the commercial annals of the upbuilding of American commerce and the fostering of American manufacturing. However much one may differ with the political principles advocated by the late Vice-President, he must confess that in the workings of his own personal career, in the undertakings of his legal profession, and in the consummation of his business plans, GARRET A. HOBART was a constructor and not a destroyer. Most men die without creating; few die without destroying. He has lived well upon the tombstone of whose grave can be carved the verity, "Herein lieth a man who was a creator and not a destroyer." In his tribute President McKinley paid as grand a eulogy to the memory of GARRET A. HOBART as man could utter when in his last message to Congress he said:

> His private life was pure and elevated, while his public career was ever distinguished by large capacity, stainless integrity, and exalted motives. He has been removed from the high office which he honored and dignified, but his lofty character, his devotion to duty, his honesty of purpose, and noble virtues remain with us as a priceless legacy and example.

In the life of GARRET A. HOBART can be found the lesson that inspiration comes of working every day. He, as much as any other man of his time, has given proof that genius is encompassed in the ability of doing a hard day's work and doing it on every working day in the year. He did all things well because he did all things intensely. He had learned that in things where the heart is not, the hand is never powerful. From his life we learn that greatness flows not from chance, nor from a mere happy combination of events, but simply from the magic of unwavering determination, clear apprehension, and ceaseless toil. GARRET A. HOBART became a great man because he possessed these qualifications and because they enabled him to fill great occasions. He had the abilities, the confidence, and the stamina to meet momentous occasions, and therefore such occasions marked him and called him to be what the successes of his abilities, confidence, and stamina would make him. Jackson, Lincoln, Clay, Blaine, and Tilden all drew their greatness from this same fountain head; aye, more, all the great master spirits, all the founders and lawgivers of empires, all the defenders of the rights of men, all the upbuilders of the greatness of a nation, are made by these same laws.

It is fitting that we should pause in the rushings of our work-a-day world to pay tribute to a man who, by the sheer force of ability, carved his way from "a man with the hoe" to be the occupant of the seat of the Vice-Presidency of the United States. Only from the facts of a life like this is composed substantial thought. All other thought is mere speculation, mathematical philosophy, a puncture by the rapier of probability into the clouds of guess-land. It is well that we should pause and reflect upon the incidents of such a life, because, when events daily increase in the growing magnitude of a nation like ours, history becomes a dwarf and passes into biography and there is need in the rapidity of national advancement for the microscope to be placed on every honored son of the Government, so that he may be seen in his true grandeur and taken at his true worth. To the student the life of GARRET A. HOBART must drive home the fact that glory is only a furrow in the dust, but at the same time it can not help teaching that it is worth while to stamp that dust under foot, so as thereon to leave an impression by which the world and posterity may know that we have once journeyed along the road of life.

Some one has said that death transforms an opponent into a friend. In a political sense this can not be said to apply to the man whose loss we mourn to-day. Even his hardest political opponents never allowed the smoke of the fiercest political battles to blind their vision as to the sterling worth of HOBART. They recognized that in politics, as in war, the greatest men are those who never capitulate. They realized that while men of different political faiths differ as to everything on earth, they may some day be united in what is larger than everything mundane, in what embraces the sum total of life and thought——the arms of Providence. History teaches us that as great men see the right more rightly than small or mediocre minds, so they see the false more falsely. The knowledge of this fact brings to opponents in politics a brotherhood and a manliness that almost deify differences of opinion and sweeten the acrimonies of opposition.

From a farmer's son GARRET A. HOBART worked his way through college and made himself a legal light of his State and a power in the politics of the nation. His ascendancy was like the atoms of the soiling charcoal that we little value, becoming by wise combinations and gradual arrangements the resplendent diamond which every eye admires. Grandly, indeed, in all the workings of his life did this son of the masses attest the fact that from the pure, untainted blood of the common people come the rulers of the world. Grandly did he perform his business functions for his associates, his official functions for his country, and accomplish projects which scores of mediocre minds could never accomplish. The people of his native State loved him, his business associates loved him, his opponents respected him, and men are not wont to cherish so deeply that which is not deserving of their love and admiration. According to Edmund Burke—

> Reproach is concomitant with greatness; envy grows in a direct proportion with fame, and censure is the tax that every man must pay the public for being eminent.

In the main these assertions are true, but in the history of GARRET A. HOBART is found the exception which proves the rule of their truthfulness. Throughout all his undertakings Mr. HOBART exercised an indomitable will to acquire and retain success. He found no joys in the intrigues of the wanton courtier; his heart was not wedded to the revels of pleasure; his soul always took flight beyond the ticklings of sense. With him one great goal was always in view and the desire to reach it was father of all his efforts. Such ambition has served the world in good stead. It has worked like the desire of the philosopher's stone on the chemists of old. The object of their search was truly a chimera, nevertheless it was productive of a real good in the shape of modern chemistry. In like manner civilization owes inestimable advantages to such ambition as HOBART'S, though the honor which is the object of its quest may prove a will-o'-the-wisp. It was the spur that goaded HOBART on from business triumph to business triumph, from office to office, only in the end to find himself Vice-President and this country the richer for his ambition. It is the motive power that has ever kept the wheel of progress in motion and prevented the world from loitering on the path to advancement. Far be it from my intention to canonize Mr. HOBART. In his career he must have made some mistakes—else he would not have been a man—but that man is the greatest who makes the fewest, and HOBART'S missteps are far outweighed by his many noble deeds and kind offices. In fact, to whatever shortcomings may have been his we can apply the words of the poet:

Motes in the sunshine, foam-bells on the ocean,
Cloud shadows flitting o'er the mountain's breast—
His faults but marked the mighty play, the motion
Of a grand nature in its grand unrest.

To say that GARRET A. HOBART was an eloquent man would be to do injustice to the great men who have attained eminence by the arts of Demosthenes and the attributes of Cicero, and at the same time to make that assertion would be to cast a shadow of disrespect upon that grand instrument by which Mr. HOBART achieved distinction, that most potential of instruments within the grasp of man—personal influence. Those who carefully note the comparative value of lives in a community soon learn that the element which counts for most is that subtle thing called personal influence. In it there is something more potent than money or speech, a mystic force which flows out from it and magnetizes all that come within its range. It is to the successful man what fragrance is to the flower, what light is to the lamp. It is part and parcel of his personality; yet it reaches outside and beyond himself. That GARRET A. HOBART was endowed with this magnetic power in a remarkable degree is evinced from the facts stated in this House to-day by the gentleman who knew him well and knew him long. The value of this personal influence was greatly augmented by a great human sympathy and a massive manly sense, communicating to his associates and allies new life and energy, touching and unsealing in their breasts the springs of resolution and self-help, and flooding them with soul-cheer.

In life there is nothing except what we put in it. In the fifty-three years of his life GARRET A. HOBART crowded so much work, so many successes, so numerous duties as to merit from the American people that most eloquent tribute paid to Goethe by the Emperor of Germany when he met him and exclaimed: "You are a man." Michelet has gone into raptures over the force of that compliment paid to the great German poet, and the American people may well be pleased that there died in harness as the second highest official in the land a man who could well be called "a man." From his generosity we know that he appreciated the fact that flowers fade without dew and light. From his amiable personality we are sure that he realized the imperishable truths that charity and love are the dew and light of the human heart. He was not of the pessimistic mind, which holds that while nations ascend in civilization, governments descend in administration. He was not of those who are constantly living in the dusk of the past, but rather one of those who by the light of the past purpose to see to it that the administration of governments keeps step with the civilization of nations. From the fate of Lot's wife being turned into a statue of salt for turning back, he had garnered the determination to press ever onward in accordance with the thought that he only lives who acts in the present and thinks of the future.

Despite the millions and millions of people on earth, the world knows only two kinds of minds—minds that are metaphysical pure and simple and metaphysical only, and minds that are not. In Robespierre and St. Louis we have examples of the mere metaphysical mind. Those that are not metaphysical are more or less fatalistical. The minds that work out the most for the amelioration of mankind are the minds that are not only metaphysical, but also reflective of their antithesis. In Charlemagne and St. Augustin we have the greatest examples of this sort of mind, while in HOBART it is duplicated in essence, though perhaps not in totality. It is such a mind that makes man the ardent believer in the dispensations of an all-wise Providence, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from New York, the leader of the majority, represent Mr. HOBART to have been.

In his religious inclinations and political enthusiasm he must have been somewhat akin to Cardinal de Berulle. Students of French history will remember that when La Rochelle, under Louis XIII, resisted Richelieu so handsomely, Richelieu became frightened and wanted to effect a treaty. Cardinal de Berulle persuaded Richelieu to deviate from this course on account of a certain something, he knew not what, which he called "trust in God." Richelieu, a strong-minded man, made fun of him and insolently asked De Berulle when God was to keep his promise. De Berulle replied with magnificent simplicity, "I am without enlightenment, but not without thoughts, and, since you command, I will tell them to you. I count on La Rochelle as I counted on the Island of Rhe. I expect success, not from the siege, nor from the assault, nor from the blockade, but from some prompt and unexpected effort." And so with HOBART; if he thought his cause was right, he was ready to fight—to fight calmly, easily, diplomatically, so as to make little bluster and but few enemies, but confident that he must win, because he thought he had right with him and because he believed that right would somehow win, even if it had to be helped from above by "a prompt and unexpected effort."

The political career of GARRET A. HOBART affords an interesting comparison between the politics of to-day and the politics of years ago. Cæsar Borgia was a giver of battles with poison. Bonaparte was a giver of battles with cannon. HOBART was a giver of battles with diplomacy, sagacity, and parliamentary etiquette, and so typifies the methods of the present as against the methods of the past, as found in Borgia and Napoleon in the olden days, when they were wont to destroy men so as not to destroy nations by allowing them to hurl themselves one against another. In those days personalities occupied the whole space of the political arena, masses none. In our day the masses are the unit of the political battle, personalities simply the kindling wood of a little enthusiasm. Battles took place then between prince and prince. A mere ordinary man was an obstacle, and was treated as such. That was called politics, and, bad as it was, for those who love humanity it was better than war. Politics then was a game between elevated heads; now it is a contest between millionaire, lawyer, laborer, and men in general, in which GARRET A. HOBART has proved that in the United States of America the son of a poor farmer can, by his own merit and his own ability, become a Cæsar of the purest type and a Napoleon in both finance and politics of the greatest influence. The lives of Cæsar Borgia and Napoleon show that murder and force were the instruments of success in the politics of olden days. The life of HOBART gives proof that the political triumphs of to-day are the victories of intellectual supremacy—not perhaps of one man, but of some party, some principle, as represented by supporters and champions.

GARRET A. HOBART is no more. In the councils of his party there is a vacant chair; in the halls of our National Legislature there reigns an air of mourning; in the business circles of the country there are being written resolutions of respect and memorials of condolence; but for all this sorrow there is consolation in the fact that while he lived he was a power among men; consolation in the knowledge that in honor of his memory the hand of History will write upon her everlasting tablets and beneath the name of GARRET A. HOBART:

His life was gentle, and the elements
So mix'd in him, that Nature might stand up
And say to all the world, "This was a man!"

The Gage Resolution.

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM D. DALY,
OF NEW JERSEY,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, January 19, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union on the pension appropriation bill—

Mr. DALY of New Jersey said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is not my intention to discuss the merits of the appropriation bill pending, but rather to take advantage of the opportunity offered by Congress, sitting as a Committee of the Whole, to discuss some features of the "Gage resolution" and the answer of the Secretary thereto.

All the powers of the Secretary of the Treasury in reference to the sale of the custom-house property in the city of New York were conferred by virtue of an act of Congress entitled "An act to supplement and amend an act entitled 'An act for the erection

of a new custom-house in the city of New York, and for other purposes,'" which act was approved March 2, 1899.

Among other things it provided that—

The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to sell at public or private sale to the highest bidder, after due advertisement, but for not less than $3,000,000, the present custom-house property in the city of New York, bounded by Wall, Williams, and Hanover streets and Exchange place, and to deposit the proceeds of the sale, after payment of the usual incidental expenses, in the United States Treasury.

Contrary to the provisions of this act, the Secretary deposited the amount of the consideration, namely, $3,000,000 or more, in the National City Bank (the purchaser), without depositing it in the United States Treasury, as required by law, thus giving that bank the use of this money for an indefinite period.

No other power was conferred or could be conferred except by these provisions. They were plain and explicit. There was nothing in the act or surrounding the act that in the least admitted of doubt, but it was a positive declaration that the proceeds of this sale should be deposited in the United States Treasury. If the money was to be deposited in any other place, such as a depositary, I have no doubt the statute would have so declared. By what system of reasoning they could extend this act to mean a United States depositary named by the Secretary of the Treasury, I do not know.

No better principle of law can be applied to this declaration of the statute than the principle in the American and English Encyclopedia of Law, volume 23, page 298, under the title "Literal construction," which says:

If the law is clear and admits of but one meaning, there is no room for construction. It is not allowable to interpret that which has no need of interpretation. In such a case any departure from the language used would be an unjustifiable assumption of legal power, and where the language is susceptible of but one meaning it must receive that meaning, although such construction leads to results that are absurd and mischievous. There can be no departure from the plain meaning of the statute on the grounds of its unwisdom or of public policy.

The Secretary of the Treasury seeks to shield himself from his unlawful conduct by claiming that he acted by virtue of the provisions of section 5103 of the Revised Statutes, which is as follows:

All national banking associations designated for that purpose by the Secretary of the Treasury shall be depositaries of public money, except receipts from customs, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary; and they may also be employed as financial agents of the Government; and they shall perform all such reasonable duties as depositaries of public moneys and financial agents of the Government as may be required of them. The Secretary of the Treasury shall require the associations thus designated to give satisfactory security, by the deposit of United States bonds and otherwise, for the safe-keeping and prompt payment of the public money deposited with them and for the faithful performance of their duties as financial agents of the Government. And every association so designated as receiver or depositary of the public money shall take and receive at par all of the national currency bills, by whatever association issued, which has been paid into the Government for internal revenue or for loans or stocks.

True it is that a general power was vested in the Secretary of the Treasury to designate depositaries and deposit therein public moneys, but it can not be insisted that this general power conferred by the statute on the Secretary superseded the special direction of the act of 1899, namely, that the money should be deposited in the Treasury of the United States. Depositaries of the United States were created for the convenience of the Treasury Department. In this particular instance the mandatory provision of the statute was not for the convenience of the Treasurer, but a mandate upon him that this money should be deposited in the Treasury of the United States.

Under the rule of construction cited in the English Encyclopedia of Law there could be no escape from his duty in the premises. If the Congress of the United States meant that he should have deposited the money in a depositary, they would have said so, but when they said it must be deposited in the Treasury of the United States, it recognized an existing institution which is in reality the only permanent institution of the Government for the safe-keeping of public moneys.

It is contended by the Secretary of the Treasury, and he insists that he is sustained by the Supreme Court of the United States, as well as by the Solicitor-General of the United States, in the case of Coudert ex., etc., *vs.* United States, that the depositing in a national-bank depositary was payment into the Treasury of the United States. This contention can not be sustained, for the reasons I have heretofore stated. By the statute it was expressly commanded that the money should be paid into the Treasury of the United States, and under the act under which the Secretary of the Treasury attempts to justify himself public moneys are placed in depositaries of the United States for the special purpose declared in the act itself, namely, "The safe-keeping and prompt payment of the public money deposited with them," thereby creating the national banks as mere disbursing agents of the Government of the United States, to honor checks or such drafts as might be drawn upon them in order to expedite the business of the Government instead of forcing the creditors of the Government to attend upon the Treasurer or subtreasurer of the United States.

No other power was conferred or intended to be conferred by this act, and the depositing of the money received from the sale of the custom-house property in the National City Bank to meet the stringency of the money market in Wall street was illegal and a departure from that which was authorized by law. There is no law that contemplates that the Secretary of the Treasury can use the funds of the Government to assist any national bank or banks. Each bank must stand on its own bottom, and each bank must so conduct its affairs that conditions will not exist which will place the institution on any other basis than a sound one. It would be strange insistment, indeed, if in times of panic or financial disaster the Treasurer of the United States could use an arbitrary discretion to come to the assistance of any national bank.

In the face of this mandatory statute that the money should be placed in the Treasury of the United States, I have no hesitancy in declaring that if the bank had failed during the period that this money was in its possession the Secretary of the Treasury would have been personally responsible, or he would have been liable for the misappropriation of the public funds. [Applause.] When a man undertakes to depart from the strict letter of the law, he being a public officer, he must abide by the consequences which attend that act of misfeasance or nonfeasance in office. The Secretary of the Treasury can say, now that no serious consequences have resulted from his act, "I did it for the public good." What would his answer be had the contrary result happened and during this money panic the bank had gone under and the public money with it? Do you think that before a court or jury of his peers he could say, "I did it for the public good?" In that case he would clearly be held for criminal misconduct and the law would be invoked. The statute must be construed strictly, and his failure to deposit the money as required by law would be his criminal act. This was a specific statute enacted for a specific purpose, and every requirement of that act must be carried into effect so that its letter and its spirit shall be obeyed.

Mr. Chairman, I have looked in vain to find some excuse for the conduct of the Secretary of the Treasury. There is not a man sitting on this side of the Chamber who would reflect upon or unduly criticise the conduct of a public official if the facts did not warrant it, or if there was a reasonable doubt as to his misconduct in office; but when I read his answer to the inquiry of the House and the circumstances surrounding the depositing of these moneys in the National City Bank, I am impelled to say that the motive which actuated him was a desire to pay political obligations growing out of the election of 1896. [Applause.] You need go no further to reach this conclusion than to read what is known as the "Hepburn letter," dated at New York, June 5, 1897, which is as follows:

MY DEAR MR. GAGE: The National City Bank of this city, of which I recently became vice-president through the consolidation of the business of the Third National with it, is one of the banks designated as a United States depository, and I write to request that in any change which may be made under the Administration we may not be disturbed in this respect. We would like to remain a United States depositary as at present. Of course the bank is very strong, and if you will take the pains to look at our list of directors you will see that we also have very great political claims in view of what was done during the canvass of last year.

Yours, very truly,

A. P. HEPBURN.

Hon. LYMAN J. GAGE,
United States Treasury, Washington, D. C.

Here is a bold, flagrant bid to remain a United States depositary, and the reason urged is "political claims in view of what was done in the canvass of last year!" It means that this bank or the directors of this bank had aided in creating a corruption fund to bribe the American voter. It means that the board of directors of this bank violated the law, and for their part in its violation they demand recognition at the hands of the Republican party.

If Mr. Gage had been adequate to the occasion, or had it not been true as stated in the letter that they had aided the Republican party financially, he would have hurled back the suggestions contained therein with all the scorn, dignity, and contempt that an honest public official would have done when such improper suggestions were made.

I can not refrain, Mr. Chairman, from further calling attention to some of the correspondence bearing upon this subject, which I will now read:

OCTOBER 28, 1897.

DEAR SIR: I have expressed a preference for your institution as the original recipient and distributer of the fund [the $62,000,000 from the Union Pacific sale].

In reply to your inquiry or expression of hope that a suitable portion of the fund will be left with the bank for a sufficient length of time to offer a reasonable profit, I can only say that, while we can make no specific promises in that direction, the purpose we have in using depository banks for the fund * * * will induce us to practice wise discretion in covering the money into the Treasury proper. There probably will be no disbursements until January 1.

L. J. GAGE, *Secretary.*

A. P. HEPBURN.

OCTOBER 30, 1897.

DEAR SIR: I note with pleasure the contents of your letter received this morning, with reference to the length of time which these deposits will be allowed to remain.

JAMES STILLMAN.

Hon. LYMAN J. GAGE.

NOVEMBER 10, 1897.

SIR: In compliance with the request contained in your letter of the 29th ultimo, and by virtue of the authority conferred upon me, the National City Bank is hereby designated a depository of public moneys, especially to receive deposits only on account of proceeds of the sale of the Union Pacific Railroad.

L. J. GAGE, *Secretary.*

VICE-PRESIDENT NATIONAL CITY [STANDARD OIL] BANK.

APRIL 11, 1898.

SIR: I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 8th instant, in which is expressed a wish that the remainder of the deposits on account of the Union Pacific Railroad be allowed to be held by the special depositories in New York City until July, and to inform you that due notice will be given you as to time and amount of proposed withdrawals, should any be required before the time mentioned in your letter.

L. J. GAGE, *Secretary.*

VICE-PRESIDENT NATIONAL CITY BANK.

SIR: This is to advise you that it is the intention of the Department to close the special account of the Treasurer of the United States on account of proceeds of the sale of the Union Pacific Railroad with the several depositories in your city. * * * Accordingly the Treasurer will draw on your bank each week for that amount (10 per cent of its holdings), beginning Wednesday, December 28, 1898.

O. L. SPAULDING,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

CASHIER NATIONAL CITY BANK.

FEBRUARY 25, 1899.

DEAR MR. STILLMAN: It is probable that by the 15th of March the Treasury Department will realize an advance payment of $12,000,000 or thereabouts on account of the Central Pacific Railway. In view of your suggestion that you would qualify to take any deposits on that account that the Department might see fit to make with you, I now write to inquire whether you will be disposed to put up the bonds required and accept the deposit.

LYMAN J. GAGE.

The New York World, commenting on these letters, says:

These letters show, first, how completely Mr. Gage fell in with the scandalous suggestion of the Hepburn letter; second, how easily the Standard Oil crowd pursuaded him to leave large deposits of Government money with them when his intention had been to withdraw them; third, how he gave them valuable tips as to the length of time they could keep the Government money to speculate in Wall street "call loans;" and fourth, how Gage had no sooner arranged to close up this first big favor than he had a second one to offer.

It would have been better had the writer of these letters admonished the recipients to burn them, and my country might have been spared the humiliation of having the misconduct of its Secretary of the Treasury paraded before the civilized world. [Applause.]

It is a notorious fact that during the Presidential election of 1896 the Republican party subsidized and bribed the press, and the channels of money were opened in this country as well as from abroad, and poured into the Republican canvass in order that the honest will of the people might be defeated and the power of the Republican party perpetuated. It is a sad commentary upon the degeneracy of the times under Republican Administration that men occupying the high positions that Mr. Hepburn and the directors of this banking institution do can flaunt their wickedness, and the Republican party in the Congress of the United States dare not offer or concede an investigation to inquire into all the transactions referred to in the resolution of inquiry. During all of this criticism on the conduct of Mr. Gage, in the press and on the floor of the House and Senate, not one in the Republican party has dared to defend his conduct or insist upon a full and free opportunity to investigate, that Mr. Gage might be placed on the witness stand and cross-examined, that the facts might be laid bare to the American people as to whether or not he was actuated by an honest motive or desired to pay tribute to those who furnished the means by which the American ballot might be degraded.

I have heard it said that the Hepburn letter would not have been disclosed in the correspondence if Mr. Gage had not been honest in this transaction—that he might have secreted or prevented its production. True it is, he might have done all this, and I charge that it was an oversight on his part; that he never intended it to be disclosed, and its production in Congress is only another evidence of the truthfulness of that old adage, "Murder will out." No person ever committed a crime who did not believe after its perpetration he would be free from detection, but he always left a trail behind him or some evidence of his guilt, and at the time he thought he was safest and most free from suspicion, it was then his guilt was made apparent and his detection sure. So, me thinks, this is only one of those accidental trails which has laid bare the infamy of this transaction. The American people and the American press are demanding a full and complete answer to these accusations, and this persistent effort on your part to shield the Secretary by answering that his reply is complete in itself without inquiry will not do it. We charge Mr. Gage with misconduct in office, and we insist he shall make a true, full, and complete answer to these allegations.

Trade of Puerto Rico.

SPEECH
OF
HON. GEORGE W. STEELE,
OF INDIANA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, February 28, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 8245) to regulate the trade of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes—

Mr. STEELE said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Two years ago our friends on the other side of this Chamber were clamoring loudly for war, jeering at the majority because we were waiting until the President had exhausted all reasonable means to relieve by proper diplomacy the distress and suffering of the inhabitants of Cuba, knowing that he was at the same time, with all the resources at his command, making absolutely necessary preparations for war if war must come.

You have been pursuing a waiting policy—

Said Mr. NORTON of Ohio, upon this floor on March 31, 1898.

Your President is waiting, and you are waiting now, while the worst flotilla that ever started out under the flag of any nation is pushing its nose toward the city of New York, and may throw their shells into New Orleans. Wait in your imbecility; wait in your cowardice; wait in the humility and in the patience of greed and avarice; wait with the blush of shame indelibly stamped on your brows forever.

Only one thing is certain—

Said Mr. LENTZ, of Ohio, on April 7, 1898—

and that is that the stock gambler is very busy and prosperous, while all true Americans are humiliated, and the flag is without honor. Our sailors are impatient; our soldiers are indignant; our wives and mothers and daughters are weeping in sympathy with the mothers and sisters of 266 murdered American seamen.

These are only sample echoes from the inconsiderate and unreasonable clamor raised for political purposes in the midst of a grave national crisis. A very few of our friends on this side listened to it. The rest of us were willing to trust to the wisdom and the patriotism of the President, and we were not disappointed.

When the President had exhausted all honorable means to avert war and gave the signal, in an incredibly short time the troops we had were called into action. The *Oregon* began its long trip around the Horn to join the squadron on the Atlantic coast; ships we had been buying for the purpose while gentlemen on this floor were crying out that the President was inactive were transformed into transports, gunboats, and supply boats; our war ships were manned to their full complement and cleared for action. Volunteers responded readily to a call, were organized, equipped, and trained, and with our scattered regulars were ordered to the seaboard or into camps from which they could easily be called to the national defense. Commissary stores of the greatest variety and the best quality ever furnished to the soldiers of any country were bountifully supplied.

Our Asiatic Squadron, under Commodore Dewey, sailed to Manila Bay and carried out the President's order to capture or destroy the Spanish fleet. Manila was within our grasp, an army was dispatched across the Pacific to cooperate with Dewey, and in a short time Manila and the Philippines were ours. Our squadrons on the Atlantic maintained a successful blockade of Cuban and Puerto Rican ports, guarded our harbors from prospective invasion by a Spanish fleet, and convoyed our transports carrying an army to Cuba. Three-fourths of the soldiers on these transports probably had never been to sea. They were tumbled ashore in the heat, rain, and mud of Cuba. Without having time for rest or recuperation, they were ordered into battle, and at El Caney, San Juan, and Santiago drove the enemy before them until the Spanish army surrendered. The Spanish fleet, which had been training its guns on our soldiers, sailed out of Santiago Harbor and was destroyed by our squadron under Sampson and Schley, or Schley and Sampson, as you prefer. The fall of Santiago was followed by the surrender of the Spanish forces in Cuba to General Shafter and those in Puerto Rico to General Miles.

A magnificent record! Such a one as every lover of heroic deeds must honor; of which every lover of his country must be proud.

Spanish domination in the Western Hemisphere came to an end. It has disappeared, never to return. In view of all this, why do we not all join in praising, in encouraging, and in holding up the hands of our Commander in Chief, the President of the United States? Why, before the smoke of battle had cleared away, gentlemen on that side of the House had commenced their cries of derision and dissatisfaction—"embalmed beef," "imperialism," "emperor," and "king." I do not wish to believe that in your

hearts you feel the sentiments you utter or applaud when uttered by others.

You know that the President is an able, honest, kind-hearted man, and that he has the very best interests of the country at heart. His responsibilities did not end with the elimination of Spanish domination in Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines. Those in the Orient whom we had wrested from Spanish oppression turned against us without the shadow of excuse, and fired upon our soldiers. Your position is that Dewey should have sailed away when he had destroyed the Spanish fleet, leaving men, women, and children, whose means of defense he had destroyed, to the mercy of an enraged and half savage people. Oh, no; I do not care whether or not Aguinaldo was or had been our ally. When he ordered his soldiers to fire upon ours—to charge our lines, expecting to kill our men or drive them off—it was the duty of the commander of our army to strike back and to pursue Aguinaldo and his followers until the last hostile in arms had surrendered or was captured or killed.

The Army and the Navy have about finished their work, have performed their duty gloriously, and have given no excuse for derision or disgraceful antagonism upon this floor or elsewhere in this country. I am glad that I do not remember to have heard a soldier on your side of the House join in the unseemly clamor.

My information is that Cuba is better off, commercially and socially, than she has ever been before, and will within a few months be in condition to organize a "safe and stable government of her own." Puerto Rico is in a deplorable condition, and is entitled to our best consideration. She has not only been a long and patient sufferer from misrule, but in August last was swept by a hurricane which killed 3,000 of her people, razed their humble huts to the ground, and destroyed the crops, thus not only depriving the owners of the farms of the means of relieving distress, but destroying the coffee industry, in which a large majority of the people in the country are employed.

They are thus left without employment and without any other means of securing the necessaries of life. Their coffee trees were stripped of the buds and leaves, and the trees that shaded the plants were torn down. Acres upon acres of land slid down the mountain sides in great landslides. It will take two years before the owners of farms in Puerto Rico will be able to take care of themselves or the laborers. The old-fashioned sugarhouses throughout the island, largely out of use on account of onerous taxation, were blown down, so that it will be impossible to work the cane if the acreage could be increased. That the acreage devoted to tobacco culture will be increased there seems to be little doubt, but not to such an extent as will greatly relieve the distress of the very poor by employment the present season.

By the special report of the Bureau of Statistics we are informed—

That there is not a single school building on the island, and that fully nine-tenths of the people of the island can neither read nor write;

That throughout the entire island there is a horde of office seekers whose salaries consume nearly all the taxes collected;

That there are only seven roads worthy of the name on the island—two good ones and five moderately so;

That in the coffee country there are no roads—only bridle paths for pack trains; and

That it is said to be the most densely populated country on the globe—about 800 people to the square mile (while in Illinois there are but 63 and in Indiana 61 to the square mile).

About 200,000 of its population live in cities and villages. In San Juan, for instance, the wealthier class live in the upper stories of the houses on the principal streets and the poorer people are huddled together in the basements.

A few yards of cotton cloth for the adults and nothing for the children meet their principal requirements for clothing.

Bananas and other tropical fruits, with very little rice, flour, or beans, constitute their food supply.

They have not now either the rice, flour, or beans, excepting it be paid for by charitable donations or out of the Treasury of the United States, and can not hope to have for some time to come; hence we must provide for them. How best to do it?

Our Democratic friends propose to give them free trade with the United States, which means tons upon tons of sugar and tobacco, now in the hands of well-to-do people or speculators on the island, shall come into the United States and they receive all the difference in price, about $1.60 per hundred pounds on the average, instead of $1.20, as proposed by the pending bill, this sugar and tobacco having been produced by miserably paid labor, and now destitute people, having no part of the benefits or profit.

What are they to live on? Our Democratic friends offer them the Constitution, and while they would seem to sleep with it and make bread of it, the destitute of Puerto Rico are not used to it, and yet you insist they shall take it as the only sweet morsel you have to offer. You will, perhaps, visit the island and tell the poor people how much you loved "the immortal Lincoln," and how you hate the only Democratic President you remember, in forty years, or ever will, I hope. You will tell them what a great man General Miles was, what glorious promises he made, but you can not tell them that he was authorized to commit the Government or the Administration in any wise, or that attempting to do so was not born of presumption. To sustain your proposition for free trade you quote from the President's message of December 5, wherein he said:

> Our plain duty is to abolish all customs tariffs between the United States and Puerto Rico and give her products free access to our markets.

But you do not quote from the same message wherein he asks that—

> the regulation of tariff rates on merchandise imported from the island into the United States have careful consideration and action—

thus recognizing the power of Congress to regulate tariff between the United States and Puerto Rico, and vice versa.

The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, and I believe nearly every member of the committee, agreed with the President as to what our plain duty was with reference to giving free access to Puerto Rican products to our markets by the abolition of customs tariffs. The chairman introduced a bill proposing this as a remedy and providing ports of entry, delivery, etc. But we had not at that time consulted Hon. Henry K. Carroll, our special commissioner; Governor-General Davis; J. R. Latimer, a provision broker, or George I. Finley; nor had the President when he sent his message to us on December 5 last. After hearing these gentlemen, your committee concluded that the revenue laws of the United States, applied to the island, would be difficult, if not impossible, of execution, and be onerous and burdensome to a very large proportion of the people.

This being so, the landholders and commercial men being hopelessly in debt, owing, it is estimated by the best obtainable figures, $50,000,000 (there is an average of $40 per acre even on the poor lands, devoted to the raising of coffee), your committee reported the bill under consideration as a means of temporary relief, to be in effect only until better conditions shall prevail. It does not take a dollar away from the Puerto Ricans; on the contrary, it puts every dollar collected in Puerto Rico from the United States and other countries and every dollar collected from Puerto Rican importations into the United States in the hands of the President, to be used for the benefit of the people of the island. Against this generous and humane proposition our Democratic friends are bringing all their forces to bear.

While they are on the floor delivering their speeches two of the gentlemen to whom I have referred—Mr. Latimer, a produce broker, representing large owners and controllers of the sugar and tobacco crop, and Mr. Finley, an ex-consul of Great Britain, and reported to be the largest producer of sugar on the island, though he claims to be only the second largest—are listening to them from the gallery with great satisfaction. Why? Because if the leaders of the Democracy are successful in their contention the sugar Mr. Finley has in store to send to the United States will be relieved of all the duty instead of three-fourths of it; or, in other words, instead of having to pay $1.60 per hundred pounds, as he now does under the Dingley tariff, or 40 cents, as he would have to pay under the pending bill, he will escape paying anything at all. Mr. Latimer represents his customers. I do not blame these gentlemen; it is a matter of business with them. But why should not persons who have accumulated large stocks of sugar and tobacco, produced by miserably paid labor, pay their fair proportion at least of the money it is necessary to contribute to relieve the starving and destitute people of the island in which they live?

It has been intimated that the sugar and tobacco trusts are to be helped by the passage of the bill; yet no one has stated how it would or could do so. I do not see any possible way for the sugar, tobacco, or any other trust to get any advantage out of it. On the other hand, the committee is informed that large stocks of tobacco are held by speculators in Puerto Rico, and the owners have been anxiously waiting for free trade before bringing it into our markets. The Democratic contention is that it should come free of duty; this bill, as I have before said, provides that it shall pay 25 per cent of the rates fixed by the Dingley law, and that every dollar so paid, as in the case of sugar, shall go into the hands of the President to be expended for the relief of the suffering poor of the island.

A general application of our internal-revenue laws in Puerto Rico at the present time seems impossible—first, because all over the island, in little neighborhoods, there are poor men who roll cheap cigars and cigarettes for consumption in these communities. The use of tobacco is a part of their very nature.

In many portions of the island rum is manufactured out of molasses very cheaply, at from 10 to 35 cents per gallon, and it is in common though moderate use. My information is that it seems to be a necessity, and when you take into account the fact that only about one-fifth of the population have ever worn a pair of shoes, and that a very large proportion have for their wardrobe

only a shirt, it is not very surprising that they "hanker" for a little rum and tobacco.

Where nearly all the people use these articles, where there are no roads, and where stillhouses, even of the Kentucky or Tennessee moonshine variety, are unnecessary, it is not believed that it would be possible to at present enforce our revenue laws, and that it will be as well to wait a year or so at least before attempting to do so.

If this bill shall be enacted into law, and I think it ought to be, as a temporary relief measure, schoolhouses will begin to dot the island, school-teachers will be employed, roads will be constructed, fair wages may be secured with which to buy proper food, a greater proportion of the population will be enabled to wear shoes and shirts than ever before, and the people of the island will be started on the high road to American citizenship, with all that citizenship implies.

I am not clamorous for a greater variety of population than we have; have sympathized with and voted for conservative laws restricting immigration; but when uneducated and unclothed but tractable people shall by the arbitrament of the sword come with territory acquired by us, does anyone believe, whatever his views may be on the Constitution, that it is not better for us to improve and elevate them than it is to turn them away and say, "I would like to help you, but the Constitution will not permit me to do so," flexible as it has been construed to be, framed though it was for the betterment of mankind?

There are only three ways out of the difficulty that I am aware of. One is to repudiate them; another, by a direct appropriation from the Treasury of the United States for their relief; the last, and I believe the best, is the legislation proposed in this bill.

As to its constitutionality I am quite content to rely upon the opinion of many of our greatest jurists and lawyers, including the President of the United States.

Trade of Puerto Rico.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN C. BELL,

OF COLORADO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, February 28, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 8245) to regulate the trade of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes—

Mr. BELL said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The legal status of this bill has been exhaustively discussed, and I desire only to make a few simple suggestions as to the apparent legerdemain and deceptive scene shifting being played here by the majority.

I will venture to assert that no such trimming, changing of positions, self-stultifications, contradictory statements, illogical and untenable conclusions, and almost physical coercion of members to vote against their conviction can be found in the past history of this Government.

Our first obligation began when General Miles with his splendid army invaded this little island and issued his proclamation to the inhabitants, promising them that—

Puerto Rico under the American flag will enjoy the same privileges and the same immunities as the citizens of the different States and Territories.

This is followed up by our peace commissioners in Paris making the demand for and receiving the island of Puerto Rico as a war indemnity.

The President, in his annual message, said:

It must be borne in mind that since the cession Puerto Rico has been denied the principal markets she had long enjoyed, and our tariffs have been continued against her products as when she was under the Spanish sovereignty. The markets of Spain are closed to her products except upon terms to which the commerce of all nations is subjected. * * * Our plain duty is to abolish all custom tariffs between the United States and Puerto Rico and give her products free access to our markets.

The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee introduced in this House a bill in pursuance of the recommendation of the President for free trade with this little territory (about the size, territorially, of my county).

The tobacco growers of Ohio, Connecticut, New York, and some of the other States, also the president of the sugar-beet growers, assailed his measure with great vigor. He as vigorously defended it. Hon. SERENO E. PAYNE, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, in a letter to W. H. Curtis, Palmyra, N. Y., January 24, said:

In accepting it [Puerto Rico] we cut off their market with Spain and with Cuba, in both of which countries there is now a high protective duty, which is absolutely prohibitive, so far as Puerto Rico is concerned. Puerto Rico produces 50,000 tons of sugar. * * * We last year imported 1,340,000 tons. You see the importation from Puerto Rico would not be a drop in the bucket. We import from the Hawaiian Islands 240,000 tons annually. Free sugar from Hawaii does not seem to affect the beet-sugar interests. * * * Puerto Rico is ours without a dissenting voice anywhere. * * * A free admission of her products to the United States, which is now accorded to every other State and Territory, and to Alaska, not organized into a Territory, would give her relief. It will not hurt us. * * * I am heartily in favor of extending this relief to Puerto Rico.

In a few days after this gallant defense of free trade with Puerto Rico, the same SERENO E. PAYNE reports a tariff bill for Puerto Rico. Mr. PAYNE, in his report, says:

The representatives of the beet-sugar industry who appeared before the committee stated that the admission of sugar free of duty from Puerto Rico, even should the product be doubled, would work no injury to the beet-sugar interest.

And shows that the tobacco imports will not injure the tobacco growers, but insists on his bill as a revenue producer for Puerto Rico. The Governor-General and the representatives generally of Puerto Rico with scorn and contempt deny their desire for any such measure and insist upon free trade and a local taxation. They give their freedom from any national indebtedness and their past history in buying and freeing their slaves as an evidence of their present ability to take care of themselves. The public has a right to a more tangible reason for this measure than has been given up to this time. Here we have the glaring spectacle of Hawaii on the west, with a population of Chinese, Japanese, South Sea Islanders, and only 8,000 Caucasian inhabitants, producing 240,000 tons of sugar per annum and other products in proportion, brought in without duty by Claus Spreckels and a few other sugar magnates, and this little island right at our doors, with 800,000 Caucasian population and only producing about 60,000 tons of sugar per annum and other things in proportion, and a revenue burden is put upon their commerce. One power is weak, without great political influence, hence is crushed; the other is owned by a few American syndicates, and they bring in five times the stuff, raised by Chinese labor free. This is what is known in political parlance as influence.

The result will be our policy will so depress values in Puerto Rico that the sugar and tobacco syndicates will go in and buy their lands for a trifle, stock them with slave labor, and then put their products on the same duty basis as Hawaii. This bill will fortunately give the people some idea of the ultimate object of the mad crusade of greed. This element does not want these islands under the Constitution because they want the slavery system now in operation in Hawaii, which is but little better than that in the United States before the war.

It has been falsely asserted time and again that the minority approved of the Philippine purchase, and as evidence the vote of the minority is cited on the $20,000,000 appropriation.

Now, what are the facts? The President, through his commissioners, made a treaty with Spain in the regular way, agreeing to pay Spain $20,000,000 for the sovereignty of the Philippines; submitted the same to the Senate, and it was confirmed by the Senate, which made it a law of the land, and the $20,000,000 a legal debt against the Government. When the bill was presented to the Appropriation Committee the whole committee regarded the $20,000,000 as a fixed debt under the confirmed treaty, and the minority of the Appropriation Committee offered the following amendment:

That by the ratification of the treaty of peace with Spain it is not intended to incorporate the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands into citizenship of the United States, and the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise permanent sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said islands, and asserts its determination, when a stable and independent government shall have been erected in said islands, entitled, in the judgment of the Government of the United States, to recognition as such, to transfer to said government, upon terms which shall be reasonable and just, all rights secured under the cession by Spain, and thereupon to leave the government and control of said islands to the people thereof.

This was attempted to be moved on the floor of the House by Mr. Dockery, of Missouri, at the time of the appropriation, but Mr. CANNON, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, under the rules would not permit a vote on the resolution.

The Democrats generally stated that they voted the appropriation, not because they approved of the treaty, but because the treaty-making power had agreed with Spain to pay the $20,000,000, and the Senate had confirmed the treaty, making the $20,000,000 a fixed debt of the United States due to Spain.

It has been stated here that Mr. Bryan approved of the $20,000,000. Many Democrats and many Populists advocated the paying of the $20,000,000 as the cheapest and most humane way to extinguish all claims of Spain to the islands, and then Mr. Bryan and Democrats and Populists generally insisted, and always have insisted, that we should treat the Philippines just as we pledged ourselves to treat the Cubans. We insisted that we might aid them in establishing a stable government, get a favorable trade arrangement with them, let them pay us back what we had paid for their freedom, to protect them against the encroachments of any hostile power, but always giving them complete local self-government.

There is a manifest attempt to conceal the purpose of the bill. It is not for protection, because the committee shows their products will not affect the price of ours if let in on a free-trade basis. The committee insists that it is purely a revenue measure, but no one conversant with what has occurred here and the protests of the people of Puerto Rico believes that such is the object. Then what is the object? It is to deceive the American voter in the fall campaign. It is to conceal from view the ultimate purpose of the Republican party. It is a conglomerate measure, which does not confine the Republican party to any definite policy, and will give it leeway to claim that no policy has been adopted by Congress, and to leave the whole subject in the dough, as in the past, until the fall campaign is over. Then they will satisfy the greed of the speculator in defiance of public opinion or the rights of the citizens of these islands.

Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation Bill.

There is no constitutional difficulty as to the acquisition of territory, and whether, when acquired, it may be taken into the Union by the Constitution as it now stands, will become a question of expediency.—*Letter of Thomas Jefferson to Albert Gallatin.*

SPEECH

OF

HON. HENRY S. BOUTELL,

OF ILLINOIS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, February 15, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 8317) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes—

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] for his distinguished consideration, and the least that I can do in recognition of his courtesy is to assure him that in any use that I shall make of his time I shall not say a word about the pending bill.

Everyone who listened to the debates in this Chamber two years ago must have been impressed, during the last month or six weeks, in following the discussions here, with the great change that has come over the sentiments of the minority in this Chamber.

Two years ago this Hall resounded with denunciations of the financial policy of the Republican party. Utter ruin for the country and abject misery for all the people were predicted as the inevitable results that were to follow upon a continuation of this policy. These walls echoed and reechoed with the defiant cry that free silver would not down, and that 16 to 1 would be the issue, the only issue, and the triumphant issue of 1900.

But I notice that as we approach more and more nearly to the conventions of the Presidential year, we hear less and less of this issue. And why? Why this transformation? The Republican party killed 16 to 1 in 1896. In 1898 we gave it decent burial; and I do not believe there is a Democrat in this House who would like to see it resurrected as an issue in 1900.

It is true that we have heard now and then since the assembling of this Congress a eulogy upon the departed, and now and then a rhetorical tear has been dropped upon its grave, but these obituaries have lacked the spirit that indicates real sorrow, and as I have listened to these mortuary discourses I have been reminded of an epitaph which I copied from a gravestone up in Vermont last summer. The stone was erected by a man to the memory of his wife, with whom he apparently had enjoyed as little happiness and prosperity as the Democrats have done with free silver, and inscribed on it was this inscription, that I have thought of whenever I have heard these lamentations over the downfall of 16 to 1:

> Here lies my wife.
> All my tears can not bring her back;
> Therefore I weep.

[Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, free silver having been laid peacefully in its grave, other live and important issues are before the country. The problems which we are now called upon to face are problems involving the fundamental principles of our national institutions. Our solution of these problems will affect our posterity in all generations. Financial systems rise and fall. The money systems of our day are not the money systems of a century ago. The industrial questions which assume importance at one time may have no significance whatever at another. But the foundations of our Republic rest upon principles which can not be changed without endangering the vigor and permanency of our institutions.

These problems, Mr. Chairman, which are now engrossing the attention of the American people have been forced upon us as a result of the successful prosecution of the war with Spain. I repeat, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the successful prosecution of that war, for if our arms had not been triumphant on land and sea these questions would not confront us to-day. I refer, of course, Mr. Chairman, to the problems respecting the acquisition of territory by the United States. It is my purpose to discuss some of the constitutional principles involved in the acquisition of territory by the United States, and to illustrate the discussion by some references to the history of our territorial expansion.

Before entering upon this discussion, permit me to say a few words concerning the criticisms that have been made by gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber of the policy that is now being pursued by the President in dealing with the situation in the Philippines.

I wish to emphasize, in the first place, the statement that our war with Spain was not a war favored by one political party in this country and opposed by another. The whole people demanded war with Spain. And as the people stood loyally by the President in the prosecution of the war, so now they should give him their undivided support while he is dealing with the present situation in the Philippines, which has resulted from a successful prosecution of the war. At the close of the war we were entitled to the peaceable possession of the Philippines. But open organized insurrection broke out against our authorities. It is the duty of the President to suppress that insurrection. And it is the solemn duty of every man in the United States, of whatever political party or creed, to support heartily and loyally the President in the course he is pursuing in the Philippines.

The final disposition of those islands is not involved in his action at the present time in restoring peace and order in the islands. The Philippines were Spanish territory; the inhabitants of the Philippines were Spanish subjects; the Philippine Islands are ours by right of conquest as an incident of the war, and not because we wished to acquire them. But it is our duty to see that organized opposition to our arms is put down, no matter what the final disposition of the islands may be.

I know there are those who say that we ought at once to withdraw our troops and leave the people of those islands to their own devices. But suppose it were our intention to give absolute self-government and independence to the Philippine Islands. Should we leave them now in a state of organized revolution of one party against the other? We are in a measure responsible for their present condition. If we are to establish a new political household among the nations, we must remember that a house divided against itself can not stand. Should it be our purpose to dispose of these islands to some other power it would be cowardly on our part to fail to fulfill our duty by establishing peace and quiet in those islands. Is it our purpose to incorporate these islands into the United States? Then surely our line of duty becomes more clear. We must suppress disorder in the Philippines as we would suppress disorder in Massachusetts, and the criticisms that are now directed against the course that the President is pursuing in the Philippines are as unjust as they would be if aimed against the suppression of organized opposition to the National Government in Massachusetts.

There was a time in the history of our territorial acquisitions when the President was called upon to pursue the same course that President McKinley is pursuing in the Philippines.

During the Mexican war our Navy, by a series of brilliant victories, occupied the Mexican forts in California.

The possession of these forts was regarded as a conquest of the entire territory, and in the treaty with Mexico, California, together with New Mexico and Arizona, was ceded to the United States. The President was governing this territory at the close of the war and endeavoring to restore order as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy.

In 1848 Congress passed a resolution asking the President what form of government had been established in the newly acquired territories. There were cries of imperialism and militarism in those days. In his message in response to this resolution President Polk, who was as thorough-going a Democrat as ever occupied the Presidential office, used this language:

> The temporary governments authorized were instituted by virtue of the rights of war. The power to declare war against a foreign country and to prosecute it according to the general laws of war, as sanctioned by civilized nations, it will not be questioned, exists under our Constitution. When Congress has declared that war exists with a foreign nation, "the general laws of war apply to our situation," and it becomes the duty of the President, as the constitutional "Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States," to prosecute it.
>
> In prosecuting a foreign war thus duly declared by Congress we have the right, "by conquest and military occupation," to acquire possession of the territories of the enemy, and, during the war, to "exercise the fullest rights of sovereignty over it." The sovereignty of the enemy is in such case "suspended," and his laws can "no longer be rightfully enforced" over the conquered territory "or be obligatory upon the inhabitants who remain and submit to the conqueror. By the surrender the inhabitants pass under a temporary allegiance" to the conqueror, and are "bound by such laws, and such only, as" he may choose to recognize and impose.

In the same message, in referring to the occupation of territory the title to which was in dispute and which our troops had occupied, he says:

Whether the country in dispute rightfully belonged to Mexico or to Texas, it was our right in the first case, and our duty as well as our right in the latter, to conquer and hold it. Whilst this territory was in our possession as conquerors, with a population hostile to the United States, which more than once broke out in open insurrection, it was our unquestionable duty to continue our military occupation of it until the conclusion of the war, and to establish over it a military government, necessary for our own security as well as for the protection of the conquered people.

All the noisy shouting about President McKinley's course in the Philippines should be silenced before this calm, commonsense statement of the duty of the Chief Magistrate made by a Democratic President placed in a position exactly similar to that in which President McKinley is now placed.

And so I say, Mr. Chairman, that, acknowledging the soundness of the principles laid down by President Polk, however we may divide into parties in this country on the question of the final disposition of these islands, there is but one duty now before the American people, one duty incumbent upon all—to maintain the President in the policy which he is now pursuing. That policy is based upon the principle that whoever insults the flag of the United States must be punished, and whoever would treat with the United States must first respect the flag of the United States.

This is not a party principle. This is a sentiment engraven upon the hearts of all loyal Americans. It is a principle that every child understands and every statesman must respect. Every criticism that is directed against the President in his course in endeavoring to secure order and peace and quiet in these islands, every attack directed against his Administration, will be repudiated by the people at the polls, regardless of party.

Do gentlemen on the other side think that they will gain votes for the Democratic party by their repeated attacks on the President? Let me call your attention to results that followed similar attacks for partisan purposes made upon a Democratic President and his Administration and policy over four-score years ago.

Three years after the close of the war of 1812 the Indians living in the Spanish territory of Florida, near the borders of Alabama, Mississippi, and Georgia, made frequent inroads on the people of the United States. Depredations were committed on their property, and men, women, and children were murdered by the Indians. President Monroe sent word to Gen. Andrew Jackson, the hero of New Orleans, who was at Nashville, directing him to repair to Fort Scott and relieve General Gaines and put down the disorder.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what did Andrew Jackson do? Did he send out for pocket editions of the Constitution to give to his generals and other officers? Did he order copies of the Declaration of Independence to give to the red men? Did he wait for a declaration of war by Congress? Did he wait for specific instructions from the President? No. The hero of New Orleans buckled on his sword, and when told to enlist the militia of the neighboring States, knowing that Georgia was the only neighboring State and that her militia was all in the field, sent out word to his veterans in Tennessee and Kentucky, mustered them in, ordered them to rendezvous at Fort Scott, joined them as soon as possible, and then went after the red men. He found that they had escaped over the Spanish line.

What did he do then? Did he send for the commentaries of Puffendorf and Vattel and Grotius? Did he sit down to consider what his constitutional rights were? Did he consider what the Declaration of Independence said about all men being free and equal? Did he consider the rudimentary principle of international law that forbade him to carry on war in a neutral territory? No. Andrew Jackson, "Old Hickory," the hero of New Orleans, simply said, "I was sent down there to put an end to the Indian uprising, and, by the eternal, I mean to do it if I follow the red men to the throne of Spain."

He brushed the President aside with one hand and Congress with the other. He threw the Constitution to the winds, trampled the Declaration of Independence under his feet, burned his treaties on international law behind him, and when the Indians went over into the territory of Spain, "Old Hickory" simply went after them. When he came to the fortified town of St. Marks flying the Spanish flag, he pulled it down. He said to the Spanish governor, "I have no personal feeling against you. Just take your baggage and make yourself comfortable in Pensacola."

The Spanish governor started for Pensacola. Jackson found at St. Marks the Indian prophet Francis and the two noncombatants Ambrister and Arbuthnot—British subjects. What did he do? I have heard the question asked, "If we catch Aguinaldo, what will we do with him?" Well, when we catch Aguinaldo, I hope that he will undergo a change of heart. I hope that he will give all the abilities which he possesses to helping us to give to those whom he claims as his people the benefits of law and order which we are ready to bestow upon them.

But let us see what Andrew Jackson, the idol of the Democracy, did in neutral territory during a time of peace with these noncombatants. He first hanged the prophet Francis, to get rid of him. He then ordered a sort of court-martial to try Ambrister and Arbuthnot. What did the court do? They condemned Arbuthnot to be hanged and Ambrister to be imprisoned and to receive fifty stripes. What did "Old Hickory" do? He thought that Ambrister as well as Arbuthnot had been engaged in instigating the Indian rebellion; so he simply reversed the finding of the court-martial and hanged Arbuthnot and shot Ambrister.

Now, you may well believe, in view of those events, that there was a commotion in the United States. We had given both Spain and Great Britain cause for declaring war against us. You may be sure, too, there was something said about imperialism and militarism. And at the end the people of the United States had something to say about the matter. Some were for impeaching President Monroe. Some were for court-martialing General Jackson. Resolutions were introduced in both Houses of Congress declaring his acts unconstitutional.

These resolutions were debated here in Congress for over six weeks, and those debates fill pages of the history of Congress; and much that was said away back at that time—over eighty years ago—sounds very much like what we hear to-day. But let me recall to you what one good, loyal man from Virginia said here in Congress. I read from the speech of Mr. Strother, on page 849 of the History of Congress:

But, sir, we have had an alarming representation of military despotism.

Do you recognize that?

We are told that Cæsar, Alexander, and Cromwell subverted the liberties of their country. Cæsar commanded an army composed of barbarian mercenaries. He found Rome emasculated by corruption, the government worn out, and the passions and the vices of the people administering the laws. They had no regenerating principle, no fountain of political youth in which the government could have itself and acquire renewed health and vigor—this is the happy invention of the American people. Cæsar died and Brutus lived; his virtues were wasted upon his degenerate countrymen. Alexander was born to despotic power; he was animated with the hatred that tyrants feel for liberty; gifted with military talents, he conquered the Grecian republics, which he found paralyzed by internal factions.

Cromwell was carried into the protectorship upon the bigotry of the nation, not the arms of the soldiery. But admitting that armies have crushed liberty, when did a people overturn tyranny and establish freedom upon its ruins without employing arms and force? No instance is recorded where despotism fell before a philosophical lecture. Talent must be connected with virtue, both in a statesman and general, to contribute to the establishment or preservation of liberty. Factious perfidy and treachery have as frequently deprived the people of their liberty and involved nations in ruin as the mad ambition of military men. A Carthaginian senator, discoloring every measure with green-eyed jealousy, induced the senate to refuse supplies to the patriotic and invincible Hannibal, saved Rome, and destroyed Carthage. America had other traitors than Arnold.

Did the eloquent Virginian have in mind his colleagues who by their attacks on the Administration were encouraging the animosity of Spain? Do these words have any application in our day to those whose utterances in this country are stimulating the insurrection in the Philippines?

Let me recall, too, the earnest words of Mr. Walker, of North Carolina, on these resolutions:

The honorable Speaker, in his able and eloquent address to the House the other day, although he spoke on a military subject, so happily combined his style as to lead us through a delightful scenery—through stately groves, flowery fields, dewy lawns, and verdant meads, throughout the regions of France, Italy, Greece, and Rome—and has given us a specific view of the rise and fall of empires and kingdoms, and of all the usurpations, both in the Old and New World, from the days of Julius Cæsar down to Bonaparte of modern times, and seemed to warn us of the least approach of military power; but, as the sun may sometimes pass under a cloud, for once in his life he may have mistaken his way.

* * * * * * *

General Jackson crossed the Spanish line and marched his army into Florida, not to subvert, not to destroy, but to preserve and secure the interests and liberties of his country; he did not enter as a military adventurer for glory and conquest; he did not declare himself generalissimo of the Spanish provinces and erect his standard as a trophy of victory as did the conqueror of Italy. No, sir; he took possession of these posts as a pledge for their good behavior, and to search into the causes of the war, and to bring peace and tranquillity, as a consequence, to the enfeebled citizens of Georgia and Alabama, which he did in effect, and to teach the world that abandoned characters of any nation should find no asylum among our Indian tribes, and then submitted his military operations to the legitimate authorities of his country.

The "legitimate authorities of his country" tried to pass resolutions holding his action unconstitutional. But those resolutions were voted down in this House; they were voted down in the Senate. The only man in the Cabinet who approved General Jackson's course was John Quincy Adams. But the people approved it. It gained Monroe his second term in the Presidency. It made John Quincy Adams President. It made Andrew Jackson a Senator, and afterwards it made him President for eight years.

I simply refer to this incident in our history, Mr. Chairman, to show that when the same cry of militarism and imperialism that we hear to-day was raised against a Democratic President for political purposes, it was drowned by the approving voice of the American people.

General Jackson's acts in this campaign were truly unconstitutional and contrary to the laws of civilized war.

But the people of the United States approved his course because he rid them of an enemy that had been for years a menace to their lives and happiness. How much more, Mr. Chairman, in our day should the entire American people approve the wise, prudent, humane course of our President in the Philippine Islands, in restoring peace and order in those possessions before entering upon negotiations with the people respecting the future government or disposition of the islands.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a word about imperialism. I must confess that I am tired of hearing the Republican party charged with imperialism. I am tired of being called an imperialist; for if I read the history of our country aright, there is no party that can be called an imperialist party except the Democratic party.

If expansion means imperialism, then the Democratic party has been imperialistic from the foundation of the Government to the present time. Mr. Chairman, if there is one word which characterizes the Democratic party throughout its whole history better than another, one word that expresses the unchanging principles of the party, it is the one word "expansion."

When our Government was formed, we had about 830,000 square miles of territory. It was Thomas Jefferson, the founder of the Democratic party, who gave us 1,200,000 miles of territory in his purchase of the province of Louisiana. It was Monroe, the third Democratic President, with the aid of Andrew Jackson, who gave to us the East and West Floridas and added 60,000 square miles to our domain.

It was under President Polk that we formed a treaty with the free republic of Texas and brought in 380,000 square miles of territory. It was under Polk, too, as an incident to our war with Mexico, that we added 550,000 square miles to our territory. It was under Franklin Pierce that we added 45,000 square miles of our territory in the Gadsden purchase. And it was under Andrew Johnson, whom no one on this side of the Chamber claims as a Republican, that we added 580,000 square miles to our national domain in the purchase of Alaska.

Democrats tell us that they are and always have been in favor of continental expansion, but that they draw the line at insular expansion.

Mr. NOONAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. Certainly.

Mr. NOONAN. I will ask the gentleman from Illinois if he believes that the Federal Government has the right to acquire territory and the right to govern territory unlimited by the Constitution?

Mr. HOPKINS. Yes; that is not debated among lawyers.

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. That is the question I am going to discuss in a few moments. I shall take up that question after finishing these preliminary observations about imperialism.

Jefferson himself cast longing eyes on Cuba, and so did Madison, and so did Monroe; and President Polk in 1848 authorized our minister to Spain to pay $100,000,000 in gold for Cuba, but the offer was curtly refused.

In 1852 the United States refused to enter into a tripartite agreement with France and Great Britain that no one of the three powers would ever attempt to acquire Cuba.

In 1854 Franklin Pierce, casting his longing eyes over the Gem of the Antilles, sent word to our ministers in Great Britain, France, and Spain—James Buchanan, John Y. Mason, and Pierre Soulé—to meet and consider the question of annexing Cuba to the United States. In their celebrated Ostend manifesto, so ably outlined and discussed by my friend from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] two years ago, these three distinguished Democrats declared that in their opinion the acquisition of Cuba by the United States would be of great benefit both to Spain and to the United States. They urged in this manifesto the true imperialistic doctrine that if we could not purchase the island we ought to acquire it by force.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will it disturb my friend to ask him a question?

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. Not a bit.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Do you not know that that Ostend manifesto and the scheme back of it was just simply a part of the African slave propaganda in this country; that that was the sole reason back of it?

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. Well, if that was the sole reason back of it, it was a great deal worse proposition than as I presented it to the House. I presented it simply as a desire to acquire territory in carrying out the spirit of the Democratic party. You Democrats have been in favor of acquiring all kinds of territory—continental territory, insular territory, inhabited territory, uninhabited territory. You have been in favor of every sort, shape, and kind of territorial acquisition except territorial acquisition under a Republican Administration.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to discuss this question of the acquisition of territory by reference to some of the fundamental principles of our institutions affecting the question, illustrating my argument by reference to the history of some of our territorial acquisitions.

In the first place, Mr. Chairman, let me say that this problem of territorial acquisition has, as each instance arises, two sides to it, or involves two questions. First, shall we acquire the territory in question: and, second, how shall we hold and govern it?

I know that many gentlemen on the other side of the House claim that the second question is involved in the first. I know that there are many who conscientiously believe that we can only acquire territory by incorporating it, by the very act of acquisition, into the territory of the United States, and giving to the inhabitants of the acquired territory all the rights and privileges of American citizenship as guaranteed in the Constitution.

But, Mr. Chairman, it is just upon this point that I must divide from my friends who maintain that proposition. When we look at the territorial acquisitions of the United States, we may class them generally as voluntary acquisitions and involuntary acquisitions. And if these words are inapt or incorrect, I will endeavor to make my meaning clear.

The acquisition from Spain of a certain part of the Louisiana territory was a voluntary acquisition. The acquisition of Florida by purchase or cession was a voluntary acquisition. So was the annexation of Texas and the Gadsden purchase, Alaska, and the Hawaiian Islands.

I regard as involuntary acquisitions acquisitions of territory which come to us as the incidental result of the successful prosecution of a war which was not a war instituted for the purpose of conquering those territories. Such an acquisition was that of the unexplored territories of California, as a result of the Mexican war. Such is the acquisition of Puerto Rico and the Philippines, as an indirect result or as an incident of the Spanish war.

Now, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. STOKES. Will it interrupt the gentleman if I ask him a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. I should be glad to yield if I had more time, but I am afraid now that I shall not have time to complete my argument.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, referring to our first acquisition of territory, which was the Louisiana purchase, I have stated that a part of that acquisition was a voluntary acquisition. The greater part of the Louisiana purchase was an involuntary acquisition. What I mean is this, looking upon the Louisiana purchase in the light of subsequent events, we rightly regard it as a glorious achievement on account of the States which it added to our Union, but when that acquisition took place, in order to get the small extent of territory that we wanted, we had forced upon us a great deal of territory that at that time we did not want, and that we did not want to take.

Let us bring the facts relating to this purchase clearly before us. Prior to the treaty of Paris of 1763, France claimed title to everything on this continent west of the Mississippi. By a secret treaty in 1762 France ceded this territory west of the Mississippi River to Spain. The result was that at the conclusion of our war of independence in 1783 Spain bounded our territory on the west, and, holding East and West Florida, entirely bounded our territory on the south. On the east our boundary was the Atlantic, and on the north the Lakes, the St. Lawrence, and the British line established by the treaty of 1783. As our southern boundary was the thirty-first parallel from the Mississippi to the Atlantic, the Apalachicola, the Perdido, the Pearl, and the Mississippi rivers south of that parallel ran exclusively through Spanish territory.

Our settlements followed the course of the rivers, and after the establishment of the Federal Government the population pressed rapidly westward along the Ohio and other streams flowing into the Mississippi and southward along the streams flowing into the Gulf of Mexico.

The navigation of the Ohio and Mississippi was of the greatest importance to our people. By the treaty of 1795 with Spain we were given the free navigation of the Mississippi and the free right of deposit for our merchandise at New Orleans. Upon the maintenance of this right of deposit for their exports and imports depended the very life of our Western settlements.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us notice how characters and events in Europe began to shape the destinies of our Republic. This is one of the most interesting chapters in our national history. Napoleon in 1800 was reaching out for a world dominion. Great Britain was paramount upon the sea, but the First Consul seemed invincible upon land, and his dreams took in a vast colonial empire. In 1800, having Spain under his thumb, he got from her a secret treaty of cession of what was called the Louisiana province, including the mouths of the Mississippi and all the Mississippi Valley below the thirty-first parallel.

For some time this cession was unknown to our people. Now watch the process by which the First Consul gained his ends with

us, while we unwillingly nearly trebled the extent of our territory. Wherever Napoleon's political strategy fell short the infinite cunning of Talleyrand supplied the remainder. In 1802, before we knew of the secret treaty, the intendant at New Orleans revoked our right of deposit and our free navigation of the waters of the Mississippi. Some idea might be gained of the consternation which this act caused in this country by trying to imagine how we should feel if Great Britain should attempt to close up the St. Clair River.

Our Western people had no other means of bringing in or sending out their goods except by the Mississippi River. What was to be done? The Federalists claimed that the revocation of the right of deposit was such a violation of the treaty of 1795 as to justify a declaration of war against France and Spain and the forcible occupation of New Orleans. Senator Ross, of Pennsylvania, introduced a resolution in the Senate looking to such a settlement of the trouble; but Jefferson was a man of peace, who disliked to increase the national debt, and he cast about for some peaceable solution of the question.

What was it that occurred to him when he saw the popular uprisings in the West and received the petitions that poured into Washington? His idea was to buy back the right of deposit from France and, if necessary to secure this right, to buy what was called the Island of Orleans. He never thought, in trying to secure this right of deposit and the free navigation of the Mississippi, of purchasing 1,200,000 square miles of territory. The magnitude and importance of the problem that confronted Jefferson is shown in his letter to Robert R. Livingston, our minister to France, in April, 1802. Mr. Jefferson wrote:

> There is on the globe one single spot the possessor of which is our natural and habitual enemy. It is New Orleans, through which the produce of three-eighths of our territory must pass to market, and from its fertility it will ere long yield more than half of our whole produce and contain more than half our inhabitants. France, placing herself in that door, assumes to us the attitude of defiance. Spain might have retained it quietly for years. Her pacific dispositions, her feeble state, would induce her to increase our facilities there, so that her possession of the place would be hardly felt by us, and it would not perhaps be very long before some circumstance might arise which might make the cession of it to us the price of something of more worth to her.
>
> Not so can it ever be in the hands of France. The impetuosity of her temper, the energy and restlessness of her character, placed in a point of eternal friction with us, and our character, which though quiet, and loving peace and the pursuit of wealth, is high minded, despising wealth in competition with insult or injury, enterprising and energetic as any nation on earth—these circumstances render it impossible that France and the United States can continue long friends when they meet in so irritable a position. They as well as we must be blind if they do not see this, and we must be very improvident if we do not begin to make arrangements on that hypothesis. The day that France takes possession of New Orleans fixes the sentence which is to restrain her forever within her low-water mark.
>
> It seals the union of two nations who in conjunction can maintain exclusive possession of the ocean. From that moment we must marry ourselves to the British fleet and nation. We must turn all our attentions to a maritime force, for which our resources place us on very high grounds, and, having formed and cemented together a power which may render reenforcement of her settlements here impossible to France, make the first cannon which shall be fired in Europe the signal for tearing up any settlement she may have made and for holding the two continents of America in sequestration for the common purposes of the united British and American nations.

The restoration of our right of deposit at New Orleans was of such vital importance to our people that Jefferson was willing to form an alliance with Great Britain against France in order to secure it.

Does it not illustrate the irony of fate that the author of the Declaration of Independence and the founder of the Democratic party should be the first American of importance to suggest an alliance between the United States and England? This country needed no alliance with England then, and no alliance with her has ever been advocated by the Republican party. To-day we want no alliance with England, and no consent from England to the carrying out of our national policy. Neither do we to-day sympathize with Great Britain in her aggressive policy against the Dutch republics in South Africa.

But Thomas Jefferson, the father of Democracy, was to purchase the right of deposit at New Orleans by an alliance with Great Britain against France. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. Half a minute.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I believe I have three-quarters of an hour.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; but the Republican side has but thirty minutes.

Mr. CANNON. If I may be recognized I think I will yield to my colleague the thirty minutes.

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. I thank the gentleman; I do not know that I can interest the House for that time.

Jefferson referred to his scheme for recovering our right of deposit as the price of our alliance with England in a letter to James Monroe, in which he said:

> If we can not by a purchase of the country insure to ourselves a course of perpetual peace and friendship with all nations, then, as war can not be distant, it behooves us immediately to be preparing for that course, without, however, hastening it, and it may be necessary—on your failure on the Continent—to cross the channel.

And in another letter, to Robert R. Livingston, the minister to France, he says:

> Should we fail in this object of the mission, a further one will be superadded for the other side of the channel.

It is my purpose to show that, in securing our right of deposit, Jefferson wished to purchase only a small area at the mouth of the Mississippi, and that the rest of the province of Louisiana was forced upon him.

Now, we not only infer this from the circumstances surrounding the acquisition, but we have Jefferson's own words for it. In a letter to P. S. Dupont De Nemours, a distinguished French resident of this country who was about to return to France, and who was a very close friend of the First Consul, he wrote:

> The country, too, which we wish to purchase, except the portion already granted, and which must be confirmed to the private holders, is a barren sand 600 miles from east to west and from 30 to 40 and 50 miles from north to south, formed by deposition of the sands by the Gulf Stream in its circular course round the Mexican Gulf, and which, being spent after performing a semicircle, has made from its last depositions the sand bank of East Florida.

Here we have Jefferson's description of what he wished to purchase. Early in 1803 Congress had authorized an appropriation of $2,000,000 to be used by the President in securing this right of deposit. Failing to get any satisfaction out of the French representative in this country, Jefferson commissioned James Monroe a special envoy extraordinary, to cooperate with Livingston, our minister at Paris, in securing this right of deposit or in purchasing what was called the island of Orleans.

It appears, in addition to his written instructions, that James Monroe had extraordinary oral instructions, referred to in a letter from the President to the minister resident, Mr. Livingston.

Five characters figure prominently in the scene that follows. Jefferson, the first Democratic President; Livingston, our minister to France; Monroe, the special envoy and minister plenipotentiary; Napoleon, the first consul of France and his chief adviser, Talleyrand. The proposition which Monroe and Livingston made to the first consul was to give $2,000,000 for the right of deposit.

The First Consul held them off, and they suspected, as week after week went by, that the cunning Corsican and the wily Talleyrand were not dealing frankly with them, and our commissioners began to look across the channel. Then came Napoleon's trouble with San Domingo, and war between France and Great Britain seemed unavoidable. With Napoleon to think was to act. He saw that he could not hold his territory in the New World against the navy of Great Britain. He did not want to give the right of deposit to us and have England seize the remainder of the province. Besides, he needed money. Our necessity was his opportunity.

By refusing to give the right of deposit, by refusing to sell the island of Orleans, Napoleon disposed of the entire Territory of Louisiana to us for $15,000,000. That is the way the purchase of the Territory came about, and I submit that so far as Jefferson and his colleagues were concerned everything outside the island of Orleans, which would give them the right of deposit, was in the nature of an involuntary acquisition.

In order to get territory that we wanted we had to take a vast extent of territory that we did not want. It was unsettled and unexplored. No one at the time of its acquisition looked upon it as a desirable acquisition.

The opinions prevalent at the time were all summed up in the words of that distinguished lawyer, jurist, and statesman, Fisher Ames, of Massachusetts, who in his mature years said of the Louisiana purchase:

> Now, by adding an unmeasured waste beyond the Mississippi, we plunge like a comet into infinite space. We may, perhaps, in our mad career, jostle some other comet out of its orbit, but we shall in any event effectually quench the light of our own.

That was the way in which the purchase of the Louisiana Territory was regarded not only by the Federalists, but by Jefferson and his colleagues. Outside of the right of deposit it was an unwelcome purchase.

Now, then, let us see the problem that Jefferson had to face when he received the packet from Paris informing him of this purchase. Jefferson regarded the territory of the United States as the territory specifically bounded by the treaty of 1783 between the colonies and Great Britain. When he read the first clause of the third section of Article IV of the Constitution—"New States shall be admitted by the Congress into this Union"—Jefferson considered that this language referred simply to States carved out of the territory described in the treaty of 1783.

He thought that it would require a constitutional amendment to admit to the Union a State outside the limits of 1783, and he also thought that it might require a constitutional amendment to authorize the United States to acquire and hold territory outside these limits. I shall endeavor to make this clear by Jefferson's own words. I repeat, the right to incorporate new States into the Union under section 3 of Article IV of the Constitution was held by Jefferson to apply simply to States organized out of territory east of the Mississippi River.

In the same way Jefferson regarded the language in the second clause of section 3 of Article IV, which says that—

The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

He regarded that language, I say, as applying simply to the territory east of the Mississippi River, or the territory described in the treaty of 1783.

You see, then, gentlemen, what a conundrum Jefferson had facing him. Spurred on by the commercial necessities of our people, his emissary to France had been given plenary power by him, and had purchased twelve hundred thousand square miles of territory. In considering the constitutional questions arising out of this purchase, Jefferson's opinions underwent a series of rapid and characteristic changes. Early in January, 1803, he wrote to Gallatin:

You are right, in my opinion, as to Mr. L.'s proposition. There is no constitutional difficulty as to the acquisition of territory; and whether when acquired it may be taken into the Union by the Constitution as it now stands will become a question of expediency. I think it will be safer not to permit the enlargement of the Union but by amendment of the Constitution.

Here we see that Jefferson clearly distinguished between territory belonging to the United States and territory incorporated into the Union. But to be on the safe side he proposed this amendment to the Constitution, which he submitted to the Secretary of the Navy:

The province of Louisiana is incorporated with the United States and made part thereof. The rights of occupancy in the soil and of self-government are confirmed to the Indian inhabitants, as they now exist. Preemption only of the portions rightfully occupied by them, and a succession to the occupancy of such as they may abandon, with the full rights of possession, as well as of property and sovereignty in whatever is not or shall cease to be so rightfully occupied by them, shall belong to the United States.

The Legislature of the Union shall have authority to exchange the right of occupancy in portions where the United States have full right for lands possessed by the Indians within the United States on the east side of the Mississippi; to exchange lands on the east side of the river for those of the white inhabitants on the west side thereof and above the latitude of 31 degrees; to maintain in any part of the province such military posts as may be requisite for peace or safety; to exercise police over all persons therein not being Indian inhabitants; to work salt springs or mines of coal, metals, and other minerals within the possession of the United States, or in any others with the consent of the possessors; to regulate trade and intercourse between the Indian inhabitants and all other persons; to explore and ascertain the geography of the province, its productions, and other interesting circumstances; to open roads and navigation therein where necessary for beneficial communication, and to establish agencies and factories therein for the cultivation of commerce, peace, and good understanding with the Indians residing there.

The legislature shall have no authority to dispose of the lands of the province otherwise than as hereinbefore permitted until a new amendment of the Constitution shall give that authority, except as to that portion thereof which lies south of the latitude of 31°, which, whenever they deem expedient, they may erect into a Territorial government, either separate or as making part with one on the eastern side of the river, vesting the inhabitants thereof with all the rights possessed by other Territorial citizens of the United States.

Secretary Smith thought that an amendment was necessary to authorize the purchase, but he considered that Jefferson's proposition might prove embarrassing to the Government in dealing with the Territory, and suggested this form of an amendment.

Louisiana being in virtue of the treaty, etc., incorporated with the United States and being thereby a part of the territory thereof, Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the same as fully and effectually as if the same had been at the time of the establishment of the Constitution a part of the territory of the United States; provided, nevertheless, that Congress shall not have power to erect or establish in that portion of Louisiana which is situated north of the latitude of 32 degrees any new State or Territorial government nor to grant to any citizen or citizens or other individual or individuals excepting Indians any right or title whatever to any part of said portion of Louisiana until a new amendment of the Constitution shall give that authority.

In August, 1803, Jefferson sent to the Secretary of State and to the Attorney-General still another proposed amendment:

Louisiana, as ceded by France to the United States, is made a part of the United States. Its white inhabitants shall be citizens, and stand, as to their rights and obligations, on the same footing with other citizens of the United States in analogous situations. Save only that as to the portion thereof lying north of an east and west line drawn through the mouth of Arkansas River no new State shall be established, nor any grants of land made, other than to Indians in exchange for equivalent portions of land occupied by them, until authorized by further subsequent amendment to the Constitution shall be made for these purposes.

Florida, also, whenever it may be rightfully obtained, shall become a part of the United States; its white inhabitants shall thereupon be citizens and shall stand as to their rights and obligations on the same footing with other citizens of the United States in analogous situations.

About the same time he wrote to his friend John C. Breckinridge on the subject:

This treaty must, of course, be laid before both Houses, because both have important functions to exercise respecting it. They, I presume, will see their duty to their country in ratifying and paying for it, so as to secure a good which would otherwise probably never be again in their power. But I suppose they must then appeal to the nation for an additional article to the Constitution, approving and confirming an act which the nation had not previously authorized. The Constitution has made no provision for our holding foreign territory; still less for incorporating foreign nations into our Union.

Here, again, you see Jefferson making this distinction between territory to be incorporated into the Union and territory belonging to the United States:

The Executive, in seizing the fugitive occurrence which so much advances the good of their country, have done an act beyond the Constitution. The legislature, in casting behind them metaphysical subtleties and risking themselves like faithful servants, must ratify and pay for it, and throw themselves on their country for doing for them unauthorized what we know they would have done for themselves had they been in a situation to do it.

It is the case of a guardian investing the money of his ward in purchasing an important adjacent territory and saying to him when of age, "I did this for your good; I pretend to no right to bind you; you may disavow me, and I must get out of the scrape as I can. I thought it my duty to risk myself for you." But we shall not be disavowed by the nation, and their act of indemnity will confirm and not weaken the Constitution by more strongly marking out its lines.

We have nothing later from Europe than the public papers give. I hope yourself and all the Western members will make a sacred point of being at the first day of the meeting of Congress; for vestra res agitur.

The distinguished founder of Democracy had a felicitous way of dropping into Latin and French now and then.

Jefferson also discussed this constitutional question in a letter to Mr. Wilson Cary Nicholas:

I am aware of the force of the observations you make on the power given by the Constitution to Congress to admit new States into the Union without restraining the subject to the territory then constituting the United States. But when I consider that the limits of the United States are precisely fixed by the treaty of 1783, that the Constitution expressly declares itself to be made for the United States, I can not help believing the intention was to permit Congress to admit into the Union new States which should be formed out of the territory for which, and under whose authority alone, they were then acting. I do not believe it was meant that they might receive England, Ireland, Holland, etc., into it, which would be the case on your construction.

And again, on this same subject, in a letter to John Dickinson, he says:

But there is a difficulty in this acquisition which presents a handle to the malcontents among us, though they have not yet discovered it. Our Confederation is certainly confined to the limits established by the Revolution. The General Government has no power but such as the Constitution has given it, and it has not given the power of holding foreign territory, and still less of incorporating it into the Union.

An amendment of the Constitution seems necessary for this. In the meantime we must ratify and pay our money, as we have treated for a thing beyond the Constitution, and rely on the nation to sanction an act done for its great good without previous authority.

The nation did sanction the act. The people were not troubled by any of the scruples respecting the Constitution which perplexed Mr. Jefferson.

We have constitutional interpretations besides those given by the courts, and in this case Jefferson, doing what he himself considered an open violation of the Constitution, found that it was unnecessary to amend it, that the people placed their own interpretations upon the Constitution and ratified his act. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But Jefferson, the strict constructionist, who had a microscopical power of discovering constitutional obstacles to the political schemes of his rivals, had also a nimble way of surmounting all such obstacles for the purpose of accomplishing his own ends.

After writing this first letter to Breckenridge, Jefferson received news from France that she was likely to withdraw from the treaty unless it was speedily ratified, and he sent this letter to Breckenridge:

I wrote you on the 12th instant on the subject of Louisiana and the constitutional provision which might be necessary for it. A letter received yesterday shows that nothing must be said on that subject which may give a pretext for retracting, but that we should do sub silentio what may be found necessary.

Be so good, therefore, as to treat that part of my letter as confidential. It strengthens the reasons for desiring the presence of every friend of the treaty on the first day of the session. Perhaps you can impress this necessity on the Senators of the Western States by private letter.

Accept my friendly salutations and assurances of my great respect and esteem.

Here, then, we have Jefferson maintaining we could not take any territory outside the original limits of 1783 into the Union or hold it as territory belonging to the United States without a constitutional amendment, and at the same time advising the Members and Senators to ratify this purchase and to treat the Constitution sub silentio. By a sort of lightning change he has become the annihilator of the Constitution.

On the same day he wrote to Thomas Paine:

On the 10th instant I wrote you on the subject of Louisiana and mentioned the question of a supplement to the Constitution on that account. A letter received yesterday renders it prudent to say nothing in that subject, but to do sub silentio what shall be found necessary. That part of my letter, therefore, be so good as to treat as confidential.

Accept my friendly salutations and assurances of my great respect and esteem.

Jefferson was the most prolific letter writer we ever had in public office, and it is from the letters which he wrote in confidence to the members of both Houses of Congress and to his personal friends that we gain a true insight into his real feelings. The plan of treating the Constitution sub silentio in dealing with an important question seems to have had a fascination for him. He writes to the Attorney-General:

I quote this for your consideration, observing that the less that is said about any constitutional difficulty the better. I think it will be desirable for Congress to do what is necessary in silence.

It seems surprising that the Attorney-General was the only one of his correspondents who did not understand Latin. [Laughter.]

Now, no constitutional amendment ever was made, and in my opinion no constitutional amendment was necessary. The people

of the United States ratified Jefferson's act in this purchase, and in ratifying this act, I submit, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that the people of the United States have placed their own interpretation upon the power of Congress under the Constitution to add new States to the Union and to acquire new territory.

Is it possible, Mr. Chairman, that we acquired Florida by treating the Constitution sub silentio? Is it possible that we took in Texas, that we took in New Mexico, Arizona, and California, by treating the Constitution sub silentio? Is it possible that there is anyone to-day who claims that the twenty States that have come into the Union outside of the original territory of 1783 have been taken into the Union by treating the Constitution sub silentio?

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that there is no escape from this proposition that as to the right of Congress to admit new States into the Union outside of the original limits of 1783 the people have put their interpretation upon the Constitution, and by placing their interpretation upon the first clause of the third section of Article IV in the Constitution, they have also placed their interpretation upon the second clause of the fourth section of Article IV.

If we have the right to take into the Union States outside of the original limits, then much more have we the right to acquire territory outside of the original limits and hold it without incorporating it into the Union and govern it by such laws as Congress may deem wise. Jefferson's views as to what should be done with the vast territory west of the Mississippi are interesting as showing how fully he believed in the necessity of governing the territory without incorporating it into the Union.

On August 9, 1803, Jefferson wrote to his friend John Dickinson:

With respect to the disposal of the country, we must take the island of New Orleans and west side of the river as high up as Point Coupee, containing nearly the whole inhabitants, say about 50,000, and erect it into a State, or annex it to the Mississippi Territory, and shut up all the rest from settlement for a long time to come, endeavoring to exchange some of the country there unoccupied by Indians for the lands held by the Indians on this side of the Mississippi, who will be glad to cede us their country here for an equivalent there, and we may sell out our lands here and pay the whole debt contracted before it becomes due. The impost which will be paid by the inhabitants ceded will pay half the interest of the price we give, so that we really add only half the price to our debt.

On July 11, 1803, Jefferson wrote to Gen. Horatio Gates:

With respect to the territory acquired, I do not think it will be a separate government, as you imagine. I presume the island of New Orleans and the settled country on the opposite bank will be annexed to the Mississippi Territory. We shall certainly endeavor to introduce the American laws there, and that can not be done but by amalgamating the people with such a body of Americans as may take the lead in legislation and government. Of course, they will be under the governor of Mississippi. The rest of the territory will probably be locked up from American settlement and under the self-government of the native inhabitants.

In his letter to Breckenridge of August 12, 1803, Jefferson said:

The inhabited part of Louisiana, from Point Coupée to the sea, will of course be immediately a Territorial government, and soon a State. But above that, the best use we can make of the country for some time will be to give establishments in it to the Indians on the east side of the Mississippi in exchange for their present country, and open land offices in the last, and thus make this acquisition the means of filling up the eastern side instead of drawing off its population. When we shall be full on this side we may lay off a range of States on the western bank from the head to the mouth, and so, range after range, advancing compactly as we multiply.

On December 2, 1803, Jefferson wrote to De Witt Clinton:

More difference of opinion seems to exist as to the manner of disposing of Louisiana than I had imagined possible, and our leading friends are not yet sufficiently aware of the necessity of accommodation and mutual sacrifice of opinion for conducting a numerous assembly, where the opposition, too, is drilled to act in phalanx on every question. Although it is acknowledged that our new fellow-citizens are as yet as incapable of self-government as children, yet some can not bring themselves to suspend its principles for a single moment. The temporary or Territorial government of that country therefore will encounter great difficulty. The question, too, whether the settlement of upper Louisiana shall be prohibited occasions a great division among our friends. Some are for prohibiting it till another amendment to the Constitution shall permit it; others for prohibiting by authority of the Legislature only; a third set for permitting immediate settlement.

I think that this illustration from the purchase of the Louisiana Territory shows clearly that we may sometimes have to acquire territory that we do not want in order to get the territory that we do want. And can it be maintained that we as a sovereign people, in taking territory that we do not want in order to get territory that we do want, must incorporate the territory that we do not want into the Union and give to the people of that territory all the rights and privileges of citizens under the Constitution?

If that is so, then this must be so, that we as a people are deprived of a right which no other sovereign nation is without. If we can not take and hold territory without incorporating it into the Union, then, in some way, we as a people have yielded away one of our sovereign rights. But let us take another view of this matter.

The first thing that you think of in a sovereign people is the right of self-protection, coupled with the right to wage offensive and defensive war. What is the most natural result of waging a successful war? Certainly it is the acquisition of the territory of the enemy. If the contention of gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber be true that we can not acquire and hold territory without incorporating it into the Union and making the inhabitants thereof citizens of the United States, then, Mr. Chairman, when we are at war and want to strike the enemy in the most vulnerable spot we must send out a commission to inquire into the nature of the country, the character of the inhabitants, whether they are fit to be taken into the Union and given all the rights of American citizens, before we can strike the blow. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

In my mind, Mr. Chairman, there is no escape from the proposition. The people, through the Constitution, have placed the right to declare war in Congress. Congress has the right to prosecute this war in every way known to modern and civilized warfare. The most ordinary result of such a war is the conquest of territory. And the holding of the conquered territory may be essential to our safety. But if, as gentlemen on the other side contend, we can not hold territory without incorporating it into the Union, then we might be compelled to do that which would work incalculable injury to our own people.

If we can not hold territory without incorporating it into the Union and making its inhabitants citizens, then we must give it up, when to give it up might strengthen our enemy and imperil our safety, or we must admit a degraded race into full American citizenship and bring into competition with intelligent, free American labor the pauper labor of the Orient. The bare statement of such a principle is sufficient to bring down upon it universal condemnation.

Have I not stated your principle correctly? Every man on the other side of the Chamber who has spoken on this subject has said that Puerto Rico is United States territory, that the Philippines are United States territory, and that the Filipinos and Puerto Ricans are citizens of the United States, and that their political status is fixed by the Constitution. Are you not, for mere temporary political purposes, asserting a principle that you will sometime indignantly repudiate? Are you willing to concede free trade with the Philippine Islands? Are you willing to admit Filipino laborers into competition with American labor?

We took Puerto Rico and the Philippines as we took California—as an incident to a just war. What are we to do with them? The answer is in the second clause of the third section of Article IV of the Constitution: "The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States."

And in considering what rules and regulations are necessary we must consider our own people and their rights as well as the claims of the inhabitants of these islands.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I should like to ask the gentleman a question right there.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. Certainly.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. If the people of that country, remote from us as they are, were such as could be incorporated, would you then favor making the Philippines American States?

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. That is not the question at issue. I am now discussing simply the question of our right to acquire and govern territory, and I would reply to the gentleman's question in the language of Thomas Jefferson, vestra res agitur. [Great laughter.]

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Having replied by an evasion in the language of Thomas Jefferson, will you reply in some way in your own language to the question? If the Philippine Islands were peopled by inhabitants suitable to American citizenship, would you then favor making them American States under the Constitution?

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. I do not think that I should, for reasons which I have no time now to discuss.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Would you favor taking in a territory which by military necessity we had to appropriate and admit its people to equal rights with us?

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. It would depend upon the character of the people and other circumstances. Each acquisition of territory must be dealt with on its own merits. I certainly should not favor admitting to American citizenship a race of cannibals.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. One further question. Would you, if not willing to take them in, go to the extent of believing that, regardless of what their qualifications be, they should be deprived of the protection of the Constitution?

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. What gives a foreign people any rights under our Constitution?

Who made the Constitution? Our ancestors, the people of the thirteen independent American colonies. For whom was it made? For themselves and for their posterity. As a nation we have expanded in territory and increased in population beyond the most extravagant dreams of our ancestors. We have received into the Union every territory inhabited by a people able and willing to enjoy the privileges and discharge the duties of American citizenship.

We have welcomed with hospitable arms to our political household men of all climes, of all races, of all religions, who came to us with the honest purpose to share with us the burdens and the blessings of our National Government; but we can not extend the Constitution over a people unwilling to be governed by it, and no people can claim any rights under the Constitution whom we do not admit to a participation in those rights. If people inhabiting territory that we acquired by discovery or as an incident of war can by reason of such acquisition be made citizens of the United States, then we are not a free people.

The first principle of free government, the principle underlying all written constitutions, is that those who found the government shall have absolute freedom of choice in selecting those who shall participate in the government. Take away this freedom of choice and the strength of the republic is lost.

Now, our Democratic friends claim that this freedom of choice as to whom we shall admit into the Union is imperialism, and they are solicitous for the welfare of the inhabitants of our newly acquired possessions.

But in this crisis, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am more solicitous for our own country.

We must do justice to the Puerto Ricans, but in doing justice to them we must see to it that we do no injustice to our fellow-countrymen. We must do right by the 8,000,000 Filipinos, but in doing right by them we must see to it that we do no wrong by 80,000,000 American citizens. [Prolonged applause.]

Case of Brigham H. Roberts, of Utah.

SPEECH
OF
HON. DAVID H. SMITH,
OF KENTUCKY.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, January 24, 1900,

On the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That under the facts and circumstances of this case, Brigham H. Roberts, Representative-elect from the State of Utah, ought not to have or hold a seat in the House of Representatives, and that the seat to which he was elected is hereby declared vacant."

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky said:

Mr. SPEAKER: At the opening of this session, upon the call of the members duly certified to have been elected to the Fifty-sixth Congress for the purpose of administering the oath of office to them, when the name of B. H. Roberts, of Utah, was called, a member from Ohio [Mr. TAYLER] arose and objected to his being sworn upon the ground as stated in the preamble to the resolution subsequently adopted:

It is charged that Brigham H. Roberts, a Representative-elect from the State of Utah, is ineligible to a seat in the House of Representatives.

Thereupon, and at the request of and with the assurance of the Speaker that he would not thereby waive nor lose any of his rights and privileges, Mr. Roberts stood aside temporarily. On the next day, December 5, the House adopted this resolution:

Whereas it is charged that Brigham H. Roberts, a Representative-elect to the Fifty-sixth Congress from the State of Utah, is ineligible to a seat in the House of Representatives; and

Whereas such charge is made through a member of this House, on his responsibility as such member and on the basis, as he asserts, of public records, affidavits, and papers evidencing such ineligibility:

Resolved, That the question of the prima facie right of Brigham H. Roberts to be sworn in as a Representative from the State of Utah in the Fifty-sixth Congress, as well as of his final right to a seat therein as such Representative, be referred to a special committee of nine members of the House, to be appointed by the Speaker; and until such committee shall report upon and the House decide such question and right the said Brigham H. Roberts shall not be sworn in or be permitted to occupy a seat in this House; and said committee shall have power to send for persons and papers and examine witnesses on oath in relation to the subject-matter of this resolution, etc.

By this resolution it was made the plain and unavoidable duty of the committee to inquire into and report upon, first, the prima facie right of Mr. Roberts to be sworn as a member of this House, and second, his final right "to a seat therein." After an exhaustive and impartial hearing the committee ascertained and has reported the facts to be as follows:

FINDING OF FACTS.

We find that Brigham H. Roberts was elected as a Representative to the Fifty-sixth Congress from the State of Utah and was at the date of his election above the age of 25 years; that he had been for more than seven years a naturalized citizen of the United States and was an inhabitant of the State of Utah.

We further find that about 1878 he married Louisa Smith, his first and lawful wife, with whom he has ever since lived as such, and who since their marriage has borne him six children.

That about 1885 he married as his plural wife Celia Dibble, with whom he has ever since lived as such, and who since such marriage has borne him six children, of whom the last were twins, born August 11, 1897.

That some years after his said marriage to Celia Dibble he contracted another plural marriage with Margaret C. Shipp, with whom he has ever since lived in the habit and repute of marriage. Your committee is unable to fix the exact date of this marriage. It does not appear that he held her out as his wife before January, 1897, or that she before that date held him out as her husband, or that before that date they were reputed to be husband and wife.

That these facts were generally known in Utah, publicly charged against him during his campaign for election, and were not denied by him.

The first section of the findings affirms the existence of every fact required by the second clause of section 2, Article I, of the Constitution, to render a person eligible to membership in the House of Representatives. The other findings of facts relate to polygamous marriages and unlawful cohabitations by Mr. Roberts. It is unnecessary for me to attempt to manifest by argument that elements of eligibility to the position of Representative in Congress, other than those specified in the section of the Constitution referred to above, can not be imposed. That has been so ably and irrefutably done by the gentlemen from Maine and Missouri, Messrs. LITTLEFIELD and DE ARMOND, that I apprehend that any effort I might make for that purpose would be commonplace indeed, if not feeble, when compared with their masterful presentations of the subject. I am content with the privilege of making the bare announcement that it is my deliberate judgment that no power exists anywhere to take from or add to the requisites to eligibility under the Constitution.

If it be so, then, that Mr. Roberts was not only elected, but according to the committee's report was eligible when elected, being so, he is now entitled to take the oath and enjoy all the rights and privileges of a member of this House until his connection therewith shall be severed in an authorized manner. But the majority have, according to my conception, failed, at least in part, in the resolution presented to respond to the demands of the resolution under which they were acting. The question of the prima facie right of Roberts to be sworn was submitted to them no less than was that of his "final right to a seat" in this body, and it was the plain duty of this committee to present resolutions answering in positive terms and unequivocal language each of these inquiries. By the resolutions it adopts upon this subject this House will deliver its judgment to the country upon this interesting case, and I submit that it ought to be so explicit that misconstruction and misapprehension will be impossible.

Not only ought it to be so, but it ought to present the questions under consideration with such clearness, distinctness, and in such form that every member can by his vote express his views upon each proposition separately and in a way to leave no occasion for misunderstanding his course. This the majority have not done by the resolution brought in by them. That resolution reads:

Resolved, That under the facts and circumstances of this case, Brigham H. Roberts, Representative-elect from the State of Utah, ought not to have or hold a seat in the House of Representatives, and that the seat to which he was elected is hereby declared vacant.

ROBERT W. TAYLER.
CHARLES B. LANDIS.
PAGE MORRIS.
ROMEO H. FREER.
SMITH MCPHERSON.
SAMUEL W. T. LANHAM.
ROBERT W. MIERS.

In it they do not say whether Mr. Roberts did or did not have the prima facie right to be sworn, though, under the facts reported, there are many of us who do not doubt it. That was one of the two questions referred to the committee, and yet by the majority resolution we are precluded from a distinct and direct vote upon it. It is no sufficient apology to say that we may express our convictions touching that point by voting against the majority resolution, because to do so is to take a position that may be construed to mean that we are opposed to the expulsion of Roberts, when, in fact, speaking for myself at least, I am for his expulsion, and I have no doubt that all, or nearly all, of those who are of the opinion that he has a right to take the oath agree with me on this proposition. But it may be contended that those who think him entitled to the oath and favor his expulsion afterwards can express themselves correctly by voting for the minority resolution and, if that fails, then voting for the majority resolution. No; this can not be. The minority resolution reads:

Resolved, That Brigham H. Roberts, having been duly elected a Representative in the Fifty-sixth Congress from the State of Utah, with the qualifications requisite for admission to the House as such, is entitled as a constitutional right to take the oath of office prescribed for members-elect, his acts as a polygamist unlawfully cohabiting with plural wives affording constitutional ground for expulsion, but not for exclusion, from the House.

It declares that the matters and thing proved against Roberts supply sufficient cause for expulsion, not exclusion, and that he is entitled to have the oath administered, while the majority resolution denies absolutely this right to him, and by its form declares that exclusion and not expulsion is the remedy to be applied. The two votes would be not only confusing, but contradictory in every phase. By the one we would be made to say that expulsion was the proper course of punishment; by the other that exclusion was. By the one we would be committed to the proposition that he had the constitutional right to demand the oath; by the other we would deny it. I would cheerfully vote to expel Mr. Roberts upon the

facts found by the committee, but it is my sincere conviction and irrevocable conclusion that he was and is eligible to his seat and had, when this Congress assembled and will have till the moment of his expulsion, the constitutional right to have the oath of office administered to him. The committee has so framed its resolution that to support it is not only to deny to this gentleman a right to which I conceive he is entitled under the Constitution, but likewise to exercise the power of exclusion by this body when the facts and the Constitution do not warrant it. I am unwilling to deprive Mr. Roberts wrongfully of that to which he is entitled. I can not consent to do that which I believe to be in violation of the Constitution, which, with uplifted hand, I swore to support and defend; I will not aid in overriding the Constitution in order that we may get rid of Mr. Roberts when he can be easily and quickly disposed of in consonance with the fundamental law.

The Late Daniel Ermentrout.

SPEECH
OF
HON. DAVID A. DE ARMOND,
OF MISSOURI,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, February 3, 1900.

The House having under consideration the following resolutions:

"*Resolved*, That the House has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. DANIEL ERMENTROUT, late a member of the House of Representatives from the State of Pennsylvania.

"*Resolved*, That the business of the House be now suspended, that opportunity may be given for fitting tribute to his memory.

"*Resolved*, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy of the same to the family of the deceased.

"*Resolved*, That, as an additional mark of respect, the House, at the conclusion of these memorial proceedings, do adjourn"—

Mr. DE ARMOND said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I avail myself of the opportunity to say something in memory of my friend DANIEL ERMENTROUT.

The thought is a melancholy one that so often, in the pilgrimage from birth to death, we find friends dropping from our side, to be gone ere we can so much as bid them good-bye and Godspeed; and when suddenly aroused to the consciousness that they are gone, never to return, how poor and idle are the best words that we can utter concerning them. How poor and weak is the speech which we employ over inanimate clay, with the spirit translated to a state of being invisible to mortal eyes and outlined only before the eye of Faith. To the exalted understanding which, it may be, death at once sets free, with the breaking of the shackles of the flesh, our strongest utterances may seem as the prattle of little children; and if the awakening into the real life is to come later, what a faint whisper must our speech be as it assaults so vainly the deaf ear of dreamless silence.

However often one may have witnessed the unerring stroke of Death, however often the sable wing may have darkened for him the sky of being and of hope, still does the unwearied messenger come with awe in his mien and pain in his touch. The mortal upon whom Death's finger is laid may find it soothing as is the divinely tender touch of the mother's hand as it rests upon the infant so lovingly cradled upon her breast, or Death may snuff the candle of life long after consciousness is gone and all earthly sensations of pleasure and of pain have come to an end. But to those who survive, the witnesses at once of Death's remorseless power and their own impotency, Death comes as the dread messenger of pain and sorrow; the rude foe to happiness; the despoiler of families; the maker of widows and orphans; the destroyer of mirth, that sadness may take its place; the agent that turns laughter to weeping, that banishes hope and installs despair, that sprinkles young heads with gray hairs, that bows the strong into semblance of weakness, that drives out affluence that penury may enter, that sets tender feet into paths that are rough, that blots out sun and moon and stars, and hangs around and about the sable clouds of rayless night. But, thanks to the good God above us, to most the sun again appears, and over most again smiles the gentle moon and beam the lovely stars, "the forget-me-nots of the angels."

DANIEL ERMENTROUT passed from earth after manhood's prime, but before the evening of life had come, and while the fires of being yet burned with a steady glow, if no longer with the strong heat of lustier days. His life was an active one, honored and useful. He was a fine type of the sturdy race from which he sprang, and which has given the world so many noble men and women. To-day, in far-away South Africa, men such as he was, possessed of the same race characteristics and with him entitled to them by a common inheritance, are fighting for liberty as he would have fought if his lot had been cast in their devoted land, and liberty had depended upon him for defense against tyranny, its foe of all ages and all climes, as now it rests its hopes in the strength of the arms of its Krugers and Jouberts and their humble Boer followers. DANIEL ERMENTROUT would have proved worthy to fight, and, if need be, to die in the holy cause of freedom, as becomes all who are worthy to live.

Who was more steadfast in friendship than he, or more generous in meeting cheerfully its every sacrifice? As one who knew him well and enjoyed his friendship, I know whereof I speak. When he was one's friend—and his friendship was by no means confined to a few—one need have no fear that temptation or prospective advantage could cool his ardor or alienate him. He was a true and unselfish friend; and who ought not to be proud of deserving so high a tribute?

How often do we fail to estimate true friendship at its high worth! I doubt if we ever overestimate it; I doubt if we could do so. The friendship that is unselfish (and really there is no other kind, though sometimes a pseudo-friendship gains currency, in a state of comparative scarcity of the genuine article) is the beautiful blossom of one of the noblest growths of the human mind and heart; next, indeed, in loveliness to pure love itself. Fair-weather friends, of course, are abundant, altogether too plentiful. But the friends of every season and all the vicissitudes of life, whom no disturbances can frighten, no storms can drive away, no darkness can blind, how priceless they are! True friendship is the towering mountain peak whence love for neighbor as for self, love sublimated and etherealized into fitness for the life beyond this life, takes its flight to the land of eternal day.

Memory of him that was, but in this world is no more, survives the tomb, to fail at last, as all things earthly fail, in the never-ending, ever-fatal conflict with Time. At least we have the consolation of realizing that our memories of DANIEL ERMENTROUT are kindly and pleasant, and long will they abide with us. And yet it will not be long until our names and deeds and characteristics, like his, will be committed to the memories of those who shall know, and, may be, shall esteem us as we esteem him. And so goes the little round of being. We shall occupy a dot of space in a fraction of time, and then we, too, shall have gone the way of the tiny wave upon the great ocean of life. We may hope to live in our children rather than in ourselves and in our country rather than in either or both. The race can move onward and upward though men perish out of it. The Republic should wax stronger while generations of men weaken with age and leave it by the door of death. The deep love of country and of republican government, pure and undefiled, may link generation after generation in a chain of patriotism that Time will be powerless to break in long ages; and thus, proudly contributing our part toward sowing widely and maintaining firmly the principles of free government, when the summons comes we may hope to depart in the soothing consciousness of being able to answer to the last salute, "All's well."

Departed friend, we can do nothing for thee. But while dropping the tear of affection over thy last resting place and feebly syllabling a few words for the monument to thy memory, let us be mindful that by emulating thy virtues and drawing the mantle of charity over thy frailties (and what man born of woman is free from them) we may help ourselves toward kindlier lives and nobler deeds. And thus, as Time goes on, moving ever and halting never, the world ought to grow better and happier.

Faithful unto death to thy friends, they that knew thee best esteem thee most, and with pleasant memories of thee which long will endure, in the light of Hope banishing the gloom of Despair, they bid thee, DANIEL ERMENTROUT, not good-by, but good night.

Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation Bill.

SPEECHES
OF
HON. RICHARD BARTHOLDT,
OF MISSOURI,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, February 14, and Friday, February 23, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 8347) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes—

Mr. BARTHOLDT said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 6 appears the following, which I ask the Clerk to read:

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There is not a State in the American Union that has a better election law than the State of Missouri. I drew it myself; I

helped pass it through the legislature. In that imperial Commonwealth every man, black or white, rich or poor, votes once and has his vote counted once.

Mr. ADAMS. Yet we had a gentleman rise in his seat the other day [Mr. BARTHOLDT] and state that the election law in Missouri was such that it would be impossible to hold an honest election there. Did the gentleman from Missouri draw and pass that law?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There is no such law. I will state what is the matter with the gentleman from St. Louis.

Mr. ADAMS. He is all right.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Wait a moment. The gentleman from Missouri represents a large German constituency.

Mr. ADAMS. That is good.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. They are in favor of the Boers and against the Philippine propaganda. The gentleman from Missouri has been running with the McKinley Administration until his political fences have got into very bad order, and he thought he would recoup by getting up here and making a spread-eagle speech about the corruption of elections in St. Louis.

Mr. BARTHOLDT rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Oh, yes.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, I made a dispassionate statement the other day——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, I did not hear it.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. It was made in a Republican caucus, and I do not intend to betray the secrets of a caucus. But I stand by every word I said—that the election law in our State is every bit as bad as, if not worse than, the law upon the statute books of the State of Kentucky, which resulted the other day in bloodshed and murder. And I want to ask the gentleman a question in this connection. If he drew the election law of Missouri, he is probably aware of the fact that under that new law there may not be appointed in the city of St. Louis a Republican either as judge of elections or as clerk; consequently the machinery is entirely in the hands of the Democracy——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Oh, no.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. So far as my own district is concerned——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Wait a moment. I yielded for a question; not for a speech. I want to make my speech myself.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. The gentleman referred to my State; will he allow me a word in this connection?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. We will give you time when I get through. I want to go on with my speech.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri declines to yield further.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. From this colloquy it appears, Mr. Chairman, that my loquacious friend did not afford me an opportunity to make further answer to his peculiar statements at the time. I propose to do so now, and am glad of his challenge, because the House will probably not be averse to hearing from Republican Missouri on this floor after Democratic Missouri has, by actual count, talked 96 columns of the RECORD since this session opened. You wonder, but it is a fact. It is equal to an eight-column contribution from each of the twelve apostles of Missouri Democracy, and if they keep up their terrible record to the end of this Congress, why, the true apostles, in spite of their work of a lifetime, will not be in it with them. This accounts, perhaps, for what a friend of mine, whom I was sending the RECORD, wrote me the other day. "I am tired," he says, "of these Democratic stump speeches. For God's sake, stop sending the RECORD!"

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman and his colleagues have filled 96 columns of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with their remarks during this session, and I must now insist upon having my say.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I want to know whether the gentleman's correspondent is black or white.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri declines to yield.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. My correspondent had been reading the speeches of my colleagues on the financial bill, and it made him not only tired, but desperate, because I know how much he at first appreciated receiving that great Congressional publication. If he is compelled to listen to the same kind of stuff during the next campaign, the Lord only knows what, besides voting the Republican ticket, he will do. I believe his feelings to be typical of the sentiments of the American people.

But while we on this side, Republican Missouri, contended ourselves with casting affirmative votes on that great financial measure, in the belief that our simple "ayes" surpassed in effectiveness the most eloquent orations, what did our Democratic colleagues say in those 96 columns? Condensed in just one word, their speeches breathed denunciation. In sixty-odd columns they denounced the financial bill, and in the balance of their time they denounced the Government and everybody and everything in and out of the country, not even stopping at either ocean, but wading 4,000 miles through the Atlantic in one direction and 6,000 miles through the Pacific in the other.

But among the names of persons upon whose heads they visited their wrath, you will look in vain for that of one Aguinaldo, the enemy of their country, which goes to show that in their eyes a rebellion against the American flag is, after all, not half as unpopular as by right the history of our country should have made it. They go about with their umbrellas up, from force of habit and as a result of the last Democratic Administration, and do not see that the sunshine of Republican prosperity is now cheering the American people. They are fighting all kinds of imaginary wrongs and do not see that labor is employed at good wages, that capital yields fair returns, and that only their honest cooperation in the enactment of the most necessary laws is needed to secure a continuation of these favorable economic conditions. [Applause.]

Only one sentence, Mr. Chairman, has been uttered by a Republican in this Congress which my colleagues from Missouri indorse, and that sentiment, rashly spoken, is not true. I refer to the assertion made in the other House that charity does not begin at home. It is wrong, I say, but it will suit my Democratic colleagues as long as Missouri is Democratic. They criticise, find fault with, and denounce the National Government as long as it is Republican, but don't you retaliate by scrutinizing the conditions in their own State as long as it is Democratic! Oh, no. They say to you, Charity does not begin at home.

Let us raise the curtain a little. The last legislature of my State passed a law introducing Goebelism in St. Louis. And yet my friend from the Ninth district [Mr. CLARK] says:

> There is no State in the American Union that has a better election law than the State of Missouri.

Now, I want to be entirely fair with him. I suspect, in making that bold statement, he referred to the law which applies to rural Missouri. But if my supposition is correct, and if it is such a good law, why, I ask, was it changed? Why was St. Louis singled out and placed under an exceptional statute? I will answer the question. Because St. Louis is a Republican city, and the change in the law was made to wipe out its Republican majority. That is it. When Missouri came up with her old-time Democratic majority last fall the leaders of that party bristled up and hatched a scheme which was afterwards enacted into law, and by which the only Republican oasis in that Democratic desert is to be swept away. The law provides for the appointment of three commissioners of election by the governor, two Democrats and one Republican, who have complete control of all elections.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is that not more than two of one political party?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Yes, sir. The commission is to consist of three.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. But you are taking for granted, which in all human probability is true, that Missouri will have a Democratic governor until the end of the world?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. And if Missouri should have a Republican governor, which it will have after the next election, I know the Republican majority will put a fair election law upon the statute books, and make the law bipartisan by appointing two Democrats and two Republicans.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. You would have two Republican commissioners and one Democrat, if you had the governor, which you never will have. We have had one, and that was enough.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. These commissioners appoint the judges and clerks, designate the polling places, and put on or strike from the voting lists any names of citizens in their discretion. Under the old law the action of the commissioners in all these respects was subject to revision by the circuit court, but this irksome safeguard of honest elections was shrewdly stricken out.

The mayor of St. Louis in a telegram to me states his objections to the new law in these terse words:

> ST. LOUIS, MO., *February 10, 1900.*
>
> Hon. RICHARD BARTHOLDT, *Washington, D. C.:*
>
> The law is bitterly partisan. It professes to recognize the Republican party by providing for the appointment of one commissioner, but he has no power whatever and can be ignored and overruled in every detail by the other two. The chief objection, however, is that the power of the courts to supervise the action of the election board in selecting judges and clerks, in designating polling places, and in striking names of citizens from the voting lists is withdrawn and the courts are left powerless. This was the great safeguard under the law replaced by the present act.

This, Mr. Chairman, is a fair sample of Democratic rule in Missouri. It leaves the Republican party in my city absolutely powerless. But not satisfied with this infamous piece of business, the same legislature, with the same sneering indifference to the people of St. Louis, saddled upon that city a new police law abnormally increasing the force, which force will consist of none but Democratic workers and heelers, ready to do the bidding of the men whom the Democratic governor has favored with appointments as police commissioners. It is partisanship run wild, and I challenge my friends on the other side to point out a single Republican State in the Union where the power of legislation has been similarly abused for partisan ends. Here we are not confronted by a mere question of policy as to whether the welfare of the people will best be promoted by this course or that course—and the national situation presents no other question—but we have to deal here with a deliberate attempt upon the very life of our institutions and upon the bulwarks of our civil rights and liberties.

This is the reason why I say to my colleagues on the other side: Charity *does* begin at home. If you come here and criticize and impugn the conduct of the National Administration, you want to have clean hands! If you want to stand sponsor for the rights and liberties of the American people, or of other people thousands of miles away, you will first have to show an unsullied title from home. And if it can be shown, as I think I have, that in your own State you trample the sacred privileges of the people under foot and propose to govern a great American city, such as St. Louis, "without the consent of the governed," then your ninety-six

columns of oratory have simply been talked to the winds. [Applause.]

But my friend talked about the Germans—that they are in favor of the Boers and against the Philippine propaganda, and that because I side with the Administration my political fences had gotten into very bad order, etc. I thank my friend for his sympathetic concern. I can imagine him walking through the corridors with tears in his eyes because there might be a doubt about my reelection, but I trust he will be somewhat comforted by the assurance that this does not bother me at all, possibly because I know the disposition of the German voters a little better than he does. I should like to know what has happened to alienate even one of them from the Republican party. Is it the prospective renomination of Bryan? While it may or may not be true that that gentleman has recently written several letters to the distinguished editor of a German Republican paper in St. Louis, asking his support, I do not think the seductive offers which may have been held out to the editor have had any effect whatever. The laws of business and sound politics prohibit such an unholy alliance.

Is it because Carl Schurz has declared that as between 16 to 1 and expansion the former was the smaller evil? Well, judging from my experience in the Ohio election last fall, and from the result of it, that advice, however honest it may have been, did not sway any considerable number of voters from their rule of political conduct. Is it because a man in Milwaukee has declared that by holding the Democratic national convention in that half-German city Bryan will catch the German vote? I can not help but feel pity for the man who thinks he can influence German-American voters the same as a photographer quiets babies—by show and claptrap. Believe me, if ten national conventions were held in Milwaukee, it would not have the slightest influence upon the vote of that population of thinking, cooly deliberating citizens, but such talk shows, and it has even found its way into the newspapers, how much, or rather how little, the true German character is known even to some who pretend to speak for that element.

No, my friends, the Germans know you better than you know them. They know you are a free-silver party. They know you are a free-trade party. They know you are a party of negation, opposing at all times anything and everything advocated by the Republicans, whether right or wrong. They know your component elements, and they do not care, at least in my part of the country, to identify themselves with you. My friend says the Germans are "against the Philippine propaganda." Yes; they are against his "Philippine propaganda." That is the great difference between the Germans and the Irish. The former are always disposed to be with the Government, while it is said of our Irish friends that, from home traditions, they are mostly "agin" it. The Germans are an inherently conservative, not a revolutionary, race, and love of peace and order, obedience to law, and loyalty to superiors and to the Government are their chief characteristics.

Whatever may have been their opinion about the acquisition of outlying territory, whatever may have been their first impulses with regard to the new course enjoined upon the ship of state by the Paris treaty—and their impulses were honest and patriotic—the majority of my German constituents agree with the Administration that a backward step is out of question now. [Applause.] They now acquiesce in the treaty of peace, as President and Senate acquiesced in it, and as you yourselves have acquiesced in it by voting $20,000,000 for the purchase of the Philippines.

And right here let me remind you that this Congressional action was the President's authority for all the measures he was afterwards obliged to adopt for the purpose of enforcing the terms of that treaty. If the newly built ship "Expansion" was to be sunk, here was your chance to scuttle it. You have failed to do it. Out of 154 Democrats in the last House only 33 voted against the appropriation, and the proposition was carried by a vote of 219 against those 33. And now the same men who then voted to uphold the treaty and to uphold the President are raising the cry of imperialism and expect the voters to believe in their sincerity. No President ever received a more emphatic expression of confidence and a plainer mandate from Congress than did President McKinley on this occasion.

Suppose, now, he had refused to obey that mandate? Perish the thought. Not to speak of the humiliating confession involved in this supposition, namely, that this great Government of ours makes a treaty but is too weak or cowardly to enforce it; not to mention the derisive sneers with which the whole civilized world would have justly met such a startling exhibition of impotence by a sappy Republic, our Democratic friends, bound to be on the other side of what we think and do, would then have surely raised the cry of czarism instead of imperialism, and, what is worse, they would have been entirely justified in doing it.

To hold new possessions by treaty instead of constitutional sanction, and honestly meet an emergency which the framers of the Constitution did not dream of and even the present generation had not foreseen, is a trifling offense, indeed, as compared with the dangerous example of a President arbitrarily setting at naught what, under the Constitution, is the highest law of the land—a treaty obligation. And if, on the other hand, the President had counseled the American peace commissioners not to insist upon the cession of the islands, who guarantees that the Democrats, as the original expansion party, would not have raised a hue and cry about such blundering statecraft which fritters away a most brilliant opportunity?

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HEMENWAY. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HEMENWAY] can yield to the gentleman from Missouri a part of his own time if he desires.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I have only about ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Missouri be extended ten minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BENTON. Will that come out of the general time?

The CHAIRMAN. It must come out of the general time.

Mr. CANNON. If I can be recognized, I will yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized, and yields to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. It is a well-known fact that Mr. Bryan advised his friends in the Senate to vote for the ratification of the treaty, and finally, with a correct estimate of the temper of the people, whose patriotic impulses had been aroused by Dewey's magnificent victory as never before, came personally to Washington and appealed to his friends not to throw away the fruits of that great victory, but to respect the patriotic sentiments of the people and vote for ratification. There is only one logical conclusion to be drawn from this attitude of Mr. Bryan. It is that had he been President, he, too, would have consented to the purchase of the Philippines. Who will disprove it? If he was opposed to the President's policy, here was his great opportunity to accentuate the difference between the two parties. He preferred that in this respect there should be no difference, just as you had declared in the House, and thus the die was cast in favor of expansion. Ever since that time the question is definitely settled, and no amount of argument, reasoning, or vituperation can now change the course which was then decided upon.

In the light of these recent historical facts it would seem that it comes with peculiarly bad grace from Democrats to pose as anti-expansionists here or elsewhere, for every charge hurled at the Administration on that score will by the force of circumstances prove a boomerang. But they are "out," and in order to get "in" they must have an issue. So they sew the torn shreds of the anti-expansion banner together, beat the tom-tom, gather the clans and choose as their standard bearer the very man who had himself torn that standard to pieces. Logical, isn't it?

I notice, by the way, that our Southern friends are strangely reticent and remarkably silent on this subject. Either as statesmen they do not appreciate the logic of some of their brethren in the North, or as guardians of the material interests of their constituents they realize that the future demands of the Orient for the staple products of the South should not be jeopardized by leading a forlorn hope for party supremacy. It may be, too, that both reasons account for their present attitude. Certain it is that they do not, like my Missouri colleagues, furnish reasons to the world why Aguinaldo is right. They are not attempting to demonstrate that their own country is wrong. They do not give aid and comfort to the enemy by denouncing the Administration for trying to carry out binding treaty obligations, and if I am not greatly mistaken in the temper of the Southern people, a vast majority of them believe with us that the road which leads to peace in the Philippines will be marked, not by the surrender of America, but by the surrender of Aguinaldo. [Applause.]

And when that goal is reached, Mr. Chairman, why, we shall give those people home rule, tempered only by American sovereignty. Is there in this great country of ours a man who would not be willing to grant them that same measure of liberty and self-government which Canada enjoys? Is our national pride and our national honor at such low ebb as to allow the American flag, the emblem of freedom and human rights, to undergo a change on its way through the Pacific Ocean? Does it symbolize liberty here and tyranny elsewhere? No, Mr. Chairman, it can not be true. I was not born on American soil, I am an adopted son of the Republic, but I would let them put me on the rack, with the 6,000,000 of Bryan voters dancing the ghost dance around me, rather than admit or believe it! [Applause.]

No true American will believe it, no matter where his cradle stood or whence his parents or ancestors came. His heart tells him that the Stars and Stripes will fade or change color neither at home nor abroad, neither in the icy fields of the polar region nor under the rays of a tropical sun. And any political prophet who

would count on our American citizens of German descent as even skeptical on this score will reckon without his host. It is grossly underrating their oft-tested loyalty to suppose that they would swap parties now and desert, at a critical juncture of our international relations, and in the midst of prosperity at home, the best President we have had since the days of Lincoln. [Applause.]

But let me face the music in all its different tunes. We hear so much about the wealth of the Philippines. Why, I say, if those islands were as barren and as rocky as the top of Pikes Peak, it would not make the slightest difference in the political aspect of the case. From the very moment the peace treaty was ratified by the Senate we had burned our bridges behind us, not as a party, mind you, but as a nation, and the carrying out of that treaty then became the concern of every good American, no matter whether we had bought a white elephant or a bonanza. It is our privilege to hope for fair returns, and none but a misled partisan's wishes will run to the contrary; but the actual results, whatever they may be, can not and should not affect the moral principle involved.

The form of government, it is true, has nothing to do with trade and commerce. Republics and monarchies are on equal footing when they reach out for the world's trade, and there are those who say that when we are among wolves we must howl with them. All this is true, but if our human necessities do not permit us to be angels we can at least take higher ground than the grasping monarchies of Europe, and history furnishes no better illustration than the payment by us of $20,000,000 to Spain. No question, we could have secured the islands for nothing from a vanquished, humiliated, and powerless foe, but this payment of a consideration makes me feel prouder of my country than any other transaction in the history of that war which our Democratic friends boast of having forced upon both Congress and the President.

At the time the peace commissioners sat around the green table at Paris the great newspapers of Europe—of London, Paris, and Berlin—said in their editorials: "Now, let us wait and see whether that mighty Republic beyond the ocean can be fair and magnanimous in the treatment of poor vanquished Spain." While their own governments would, perhaps, have acted less considerately under similar circumstances, their verdict now is and must be that we were fair and magnanimous, and I would not have another verdict at ten times the cost. Who can say now that we have acquired those islands by conquest? We have simply purchased them, just as Germany recently bought the Caroline Islands and as Thomas Jefferson bought the Louisiana Territory nearly a hundred years ago.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I thank the House for its attention and hope to have an opportunity to conclude my remarks at some future time. [Applause.]

Friday, February 23, 1900.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, since I occupied the floor a few days ago one of my colleagues from Missouri [Mr. BENTON] has seen fit to champion on this floor the cause of the Goebelites of my State and to actually defend the iniquitous election law by which our last Democratic legislature has tried to punish the great city of St. Louis because that city has had the temerity to go Republican by a large majority. I shall not answer him at this time, because no answer is necessary. My colleague has surprised his own party friends by his bold statements, and I believe few Democrats from St. Louis if clothed with the responsibility of a member of Congress and at all familiar with the actual conditions existing in that city, would have stood up here, as did my colleague, to excuse, justify, and defend what all good citizens, irrespective of party, agree to regard as an unheard-of piece of partisan legislation.

But, as I said, I shall not now take up the time of the House to discuss this question further, especially because a higher arbiter than even this House will soon pass judgment upon it. I refer to the people, the voters of my city and State, who will properly receipt for value received at the polls next November. In the meantime Congress, with all the facts before it, will, I trust, take up the matter and determine whether the Democratic contention that the nation as a whole is not interested in honest elections in the several States is correct or not. At present I prefer to go on with my argument on the policy of the National Government.

Our constitutional lawyers, Mr. Chairman, are busy these days to prove that we can hold outside possessions by treaty and govern them by the authority of Congress, not regardless of the Constitution, but, rather, without stretching it in order to cover such territory. I am inclined to agree with them. But, with all due respect to their learning, as legislators they seem to overlook the simplest thing in the world, namely, the laws of nature. These laws are apt to assert themselves in spite of human statutes and constitutions. It was in accordance with them that this great continent was settled. Call it the right of might or the survival of the fittest, certain it is that an irresistible force outside and beyond the artificial machinery of human laws has at all times influenced and shaped the destines of mankind.

The extermination of the Indians was legally and morally wrong, judged even from the level of civilization attained a century ago; but we, a superior race, needed the space they occupied, and so they had to go. The good people of the East, and especially the New England States, after they themselves felt secure in the possession of what they had taken from them, raised their voices in vehement protest against the treatment of the aborigines, and they were undoubtedly right, but the Indian had to go all the same, and to-day we feel unscrupulously comfortable upon the land which by right had belonged to him. He defended his hunting grounds as stubbornly, and fought for his liberty and independence as bravely as any Tagal ever did or ever will, yet he had to give way to make room for us, simply because he was resisting a force which was resistless, a force stronger than our army and its firearms, namely, the invisible momentum of progress and civilization.

The Spanish war has brought the Filipinos in contact with that same force. Their resistance is natural. The grating of the Oriental and Occidental flint stones must produce sparks, but the final outcome of this struggle between two civilizations, a lower and a higher one, can not be for a moment doubtful. Those people who, for sentimental reasons or a sense of what they honestly think is just and right, take up with the lower form merely aid in prolonging the agony of this uneven struggle. They remind us of the Indians who, relying upon their strength, attempted to stop the locomotive by holding up a rope across the track.

"Necessity knows no law," is an old truism. The migration movements of the world have been impelled less by physical than by moral necessity. There was still room in Europe for many millions of people when, in the seventeenth century, the great exodus in the direction of this continent began. There is room in the United States now for hundreds of millions more, and yet expansion has become the shibboleth. In this case the issue is due neither to physical nor to moral necessity, but to the incidents and fortunes of war; but how do you account for its growing hold upon the people's minds in spite of the undeniable uncertainties of the experiment?

You surely can not explain it by legal formulæ or political platforms, but yet as lawmakers and politicians you must reckon with it, and if existing laws and constitutions do not cover it, they must give way, because it exists, and, being stronger than either, it will not down. It is the law of nature, the human longing for the change and for the new, the never latent and irresistible force of progress whose mysterious source is nature itself. The westward course of the "star of empire" is one of its most noted manifestations. Look at history.

Since the birth of human race the restless spirit of migration and the desire to expand beyond the narrow confines of the home have moved it. Man started from the Himalaya, in middle Asia, in a westerly direction, and after thousands of years is still wandering. Persia, Arabia, Palestine, Egypt, Phœnicia, Greece, and Rome in rotation became his home; then northern and western Europe, until, in search of a waterway to India, he discovered America. Nearly a thousand years had then elapsed since England had been settled by the Angles, the Saxons, the Jutes, and other Teutonic tribes, but after the safety valve was once found it began sending forth streams of warm human blood across the Atlantic Ocean and is doing so to the present day. It required but four centuries to settle and civilize this vast continent, extending from ocean to ocean and from Polar region to the Tropics.

The primeval forests disappeared like flakes in the sun, mountains were tunneled, rivers bridged, and within the vast domain west of the Mississippi, which at the beginning of this century was a wilderness and a "terra incognita," more than twenty millions of people have since found happy homes. To-day more than five transcontinental railroad lines connect the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, and soon the center of population will have reached and crossed the Mississippi. Nor will the star of empire in its incessant course stop on the Western Hemisphere. As the teeming millions of Europe found an exit across the one ocean to America, so will the masses of America, gradually thickening, find an exit across the other ocean to Asia.

The sun of Western civilization and modern enterprise is rapidly melting the ice surrounding the barbarian countries of the Orient. The Chinese wall has already crumbled to dust; England and Germany have broken into the Celestial Empire and the United States has taken the Philippines, and soon man will again find himself in the country of the Paradise, whence he had started thousands of years ago. Having once "swung around the circle," he will take a new start; his second migration will again take many centuries, but his mission of carrying the blessings of culture and civilization into every vacant spot can be stopped, his purpose of finding room and eking out an existence for himself and

the unborn millions to come can be frustrated neither by mountains nor oceans, nor even by the learned arguments of constitutional lawyers.

The best we can do, then, Mr. Chairman, is to try and reconcile our laws with elementary conditions. Our aim must be to protect and save our fundamental law and institutions in the face of a superior force, which could easily destroy them. And this we can not do by uselessly interfering with the natural course of human events, but by adjusting our affairs to suit it. The Spanish war, it is true, has artificially hastened a decision in this matter; but every thinking man will admit that with Hawaii in our possession, and in view of the early construction of an isthmian canal and the keen rivalry of all commercial nations in the race for the Asiatic trade, the question of expansion would have soon knocked at our door anyway.

But a hundred years hence the same problems which are now pressing for solution would confront us, and, therefore, it is better that we face them right here and now. The material welfare of the American people depends, like that of every other nation, upon commerce and trade, and in this international struggle, as much as the philosopher and philanthropist may deprecate it, political systems and forms of government are questions of no consideration. The Russian absolutist has precisely the same chance as the American democrat, the French republican the same as the German monarchist, and he alone has the advantage who, by the right of sovereignty, can control great markets to the exclusion of the other. It is, indeed, a question of customs laws, the same as is presented in the pending bill. Give us the right to shape the customs laws of a country and we can snap our fingers at every competitor.

Look at what has happened in this respect. We can hardly realize what great strides we have made in a ridiculously small space of time. We have not only retained, under a wise system of protection, the largest home market of any one country in the world, but we also have it in our power to regulate at will the customs systems of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Philippines, and Cuba. And more than that, by a diplomatic master stroke we have secured the consent of the commercial nations of the world to an open-door policy in China. The question may well be asked here whether that consent would have been so readily given if we had not, by the fortunes of war, become the close neighbors of the Chinese Empire. By this diplomatic triumph the present Administration has arrested the dismemberment of that vast empire, because a guaranty of equal trade advantages to all nations renders the right of sovereignty or ownership not only superfluous, but robs it of all charm.

If there ever was a European conspiracy or merely a hidden desire, having for its object the parceling out of the domain of China among the powers, it has been frustrated. The danger of America ever being shut out from the Chinese markets has been forever removed, and the American people have secured to themselves those great advantages which the Administration refused to secure by a participation in land-grabbing performances which would have been beneath our national dignity.

I do not know, Mr. Chairman, whether this great success of American diplomacy is sufficiently appreciated by our people, but I, for my part, hold to the opinion that its value can hardly be overestimated, and if the agreement is carried out as contemplated, our verdict should be that the brilliant victories of the American Army and Navy have been crowned with the glory of American statesmanship. We readily accepted the heritage of the war with Spain, but we indignantly refused to rob China. The one means expansion, as well as the other, but to the one kind we quietly consented; the other we revoltingly rejected as contrary to our traditions. Let me shout the difference into the ears of our opponents: We accept expansion as a responsibility born of war, but we are opposed to it as a tenet of government.

But here, they say, is a great stumbling block. The Declaration of Independence says governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. True; and I say the crown of American citizenship would be robbed of its luster if it ceased to rest on this foundation. It makes each citizen a sovereign and each public official a public servant. It is the corner stone of republican government. Have we always been true to this great principle? If it means that territory can not be acquired or held without the consent—that is, a majority vote—of its inhabitants, then half of the United States was acquired in open violation of the injunction. Jefferson bought the Louisiana Territory; Monroe, Florida; Johnson and Seward, Alaska, and in no case was the consent of the inhabitants asked. They were simply taken in under the folds of the great flag, if not at first under the wings of the Constitution, and nobody was foolish enough to ask for their pedigree ever after.

Is it possible that these illustrious Presidents should have contemptuously defied the most vital principle upon which our Government is erected? And has it not occurred to our Southern friends that after the war they were governed without their consent? They had to remain in the Union against their wish, and the Government did hardly at any time since derive its just powers from their consent. The whole history of the country is a chain of violations of that principle, especially when we count in this category the many partisan election laws, by means of which the "consent" was and is to be fraudulently manufactured.

Two wrongs do not make a right. This is true, too. But will you tell me how you would ascertain the consent of the Filipinos? There are, perhaps, 10,000,000 of them, spread over a thousand islands. The Tagals—those who are now making all the trouble—are estimated to number about one million and a half. The other 8,000,000 are said to be either friendly, neutral, or indifferent. Majority rule means that the 49 have to submit to the 51. Who will authoritatively contend that a vote of these people, if such a thing was possible, would not result in favor of American rule? The fact is that the many different tribes inhabiting the islands speak different languages, represent different races, and are not at all on friendly terms with each other. We learn many other things from the report of the Philippine Commission to satisfy any sane man that to apply the fundamental rules of an enlightened government to them now would be about like reading Shakespeare to a newborn babe.

This will, of course, not prevent us from setting up a system of local self-government for them, adapted to the degree of intelligence and to the customs of each tribe, which will have the consent of the governed within the real meaning of the term. It may require wise statesmanship, and some may shrink from the task. But as long as we are willing to accord to them the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, with a guaranty of peace and order and protection against all the world thrown in, the solution of the problem will be much less difficult than our pessimist friends would want us to believe.

To withdraw from the islands now would be a crime against the Filipinos and a disgrace to us in the eyes of every nation in the world. [Applause.]

And now I want to tell my friend from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] something about the Boers. He says my German constituents sympathize with them. So do I. It is the sovereign right of every American citizen to sympathize with whomsoever and whatsoever he pleases, and, in my eyes, the man who is not deeply touched by the heroic struggle of that brave people, closely resembling, as it does, the American war for independence, is a poor American indeed. But, pray, what connection has this African war with the internal affairs of our country? I know what you are driving at.

For political effect you want to make it appear that there is a sort of secret understanding between the Administration and England which prevents the American Government from taking such action as the preponderance of sentiment in this country would dictate. It is a base insinuation dexterously propagated to arouse the resentment of the German and Irish voters. I am glad we now have it officially, black on white, from the Secretary of State in his answer to the Macrum resolution, that no such understanding or alliance exists in fact, except, let me add, in the imagination of Democrats, who have a plain purpose in adhering to the imputation. Well, that lie has had long legs, but we have caught up with and nailed it at last. Now, suppose the denial had not come forth as promptly as it did. Could you not with the same justification accuse the German Emperor of English sympathies because of his strict neutrality, especially when we know that his people, almost to a man, side with the Boers?

The reason why Emperor William is keeping hands off is undoubtedly because he feels the great responsibility of international obligations, just as our Administration does, and as any American Administration would, whether Republican or Democratic. Sensible people will easily see the difference between private sympathy and public policy, and no true patriot will needlessly embarrass his own government in its dealings with foreign nations. Its own patriotism must be taken for granted, and, indeed, that degree of confidence any American Administration is entitled to exact from even a political opponent as to be spared the reproach of having failed to properly guard and protect the best interests of the country in its relations with the outside world.

But why, it is asked, did not the President offer mediation under The Hague convention? I myself would have rejoiced in seeing it done, and perhaps the President was much inclined that way. But there were no doubt good and sufficient reasons. One is that the Transvaal Republic had not been recognized at The Hague as an independent power, with authority to sign that convention; and waiving this, because of her present rights as a belligerent, another reason is that we have never been officially asked to mediate. In view of the savage declaration on the part of Great Britain that such an offer would be looked upon as an unfriendly act, the President had every reason to hesitate, especially in view of the remarkable apathy of European powers, who have a thousand times more concern in the feuds of the Old World than the United States.

Our friends on that side of the House must indeed be in desperate straits if they have to rely upon a war in Africa for a campaign issue. They will find before they get much older that sympathy with a civilized people fighting for liberty is not patentable, and that certainly the Democrats have no monopoly upon it. But they will also find, I believe, that the American people are not now and never will be in a humor to have their political policies, the exclusive concern of their own country, determined by the quarrels of European nations.

Therefore, I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, our friends will have to fall back upon the Sultan of Sulu as their only issue left, and this being so, I suggest that they call upon some good opera bouffe man to write their campaign book and fill it with comical songs and funny music.

Yesterday was Washington's birthday. If the Father of his Country could come back now, what would be his sensations? That side of the House would make you believe he would hide his face in sorrow and shame. We say he would rejoice with us because, in spite of our marvelous growth, our liberties and our unity have been preserved, because an enlightened and united people is enjoying the blessings of prosperity, and the American Republic has achieved, under the leadership of a wise and patriotic President, the name and fame of a world's power. And upon this issue we are willing to stand or fall in the next campaign. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Diplomatic and Consular Appropriation Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES F. COCHRAN,

OF MISSOURI,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, February 6, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 7941) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901—

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No question equaling in importance that raised by the President's plan for the government of Puerto Rico and the Philippine Islands has been discussed in this presence during our generation. I embrace this opportunity to present my views concerning it, fully persuaded that the scheme of imperialism proposed by the Republican party will not be sanctioned by the people, yet so thoroughly imbued with the belief that the integrity of our free institutions are endangered that if few were in agreement with my views, still I could not renounce them or remain silent. As an American I entertain the settled conviction that the republic is preferable to the monarchy. I believe that the maxims of liberty coined by Patrick Henry, John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, and Abraham Lincoln apply to all peoples and to all countries. I do not believe that any government ever did or ever can derive the just and lawful right to rule over millions of people by invading their country and reducing them to submission by force of arms. No matter what the pretext, no matter how lofty the avowed purposes of the great power that thus would override the eternal principles of justice voiced in the Declaration of Independence, the fact remains that governments do derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

Entertaining these views, I am unalterably opposed to the forcible annexation of the Philippine Islands. But the fact that they are to be added to the territory of the United States by violence is not my only reason for opposing their acquisition. Even if their inhabitants were unanimously favorable to the scheme, still I would be opposed to it. The President insists that because Manila Bay chanced to be the scene of a naval engagement in which our squadron achieved a victory, and the island of Luzon the theater of a war in the course of which our army, acting in alliance with an army of natives, captured the city of Manila, it therefore became our bounden duty to take forcible possession of the entire archipelago. For a whole year his excellency has been engaged in the performance of what he declares is "a duty imposed by Providence," "a duty to humanity," "a duty to the civilized world," and most absurd of all, while carrying on a war of extermination in Luzon and compromising with slavery and polygamy in Sulu, he has repeatedly expressed the determination to elevate, save, and regenerate the Filipinos!

And what have been the net results of this hideous travesty? The expenditure of nearly two hundred millions of treasure; the death of several thousands of our soldiers and ten times the number of natives; the desolation of the island of Luzon and neighboring islands; a treaty with the Sultan of Sulu recognizing slavery and polygamy in the southern islands, and continuing the reign of the Sultan, who, as civil ruler over his dominions, receives from our Government a comfortable salary, as do, also, the keepers of his harem and slave pens! And this is what the President of the United States regards as a solemn, heaven-imposed duty!

Mr. Chairman, it is not surprising that the author of this policy is coming to Congress with a request that he be given authority to appoint subordinates and, through them, rule over the Philippines as an absolute monarch, giving to the people of the islands only such rights and privileges as his majesty may deem best for them, with the understanding that if they revolt our soldiery stand ready to compel obedience.

Sir, this demand, which is nothing more nor less than a proposal to revolutionize the Government, is the inevitable sequence of a medley of blunders and crimes, committed in the prosecution of an enterprise planned by persons ignorant of conditions existing in the Philippine Islands or of the insuperable obstacles which preclude its consummation, except on lines forbidden by the Constitution and subversive of the principles of liberty which are the foundations of our institutions.

I do not believe that when first the President conceived the idea of annexing these islands, with their 12,000,000 Asiatic inhabitants, to the territory of the United States he contemplated the fatal departure which now, of necessity, he is compelled to recommend. He expected easy sailing in the Philippines. Evidently he had not investigated their history or informed himself as to conditions existing in the islands for centuries prior to the war. He knows now, and should have known a long while ago, that the Philippines can never be Americanized. He knows that the difference between their methods and ours is the difference between the Asiatic and the American. He knows, and I think we all ought to know by this time, that if we are to retain dominion in the Philippines, we must maintain there permanently an army of not less than 50,000 men and compel obedience to our authority by a constant show of force. These are the circumstances under which the President announces that in providing a government for the Philippines Congress is not bound by the restraints and limitations of the Constitution.

He can not retrace his steps. He dare not renounce a policy upon which he has already staked everything. He must go forward even though it be necessary to revolutionize the Government. He has burned the bridges behind him. He does not ask Congress to undertake the enactment of laws for the government of the Philippines. Of course such a thing is so impractical as to be fairly impossible. A local government must be provided. Congress must prescribe its form and define its powers. The President demands authority to fill the important places in this local government by appointment and insists that when organized it may proceed without let or hindrance, regardless of the Constitution. The islands are to be held and governed as vassal states, and in reference to them the President is to be invested with the powers of an emperor. Of course details will be attended to by the President's subordinates, but this is the case under all forms of government. The fact is that the scheme proposed, if carried out, will make the President of the United States the emperor of the Philippine Islands.

Of course the projectors of this monstrous enterprise know that the Supreme Court of the United States, the text-books upon constitutional law, and the utterances and writings of the great statesmen of all political parties have denounced it as unconstitutional, but this does not deter them from boldly entering upon the work of revolutionizing the Government. In the opinion of the President the Declaration of Independence is antiquated; the opinions of Adams, Everett, and Webster worthless. The decisions of the Supreme Court stand in the way, but it is said these decisions were rendered when nobody was thinking of a proposition to confer the powers of an emperor upon the President of the Republic. They were rendered at a time when Americans unanimously concurred in the opinion that no man on the footstool should be invested with unlimited power over millions of his fellow-men.

Nobody at that early date, when the people entertained old-fashioned ideas about the sacredness of the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights, could have foreseen the necessity of so qualifying the restraints imposed by the Constitution as to permit this country to become "a great world power"—an empire—which, being interpreted into plain English, means a land grabber and robber of weaker countries. The President evidently assumes that had these contingencies been foreseen, the founders of the Republic and the Supreme Court would have proceeded accordingly. Had they anticipated that some future President might deem it a heaven-imposed duty to annex part of Asia, first conquering and subjugating the inhabitants, they would have made special provision for this contingency. Had they known that in reference to 12,000,000 people thus to be added to the population of the United States, the President would demand imperial

powers, the Constitution would have been so framed by its authors and so construed by the courts as not to permit the inference that it was intended to embody the fundamental doctrines of the Declaration of Independence.

In this, as in every other matter, the Republican majority in this Chamber is content to echo the opinion of the Executive. In a few days we will have before us a bill providing for the imposition of a tariff upon imports from Puerto Rico. Upon what theory are we to impose this tax? Is not Puerto Rico a part of the United States? Are not the people of Puerto Rico inhabitants of territory belonging to the United States? Could we impose a tariff upon the products of Arizona or New Mexico? If not, we can not impose a tariff upon the products of Puerto Rico.

Mr. Chairman, I think that if the gentlemen will investigate the matter, they will find that the Supreme Court has decided, in well-considered cases, every important question that has been raised as to the legal status of our recent acquisitions, and that the policy and plans of the Administration in reference to the government of the Philippines and Puerto Rico can not be carried out without palpable violation of the Constitution.

I do not say that the President, as the Commander in Chief of the Army, may not, under present conditions and until Congress shall act upon the matter, impose upon these islands an arbitrary government. Their present status, that of conquered territory, held by the military forces of the United States, is analogous to the status of Florida for a considerable period succeeding its purchase. Florida, after it was ceded, pending Congressional action providing for its government, was occupied by the military forces of the United States, and the Supreme Court validated an order made by the President, as Commander in Chief of the Army, continuing Spanish customs duties and regulations. This was mere affirmation of well-recognized principles of law. A subsequent decision, sustaining as lawful the collection of duties on goods imported into the United States from Tampico, Mexico, when our military forces were in possession of that city, was based upon the same reasoning. The duties collected were not those imposed by virtue of any statute, but were prescribed under the authority of the President as Commander in Chief of the Armies.

The Supreme Court (Fleming *vs.* Page, 9 Howard, 603) lays down the principle governing under such circumstances as follows:

> The principle thus adopted by the executive department has been sanctioned by this court and the circuit courts whenever the question has come before them. * * * It is sufficient to say that there is no discrepancy between them, and all of them, so far as they apply, maintain that under our revenue laws every port is regarded as a foreign one unless the custom-house from which the vessel clears is within a collection district established by act of Congress and the officers exercise their functions under the authority and control of the laws of the United States.

The same decision holds that conquest or occupation of foreign territory by our military forces does not have the effect of adding the country thus occupied to the territory of the United States. The Executive, acting in the capacity of Commander in Chief, possesses no authority except that conferred by the Constitution, which clothes him with control of the military forces. As such he possesses no authority to add foreign countries to the territory of the United States. Military occupation of foreign territory necessarily involves its government during such occupation, and this necessarily invests the Commander in Chief with authority to perform all the duties and exercise all the functions necessary to the maintenance of civil government in the territory so occupied. The case cited rests upon this principle.

It may be said that the ratification of the treaty and the appropriation of $20,000,000 had the effect of adding the Philippines and Puerto Rico to the territory of the United States, but in this respect their case is precisely similar to that of Florida, Louisiana Territory, and New Mexico and California. In reference to each of these acquisitions the Supreme Court has distinctly adhered to the views set forth in the opinion I have cited. New Mexico was held as conquered territory for several years after the Mexican war, before Congress took any action in the premises, and during that period the Executive prescribed the laws and appointed the civil officers of the Territory.

It should be borne in mind, however, that he did this as Commander in Chief, and upon the theory that for certain purposes New Mexico could not be deemed part of the territory of the United States until Congress acted. This was only following the precedents established in the case of Louisiana and Florida. In view of these decisions of the highest court, the present legal status of the Philippine Islands is not doubtful. They are not in the full significance of the term part of the territory of the United States; but, Mr. Chairman, Congressional action looking to the exercise of civil authority in these islands will undoubtedly consummate their annexation to the territory of the United States. Thereafter, in law, the inhabitants will stand upon an equality with other citizens and residents of the country. Thereafter a government of laws must supersede the military dictatorship now existing. Congress or a local legislature authorized by Congressional enactment, subject to all the restraints of the Constitution, must make these laws.

I shall not undertake a lengthy discussion of this proposition, for, fortunately, it is unnecessary. If repeated adjudication can settle a question of constitutional construction, certainly this one has been settled. The court has rendered decisions covering every point in controversy and as to every one of them distinctly sustains my position. The President, supported, presumably, by the Republican majority in this House, which is become a mere agency for registering the views of the White House, contends that these islands, when definitely annexed, will not be part of the United States, and that therefore in providing for their government Congress is in no sense restrained by the limitations of the Constitution.

I suppose it will be admitted that if this view of the question is erroneous the President's scheme for an imperial government must be wholly abandoned. Unfortunately for the imperialists, the Supreme Court has decided that not only the States comprising the Union but all territory belonging to the people is a part of the United States. In the case of Loughborough *vs.* Blake (5 Wheaton 317) the meaning of the words "the United States" was thus defined:

> The power, then, to lay and collect duties, imposts, and excises may and must be exercised throughout the United States. Does this term designate the whole or any particular part of the American empire? It is the name given to our great Republic, which is composed of States and Territories.

Mr. Chairman, this definition of the meaning of the term "United States" seems to me so plainly and manifestly correct that the thought of adopting a different definition is preposterous. If it is a correct definition of the term, the theory that Congress possesses power to enact unconstitutional laws for the government of the Philippines falls to the ground bodily. If it is a correct definition, then the proposal to invest the President with powers precisely analogous to those exercised by Victoria, Empress of India, so that henceforth the functions of our Executive in the government of the Philippines would be those of an absolute monarch, must be abandoned. As early as February 13 last year, in a speech delivered in this Chamber on this subject, I said:

> Mr. Chairman, I appeal to history for vindication of the statement that if this country is to become a great colonial power we make the departure with the distinct understanding that such a course will compel a change in our form of government. When Great Britain succeeded in definitively establishing her authority over India, the British sovereign was hailed as "Queen of England and Empress of India." If we are to establish a government in the Philippines modeled upon the English plan, let some gentleman on the other side of the Chamber bring forward a measure declaring our Chief Executive "President of the United States and Emperor of the Philippines."
>
> Mr. Chairman, shocking as is this proposition when expressed in exact terms, the truth is that if we are to establish in the Philippines a military government or any form of government which could not be established on this continent without violation of the Constitution; if we are to place in the President's hands the appointment of officials charged with the formulation of laws for the government of distant conquered possessions, manifestly it is true that under such a system the President of the United States would be invested with powers more arbitrary and authority more far-reaching than is exercised by the ruler of any power on earth, the Czar of all the Russias not excepted. * * * Therefore, if the Philippines are to be subjugated, annexed, and governed by methods unknown to the Constitution and not legally applicable to other territories subject to the control of the Federal Government, as to the provinces that are to be subjected to this accursed system let the American President be declared Emperor.

Sir, I reaffirm these words; for, whether invested with the title or not, if the President is to be empowered to establish in the Philippine Islands and Puerto Rico such governments as have been proposed, his prerogatives in respect to those islands will be those of an emperor.

Already it is announced that the people of Puerto Rico are to be subjected to taxation not levied upon the people of the remainder of the United States, and by taxation they are to be restricted in their right to trade in our markets. And the United States are to fix conditions upon which we may trade in their markets. Could tyranny go further? They are to have no voice in making the laws imposing these burdens, no right to control their own affairs. They are to be taxed without representation in the government.

It is true the President does not favor this proceeding, but his opposition is based not upon the theory that Congress possesses no such power, but upon the belief that the pitiable poverty of the people of Puerto Rico commends them to their new masters as worthy of special kindness. Strange, is it not, that a committee of the American Congress should have under consideration a law which proposes to visit upon a million people the very injustice—taxation without representation—which led the patriots of Massachusetts to throw that famous cargo of tea into Boston Harbor over a hundred years ago?

Mr. Chairman, I now invite attention to other decisions of the Supreme Court bearing upon this question. And let me premise presentation of these authorities with the observation that before the President's plan can be carried into effect it will be necessary

for the Supreme Court to render a decision overturning a number of adjudicated cases—some of which have been acquiesced in and quoted as precedents for a century—in which the court has laid down rules for the construction of the Constitution, defined the powers of the various branches of the Government, pointed out the limitations upon power imposed by the organic law, and even decided the identical questions involved in the pending controversy.

I take it that as to the constitutional power of this Government to acquire territory by treaty or by conquest there is no longer room for controversy. Jefferson, Adams, Madison, Webster, and Calhoun, as well as scores of others, contended that no such power was conferred by the Constitution; but the fact that they held this view is only important now as going to show the tenacity with which the great lawyers and statesmen of the past clung to the theory that the Federal Government possesses only the enumerated powers conferred by the Constitution. But this does not authorize Congress to arrogate to itself powers not conferred by the Constitution. For what purpose may new territory be acquired? And when territory has been acquired, may its inhabitants be reduced to vassalage? Upon these questions the decisions of the Supreme Court and the views of the recognized authorities upon constitutional law are in accord. Chief Justice Taney, in the Dred Scott case, squarely decides the question, as follows:

As there is no express regulation in the Constitution defining the powers which the General Government may exercise over the person and property of a citizen in a Territory thus acquired, the court must necessarily look to the provisions and principles of the Constitution and its distribution of powers for the rules and principles by which its decision must be governed. Taking this rule to guide us, it may be safely assumed that citizens of the United States who migrate to a Territory belonging to the people of the United States can not be ruled as mere colonists dependent upon the will of the General Government.

The principle upon which our governments rest, and upon which alone they continue to exist, is the Union of States, sovereign within their own limits, etc., and bound together as one people by a general government, possessing certain enumerated powers, etc., and exercising supreme authority within the scope of the powers granted to it throughout the dominion of the United States. A power therefore in the General Government to obtain and hold colonies and dependent territories over which they might legislate without restriction would be inconsistent with its own existence in its present form.

It is not out of place to mention at this point the fact that the spokesmen of the Administration, at least those who are sufficiently honest to refrain from pettifogging, admit that the decisions of the court and the views of the great writers have condemned the whole scheme of imperialism as unconstitutional, but evidently they expect the Supreme Court to recant all its former decisions; and, as for the text-books—well, I suppose the President and his advisers will write new ones to fit the new situation. Over a year ago a labored argument was delivered by a Republican Senator fully setting forth the doctrine of these imperialistic constitutional lawyers. He devoted much of his time to criticising Supreme Court decisions, evidently hoping to pave the way for the effort that is to be made to secure their reversal. Concerning the Dred Scott case, he said:

Mr. President, it is an unfortunate source to which to go for authority. The case has never been referred to in the Supreme Court as authority. It certainly never has in recent years. It has become a hissing and a byword.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether to attribute this statement to gross ignorance or total indifference to the truth. Certainly it is attributable to one or the other, as was conclusively shown by Mr. Isaac Lobe Straus in a paper which appeared in the Conservative Review shortly after the speech was delivered. Mr. Straus pointed out the Senator's reckless perversion of the truth, as follows:

It is true that the amendments to the Constitution following the civil war obviated the effect of the Dred Scott decision as far as it related to the subject of slavery, and so far the decision has been nullified. But in other respects, as the Supreme Court declared in the Slaughterhouse cases, it stands unreversed, and, contrary to the above statement of the speech, it has been repeatedly referred to and accepted as authority by that august tribunal, both recently and during the whole period that has elapsed since its announcement. We could give many illustrations, but selecting a few of more recent years, we refer to the cases of National Bank *vs.* County of Yankton, Elk *vs.* Wilkins, Civil Rights Cases, Murphy *vs.* Ramsay, Boyd *vs.* Thayer, and Shively *vs.* Bowlby. We repeat, that in no case has the decision been rejected or denied.

Mr. Straus then presents other decisions of the Supreme Court defining the powers of Congress in reference to the Territories which were merely followed and affirmed in the Dred Scott case. Furthermore, he points out the fact that the portion of the decision in the Dred Scott case applicable to the question now under discussion was concurred in by all the members of the court. He sets over "against the postulates and conclusions of the address * * * the contrary proposition that, although the express and auxiliary powers conferred by the Constitution upon the General Government are all sovereign powers, they are all nevertheless limited and controlled by the scope and objects of the Constitution, to be gathered from the provisions, the structure, the principles, and spirit of that instrument. Such, it will be recalled, was the doctrine maintained by Hamilton, Marshall, Webster, and the other authorities which we have had occasion to refer to, and as far as our researches have advised us, this doctrine has never before been questioned or denied.

"The opinion of Chief Justice Taney in the Dred Scott case, to the effect that the Federal Government has no power to maintain colonies, governing their inhabitants with discretionary authority, proceeded upon the theory of constitutional law which we have just asserted, and his decision in the particular mentioned is fully sustained by the history and principles of the Constitution and by the decisions of the Supreme Court. As has already been indicated, the Chief Justice in that case, reasoning from the provisions, scope, and structure of the Constitution, reached the conclusion mentioned, determining from all those sources that the purpose for which the Constitution authorized the General Government to acquire and rule territory was its ultimate admission as a State into the Union."

It is worth while to bear in mind that in the Dred Scott case, as to the part of the decision above quoted, the court rendered an unanimous opinion. Both Mr. Justice McLean and Mr. Justice Curtis concurred with the Chief Justice, the former declaring:

In organizing the government of a Territory Congress is limited to means appropriate to the attainment of the constitutional object. No powers can be exercised which are prohibited by the Constitution or which are contrary to its spirit; so that, whether the object may be the protection of the persons and property of purchasers of the public lands or of communities who have been annexed to the Union by conquest or purchase, they are initiatory to the establishment of State governments, and no more power can be claimed or exercised than is necessary to the attainment of the end. This is the limitation of all the Federal powers.

And Mr. Justice Curtis said of the power of Congress over the Territories:

I can not doubt that this is a power to govern the inhabitants of the Territory, by such laws as Congress deems needful, until they obtain admission as States.

Early in our national history the Supreme Court, in a number of cases, had announced the same doctrine in unequivocal terms, first in the list being a decision rendered by Chief Justice Marshall in the case of Loughborough *vs.* Blake, in which it was contended that the citizens of the District of Columbia, not being represented in Congress, could not be subjected to direct taxation by the Federal Government. It was claimed that such an imposition would clearly be a case of "taxation without representation."

Concerning this case and the decision by Chief Justice Marshall, and other cases which subsequently have followed this early adjudication of precisely the question now raised by the extraordinary proposals of the imperialists, I direct attention to the fact that the question was here unmistakably presented as to whether the Constitution contemplated or permitted a colonial system. Chief Justice Marshall, having held that direct taxation could be applied to the District and to the Territories as well, found the reply to the above question in the fact that statehood was the end necessarily intended and marked out by the Constitution for the Territories of the United States. He declared that—

The difference between requiring a continent with an immense population to submit to be taxed by a government having no common interest with it, separated from it by a vast ocean, and associated with it by no common feelings, and permitting the representatives of the American people, under the restrictions of our Constitution, to tax a part of the society, which is in a state of infancy advancing to manhood, looking forward to complete equality as soon as that state of manhood shall be attained, as is the case with the Territories, is too obvious not to present itself to the minds of all.

This constitutional limitation of ultimate statehood for the Territories of the United States is asserted with equal force in other decisions of the Supreme Court.

During the interim between the decision in Loughborough *vs.* Blake, and that in Scott *vs.* Sanford, that tribunal had distinctly announced the same doctrine in the important and instructive case of Pollard's Lessee *vs.* Hagan, and that case was in that particular fully affirmed in 1893 in the case of Shively *vs.* Bowlby, in which the court asserted:

The Territories acquired by Congress, whether by deed of cession from the original States or by treaty with a foreign country, are held with the object, as soon as their population and condition justify it, of being admitted into the Union as States, upon an equal footing with the original States in all respects.

In the same case the court, summing up its conclusions, adds (page 57):

Upon the acquisition of a Territory by the United States, whether by cession from one of the States or by treaty with a foreign country, or by discovery and settlement, the same title and dominion passed to the United States for the benefit of the whole people and in trust for the several States to be ultimately created out of the Territory.

In Murphy *vs.* Ramsay, to the same effect, it was said:

The power of Congress over the Territories is limited by the obvious purposes for which it was conferred, and those purposes are satisfied by measures which prepare the people of the Territories to become States in the Union.

The same doctrine is distinctly laid down by Mr. Justice Field in Weber *vs.* Harbor Commissioners, and it is notable that all these later decisions contain express references to the Dred Scott decision for the propositions they announce.

The views of the late Mr. Justice Cooley fully coincide with those above stated. In his Constitutional Law he says:

It could never have been understood that any territory which by purchase, cession, or conquest should at any time come under the control of the United States should permanently be held in a Territorial condition, and the new States which have been formed of territory acquired by treaty must be supposed to have been received into the Union in strict compliance with the Constitution.

He cites the Dred Scott case, and continues:

And when territory is acquired the right to suffer States to be formed therefrom and to receive them into the Union must follow of course, not only because the Constitution confers the power to admit new States without restriction, but because it would be inconsistent with institutions founded on the fundamental idea of self-government that the Federal Government should retain territory under its imperial rule and deny the people the customary local institutions.

The same learned authority, distinguishing, as did Chief Justice Marshall, between the Territories of the United States and the American colonies under Great Britain, points out that—

There are differences which are important and, indeed, vital. The first of these is that the Territorial condition is understood under the Constitution to be merely temporary and preparatory, and the people of the Territories, while it continues, are assured of the right to create and establish State institutions for themselves as soon as the population shall be sufficient and the local conditions suitable; while the British colonial system contained no provision or assurances of any but a dependent government indefinitely.

In deciding the case of Springville *vs.* Thomas, Chief Justice Fuller declared:

It has been decided by the court that the [Utah] Territorial act of March, 1892, permitting this [i. e., judgments to be entered on verdicts returned by less than the whole number of jurors], was invalid because in contravention of the seventh amendment of the Constitution and the act of Congress.

In the same opinion he referred to the case of American Publishing Company *vs.* Fisher, in which the court, per Mr. Justice Brewer, held:

Either the seventh amendment to the Constitution or these acts of Congress, or all together, secured to every litigant in a common-law action in the courts of the Territory of Utah the right to a trial by jury, and nullified any act of its legislature which attempted to take from him anything which is of the substance of that right.

In the case of Thompson *vs.* Utah the court declared:

That the provisions of the Constitution of the United States relating to the right of trial by jury in suits at common law apply to the Territories of the United States is no longer an open question.

It is equally beyond question that the provisions of the National Constitution relating to trials by jury for crimes and to criminal prosecutions apply to the Territories of the United States.

In the early days of the Republic the first judges of the Supreme Court had announced substantially the same principle as that above quoted from Chief Justice Marshall. In the case of United States *vs.* More it was declared:

The position assumed by the court that Congress in the exercise of its legislative function for the Territories is bound by the restrictive clauses of the Bill of Rights can not be successfully attacked. Indeed, it can make no difference whether that body proceeds under the express grant of Article IV or under its power implied in the capacity to acquire and hold additional soil. In either case it is equally hedged round and trammeled by the safeguards of individual rights that are contained in the first eight amendments.

The doctrine has also been enunciated in recent decisions of the Supreme Court oftentimes with express reference to the Dred Scott case.

In Murphy *vs.* Ramsay, the Supreme Court declared:

The people of the United States as sovereign owners of the national Territories have supreme power over them and their inhabitants. In the exercise of this sovereign dominion they are represented by the Government of the United States, to whom all the powers of government over that subject have been delegated subject only to such restrictions as are expressed in the Constitution, as are necessarily implied in its terms, or in the purposes and objects of the power itself. * * * The personal and civil rights of the inhabitants of the Territories are secured to them as to other citizens by the principles of constitutional liberty which restrain all the agencies of government, State and national.

The text-books in use in the colleges and universities, and accepted by the bar and the bench as authorities upon constitutional questions, denounce as impossible under our Constitution the very scheme proposed by the President, using language so apropos that one might almost believe it was written to be used in rebuking a proposal the most revolutionary and dangerous that has ever emanated from high official circles in the whole history of the Government.

In Pomeroy's Constitutional Law the doctrine laid down by the courts is enunciated without qualification, as follows:

But is Congress absolute over these districts or Territories? Is it, like the British Parliament, bound by no limitations save those which are self-imposed? This can not be; nor does the language of the Constitution require a construction so much opposed to all our ideas of civil polity. The safeguards of individual rights—those clauses which preserve the lives, liberty, and property of the citizen from the encroachments of arbitrary power—must apply as well to that legislation of Congress which is concerned exclusively with the District of Columbia or with the Territories as to that which is concerned with the States. The reasoning which leads to this conclusion is irresistible. A bill of rights is certainly no less important for the District of Columbia and for the Territories than for that portion of the nation which is organized into States.

If it were thought necessary that Congress should be hedged round with restrictions while it is legislating for the inhabitants of States, who may be partially protected by their local governments, how much more necessary that the same body should be restrained, while legislating for the inhabitants of those districts and Territories over which it has an exclusive control. The mandatory clauses of the first eight amendments are clothed in the most general language; they make no exceptions; they apply to Congress in the exercise of all its functions; in general terms they cover its legislation for the District of Columbia and for the Territories as well as for the States. These clauses must therefore be compulsive upon Congress when it makes laws for the District or for the Territories, unless the general language in which they are framed is modified by the particular language of the provisions which especially relate to the District and to the Territories. There is evidently nothing contradictory between these provisions and the general restrictions of the bill of rights.

In the same work the author declares that the first eight amendments "are binding with equal force upon the legislative, the executive, and the judiciary," and that—

Furthermore, as the clauses in question are mandatory and peremptory in their nature, and directed at once to each branch of the Government, they require no statute of Congress, decision of judge, or act of President to execute them and give them binding efficacy. They execute themselves without the aid of an inferior law. Any proceeding of the Government in derogation of their command would be void; any proceeding declaratory would be useless.

Judge Cooley, in his work on Constitutional Law, lays down the same doctrine.

Besides being thus embodied in the jurisprudence of the country, the doctrine in question is fully supported by our political philosophy, and it is not necessary to quote the opinions of the great leaders of the Democratic party, every one of whom contended for the strict construction of the Constitution and observance of the limitation of the powers of government by it imposed in order to show that the policy advocated by the President and his friends rests upon a theory of constitutional construction, which has never been sanctioned by the great jurists, writers, and thinkers of the country. Federalists, Whigs, Democrats, and Republicans have, in the past, concurred in denouncing it.

Edward Everett finely points out "the inherent incongruity of colonial government with the principles of constitutional liberty." He declares that the colonial form of government "in its very nature is inconsistent with the requirements of constitutional freedom, either to the colony or the mother country," and that it "obstructs the growth of liberty in the colonies and favors the growth of arbitrary power in the mother country."

Prof. James Schouler, the jurist and historian, presents the same views, stating that it is hostile to our system of union and government to hold territory as a province, its citizens having inferior rights, and says that "in every case of annexation thus far, except that of Alaska, with its trivial population, the annexation under the original provisions of the Constitution has been of territory adjacent to the United States." "It ought not to be readily granted," he concludes, "that the present Constitution permits distant and populous countries to be thus added."

Daniel Webster on this point expressed the same opinion. Said he:

In the part which I have acted in public life it has been my purpose to maintain the people of the United States what the Constitution designed to make them—one people, one in interest, one in character, and one in political feeling. If we depart from that we break it all up. Arbitrary governments may have territories and distant possessions because arbitrary governments may rule them by different laws and different systems. Russia may rule in the Ukraine and the provinces of the Caucasus and Kamtschatka by different codes, ordinances, or ukases. We can do no such thing. They must be of us, part of us, or else strangers.

Mr. Chairman, a year ago, when this subject was under consideration, I had occasion to refer to the form of government now proposed for Puerto Rico and the Philippines. Then, as now, I was of the opinion that the President meditated an enterprise which, if carried into effect, would work a complete revolution in the form of our Government, and I took occasion to discuss briefly the constitutional questions involved. At that time I said:

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this appalling departure. I am opposed to the forcible annexation of the Philippine Islands; and I believe that when all the facts are known the American people will repudiate a policy the adoption of which imports a deliberate abandonment of principles which are the foundation of our free institutions.

I do not, however, share the belief that the forcible annexation of the Philippine Islands would be unconstitutional. The question in hand is one of public policy and not of constitutional law. The limitations imposed upon the Federal Government by the Constitution bear upon its relations to the citizen and to the States. * * * In this country every kingly prerogative resides in the people, and may be exercised through the medium of the people's representatives and agents. * * *

The framers of the Constitution recognized the necessity of safeguarding the country against unnecessary wars, and this was accomplished by empowering Congress, and not the Executive, to determine when the sword shall be drawn and when returned to its sheath, and not by an attempt to define the measures that may be taken in carrying on war with a foreign enemy. * * *

If it be conceded that while war is in progress the armies of the United States may invade, conquer, and hold possession of the enemy's territory, it necessarily follows that possession thereof may be retained or relinquished accordingly as the one policy or the other seems best calculated to insure the safety and protect the interests of this country, and if this be admitted, the contention that the Constitution prohibits the annexation of conquered territory necessarily falls to the ground.

It can not be urged that because territory invaded by our armies is occupied by a numerous population, under the Constitution we must obtain the consent of the people before imposing the authority of this Government upon the enemy's country. While the war is in progress we deal with the occupants of the territory invaded as enemies, and as such they can not claim the protection of our Constitution. In contemplation of law they remain enemies until by a treaty of peace the war is brought to a termination, and as such they can claim no voice in fixing the stipulations of a treaty. That duty devolves upon their government. But, sir, if by the treaty the country in which they are domiciled becomes an integral part of this Republic, thenceforth, equally with every creature domiciled under the protection of the American flag, they have the incontestible right to share with Americans to the manor born the safeguards of liberty, justice, and equality before the law guaranteed to all alike by the American Constitution.

So that, in my judgment, the constitutional questions which have figured to some extent in this discussion arise after and not before the annexation of conquered territory. I contend that, when Congress undertakes the enactment of laws for the territory acquired in the war with Spain, statutes for their government must be such as could be enacted for the government of Arizona or New Mexico; and that the citizens of territory which has been or may be annexed to the United States as a result of the war with Spain are entitled to enjoy the legal safeguards which nobody imagines could be denied to the citizens of our other Territories.

The acquisition of territory by conquest does not confer upon the Executive extra constitutional powers. The powers of the Executive as well as the rights of the citizen are defined by the Constitution. Throughout all the domain now comprising, or which shall hereafter comprise, the American Republic, the measure of the rights of the citizen must be uniform. As to territory acquired by conquest, it is for the Congress of the United States to say what kind of a government shall be established, but not even the Congress has power to depart a hair's breadth from the Constitution in the exercise of this authority. The proposal to establish a military government permanently in any part of the domain of the United States is monstrous.

It is at variance with the letter and spirit of the Constitution and with the fundamental maxims of liberty long ago crystallized into the Bill of Rights. It is violative of the principles upon which free institutions are founded. If predicated upon the assumption that the people over which we are to extend this arbitrary system are incapable of self-government, and can never become capable of self-government, instead of being an argument in favor of the extension of our system to a country thus cursed, it is an unanswerable admonition to abstain from so doing; for in the hallowed formula of Democracy and Republicanism neither Congress nor the President has authority to establish in the Philippines a military satrapy.

Mr. Chairman, I believed then and I believe now that under the Constitution, as construed by the Supreme Court and the great men whose utterances and writings embellish the political literature of the country, the mad policy proposed by the President is contrary to the organic law, wicked, and revolutionary, and was of the opinion that this was so palpable that the proposal now brought forward, and which then had been tentatively suggested, could not possibly meet the deliberate approval of the Executive. But, Mr. Chairman, the President has gone on and on, adding one folly to another, until he can find no plausible excuse for retraction or retreat. He has committed his party to a policy wholly indefensible, and, in order to save it and himself from the wrath of the people, has unhesitatingly proposed a change in the structure and form of the Government.

If the President desires to get a glimpse of the weakness of the foundation upon which his scheme of imperialism rests it is only necessary for him to note the disingenuous methods and contemptible expedients to which the statesmen who have attempted his defense have been driven. Garbled passages from the text-books, fragmentary and misleading paragraphs from Supreme Court decisions and from the speeches and writings of leading statesmen, quotations and briefs used by great lawyers in cases in which they appeared as employed counsel to advocate the cause of their clients, have been made to do service as legal authorities supporting the President's views. Thorough investigation convinces me that in no case has the Supreme Court made a decision sustaining his contentions.

On the contrary, the judiciary, the great writers on constitutional law, and the public utterances and writings of leading statesmen of all parties have condemned it as contrary to the Constitution and destructive of the basic principles of liberty which form the foundation of our free institutions.

The decisions of the Supreme Court I have cited stand as the settled law of the case. They have never been reversed or even called in question. The first was rendered by Chief Justice Marshall, the last by Chief Justice Fuller, so that they form an unbroken chain reaching from the infancy of the Republic down to this hour. They are in harmony with the robust public sentiment of our people, which throughout our history has condemned military conquests as criminal aggressions, the enforced vassalage of states as hideous injustice, and the deprivation of large populations of a voice in the governments under which they live as a degree of despotism justifying revolution. They are the law of the land, and are therefore binding upon the President and upon the members of his Cabinet. Upon their due observance the perpetuity of the Republic depends, and woe be unto the party leaders who shall attempt to set them aside.

Indian Appropriation Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN J. FITZGERALD,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, February 2, and Saturday, February 3, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 7433) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes, and the Clerk having read—

"SUPPORT OF SCHOOLS.

"For support of Indian day and industrial schools, and for other educational purposes not hereinafter provided for, including pay of an architect, a draftsman, and a laborer, to be employed in the office of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, $1,200,000, of which amount the Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion, use $5,000 for the education of Indians in Alaska"—

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "Alaska," in line 14, page 45, insert the following:

"*Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior may make contracts with present contract schools for the education of Indian pupils during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, but shall only make such contracts at places where the Government has not provided school facilities for all the children of school age residing thereat, and to an extent not exceeding the number of children in attendance at such contract schools at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900."

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of order on the amendment.

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York. I ask the gentleman to withhold his point of order.

Mr. LITTLE. I will reserve the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas reserves the point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York. Mr. Chairman, for the first time in more than twenty years it is intended that no provision shall be made for Indian pupils in contract schools. To those who are familiar with the question of educating and civilizing the Indians of this country this is a matter of deep regret. Almost from the beginning of this Republic, sir, encouragement and aid have been given by the Government to associations engaged in the work of Indian education. It is now proposed to completely revolutionize the ancient policy of the Government, and to obliterate, if possible, the most important factor in Indian civilization.

From the earliest days of its existence, this Government has been alive to the influences that have been most beneficial in Indian affairs. Impartial and broad-minded men, occupying the highest places of trust in the Government, never hesitated to encourage and assist in every legitimate way individuals and associations laboring to bring the red men of this land to a realization of the benefits of Christian civilization. In the year 1819 a direct appropriation of $10,000 was made for this very purpose. On the 3d of September, in that year, the War Department, then charged with the care of the Indians, issued a circular in which is said:

Such associations or individuals who are already actually engaged in educating the Indians, and who may desire the cooperation of the Government, will report to the Department of War. In proportion to the means of the Government, cooperation will be extended to such institutions as may be approved, as well to erecting their necessary buildings as in their current expenses.

This formal invitation of the Department is the key to the policy pursued for three-quarters of a century. The first Secretary of the Interior, the Hon. Thomas Ewing, said in his first report:

The establishment of manual labor schools in charge of missionary societies of various religious denominations is working a great moral and social revolution among several of the tribes, and if the Department had the means of extending the benefits of these institutions to those more destitute it would no doubt be productive of like happy results.

From year to year until 1894, and even then and now, successive Secretaries of the Interior and Commissioners of Indian Affairs speak in terms of highest praise of Indian religious schools.

The inauguration in 1870 of General Grant's "peace policy" marks the beginning of large appropriations for Indian schools conducted by religious societies. In time, however, it was urged that out of this system an undesirable union of church and state had been effected. Although practically appointed by the societies in control of the schools, the teachers and other employees were paid by and carried upon the rolls of the Government. To obviate this objection the "contract" school system was substituted for other systems then in vogue. This system, now proposed

to be entirely abolished, was the practice adopted by the Department of the Interior, of making agreements with religious organizations whereby for a fixed per capita sum such societies were to feed, clothe, lodge, and educate Indian pupils.

This policy was indorsed and the system extended by every Commissioner of Indian Affairs until the time of Commissioner Morgan. In his report for 1885 Commissioner Atkins said:

But the Government can and does, fairly and without invidious discrimination, encourage any religious sect whose philanthropy and liberality prompt them to assist in the great work of redeeming these benighted children of nature from the darkness of their superstition and ignorance.

Indian School Superintendent Oberly (afterwards Commissioner of Indian Affairs) in the same year extended a sweeping invitation to the various churches to engage in Indian-school work. His report for 1885 contains the following:

The Government should be liberal in making contracts with religious denominations to teach Indian children in schools established by those denominations. It should throw open the door and say to all denominations, "There should be no monopoly in good works. Enter, all of you, and do whatever your hands may find of good work to do; and in your efforts the Government will give to you encouragement out of its liberal purse." In other words, the Government, without partiality, should encourage all the churches to work in this broad field of philanthropic endeavor.

It was natural, sir, that contract schools should be enlarged, and that their promoters be encouraged by such suggestions. Surely the responsible heads of the departments in control of the Indians—men familiar with the history of Indian education and civilization, close students of the life, the habits, and of the needs of the unfortunate aborigines of this land—never embodied such encouragements in their official reports without fully comprehending that the natural and necessary result would be the extension of the contract-school system.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the committee, I occupied no time in the general debate——

Mr. SHERMAN. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended until it is time for the committee to rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks that the time of his colleague be extended until it becomes necessary for the committee to rise. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York. Thus it happened, Mr. Chairman, that from year to year, with the enlargement of existing schools and the addition of new schools, the amount set aside for them rapidly increased. In five years it doubled.

Suddenly many engaged in this work became possessed of a peculiar and an astounding idea. This system, so admirably adapted for effective service in Indian work and so harmonious with the theory of this Government, unexpectedly was found by some people to be the lurking place of serious dangers and menaces to the free institutions of the country. Many who had labored for years in this field hastily withdrew. Even the high places in the Government were affected with this ridiculous fear. The Commissioner of Indian Affairs was cajoled into recommending that Government aid be completely withdrawn from these schools. A new policy was advocated. The system that had resulted in such good, effected wonderful changes in the Indians, was to be completely cast aside and an era of experiment begun in Indian education and civilization.

At this time, Mr. Chairman, I am not concerned with the cause for this change of policy. Perhaps at some future time it will be proper to shed some light upon that phase of the question. For the present it suffices to know that in 1895 a novel policy was initiated by those in official circles in control of Indian educational affairs. That policy was twofold in nature. It was intended gradually to eliminate contract schools by the almost imperceptible substitution of Government schools. This is very clearly shown by the Hon. Hoke Smith, Secretary of the Interior, in his report of November, 1894. In that report he said:

The contract schools are now the subject of general discussion. I agree fully with those who oppose the use of public money for the support of sectarian schools. But this question should be considered practically. The schools have grown up; money has been invested in their construction at a time when they were recognized as wise instrumentalities for the accomplishment of good. I do not think it proper to allow the intense feeling of opposition to sectarian schools, which is showing itself all over the land, to induce the Department to disregard existing conditions. We need the schools now, or else we need a large appropriation to build schools to take their place.

It would scarcely be just to abolish them entirely—to abandon instantly a policy so long established. My own suggestion is that they should be decreased at the rate of not less than 20 per cent a year. Thus, in a few years more, they would cease to exist, and during that time the Bureau (of Indian Affairs) would gradually be prepared to do without them, while they might gather strength to continue without Government aid.

Further investigation of the question convinced the Secretary of the enormity of the task of substituting Government facilities for all Indian pupils, and as a result, in a communication to Congress on December 13, 1894, he said:

It is possible that the plan of annual reduction can not be carried out to the full extent proposed, namely, 20 per cent each year.

Since that time, Mr. Chairman, the Bureau of Indian Affairs has striven strenuously to provide the required facilities. It has not been able to do so. It is not even now able to provide accommodations for all the children of school age, excluding from consideration those provided for in the contract schools. Yet it is proposed to discontinue these schools and to increase by 2,000 the number of children that the Government is now utterly unable to accommodate.

The adoption of the proposed amendment is absolutely necessary, if the Department is to care for the nation's helpless wards. This amendment merely gives to the Secretary of the Interior authority to continue agreement with present contract schools wherever the Government has not provided adequate facilities. It is not a startling proposition; it can hardly be considered a dangerous or wild experiment.

Two objections are urged against the amendment. In the first place, it is claimed that the Government has sufficient facilities of its own to provide for all Indian children of school age, and therefore the authority contemplated in the amendment is unnecessary; in the second place, it is urged that, in effect, an appropriation is made for the benefit of certain churches and religious associations, and is therefore "sectarian" and improper. Neither objection is sufficient; neither can justly be maintained. I propose, sir, to analyze both objections, confident that impartial, broad-minded and just men will agree with me that the amendment is absolutely required by the present Indian educational conditions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired, under the leave given, and it now becomes necessary, under the rule, that the committee rise.

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York. I ask unanimous consent that when the committee resumes, I may be recognized to continue the discussion of this question.

Mr. SHERMAN. There will be no question but what the gentleman can have all the time he wishes to-morrow morning. I move that the committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the committee must now rise.

Saturday, February 3, 1900.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Indian appropriation bill.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] be permitted to proceed without interruption for twenty minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York. Mr. Chairman, yesterday, in a feeble way, I attempted to review the history of the Government's attitude to churches and to religious organizations engaged in Indian education. To the best of my meager ability I endeavored to show to this committee that from the earliest days of its existence the Government had encouraged and assisted religious associations laboring to bring Christian education and civilization to the unfortunate red men of our country. I tried, sir, to sustain the statements made by me by copious extracts from the official reports of various Government officers, and I will assume, for the convenience of the occasion, that up to the year 1894 the Government had encouraged in every way possible religious associations engaged in Indian educational work; that in 1894 it was decided to eliminate such schools from the possibility of Government aid by the gradual substitution of Government schools. I now propose to attempt to show that the Government has not sufficient facilities without resorting to the present contract schools, and that a continuance of these schools is not offensive because "sectarian."

GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS GROSSLY INADEQUATE FOR PRESENT NEEDS.

There are in existence to-day, sir, 26 contract schools. In these schools there are some 2,000 Indian children. Five hundred and thirty-four of these children are there under Government contracts; the remaining fifteen hundred are maintained through the charity of people interested in their welfare. If the Secretary of the Interior be not authorized to continue existing contracts, what is to become of these children?

The Commissioner of Indian Affairs in his report for 1899 submits certain tables which show the capacity of the Government schools and the enrollment of pupils therein. On page 10 of that report is a table, numbered 1, purporting to show the "location, average attendance, capacity, etc., of nonreservation training schools during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1899."

This table discloses that the nonreservation training schools can accommodate 6,295 pupils, and that the number of pupils enrolled therein is 6,830. On pages 11 and 12 of the same report is a table (No. 2) purporting to show the "location, date of opening, capacity, enrollment, and average attendance of Government reservation boarding schools." The summaries of this table give the following information: Capacity, 8,865; enrollment, 8,881. On pages 13 and 14, Table No. 3, showing the "location, capacity, enrollment, and average attendance of Government day schools, June 30, 1899," shows that the capacity of those schools is 4,966, and the enrollment therein 4,951.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, the total capacity of Government schools of all kinds at the end of the fiscal year 1899 was 20,120, while the enrollment of pupils in those schools was 20,712. These figures conclusively prove that at that time the Government could not accommodate 586 pupils enrolled in its various schools. Where, then, are the 2,000 pupils in the contract schools to be placed, if the pending amendment be not adopted? Nowhere in the Commissioner's report is there a suggestion that the Government has sufficient facilities to accommodate these 2,000 pupils who in a few months will be knocking for admission to the Government schools. No material, if any, additional facilities have been provided since June, 1899, and no such extensive increase as will surely be required by the Government, if the pending amendment be not adopted, has been contemplated in framing this bill.

FREE SCHOOLS WILL NOT SUPPLY NEEDED FACILITIES.

Many gentlemen, however, find a ready if not sufficient answer to this proposition. Place them in the free schools in the various States, they say. This argument is as specious as it is alluring. It is not a novel suggestion. For nine years that experiment has been tried. Hearken to the opinion of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs on that proposition. At page 15 of his report for 1899, he says:

An inspection of the above table (which shows number of district public schools, contract number of pupils, enrollment, and average attendance therein) demonstrates that after nine years' trial the results attained by these schools do not seem commensurate with the expenditure. It was believed that an allowance of $10 per capita per quarter for such average attendance as could be obtained would have induced greater effort to secure these pupils. The great difficulty experienced by agents on reservations in maintaining a good attendance seems emphasized at these schools.

Another feature of these contracts (with district public schools) arises from the disinclination of the full-bloods to withstand the not always silent race prejudice often prevailing in the neighborhood of these district schools, and the result has been that in the majority of instances the benefits are conferred upon children of mixed blood, who are or should be entitled to participate in the State funds for education. Theoretically, the placing of Indian youth in public schools, where they come in contact with white children, is a most admirable expedient for breaking down prejudices on both sides and civilizing the Indian, but the above table shows that it is not an unqualified success. The full-blood, who needs such contact most, is rarely secured.

In the face of this language it can not successfully be urged that the free schools of the several States will furnish the additional two thousand and odd sittings that will be required should this amendment fail of adoption. And if this be conceded, as I assume it must be by all fair-minded men, the necessity for this amendment is beyond question or controversy.

SECTARIAN NATURE OF SCHOOLS NOT SUFFICIENT OBJECTION.

Some will say, however, that, conceding the necessity, which certainly is apparent, for this amendment, an appropriation will be made for "sectarian" purposes, and such objection is fatal. This objection, I believe, sir, is as easy to wipe away as that previously urged. Gen. Francis A. Walker, former Superintendent of Census, and Commissioner of Indian Affairs from 1871 to 1873, pithily states the true principle. He said:

If the use of these (trust) funds to support Indian children at the so-called contract schools will yield the Indians a better educational result than can otherwise be obtained, the Government is false to its duties as trustee if it fails to take that course. No political consideration, independent of the best good of the Indians themselves, can properly be allowed to enter into the treatment of this subject. No matter what objection might exist to the support of sectarian schools by funds derived from taxation, these can not apply to the present case. Even were the funds applied to the education of Indians obtained wholly by taxation, I should not be disposed to think that the objections which exist to the use of public moneys for the support of sectarian schools in communities like ours hold here.

The test I would apply would be this: Does the Government send Indian children to be educated at these schools for the benefit of the denominations maintaining them or for the good of the Indian children? If the latter be the case, it seems to me that no objection in the nature of a principle applies. The only remaining question then would be, Is the education thus given the children better than that which they would obtain in agency schools, subject, as they are, to political control and frequent change of teachers?

* * * * * * *

To appropriate money for establishing and maintaining sectarian schools, for the sake of having sectarian schools, would, according to my way of thinking, be altogether wrong. To make use of good schools already existing and partly maintained by private contributions, even though under sectarian control, involves no departure from sound principles if the sole object in doing so is the good of the Indians themselves.

The value of these schools is not at issue. It has never been questioned. In the report of the board of Indian commissioners for 1898 this commendation is found at page 7:

The contract and mission schools are continued by the various church missionary societies, though with a slight reduction of attendance, since the most of them no longer receive Government aid. We trust that this work may go on and increase, for, as we have often said, our deep and abiding conviction is that what the Indian needs above all things is moral and Christian training.

The Commissioner of Indian Affairs, in his report for 1899, made no comment on contract schools. Unable to speak in derogation, he refuses the tribute of just praise. Upon the question of mission schools, however, which differ from contract schools only in that no pupils are in the former under Government contract, he says:

The labors which they do in an educational way are of inestimable value for civilizing these people, and while the heavy burden must, as it should, rest upon the shoulders of the Government, yet these little institutions of learning, with their faithful Christian workers, are important adjuncts.

The very latest official reports and utterances commend these schools. Their necessity and their value are apparent.

Again, however, the question of "sectarianism" is raised. What is meant by this word "sectarianism?" I will adopt that definition or explanation given by the Most Rev. P. J. Ryan, archbishop of Philadelphia, in a statement before the Senate Committee on Appropriations in February, 1898. I commend this definition of the learned and distinguished prelate to gentlemen writhing at the thought of "sectarian" appropriations. He said:

This word sectarianism, gentlemen, is the most thoroughly misunderstood and at present, perhaps, the most mischievous word in the English language. Properly speaking, sectarianism is the religion of sects—that is, of bodies cut away, as the term implies, from the original church. Unsectarian religion is the religion of that original church. But this is not the meaning popularly attached to it. Webster defines as sectarian "one of a party in religion which has separated itself from an established church, or which holds tenets different from those of the prevailing denomination."

Now, as we have no established church, for union of church and state in our circumstances is out of the question, and there is dispute as to which is the "prevailing denomination," a "sectarian" is not easy to find. For a man to preach unsectarianism it is supposed that he must avoid all doctrines in which he may disagree with any one of his audience. Now, as every doctrine of Christians has been denied by some one, unsectarian preaching is simply impossible, when the audience is representative of all shades of religious opinion. What is called unsectarian teaching is attempted in some of our public institutions by what are known as "moral instructors," but it is sometimes the most sectarian of all teaching, as it represents simply the peculiar religious views not of a body but of the individual who teaches. It has the merit of great variety, as it changes with each moral teacher, and not unfrequently with the same individual at different periods of life.

The logic of that statement should appeal to all reasoning men. It is fair, it is true, it is a just and impartial explanation of the meaning of a much misused and misabused word. Yet, in the light of such reasoning, a most peculiar situation confronts the opponents of contract schools and supporters of Government schools. If the logic of the distinguished prelate's statement be conceded, and I assume, Mr. Chairman, that it is, then the Government schools are the most offensive of all existing schools, because the most sectarian.

The Government schools are supposed to be stripped clean of everything that smacks of sectarianism. The report of Miss Estelle Reel, the Superintendent of Indian Schools, for 1899, however, refutes this supposition. At the outset of her report she says:

* * * Therefore it seems most fitting that I should set forth in my report such matters as have come under my personal observation while in the field.

As a result of her "personal observation," she reports the conditions existing at the many schools visited. Some of her observations follow. She found at the Haskell Institute, Kansas, that "a most happy Christian influence pervades the school;" Chilocco Indian School, Oklahoma, "religious exercises are conducted regularly;" Nambe and Tesuque Pueblo day schools, "religious training is carefully given;" Albuquerque Indian School, New Mexico, "the religious welfare of the children is carefully looked after;" Phœnix Indian School, Arizona, "Christian influences surround the students;" Perris School, California, "Sunday-school exercises are held regularly;" Carson Indian School, Nevada, "religious exercises are held regularly;" Klamath Agency, Oreg., "at each school (there are three) there is a force of faithful, Christian teachers;" Chemawa Indian School, Oregon, "religious exercises are regularly held;" Siletz Boarding School, Oregon, "the religious training of the children is carefully looked after."

These, sir, are all Government schools. Can there be religious training without sectarian teaching? Why, these schools are the most objectionable because the most sectarian of all existing schools among the Indians. Speaking of this phase of the school question, the Commissioner, in his report for 1899, says, at page 29:

Although sectarian teaching is forbidden in the schools, they are not Godless institutions. The broad principles of the Bible, of religion, and morality are taught, and, so far as it is possible, only strong religious characters are placed in charge of the children. The petty distinctions of creeds are ignored, but all employees are required to lay such a foundation in the hearts and minds of their pupils that the great religious bodies of our country may hereafter build upon it a vigorous and enduring Christian character.

In other words, the Commissioner believes in a "creedless" religious training by lay teachers.

Mr. Chairman, if this be not "sectarianism," then the greatest minds that this country has produced have not been able to comprehend that expression. Webster's argument in the celebrated Girard will case was published at the request of a "committee of eight persons of the several Christian denominations," because it "demonstrates the vital importance of Christianity to the success of our free institutions and its necessity as the basis of all useful moral education." Although the argument of the advocate, published under such circumstances, it may properly be ranked with his most notable statesmanlike utterances. In the course of that argument—and I commend this particularly to those who pin their faith to the above opinion of the Commissioner—he said:

It has been said that there may be lay preachers among them. Lay preachers! This is ridiculous enough in a country of Christianity and religion.

* * * * * * *

Now, are not laymen equally sectarian in their views with clergymen? And would it not be just as easy to prevent sectarian doctrines from being preached by a clergyman as from being taught by a layman? It is idle, therefore, to speak of lay peaching.

Here Webster was interrupted by a statement that it was not lay preaching, but lay teaching, that had been discussed. He continued:

Well, I would just as soon take it that way as the other—teaching as preaching. Is not the teaching of laymen as sectarian as the preaching of clergymen? What is the difference between unlettered laymen and lettered clergymen in this respect? Everyone knows that laymen are as violent controversialists as clergymen, and the less informed the more violent. So this, while it is a little more ridiculous, is equally obnoxious. According to my experience, a layman is just as likely to launch out into sectarian views and to advance clashing doctrines and violent, bigoted prejudices as a professional preacher, and even more so. Every objection to professional religious instruction applies with still greater force to lay teaching. As in other cases, so in this, the greatest degree of candor is usually found accompanying the greatest degree of knowledge. Nothing is more apt to be positive and dogmatical than ignorance.

Mr. Chairman, I am willing to let the determination of the question of sectarianism rest upon what I have said. If the contract schools are obnoxious because sectarian, Government schools are certainly much more objectionable.

I do not wish to be misunderstood, sir, as criticising the Department for attempting to Christianize, as well as educate, the Indians under its control. God forbid that I should ever stand obstructing such work. I am one of those who believe most firmly that religious training is an essential of proper intellectual development. No matter what the creed professed, the man who conscientiously lives up to his religious beliefs, in my opinion, is a better man, a more desirable citizen, and a more useful member of society than he who has no religious belief whatever. Religious instruction is essential to the proper development of the intellect. Without it men are menaces rather than advantages to society. Mere intellectual development is not a preventive of vice. Herbert Spencer, in his Study of Sociology, makes this clear. He pertinently asks:

Are not fraudulent bankrupts educated people, and getters-up of bubble companies, and makers of adulterated goods, and users of false trade-marks, and retailers who have their light weights, and owners of unseaworthy ships, and those who cheat insurance companies, and those who carry on turf chicaneries, and the great majority of gamblers? Or, to take a more extreme form of turpitude, is there not among those who have committed murders by poison within our memories a considerable number of the educated, a number bearing as large a ratio to the educated classes as does the total number to the total population?

This belief of the moralizing effects of intellectual culture, flatly contradicted by the facts, is absurd a priori. "What imaginable connection is there between learning that certain clusters of marks on paper stand for certain words and the getting of a higher sense of duty? What possible effect can acquirement of faculty in making written signs or sounds have in strengthening the desire to do right? How does knowledge of the multiplication table or quickness in adding and dividing so increase the sympathies as to restrain the tendency to trespass against fellow-creatures? In what way can the attainment of accuracy in spelling and parsing, etc., make the sentiment of justice more powerful than it was? Or why, from stores of geographical knowledge, perseveringly gained, is there likely to come increased regard for truth?"

It must be remembered, sir, that Indian children must acquire their religious knowledge and training in the schools. How, then, is the knowledge of Christian truths to be inculcated without offense to this absurd theory of nonsectarian teaching? It has never been proposed to eliminate Christianity from Indian education. Why attempt with them, of all others, the experiment of "philosophical morality." If there is to be true morality, it must be founded upon religion.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity—

Said Washington in his Farewell Address—

religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connection with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths, which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

These schools are absolutely necessary if the Indians are to be given a Christian education and the blessing of our civilization. In the language of an aged and veteran Indian missionary, the Right Rev. H. B. Whipple, bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church:

Under our system I do not believe that it is possible for the Government, with our system of patronage and its dependence on political agents, to take the entire educational system of Indian schools into its hands without failure. There is no educated civilized constituency in the Indian country to watch and guard the schools.

ECONOMY OF CONTRACT SYSTEM.

Yesterday, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURKE] pointed out that the per capita cost a year of educating children under this bill is the sum of $288. The Indian Office places its average per capita for educating pupils at $140. Under the contracts made by the Government for pupils at contract schools the sum of $108 is paid for each pupil. In return for this sum of $108 the contract schools agree—

To provide for said school a sufficient number of employees to conduct it to the satisfaction of the party of the first part, presenting such evidences of the qualifications of each instructor as may be required, all employees to converse with pupils under their charge in English and to be able to speak and write in the English language fluently and correctly; to instruct the male pupils of said school in gardening and farming and care of stock, or such other industries as are suitable to the reservation to which they are to be returned; to instruct certain of the male pupils in mechanical trades; to instruct the female pupils in cookery, laundering, needlework, dairy work, and general housewifery; to teach all the pupils in the ordinary branches of an English education; to teach the effects of alcoholic drinks and narcotics upon the human system, as required by act approved May 20, 1886; to observe with appropriate public exercises all national holidays; to instruct pupils as to the duties and privileges of American citizenship, explaining to them the fundamental principles of the Government, and to train them to sing such patriotic songs and recite such patriotic selections from time to time as shall tend to inspire them with love of the country and the flag.

To supply the pupils of said school with suitable and sufficient clothing, subsistence, lodging accommodations, medical attendance, school books, stationery, school appliances, and all other articles necessary to their personal comfort; and also to supply the school with mechanical tools, seeds, and all other articles necessary in a properly conducted industrial school.

To have schoolroom exercises on five and industrial exercises on six days in each week, legal holidays excepted.

Moreover, sir, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs has the right under all such contracts—

To make inspections of the said school, and to require the party of the second part at any time to immediately dismiss from the service of the school all school employees who may be considered by the party of the first part not qualified for the respective positions occupied by them in the school.

To prescribe the course of study, to direct the grading and classification of the pupils of the school, and to designate the text-books to be used therein.

These schools are more economical than the Government schools; they are satisfactory in every respect; they are subject to the closest scrutiny and inspection of the Government. Every penny of the 30 cents a day received for each pupil is expended for the benefit of the Indians; none is spent for the peculiar benefit of the association conducting the school. It is possible, sir, to maintain these schools upon such small expenditures because those engaged in this work have devoted their lives, their energies, and their talents to it. No earthly reward is expected other than the consciousness that something has been done for the betterment of mankind in the service of the Lord.

Mr. Chairman, I have attempted to make this committee realize the importance of this question. The pending amendment provides for facilities needed by the Indian Office. It is not for me to determine its fate. I am alive to the high motives that guide members of this House in the performance of their duties. I appeal to their sense of fairness and justice to provide in this bill for these 2,000 Indian children and not leave them dependent upon charity nor permit them to return to their former barbarous, uncivilized lives, menaces to society, and an everlasting reproach to our beloved country. [Applause.]

Death of Hon. Lorenzo Danford

REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES H. GROSVENOR,
OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, January 20, 1900.

The House having under consideration the following resolutions:

"*Resolved*, That the business of the House be now suspended, that opportunity may be given for paying tributes to the memory of Hon. LORENZO DANFORD, late a member of the House of Representatives from the State of Ohio.

"*Resolved*, That, as a particular mark of respect to the memory of the deceased and in recognition of his eminent abilities as a distinguished public servant, the House at the conclusion of these memorial proceedings shall stand adjourned.

"*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the family of the deceased.

"*Ordered*, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate"—

Mr. GROSVENOR said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I come here with no prepared eulogy to participate in the ceremonies of this hour. My first acquaintance with Captain DANFORD was during the period of the civil war. I knew him as a bright, handsome, thoroughly capable soldier of the Volunteer Army. I have no particular remembrance of anything special in his career that came under my own personal observation, excepting a general recollection of this character. Following the battle of Stone River, in which he participated, the regiment to which he belonged, the Fifteenth Ohio Infantry, became the subject of an investigation, which was made by a court of inquiry appointed by General Rosecrans, and which consisted of Col. Stanley Matthews, then colonel of the Fifty-first Ohio, and another officer whose name I have forgotten, and myself. It was not because of any character or conduct of the regiment itself, but there was an issue made in a controversy between the colonel of that regiment and the major. The turning point of that inquiry was whether or not Colonel Wallace was in command of the brigade on the second day of that great battle, and if so, who was in command of the regiment itself; and if it was the major, whose name

I know but do not care to mention, the question arose whether he took command of the regiment as he ought to have done, and properly discharged his duty.

We spent several days visiting the various points of the battlefield, and some very laughable facts came to our knowledge. We found that there was absolutely grave doubt and uncertainty whether Colonel Gibson actually commanded the brigade at any time during that day or whether he did not; and when he came to testify himself he described how he had been cut off from his command with two pieces of artillery, a section of a battery, and he had skirmished around over the principal parts of the battlefield, and finally got safely into camp at night with his two guns and the few men he had with him.

Here is where Captain DANFORD came in with that precise, clear-headed mind that he always had. As captain, or the officer in command of his company, he testified. He testified of the movements of his part of the command on that day, and there was no general officer from Rosecrans down who had a more complete and graphic description at his tongue's end of every movement made by him than DANFORD had. He bore the characteristics of a soldier that he had afterwards as a lawyer and afterwards as a statesman.

He was elected to the Forty-third, Forty-fourth, and Forty-fifth Congresses. He served about the time that it takes a man of ordinary capacity to become valuable and efficient, and then he was retired for some reason that I do not understand. That he was making rapid progress toward leadership in the House is the common report of men who knew him in that day, and he served with a class of men equal, at least, to any one period of time that we have had since the war. Then he became conspicuous as a lawyer, not perhaps conspicuous in the scientific knowledge of the law books, but noted as one of the greatest trial lawyers in that section of the State of Ohio, and he lived in a locality that produced not only the great men which my colleague [Mr. KERR] has referred to, but such men as Shannon and Kennon and Cowen and other great men of that day. Then he came to Congress. He had participated in every political campaign in the State of Ohio. There was a time when I believed that he was as effective a stump speaker as there was on the stump in Ohio, and he came very often into the mining sections of my district, before I came to Congress, and spoke with wonderful efficiency. He was not what we usually call an eloquent man; he did not lay any claim to that; but he had the power of statement, of political proposition, and the power of application of current facts which made his speech upon the stump one of the most vote-getting of all the speakers I knew when he was at his best.

He received a serious injury, almost met his death, by a railroad accident, and came out of that and lingered at the very door of the other world for quite a time. I have thought, and I think I am right about it, that he never quite recovered the full spring and activity of the capacity that he enjoyed before. But he came back to Congress, and we all of us who were here in the Fifty-fourth and Fifty-fifth know how well he discharged his duty. He had become exceedingly anxious with regard to certain matters of legislation, and sometimes he almost lost his temper when baffled and headed off by the various plans of the opposition here. He was one of those persistent, steadfast men who never yield when they believe they are right. I do not believe that there was one man on this floor nor in public life in this country who in his official capacity acted with a closer reference to conscientious belief and conscientious duty than did LORENZO DANFORD. He never had any buncombe about him. You never heard him on the stump, nor in this House, nor by the introduction of bills, nor by any other process, ever bringing forward a mere buncombe resolution, bill, or suggestion. What he brought here he favored. What he advocated here he believed it was his duty to support. That which he opposed he opposed not because of its effect upon him, but because of his obligation to duty.

He began to go downward; death was staring him in the face; and in that hour, as in the case of a great many others, he turned with fond recollection to his old home in Ohio. In the month of November or December preceding his death he had gone to his home and stood at the deathbed of his father, an old man, a farmer of Belmont County, over 90 years of age. When he came back he himself was ill, and he told me and others that his present trouble had come of staying in the cold and cheerless farmhouse of his father, away from the usual comforts that he had enjoyed, and he felt that a very serious condition had come upon him. He wanted to get back again, as his trouble pressed upon him. He thought of Ohio, and talked of Ohio, and finally he told a colleague very dearly loved and myself, one day, that he was going home. He said, "I am going to Ohio. I will get more good out of that air of southeastern Ohio than I can get out of all of the medicine of all the doctors in this city."

He spoke of its altitude, 600 feet above the Ohio River, and said: "The purest air on earth is the air of Belmont County." And he was not far wrong in his assertion of the loveliness, beauty, and healthfulness of the home in which he had lived. Those of us who attended his funeral and went to St. Clairsville for the first time were impressed with the beauty of the surroundings, and we did not wonder that in the hour of his dissolution, as it were, he almost cried like a child for the air and the surroundings of his Ohio home.

He had the confidence and respect and love of his people. They came from every county in his district. They came in great numbers. They came on that beautiful June day to do honor to the memory of the man who had been so long their champion and leader. And I can pay no better tribute to his memory than to say that around that bier, around that open grave, there were tears of affection from men not related to him, but who had known him so long and well that it seemed that a friend and brother had been taken away.

Shall America Become a Tyrant Nation?

SPEECH
OF
HON. THOMAS CUSACK,
OF ILLINOIS.
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Monday, February 26, 1900,

On the bill (H. R. 8245) to regulate the trade of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes.

Mr. CUSACK said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The lawyers of this House have spent many days in arguing the technical questions involved in this bill, and gentlemen on this side have presented their legal objections to it. But it needs no lawyer to explain why the bill should not pass. I am utterly opposed to it, because I believe in keeping our promises. The man who breaks his word can not hope to have the respect of his neighbors. The nation which breaks its pledges to a weaker people will receive the condemnation of history.

When we entered upon the Spanish war we called upon the world to witness that we took up arms for a high and humane purpose—to relieve the people of the island of Cuba from the murderous oppression and cruelty of Spain. As an incident of that war we occupied Puerto Rico, and the inhabitants of that island offered us no resistance. They welcomed our troops as bringing to them the blessings which, we always boasted, go with our flag. The general commanding the Army made to those people the fairest promises ever penned by a hand that carried a sword. What did he say? Listen:

HEADQUARTERS OF THE ARMY,
Ponce, Puerto Rico, July 28, 1898.

To the inhabitants of Puerto Rico:

In the prosecution of the war against the Kingdom of Spain by the people of the United States in the cause of liberty, justice, and humanity, its military forces have come to occupy the island of Puerto Rico. They come bearing the banner of freedom, inspired by a noble purpose. * * * They bring you the fostering arm of a nation of free people, whose greatest power is in its justice and humanity to all those living within its fold, * * * to bring you protection, not only to yourselves, but to your property, to promote your prosperity, and bestow upon you the immunities and blessings of the liberal institutions of our Government. * * * This is not a war of devastation, but one to give to all within the control of its military and naval forces the advantages and blessings of enlightened civilization.

NELSON A. MILES,
Major-General Commanding United States Army.

And following this, President McKinley used almost the same words when he said to Congress:

The highest considerations of justice and good faith demand that we should not disappoint the confident expectation of sharing in our prosperity with which the people of Puerto Rico so gladly transferred their allegiance to the United States, and that we should treat the interest of this people as our own; and I wish most strongly to urge that the customs duties between Puerto Rico and the United States be removed.

How beautiful a picture was here presented, one that would have made glad the hearts of all the lovers of liberty and justice from the time of those who on these shores first resisted unjust and unequal taxation by the English king.

But the same hard, selfish influences which seem to control everything that the Republicans have done lately have whispered to the Ways and Means Committee that these promises must not be carried out, and in spite of the plain terms of our Constitution, we propose to begin a policy of unequal taxation in our Territories, a policy as different from the spirit of our institutions as darkness is from light.

This is the beginning. What will be the end? Ah, Mr. Chairman, when nations desert the plain path of duty, when the strong oppress the weak for selfish ends, they begin to work their own ruin. In following the example of the greatest tyrant of all the earth, in imitating England's course toward weaker countries, we harm ourselves more than we do those whom we oppress. Are we to treat Puerto Rico as England has treated Ireland? Are we to darken the humble homes of that beautiful little island? One

of the witnesses from Puerto Rico, whose testimony is before us, says:

Since the United States has had the occupation, I am sorry to say, we have gone backward; two years ago we were certainly a great deal more prosperous than we are to-day. There is a great deal more poverty than there was two years ago.

Mr. Chairman, our Government is in bad company and following a bad example. During the past two years we have heard a great deal about an understanding between the United States and England, and in Puerto Rico we see our Government doing something very similar to that which England tried to do to the American colonies a century and a quarter ago. Not only that, but our Government, which made such fair pretenses when it went to war with poor old Spain, because that country was unjust to Cuba, seems strangely blind to the cold-blooded murder which England is now committing in South Africa.

It is said that England performed some service for us during the Spanish war. I ask any man to point out what that service was, when it was performed, where it was performed, and by whom? Our State Department is now presided over by a man fresh from the flattery and social attentions of English drawing-rooms. Is it not a strange and humiliating coincidence that almost as soon as England began her attack upon the Boers, the American consul to the Boer Republic, who protested against English meddling with his official mail, should be removed and our late ambassador to England should send his own son instead?

Mr. Macrum, who has been so summarily and mysteriously displaced, to be succeeded by the son of our Secretary of State, is too old-fashioned in his ideas of freedom and independence to suit the spirit of these times, it seems. He says:

I had the humiliation, as the representative of the American Government, of sitting in my office in Pretoria and looking upon envelopes bearing the official seal of the American Government opened and officially sealed with a sticker, notifying me that the contents had been read by the censor at Durban. * * * When I accepted my post as consul I knew nothing of any secret alliance between America and Great Britain.

Mr. Chairman, what a spectacle is here presented! It has been our boast that whatever other nations did we at least were the friends of freedom everywhere. But now we are blind to the crimson streams of South Africa and deaf to the roar of English cannon. In the war now raging there we see a plain, free republic, such as ours once was, struggling against the greatest robber of all the ages, who simply says: "Your gold and diamonds or your lives; and I think, as you are in the way, I'll take your lives anyway!"

In all the history of the world there is no sight more pitiful than that of the heroic Boers, fighting like the humble heroes they are against overwhelming numbers. Who can read the story of those people and not be moved to admiration and to indignation?

When English oppression in Cape Colony became unbearable to the liberty-loving Boers many years ago, they asked the English Government, "What do you claim to be the northernmost boundary of English territory in South Africa?" The English Government replied, "Our northernmost boundary is the Vaal River." "Very well," responded the Boers, "we will leave our homes and the graves of our fathers and go beyond the Vaal, and all we wish there is to be let alone."

They went, and, as if to warn them of future danger, every night on their long journey they had to post sentinels to protect their flocks and herds from the attacks of the cowardly and treacherous lions which are England's emblem, and which well illustrate her methods, always skulking on the outskirts, ready to pounce upon the helpless.

Beyond the Vaal, in a country too poor to tempt even England's greed, these sturdy people established their new home and set up a republic as simple as ours used to be. If gold and diamonds had not been discovered there, they might yet be at peace on their quiet farms and have no use for their rifles except in the noble art of the chase. But now they are being held up, the victims of the great highwayman of the world; and while every man who loves justice must admire the Boers for their plucky defense of home and country, our Government stands idly by, not offering to make a protest, not even trying, in a friendly way, to stop the unequal conflict.

If we were justified in armed intervention against Spain, fighting from motives of national pride to maintain her ancient rule in countries which for centuries had been hers, how much more do national honor and good conscience impel us to use all peaceable means to stop a warfare, merciless and hateful, waged from motives of national greed on the one side against a brave, free people in a sister republic on the other!

Are not our proposed injustice toward Puerto Rico and our indifference to England's wanton attack on the South African Republic the visible signs of the beginning of a policy on our part which will inevitably land us among the tyrant powers of the earth? And will not all liberty-loving men in this country rise up and repudiate an Administration which places us in such disgraceful company?

Trade of Puerto Rico.

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANK M. EDDY,

OF MINNESOTA.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, February 24, 1900.

The House being in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 8345) to regulate the trade of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes—

Mr. EDDY said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The truth of the old and trite sayings that history repeats itself and that there is nothing new under the sun has never been more clearly manifest than in the circumstances surrounding the declaration of the war with Spain, its conduct, the conditions and responsibilities growing out of that war and which came as an unavoidable and inevitable inheritance, and the settling of the great questions that grew up by reason of this inheritance and these conditions.

The American people have engaged in five great wars—that of the Revolution, that of 1812, the Mexican war, the civil war, and the war with Spain. And I want to call attention, first, to the fact that all these wars were entered into with practical unanimity on the part of the American people—this is not absolutely true, but it is practically so—that as the wars progressed the conduct of the same was criticised vigorously and, I might almost say, virulently by a minority, and, second, as a result of all these wars, new conditions arose and new great responsibilities were created that were undreamed of at their beginning, and when a majority of the people's representatives settled those great questions the minority always insisted that if the will of the majority was carried out direful results would follow, and I might add that there were always a few members of the majority who realized that the easiest way in the world to get a reputation was to kick, and so went over to the minority and joined with them in crying havoc.

Mr. Chairman, our first war with Britain was engaged in for a principle, and the most ardent advocate of that war never asserted or dreamed that it was for the purpose of establishing a separate sovereignty. As wise a man as Benjamin Franklin shortly after the battle of Lexington made this statement:

I have traveled all over the thirteen colonies, and I have not found a man insane enough to advocate a complete separation from the mother country.

It is safe for me to say now that had the leaders in the beginning of that struggle asserted that their purpose was to set up a separate government five-sixths of the men who so bravely fought on so many bloody fields would have laid down their arms and gone home in disgust.

But, Mr. Chairman, "Man proposes and God disposes," and in the fullness of time, in His own way, He made known to the minds of men His purpose to set up in the New World a new nation or new principles of freedom, and after the great struggle had ended in independence, the great men of the colonies, the great statesmen, great soldiers, great scholars, and great lawyers assembled under the direction of their respective Commonwealths and after many weeks of stormy discussion promulgated this Constitution and offered it to their several States for adoption. Then it was that the minority got in their work. They declared if the Constitution was adopted it was the beginning of the end of their newly acquired, blood-bought liberties. They dragged forth the specter of imperialism, then ten times more real and hideous than now, and tried to do business with it.

The decline and fall of the Roman Empire, the lost prestige of Holland, the decay of Portugal, and the departed glory of Spain were held up as examples, frightful examples, of what would happen to the young Republic if the people surrendered their rights by adopting this Constitution; but these tactics were as ineffective in the closing years of the eighteenth century as the same tactics will be in the closing years of the nineteenth, and the Constitution was adopted. The American people could not be frightened then and can not be frightened now by delirious creations of diseased imaginations.

I wish I had the time to go into the details of the settlement of the great problems growing out of subsequent wars. It is enough for me to say that at the close of each new and great questions arose as the result of conflict. The majority in control had to settle these questions; they did settle them notwithstanding the minority have always declared that such settlements would be anarchistic, barbaric, imperialistic, inhuman, unconstitutional, and a lot of other things. [Laughter].

Mr. Chairman, we have had a hundred years of doleful minority predictions of misfortune to the individual and disaster to the

nation, and it seems to me they grow gloomy and darkly foreboding with each new crop of predictors; yet I submit that in spite of these prophets of evil this Republic has staggered along fairly well for a hundred years, and this very day, this very hour, every individual resident of the United States, or of the Territory belonging thereto, enjoys a greater freedom of speech and action than the resident of any other nation under the bending heavens, and his privileges of freedom and blessings of opportunity are greater this minute than at any time in the previous history of this nation, and "still there's more to follow." [Applause.]

Bearing in mind the absolute and utter failure of past predictions of woe, is it not strange, passing strange, that our friends on the other side persist in dragging out into the sunlight the same old scarecrows, of setting them up in the plain view of men, of manipulating the wires so that they wave their skeleton arms up and down and wag their gruesome heads from side to side? But I apprehend, Mr. Chairman, that when the manipulators of these ancient effigies discover, as discover they must, that they are frightening no one, deceiving no one, not even themselves, they will once more take down their fantastic creations, carefully box them up, and safely stow them away in the attic of the Democratic Chamber of Horrors for the use of future generations of Democracy. [Great laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, never in the history of this nation was a war entered into with more unanimity of purpose on the part of the people than the one from which the country has just triumphantly emerged.

Well do I remember that imposing, inspiring half hour of history that was enacted on the floor of this House a short time since, to participate in which was worth ten years of ordinary lifetime, when Republicans, Silver Republicans, Democrats, and Populists forgot they were partisans and remembered only that they were Americans, and in a spontaneous burst of patriotic enthusiasm voted the President $50,000,000 with which to carry on the war. There was no politics in the war; it was a people's conflict. Men who had worn the gray fought side by side with men who had worn the blue, and sons of the Southland vied with Northern boys in deeds of desperate daring, and even Africa's children caught the martial spirit, and a moving black wall, showing rifts of gleaming ivory, was one of the things that struck terror in the hearts of Spain's legions on San Juan Hill; and when they returned victorious—those boys of ours—we crowned them with wreaths in which the leaves of the Southern palm were intermingled with the leaves of the Northern pine as a symbol that the hateful thing "sectionalism" was placed forever behind, and in the fore oneness and unification should rule and reign. [Applause.]

The war with Spain, though brief in duration, was pregnant with great results. When we take into consideration the lives lost, the money expended, and the results achieved, nothing like it appears in the history of the world since wars began. The results were as stupendous as they were undreamed of at the beginning. Thousands of square miles of territory were added to our dominion and millions of new people came under our jurisdiction. Puerto Rico and the Philippines are ours. I believe they will forever remain ours. Legislation in their interest is imperatively demanded. The party charged with the responsibility of this legislation through its representatives on the proper committee has presented legislation. As to be expected, it is stoutly contested by Democratic opposition, and, as I gather from the debate, they based their opposition on two grounds:

First. That it is unwise, ill-considered, and inexpedient legislation.

Second. That it is absolutely unconstitutional.

Very little has been said on the first proposition on either side, and the merits and demerits of the measure have been but slightly discussed, and I must pass the subject without comment, except to say that the bill would suit me better if in addition to the provisions carried it extended the internal-revenue laws to the island. Great questions and weighty problems, requiring the highest order of statesmanship to solve and solve rightly, were left to us as a legacy of the war. It is a matter of profound regret that we could not approach their solution with the same oneness of spirit that we entered upon the war that entailed them upon us; but partisanship, smothered by patriotism during hostilities, blazed forth anew and politicians began to play for position and maneuver for advantage. I can not dwell upon the question of acquisition of territory, governing without the consent of the governed, and many other interesting questions, as my time is limited and I want to talk a little about the bill in question.

Presumptuous as it may seem in me, I desire to briefly discuss the constitutional question, and discuss it from the standpoint of a layman instead of a lawyer.

If I understand it, the line of difference is sharply drawn. Our Democratic friends claim in their contention that whenever territory comes under the dominion of the United States it at once becomes an integral part of the Union, and by the very act of acquisition the Constitution is extended over such territory like a blanket, covering the inhabitants thereof; all the rights of every character are conferred by its provisions except only those peculiar political rights that are inherent with statehood; while, on the other hand, our contention, at least my contention, is that certain provisions of the Constitution apply only to the States, and mere acquisition of territory does not carry with it all the constitutional provisions.

Without being at all original, I can truly say the Constitution is a most wonderful document. Without taking into account its political significance, considering the time it was produced, the scholarly and legal attainments of the men who produced it, it is the most marvelous literary production the world has ever perused, save only the Sermon on the Mount. Written by eminent scholars in an age when stilted phrase and polysyllabic wording was supposed to be a sign of erudition, its language is incomparably simple, clear, and concise.

Approximately thirteen-twentieths of it is in words of one syllable, four-twentieths in words of two, two-twentieths in words of three, and only one-twentieth in words of four or more. The Sermon on the Mount, as I said before, is its only parallel for directness of statement.

Composed largely by lawyers at a time when Latin may almost be said to have been the language of the law, it contains only two Latin terms, "ex post facto" and "habeas corpus," for which no English synonyms exist, and which are of such common use that everyone understands their meaning. There is scarcely a word in the entire document that an ordinary man can not comprehend and define the moment he hears it, without the aid of a dictionary. Volumes of commentary have been written upon it, but it is, and always will remain, its own best commentator. Judges learned in the law have construed the meaning of its provisions, yet each separate paragraph explains itself better than any man ever has or ever can explain it.

I have always contended and contend now that the best way to find out what it means is to read it, regardless of judicial decision and unhampered by any comment. Taking into consideration only the time of its production and the circumstance under which it was written, we know it was intended as a basis or framework for the government of a union of States, for it plainly says so in the preamble, where the first sentence of which is: "We, the people of the United States." But it would be preposterous to suppose that the men who promulgated it did not contemplate the territory under them under the dominion of the United States or to come under such dominion in the future that had not acquired the dignity of statehood, and this is made clearly manifest in paragraph 2 of section 3 of Article IV of the Constitution, which reads:

> The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States, etc.

Could language be plainer than this? Congress has the power not only to "make all needful rules and regulations" but "to dispose of" territory.

Paragraph 1 of Article VII states:

> The ratification of the conventions of nine States shall be sufficient for the establishment of this Constitution between the States so ratifying the same.

Plainly implying some action was necessary on the part of the people themselves before all the provisions applied.

Passing without further comment to the provisions of sections 8 and 9 of Article I, defining the powers of the Congress, the most casual reader will at once determine that section 8 is affirmative and section 9 is restrictive. That whatever the Congress can not do, it can do the things mentioned in section 8; and whatever it can do, it can not do the things in section 9.

The reader will also observe that the provisions in these two sections, as well as all sections, naturally group themselves into two well defined divisions, which we may term political provisions and revenue provisions—a political provision may be defined as one that affects man's liberty; a revenue provision as one that affects man's pocket—and every single word of the revenue provisions are made directly applicable to the States by express words or direct implication, but the political provisions contain no such restriction.

The first paragraph confers the power to impose and collect taxes, duties, etc., but this power is modified by the declaration that all duties shall be uniform "throughout the United States," clearly indicating as a negative proposition they need not be uniform in the Territory.

If I am in the book business and send out two agents, and to one I say "You may sell these books throughout the District of Columbia," and to the other, "You may sell these books," the most obtuse would understand that one was limited to the District of Columbia and that the other was without restriction. If this distinction was not intended to be made the framers of the Constitution, who were past masters of the art of expression and never wasted a word, would have said, "But all duties, excises, and imposts must be uniform."

Section 8 contains what I term six revenue provisions, each of which are applied to the States. The other provisions are not so limited. Section 9 contains nine revenue provisions, each one of which applies to the States, while this application is absent in the other provisions.

It was the old doctrine of the pro-slavery advocates first proclaimed by John C. Calhoun that all the provisions of the Constitution applied to all the territory under the dominion of the Government of the United States—and he stated it took him thirty-five years to educate the South up to his idea—and hence slaveholders had a right to carry their slaves into any territory belonging to the United States; for as the Constitution recognized slavery, any law passed by the Congress prohibiting it in the Territories, or limiting it in any way was "unconstitutional." The great abolitionists, the Garrisons, the Greeleys, and Lincolns, while sorrowfully admitting that the Constitution authorized slavery in the "States" where the laws recognized the abomination, stoutly contested the theory that this provision attached to territory by mere acquisition.

The Calhoun theory of the Constitution was burned out of existence in battle flame, and in fact every recognition of human bondage was shot out of the Constitution by freedom's bullets [applause], and to my mind it is a monstrous proposition that the mighty minds who conceived the Constitution so shackled us with fetters of steel that we are absolutely compelled to force our well-housed, well-paid, well-fed beet and cane sugar workers into equal competition with those of Puerto Rico and the Philippines, clothed only with a palm-leaf hat and their modesty [laughter], who live in windowless, doorless, palm-thatched huts, bare of furniture, where all members of the family, red, white, and black—for all these colors are often found in one household—occupy the one room in common, and make it absolutely imperative that our thousands of cigar makers should place their labor on equal terms with natives who work a week for an amount they would be ashamed to drop into a contribution box on a Sunday morning, because the fortunes of war or the providence of God placed these islands under the dominion of this Government. [Applause.]

All the constitutional lawyers in this House, with all their precedents, could not make me believe the Constitution is opposed to common sense. If we must, under the Constitution, place the American workmen in equal competition with the 12,000,000 Puerto Ricans and Filipinos, then we had better pick a quarrel with some nation, permit them to lick us, and cede them these islands as indemnity; for if the Democratic construction of the Constitution is correct, we can not dispose of them any more than we could dispose of Ohio, and absolutely the only way we can get rid of them is to permit some nation to take them by force.

But this is not true, in my judgment. I believe Congress has the right to impose "the necessary rules and restrictions," to quote the Constitution, as it may deem just and proper to protect the interests of the people of the United States, as well as for the interests of the inhabitants of these Territories. And with a liberality that is always characteristic of the American Republic, a measure has been devised that does protect our citizens and raises revenue for the benefit of the inhabitants of our new possessions.

For it must be borne in mind that every dollar of this revenue is devoted to the uses and benefit of the people of the island of Puerto Rico. This revenue comes out of the pockets of those best able to bear it. Not a dollar of this money comes out of the pockets of the wage-worker. Not a person who works with his hands is or ever will be one cent poorer for its enactment, either in the United States or Puerto Rico.

I have seen something of the opposition; something of the letters and telegrams that have poured in on the members. Every one of them comes from an interest that would profit by "free trade" or some one directly representing those interests; and I am fain to believe if a profit to them resulted from this bill, they would not be so swift to discover its unconstitutionality and oppressiveness.

By reason of expansion, which has become the policy of the Republican party, markets have been opened to many manufacturers, markets that have been hitherto closed against them, and it seems to me it is but fair and just that those who are directly benefited should contribute a small per cent of their new profits for the benefit of the inhabitants of our new possessions than that all our people should be taxed for this purpose.

But my time is rapidly passing, and I will only say, in conclusion, I shall accord this measure my hearty support, because men in whom I have the utmost confidence have given their solemn assurance that it is the best measure they in their wisdom could devise, after careful, long-continued, and arduous study, to furnish funds to lift the people of Puerto Rico out of their ignorant, degraded, and desperately poverty-stricken condition in which centuries of Spanish oppression and the awful convulsions of nature have placed them. I shall support it because to my mind it offers a complete solution for future legislative problems in the Philippines, soon to rise. I shall support it because I believe that the Constitution clearly confers on the Congress the power to impose whatever revenue legislation it may deem wise and expedient on the Territories.

Mr. Chairman, I unhesitatingly proclaim to this House, the country, and my constituency that I am an expansionist. I believe that the moment a nation ceases to expand it begins to contract like a pine tree; the instant growth ceases decay begins. I believe in expansion in religion, expansion in education, expansion in liberty, expansion in trade, and expansion in territory.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. EDDY. I have a carefully prepared, beautiful, extemporaneous peroration, and I ask two minutes more time. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that his time be extended two minutes. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. EDDY. I believe, although man's short-sighted vision discerned not the motive, a higher than mere human power involved us in this war to furnish this very opportunity of expansion, that education, religion, and American liberty should follow the flag into these tropic islands, blessed with the most lavish gifts of nature, that their people might be led out of the dark night of ignorance, oppression, and barbarism in which centuries of Spanish misgovernment had engulfed them. I believe divine Providence raised these great questions to be settled at a time that the Republican party, the only party that has ever settled a national question right—during the last thirty years—was in full control of the nation to settle them.

I believe it is our duty, as Republicans, to waive our individual preferences and settle them according to the best collective judgment of the Republican party—settle them in the teeth of open threats and gloomy prognostications of rampant Democracy—settle them quickly and appeal to the great forum of the people for our vindication, and I predict that in the future, and not in the distant future either, these islands will bloom and blossom with undreamed-of prosperity. Clustered on the eastern shores of the Pacific Ocean are many millions more people than in any other part of the habitable globe, they are waiting and longing for the cotton of the South, the flour of Minnesota, and the corned beef and pork of the great food-producing area of our nation.

The Pacific Ocean is our ocean, the inheritance of the children of the West and South, and in my mind's eye I can see its placid surface dotted with countless great steamers and innumerable sailing vessels flying the starry spangled flag, vessels that have cargoed in the Pacific harbors or which have passed through the great interoceanic water highway, soon, I believe, to be constructed by American capital and under sole American control. And these mighty transports will utilize these new possessions as way stations on their journey to the far east, and then will all people realize that the men who fought in Cuba and chased Aguinaldo under the blistering sun of the Philippines builded better, far better than they knew, and their hearts will wonder how some of the statesmen of to-day could have been so shortsighted as to oppose the policy of the Republican party. [Great applause on the Republican side.]

The Puerto Rico Tariff.

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES E. LITTLEFIELD,

OF MAINE,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, February 23, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 8245) to regulate the trade of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes—

Mr. LITTLEFIELD said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN AND GENTLEMEN OF THE COMMITTEE: I believe that the pending bill is un-Republican, un-American, unwarranted, unprecedented, and unconstitutional. Inasmuch as I am in the painful position of differing with a large majority of my political brethren, and as I believe this measure is one of vast importance, of far-reaching consequence, involving results that perhaps none of us can now anticipate, I feel that I should, perhaps, render the reasons for my position. I concede, and I gladly concede, the right of leadership to the distinguished men who, by their long experience and great abilities, have the responsibility and the honor of leading the Republicans in this House. The leaders of the Republican party will find me, upon all measures that involve Republican policy, following loyally in their footsteps. When an issue, however, arises that involves, in my judgment, grave questions of right and wrong, great questions of principle, I feel, and I have

no doubt they feel, that every individual member of the Republican party must be allowed to think, speak, and act for himself.

Upon such questions I believe it to be the duty of every Republican, and every Democrat, to do the right, as God gives him to see the right. [Applause.] Profoundly impressed with this view of the case, I shall submit to the House some of the reasons why I believe the pending measure should not receive the approval of the Republican party.

THE CONDITION OF PUERTO RICO.

Before I enter at any length upon the discussion of the questions involved in this bill—and I shall discuss the bill somewhat in detail—I invite the attention of the House to the condition of the people, for whom, we are about to legislate. And I desire, without repeating it now, to incorporate in my remarks in the RECORD the magnificent, and cameo-like description, of this beautiful island given by the distinguished gentleman from New York when he made his speech on Monday last. I incorporate that in my speech because I can not improve upon it:

The island of Puerto Rico, with which the bill deals, is one of the richest islands of the West Indies, a small island, about 80 miles in length and 40 miles in width, in the form of a parallelogram, running east and west, with a mountain range running along the center, some 3,000 feet high at the summit, and cultivated from the summit clear down to the seashore, with level lands along the line of the sea at the foot of the hills averaging in width from nothing to 5 miles, on which sugar is raised, the higher lands adjoining fitted for the cultivation of tobacco and pasturage, and the higher lands of the mountains on which coffee is cultivated. It is said to be the most densely populated of any land in the whole world.

But I ask attention to a few other suggestions and considerations in relation to this island, in order that we may intelligently appreciate its condition, and situation, and that of the people living thereon.

It is inhabited by about 1,000,000 people. Seventy thousand of them are dark-skinned people; 100,000 of them are of mixed blood; 830,000 of those living upon that island are white, Caucasian people, made up of Spanish, French, Italian, Portuguese, English, American, Scotch, and Irish. Its area is about 3,650 square miles, giving, say, 273 persons to the square mile.

The intelligence of these people is not measured (as was suggested, I have no doubt, with honest intent as to accuracy) by the assumption that only 10 per cent are able to read or write. The result of the last census, taken under the authority of the United States by Colonel Dingman, who returned to this country within three weeks, shows that about 25 per cent can read and write. The island has a property valuation of one hundred and sixty to one hundred and eighty million dollars. Before our flag was raised upon its soil it was under Spanish domination. It had an autonomous local government, with universal suffrage.

The people of Puerto Rico had the same pro rata representation in the Spanish Cortes as the citizens of the Empire, in Spain itself. They had sixteen members in the lower house, and four members in the upper house. Every citizen of Peurto Rico had the same legal rights as a citizen of Spain. With reference to tariff conditions, for several years preceding the advent of Miles upon their soil, they had a 10 per cent preferential tariff between themselves and Spain. By virtue of a budget which had been adopted and accepted, and by a statute which had been enacted by the Spanish Cortes, this tariff of 10 per cent was to expire on the 1st of July, 1898, so that on, and after that date, there would have been perfect free trade between Puerto Rico, and the parent State, Spain.

The suggestions which have been made by the gentleman who immediately preceded me—the gentleman from Connecticut—in relation to the revenues collected in Puerto Rico are, I submit, somewhat misleading. I shall not undertake here, because I have not the time according to the plan which I have marked out for my address, to discuss such matters in detail. I only call attention to the operation of the tariff between Puerto Rico and Spain. The license fees that were collected, the taxes that were collected upon incomes, the internal-revenue taxes, should not properly be reckoned as any part of the taxation by way of a tariff imposed on products going from Puerto Rico to Spain, or upon the products of Spain, going into Puerto Rico.

Such a statement is an unfair presentation of the fiscal condition of this island. The gentleman from Connecticut ingeniously, and confusingly combined them all in his description of fiscal conditions on the island, when nothing but the tariff has any proper place in the consideration of the pending measure. For years, has this island been populated by this white, Caucasian population. It never has had a dollar of public indebtedness. Time, and time again, the island from its own taxation has loaned to Spain money with which to carry on its various wars; and it has loaned to Santo Domingo and Cuba money for their public purposes. When the American flag was raised over this island, it had a surplus of a million and a half dollars in its treasury.

The people who inhabit this island are a self-respecting, valorous, and heroic people.

Four times, during the eighteenth century, unaided and alone, the citizens of Puerto Rico repelled the attacks of the English navy, once under the command of Drake, and once under the command of Abercrombie, and preserved Puerto Rican soil for Puerto Rico, against the most powerful of foreign invaders, although it was then a dependency of Spain.

In 1873 there existed upon the island of Puerto Rico 39,000 slaves. In 1860 there existed in the Republic 3,000,000 slaves. The Republic freed its slaves at a cost that staggers humanity. It did not free the slaves "until all the wealth piled by the bondsman's two hundred and fifty years of unrequited toil" had been sunk and "until every drop of blood drawn by the lash had been paid by another drawn with the sword."

Puerto Rico, in 1873, manumitted its slaves without tumult, without disturbance, without convulsion, without bloodshed, without murder, without outrage, and without revolution. With the consent of the Spanish Cortes, upon motion of a representative of Puerto Rico, in one moment 39,000 persons who before that time had been held in human bondage, became freemen. One day found them slaves; the next day they continued in their employment for the same masters, but working for hire—their own masters. On one day they bent down, bondmen. The next day they stood erect, freemen. This great change was wrought as quietly, and silently, as the dawn precedes the rising of the sun. The little island of Puerto Rico paid for those slaves, by its own revenue, from its own prosperity. Seven million eight hundred thousand dollars in 1873, with a loan that required only fourteen years to pay, and, adding the interest and principal, aggregating the magnificent sum of $12,000,000—paid by whom? By the people that live to-day in Puerto Rico. For what? To emancipate 39,000 human bondmen. This nation of "illiterates," this people to whom we now propose to act the part of a "good Samaritan!" That was a deed worthy of the highest triumph of Christian civilization anywhere. [Applause.] The mechanics of Puerto Rico, consisting of masons, blacksmiths, leather workers, and silversmiths, are superior in their various branches to similar mechanics in nearly every part of the civilized world. The carpenters and cabinetmakers do not rank so high.

This is the condition of the island; this is the character of the people for whom the American Congress is about to legislate. They are an intelligent people, not barbarians, not slaves, but a free people, and I submit, as I shall submit later to the Republican party—for I do not stand here to address gentlemen upon the other side of this House—I submit, as I shall submit later to the Republican party, that they are a people who, by their history, by their character, by their intelligence, their endeavor, and inheritance, are entitled to fair treatment at the hands of the Republic, and to the maintenance of its plighted faith.

Thus stood the Pearl of the Antilles, "The Ever Faithful Isle," when, a rich and willing prize, it fell into our hands. I devote a moment to the question of raising revenue in Puerto Rico for their own purposes, and then I pass from this branch of the question, to a discussion of the provisions of this bill.

It is estimated that $3,000,000 annually is necessary for the wants of this island, one million to be devoted to public administration, one million to be devoted to schools, and one million to be devoted to public works. This is a large estimate, a liberal and a generous estimate. The amount that was used for schools in Puerto Rico last year, and the preceding years, was only $345,000; and no wise and economical administration can properly expend in Puerto Rico in the next two or three years three times the sum that is now being used, because it is a practical impossibility, under what they have there as a common-school system, to make such an expenditure economically.

It was conceded by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] in his speech yesterday, that a million and a half of dollars will be raised from the internal-revenue tax upon rum. It is also conceded that under ordinary methods of local taxation they will raise about $500,000 besides, taking the island in its present prostrated condition, in all two million of the $3,000,000 necessary to be raised.

Just a word as to their condition and situation. This estimate which I have given you of $500,000 is based upon the present condition of Puerto Rico. And what is that? As was very handsomely and accurately described by the able chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, it is one of utter and awful devastation and ruin, with the absolute prostration of every industry in the island of Puerto Rico. And it is further described by the report of Brigadier-General Davis, to which I shall call your attention, presenting a more awful picture than that suggested by the chairman of the Committee:

The coffee lands suffered worst. These trees are planted on the hill and mountain slopes, and in many places the declivities are very abrupt. The gale tore up the trees, loosened the soil, and the deluge of water converted the earth into a semifluid.

Then followed landslides, and thousands of acres of coffee plantations slid down into the valleys; trees, soil, rocks, and every vestige of culture are piled up in the bottom of the valleys. In such cases there is no restoration possible, for where there were smiling groves are now only bald rocks which were uncovered by the avalanches.

Where the soil was not disturbed the most of the coffee trees were either uprooted, broken off, or stripped of foliage and the immature berries. The

larger trees of other varieties, which are habitually grown for shade to the coffee, were blown down, and their protection to the coffee trees is also gone; so where the trees are not wholly denuded the protection of the berries from the sun's heat is absent, and the green fruit is blighted and spoiled.

It will take five years to reestablish these coffee vegas, and there will be necessarily years of want and industrial paralysis.

The sugar industry has suffered much less than the others. Some cane has been uprooted and some has been buried, and many mills have been damaged or destroyed. The margin of profit at present prices to the sugar grower is small, but there is a margin of probably a half cent per pound to the manufacturer who has modern machinery; but the old "Jamaica train" mills, which are badly damaged, will probably never be reconstructed, and the growing cane for next year can not be ground on such estates unless their owners can negotiate large loans. Many will be unable to do this, so the prediction seems justified that much growing cane will next year be left to rot in the fields.

The municipal governments are many of them prostrate; the police can not be paid, the prisoners can not be fed, and the schools must be closed if not wholly supported from the insular treasury.

From every town and village I am appealed to for financial help, donations; loans are asked, implored even, and the alternative of chaos is predicted as the result of refusal. Proprietors beg for financial help and the homeless for rehabilitation of their dwellings. * * *

I can think of but two measures of relief. Neither alone will fully realize that result, and with a combination of the two the recovery will not be immediate. Unless something is done by the invocation of powers beyond my control, I fear that the conditions prevailing will go from what is now extremely bad to a still worse condition, even to the assumption in certain localities of military government, pure and simple, with hordes of people dependent for their existence on the bounty of the Government of the United States and its people.

I have abstained from any expression of opinion upon this matter until I could have time to investigate the real state of affairs in which the island was left by the calamity, the like of which the people of the United States fortunately have and can have no conception.

It is with hesitancy that I propose measures of relief that have been hitherto unknown, but our country has by assumption of sovereignty over foreign lands and people incurred responsibilities which can not be evaded. By the treaty of Paris nearly 1,000,000 inhabitants of Puerto Rico have been *brought under the laws of the Union*. They are unused to American laws and customs, and have had in the past no power of initiation. They were taught and forced to rely upon the Government in any and every important undertaking or proposition. They have been thoroughly taught to obey, but know little of self-reliance. Is it surprising that the obliteration of one-third of the wealth of the island, other than the soil itself, has been followed with industrial paralysis? So I have to hear the appeals—most piteous appeals—for help from almost every hamlet. They see no way to turn but to the way they have always turned—i. e., to the Government, and as its representative here I must hear and dispose of those appeals.

Many millions of money, as loans, have been asked by municipalities and individuals. *I can only give food for the hungry. Should the supply fail, there would be a famine such as in the past has swept over and depopulated large districts in India and China.*

The estimate is, that even in that condition, with agriculture paralyzed, the amount which I have stated can be raised. And I should say here, perhaps, for the information of gentlemen that while this island is fertile, and its soil only needs to be tickled with a hoe to laugh with a harvest that its fields when once allowed to pass out from under cultivation, go back in less than a year's time into a state of natural wildness, so that they have to be reclaimed again, before any profit can be made from them in agriculture. A large portion of the island is in that condition to-day. Yet, in that condition, it is conceded that by the ordinary methods of taxation this amount can be raised. The ordinary method of taxation there is simply this: It is in the nature of an income tax—a percentage on the income of the planter of sugar, tobacco, or coffee, or the man who is engaged in business, professional or otherwise—a reasonably fair method of taxation.

It is estimated by men capable of judging upon this question that when this island once gets back to its pristine condition (which will, perhaps, require two years' time), with the improved conditions of agriculture and methods of manufacture, that it is expected will be carried into this island by American industry, energy, enterprise, and intelligence, that the tax, upon the same basis, would aggregate from five to ten million dollars. This island, this Pearl of the Antilles, is no pauper or mendicant, standing begging at the doors of the American Congress for alms, or for the work of a "good Samaritan." All that the island of Puerto Rico asks, is to have the American Congress give it a stable government, an opportunity to take care of itself, and then take off its hands and let it take care of itself, a thing which it can well do. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I now call your attention to the recommendations of General Davis as to what is proper to be done toward Puerto Rico, and I beg the attention of the House to the fact that this report which I hold in my hand was written on the 5th day of September, 1899. After describing these lamentable conditions, he suggests the proper remedy. Brigadier-General Davis has been the representative of the United States Government in Puerto Rico for the last two years. He is a man of great intelligence, capacity and ability. He has made a report to the United States Government, giving us the benefit of his information, and states what he thinks the remedy should be.

I will read it. I do not understand—and if I am mistaken I will thank any gentleman to correct me as I proceed—I do not understand that Brigadier-General Davis at any time, in any place, has ever undertaken to make a statement that contradicts this recommendation of his. I read from page 7:

> The measures of relief I have had suggested to me, and which I deem of sufficient importance to submit to the Government at Washington, are "*The removal of all duties on trade between the United States and this island.*"

That is his first recommendation. His second is:

> The authorization by the Washington Government for the issue by the insular authorities of interest-bearing notes in small denominations to the amount of $10,000,000, the notes representing money to be loaned solely on landed security to the extent of 30 or 40 per cent of the value of the same, and no note to be issued save when a first mortgage on the land is behind it.

Right here, for a moment, let me call your attention to a practical condition that has existed in Puerto Rico for the last fifteen or twenty years, and under which Puerto Rico has not only paid its own bills, but had a surplus of a million and a half dollars in its treasury, besides manumitting its slaves at a public charge of $12,000,000. That condition is this: The method seems to have been, for traders and money lenders to assist in its agriculture in this way: A man who had a store in a given locality, near where there were plantations, would loan to a planter, say, the sum of $5,000. He would charge him anywhere from 12 to 25 per cent interest. When the loan was made, the money remained in the hands of the trader, or lender, and the planter drew it as fast as he wanted it, but he paid interest on the whole of it. When his crop was taken from the ground, he carried it to the trader, the trader sold it, received a commission upon it, in addition to the charge of 12 to 25 per cent interest, and then the trader sold to the planter his goods, and made a profit on them besides.

Under these conditions, with that management, this island has been able to take care of itself. It is proposed by the people of Puerto Rico, to eliminate the money lender at the rate of 12 to 25 per cent, and loan to the agriculturist at the rate of 5 to 6 per cent, and what then, under such circumstances, would be the prosperity of this thrifty people? They are entitled to the appellation of magnificent people, by virtue of their history, by virtue of their inheritance from the various Caucasian races which they represent, and from the standpoint of aspiration for liberty and freedom.

With this change in condition that it is hoped may ensue, what will be its possibilities? General Davis says:

> But it matters very little what method be adopted for raising the money, so it be raised and soon available. Unless financial help be given to Puerto Rico very soon, the present temporary difficulties will, I fear, become *permanent, involving the loss of a business worth six or seven million dollars, which surely is worth an effort to preserve.*

Gentlemen express a good deal of horror at the idea that Puerto Rico should want to negotiate a loan. They do not want this dependency to enter upon its new life with a debt upon its back. The people of Puerto Rico are mainly interested in that proposition, unless the United States Government is asked in some way to guarantee this loan. They have not been asked to do so. It never has been suggested. On the contrary what does Brigadier-General Davis say—

> I do not recommend the guaranty by the United States of a loan for this island. It does not require it. For nearly 4,000 square miles of rich soil, inhabited by a million of people—

And the kind of people which I have described—

> who have had an exterior trade averaging over $18,000,000 do not need a guaranty. I am assured by financiers that investors would immediately subscribe for this loan at a low interest the moment it was sanctioned by the United States.

That is all these people ask—an opportunity to do business in their own way, and practically to anticipate the collection of taxes by a temporary loan. There is hardly a municipality under what we have been in the habit of referring to as the American flag, and in this great Republic, that does not anticipate by temporary loan the collection of its taxes. In one or two years' time, under these circumstances, with its inexhaustible agricultural resources, this island of Puerto Rico will be able to take care of itself and extinguish the loan. A people who will pay by their own taxation $12,000,000 to free 39,000 slaves may be trusted by the American Republic to hire two, three, or four million dollars, if necessary, to pay their running expenses for a year or two of time.

Mr. LACEY. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Yes, sir.

Mr. LACEY. I will ask the gentleman if he thinks we are confronted with the alternative of allowing the island to go heavily in debt by the issue of bonds or pass this bill?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. On the proposition of going heavily in debt, does the gentleman think that two or three million dollars on an island worth $160,000,000 to $180,000,000 would be "heavily in debt?"

Mr. LACEY. I should call that a heavy debt. My own State forbids a debt except as to a limited amount, and it is absolutely out of debt.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. My State forbids debt in excess of 5 per cent of valuation, and 5 per cent of this valuation would be $8,000,000 to $9,000,000.

Mr. TAWNEY. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I will.

Mr. TAWNEY. Are you aware that when General Davis was before the Committee on Insular Affairs he stated that the loan ought to equal at least $10,000,000?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I have it right here in his report. I have the facts and figures, and I have given them. Three million dollars is all that they need by the wildest estimate. They have a revenue, as estimated by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] yesterday of $1,500,000 on rum—and personally I have no objection to a tax on rum, because I have no use for rum [laughter and applause]—and $500,000 that can be raised by the present rate of taxation, and that is $2,000,000, so that it only needs another million. What are they going to do with this $10,000,000? What necessity is there for it? Again, if the facts and figures are correct, $2,000,000 is to be raised on your own figures, and it only leaves one million to be raised.

Now he wants ten millions. Three or four millions would be ample, in my judgment. I am willing, for one, to leave the amount of the loan in the hands of the people who propose hereafter to pay it, and whose history demonstrates that it can be left in their hands without danger as to their ability to pay it; because, I assert, it does not lie in the mouth of anyone standing upon this floor, or anywhere else, to say that this fruitful island, this Pearl of the Antilles, that has paid $12,000,000 under the circumstances to which I have called your attention, can not pay $10,000,000 when it is operated with free labor, and with equal opportunity for their products in our market, the domestic market, the home market.

These are all the suggestions I care to make in relation to the character of the island of Puerto Rico.

THE OCCASION FOR THE BILL.

This bill comes here against the recommendation of Brigadier-General Davis, against the protest of the delegates from Puerto Rico, against the recommendation of Elihu Root, the distinguished and able Republican Secretary of War, and against the recommendation of William McKinley, the President of the United States [loud applause on the Democratic side], and against the original recommendation of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. [Renewed applause on the Democratic side.]

I submit that there has not yet been rendered, by any man on the Committee on Ways and Means, or any other man, a sufficient reason why the Committee on Ways and Means has changed its front upon this proposition. I think I know. I shall not suggest it, but no sufficient reason has been suggested. What has been suggested? That the tobacco and sugar of Puerto Rico does not interfere with any American industry now, and therefore we do not need it for the present protection of American industry. The chairman of the committee said that he discovered that the original bill would raise no revenue. It would seem that he might have learned when he drew the bill that it would produce no revenue, as it did not provide for any revenue and was not intended to produce revenue. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

The bill is grossly inadequate for the purpose claimed, even from the standpoint of revenue. What Puerto Rico needs is help, and help *now*. "Unless financial help be given Puerto Rico very soon the present temporary difficulties will, I fear, become permanent, involving the loss of a business worth six or seven millions, which surely is worth an effort to preserve." This was stated December 15, 1899. It is now February 23, 1900. The tariff features of this bill do not provide a dollar for immediate use. The estimated $2,000,000 to be raised under this bill will be spread over a whole year, and meanwhile the six or seven millions of business will have been lost.

The gentleman from Connecticut says it does not interfere with domestic tobacco. It might be interesting to know why they have changed front upon this great question, that is about to put the Republican party in the position to which I have called your attention, before the people of this country, upon the threshold of a great national campaign, which will determine whether the Government of this country is to rest, either in the hands of the Republican party, or of gentlemen upon the other side of the House. I yield to no man in the Republican party, upon this floor, or to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, much as I reverence and respect him, and as high an admiration as I have for his great ability—I yield to no man in my devotion to the Republican party, and my desire for its success in the coming campaign. This it is that leads me to suggest that it is better to have the fullest consideration here, of this question, rather than to inject it inconsiderately into the coming campaign, as later upon the stump it may be difficult to satisfactorily explain our position, to the enlightened, fair-minded intelligence of the American people.

We had better listen, and think now, than to listen later. A word here as to the assertion of the President of the United States as to "the plain duty" of the Republican party and of the American Congress. It is as much the duty of the Democrats as the Republicans, because later, when I reach that stage in this discussion, I shall base it upon the broad proposition that, to my mind, appeals to every patriot, and every man who believes in the good faith of the Republic, its honor, and its integrity. Every Democrat who sits on this floor is interested in that proposition as well as my Republican friends, with whom I just now can not act upon this bill.

As to the suggestion of the gentleman from Ohio that there had been a change in conditions I would like any gentleman here, to suggest what change there has been. He suggested—and I want to call your attention to this particularly—he suggested that there had been a change in conditions. The report of General Davis was made September 5, 1899. In the middle of the preceding August that awful tornado, that terrific cyclone, swept over this fateful island and carried these coffee plantations from the mountain sides, an indistinguishable mass of ruin, into the valleys below. That awful ruin had visited the Pearl of the Antilles, before this report was made by General Davis to the President of the United States. No calamity has visited the island since. No calamity is now impending over it, except what may be involved in this measure now pending. [Applause.]

There has been no change in conditions, there has been nothing that can be suggested. When William McKinley—and, by the way, I shall spend no time in this discussion in referring to Andrew Jackson, or Thomas Jefferson, or Tom Benton, or any of that great galaxy of men—for me it is sufficient if William McKinley, the honored President of this Republic, the distinguished representative of the Republican party, who is enthroned in the hearts and affections of all our people, will follow in the footsteps of Washington and Lincoln. [Applause.] A great many things have been done by the other distinguished gentlemen, that I would not like to have any Republican President undertake to do, or even think of.

What does President McKinley say? He said when he sent his message to the House—and I have received no communication from the President of the United States since—mark that—he communicated to me through the Constitutional channel; I say since then, neither directly nor indirectly, have I received any communication from the President of the United States that would tend to indicate that when he said—not that it was his opinion, not that he thought, not that he would advise or suggest, but that it was "*the plain duty*"—stop and listen to that a minute—"*the plain duty*" of the Republican Congress to give free trade between Puerto Rico and the United States, he did not mean it. That is an assertion of fact. It was either true or false.

If conditions have changed, let some gentleman suggest it while I am speaking. If there has been any change of conditions that could be mentioned by any gentleman, since the President of the United States said it was our "*plain duty*," let him assert it now. That statement was either true or false when he made it, and if it was true or false when he made it, it is true or false now. I believe it was absolutely true.

I say to my friends that I am not ready, upon the question of policy even, to cast a vote in this House against what the President of the United States has truthfully said was my "*plain duty*." I stand upon that proposition. I stand by the President of the United States, and a little later I will call your attention to some significant reasons why.

EXPORT DUTY ON ARTICLES EXPORTED FROM A STATE.

What is this bill? I take it in detail. The second provision in it, imposes what they call an import duty on the manufactures and products of the United States "coming into Puerto Rico." The bill imposes a duty on all goods "coming from Puerto Rico" into the United States and on goods "coming into Puerto Rico" from the United States. "Coming" both ways. I suppose the language of the bill is so couched, in a futile effort to get rid of a provision of the Constitution which provides that "no tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any State." (Constitution, Article I, section 9, paragraph 5.) I submitted to two members of the Ways and Means Committee the question, as to whether they could give me any legal distinction between these propositions: First, a vessel is loaded with lumber, say in Portland, and starts for Puerto Rico. Under this bill we will assume the tariff to be $1,000.

Under this bill they collect the duty when she arrives, and who collects it? The United States Government. Into whose pocket does it go? Into the United States Government's. Second, what legal distinction is there between collecting the duty when she clears from Portland for Puerto Rico, before she leaves the State, or collecting it afterwards in Puerto Rico? The same hand collects it either in Portland, or in San Juan. It goes into the same pocket in either case, into the same Treasury, and is to be disbursed, under the provisions of this bill, without any appropriation from the public Treasury, which the Constitution provides. But I do not suppose the Constitution is anything between friends. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

I suggested that question to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and asked him if the tax was collected in the city of Portland on the products of the United States going into Puerto Rico, whether it would not be a tax on "articles exported

from any State," and he could not tell me. I asked him what the legal distinction was, when the same duty, on the same cargo, was collected by the same hand, for the same Treasury, in Puerto Rico. He could not tell me what the distinction was, or whether there was any. I heard his speech after I had put the question to him; he occupied an hour and a half about other things, and he did not tell me then. I put the same question to another member of the Ways and Means Committee, who gave me no answer. He has not yet made a speech. I suppose when he gets around to it, he may answer it. But I have not had the pleasure of hearing that question answered, much as I have desired to have it answered in order to bring me to the support of this branch of the measure, by reason of its harmony with the Constitution. I sought from two members of the Ways and Means Committee an answer to this question, more than four days ago—yes, last week. It is not answered yet.

What did they do? I imagine they suggested the question to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY], the chairman of the Judiciary Committee—a man of eminence, ability, and character, a man whose suggestion ought to have weight with this House, and does. How did he answer it? I did not hear his speech, but I have read a part of it in the RECORD. He states that he spent a whole day looking up the lexicographers and dictionaries, for the purpose of finding a definition of "export." I have an idea that the gentleman rather looked for a definition that would help his case; because, being on that committee, I know that if he had whirled round in his revolving chair in that committee room, and reached his hand out to the revolving bookcase, he could have put it upon Bouvier's Law Dictionary, where he would have found in one minute's time a very good definition. After his exhaustive research he discovered that "export" meant the exporting of goods "to a foreign country;" but Bouvier would have shown him this:

Export: The act of sending goods and merchandise from one country to another.

Now, in the name of all the gods at once, is it possible that by virtue of a treaty, or by virtue of conquest, we have eliminated Puerto Rico from the map of the earth and it is no longer even a "country?" [Laughter.]

Let me read another definition. I think the gentleman ought not to have spent so much time on this question. "Much study is a weariness of the flesh." [Laughter.] The gentleman referred to the Standard Dictionary, which is not yet old enough in its present form to have been cited by the courts as an authority.

I understand the gentleman from New York to admit that if "export" as used in the Constitution does not mean going into a "foreign country," then the act is unconstitutional as providing for an export duty. I am not going to weary myself very much on this point as it is not the important feature. I am simply suggesting this as one of the inconsistencies of the bill.

I read the definition as given in the American and English Encyclopedia of Law:

To export an article of commerce is to carry such article out of a country or place.

When an article passes from the United States to Puerto Rico does it, or does it not, go out of "a country or place?" It seems to me it does; and it seems to me that when it goes out of the country, then, according to this legal authority—I do not refer to the literary authority quoted by the gentleman, but according to this legal authority—it becomes an export, and does not necessarily involve the idea of going to a "foreign country."

Let us turn to the Century Dictionary, which has been quoted quite frequently by the courts. Its definition is:

Export: That which is exported; a commodity carried from one place or country to another, for sale; generally in the plural.

That unfortunate island is, it seems, for some purposes foreign, and for other purposes domestic, corresponding with the condition of certain gentlemen in this House some years ago who undertook to be present and absent at one and the same time, according as one or another purpose was to be accomplished. In order to sustain the validity of the tariff upon goods coming into the United States from Puerto Rico, Puerto Rico is held to be a foreign country. In order to sustain the validity of the tariff upon goods exported from the United States to Puerto Rico, under this discovery of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Puerto Rico is a domestic country. I think I understand the argument, but I do not feel impressed or oppressed with its weight.

The gentleman from New York, who made his speech under some degree of excitement, said that he would like to look in the face of any lawyer who would undertake to dissent from some of the propositions which he laid down. I do not see the gentleman in his seat, but if he wants to see me he can look into my face, for I have never turned my back on any man. [Applause.] That is one of the things I do not do.

One of his propositions, as I understand, is that because the Constitution says that under some circumstances a State can lay an export duty, with the consent of Congress, and because Congress has the powers of the General Government and the States (which they have discovered in connection with some of these cases which they undertake to discuss), therefore—what?

Under the Constitution, Congress can suspend the operation of that clause of the Constitution which provides that no export duty shall be imposed on articles sent out of a State; that is, the State could act with the consent of the Congress; but as it has been held in general terms, in discussing a clause of the Constitution that has no connection whatever with this, that Congress has the powers of the State as to a possession, it can give its consent, and then act for the State, and when it acts for the State it is supposed to give its own consent, and hence you have the absolute repeal, by the mere operation of logic, of an express prohibition of the Constitution. I think this proposition may be fairly designated as metaphysical, and while it is as well founded undoubtedly as many of the propositions upon which the Committee rely, little is hazarded when it is asserted that if the court ever sustain this clause of the bill it will not be upon this attenuated ground.

I have another objection to this branch of the bill. I submit that it is un-Republican. When—and I asked this question of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, and if I misrepresent or misquote him I will thank him to correct me at once—I asked the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means when in the history of the Republican party, that party ever voted to impose a tariff upon American capital and American labor? Ever before? He did not answer. He did not answer in his speech. Will any man on this floor answer? Where is the warrant in the history, or the platforms, of the Republican party, the party of protection to what? To American labor and American capital, against foreign labor and foreign capital. Where is the warrant in the platforms of the Republican party, or in the history of the Republican party, or in the assertion of any man who undertook to belong to the Republican party, for imposing a tariff upon American labor and American capital?

The necessaries of life—flour, rice, codfish, pork, bacon, corn meal, fresh beef, and mutton—to-day go into Puerto Rico free. Bags for sugar, shooks, rough lumber, agricultural implements, machinery, trees, shrubs, seeds, and school furniture are all free under an Executive order. They have been going in free since October 21, 1899. This bill makes them all subject to 25 per cent of the Dingley tariff.

The people of Puerto Rico, partly as the result of our disturbance of their affairs, are starving. They have scarcely anything with which to buy food, if the food was there. In the exercise of our enlightened philanthropy, and from a desire to play the part of the "good Samaritan," our first act is to increase the cost to them of the necessaries of life by a tariff, and to that extent place it beyond their power to sustain life. An allopathic dose of that brand of philanthropy would tend to depopulate the island.

Let me illustrate this for just a moment. Let us see where we are. Let us understand what we have got to meet in the coming campaign. The tariff upon coarse lumber coming from any foreign country into any part of the United States, and into Puerto Rico—because that is enough a part of the United States to have the tariff apply—is $2 a thousand. What does this bill do? Our lumbermen have the protection of $2 a thousand, as against the Canadian lumberman, and I see a man sitting in this Hall who lives within a mile of the territory over which floats the Cross of St. George. To discriminate against its industries the Dingley bill, the work of my distinguished and lamented predecessor, with the cooperation of the great men in this House, was passed. That gave to the lumber industry a protection of $2 on a thousand. What does this bill do? It takes off 25 per cent of it and leaves it with a protection of $1.50 on a thousand. On codfish it is precisely the same in proportion.

I only use this as an illustration. Where is the warrant in Republican history, where is the warrant in a Republican platform, for discriminating against these industries and these products that happen to be exported to Puerto Rico by the amount of 25 per cent of the Dingley tariff, and putting no duties whatever upon other products or manufactures going to other countries or other places in this country? Where is that proposition? I submit it as a Republican proposition. I make no complaint for this reason, but it illustrates the operation of the bill.

DUTY ON IMPORTS FROM PUERTO RICO.

I now take the provision in this bill in which the great fundamental proposition is involved. The amount at stake I shall not take time to discuss. I do not undertake to weigh in the scales of an apothecary the integrity of the Republic or human rights of people anywhere. If they are infringed so far as I am concerned, by so much as a hair, I will not approve or adopt the proposition.

This provision does what? It imposes a tariff of one-quarter of the Dingley tariff upon the products of Puerto Rico coming into the United States, and upon what products? Upon sugar and upon tobacco. There is none upon coffee. The value of the coffee produced before this awful cyclone struck this devoted

island was $4,200,000 a year. The value of the sugar was $2,700,000 a year. The value of the tobacco was $300,000 a year. This imposes a tax for the revenue of Puerto Rico upon two industries, sugar and tobacco, and leaves coffee entirely free, and coffee represents as much as both of them—yes, more than both of them put together. And so far as this tax is concerned, conceived in the "good Samaritan" habit, in the "good Samaritan" theory, of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RUSSELL], out of great philanthropy and benevolence—this philanthropy that takes out of a man's pocket with the right hand, and shifts it over to the left hand, and carries it back to his left-hand pocket, less expense of collection—magnificent philanthropy and benevolence, without a copper's expense to the magnificent people who exercise the philanthropy and benevolence!—upon whom does it rest? It rests solely upon the producers of sugar and tobacco. Of course there are other industries, but these are the principal ones. It leaves the producers of sugar and tobacco paying all that tax, the coffee planters and all other property and business paying none of it. That is the practical proposition. Why is this suggested here now? What is its purpose? What is its object? It is said that it is not to protect any American industry; it is said that it does not bear grievously upon Puerto Rico; but what else is said? It is said that we are here and now—and that is the great objection which I have to this bill—it is said that we are, here and now, as the representatives of the Republican party, to announce to the world our policy in connection with Puerto Rico and the Philippine Archipelago.

And what is that policy? That policy is to protect the industries of the United States, against the industries of Puerto Rico and the Philippine Archipelago. That means what? That we are going to develop those territories? That we are going to give them an opportunity to blossom like the rose? It means this, and you may as well meet it here, as meet it hereafter: It means that when they can raise sugar in Puerto Rico, that does not interfere with us, they can raise it and send it here. It means that when they raise it, so that it does interfere with us, we will put our foot upon their necks, with a tariff, and stop it from coming here in competition with our sugar. It means that anywhere and everywhere, in Puerto Rico or the Philippine Archipelago, any industry or any occupation, however much it may be developed under the flag, with our energy, and our enterprise, and our industry, the moment it comes into competition with anything raised or manufactured in the Republic, meaning the forty-five States, according to the new theory of sublimated selfishness, just that moment, the Republic will put its hand upon it and keep it down, so that it will not compete. How much will you develop Puerto Rico and the Philippine Archipelago on that policy?

I say here frankly, I say here coolly, and I am not excited about this, that I do not believe that proposition will appeal to the good sense, the fair mind, honest judgment, of the people who have been in the habit of voting loyally the Republican ticket. I care nothing about the other side. So far as we are concerned, I do not believe it will appeal to them. That is the proposition—that Puerto Rico and the Philippine Archipelago are an orange for us to squeeze. The 12,000,000 subject people in these islands are simply, under this proposition, "hewers of wood and drawers of water" for 75,000,000 free people. How much American capital will go into Puerto Rico or into the Philippine Archipelago, if this proposition is to be sustained, when they know that any development they may make there is subject to the repressing hand of an American Congress? They are our own people in more senses than one, according to the theory of those who propose this bill—peculiarly our own, because they are a good deal more our own, if they have no constitutional rights, than they would be if they came in as a part of this body politic, with the political rights of American citizens, so that they could protect their own interests.

This is from the standpoint of policy and fair dealing.

BREACH OF GOOD FAITH.

The breach of good faith is another reason why I am opposed to this measure.

In 1898 the army of the United States, in a war declared in the interest of humanity, and upon the proposition that the old flag would carry with it liberty and freedom and equal opportunity and all the blessings of a Christian civilization, went where? It went to the island of Puerto Rico, and Major-General Miles held the standard. I will read to the House, the proclamation with which General Miles signalized his advent upon Puerto Rican soil. It is dated Ponce, Puerto Rico, July 28, 1898.

In it he said, among other things, referring to the soldiers of the Union:

> They come bearing the banner of freedom, inspired by a noble purpose, to seek the enemies of our country and yours, and to destroy or capture all who are in armed resistance. They bring you the fostering arm of a nation of free people, *whose greatest power is in its justice and humanity to all those living within its fold.*

This is not the conversation of any Secretary of War itinerating over this magnificent island. He said further:

> We have not come to make war upon the people of a country that for centuries has been oppressed, but, on the contrary, to bring you protection, not only to yourselves but to your property, to promote your prosperity—

And now mark the language—

> *and to bestow upon you the immunities and blessings of the* liberal institutions of our Government.

Now, if the gentlemen of the Ways and Means Committee, instead of spending so much time in trying to ascertain that the United States meant the United States, and that a State meant a State, and that forty-five States constitute the United States, and that the United States, meaning forty-five States, is described by the boundary line of the forty-five States—if they had taken their dictionaries and looked just for a moment at Webster, for his definition of immunity, they would have ascertained what the promise was that General Miles made to this devoted people. What does "immunity" mean?

> Freedom or exemption from any charge—

And it did not take me a day to hunt this up—

> Freedom or exemption from any charge, duty, obligation, office, tax, imposition, penalty, or service.

Was there any tax, in the nature of a tariff, in any part of the Republic, between the States and the Territories, when General Miles made that promise to these people? The word "immunity" in his proclamation could have referred to nothing by any decent construction of the English language except what? Immunity from charges, taxes, and service. The same immunity that the citizens of the United States enjoyed, and in no State or Territory was there then, nor will there ever be, any duty or tax upon exports and imports between States or Territories, or States and Territories. That is one of "the immunities and blessings of the liberal institutions of our Government." Relying upon this proclamation these people did what?

"AND THE COMMON PEOPLE HEARD HIM GLADLY."

They prostrated themselves before him; they covered him with wreaths and garlands of flowers; they kissed the flag that was carried there under that promise [applause], and the delegates from Puerto Rico stand here, asking the Republican party to make good the promise made by General Miles for the Republic, when they eagerly delivered "The Ever-Faithful Isle" into his all-conquering hands. Miles, the magnificent representative of our institutions, the typical American citizen, who won his way by sheer force of merit, ability, and valor, from the position of a common soldier, step by step, to the position of leader of the Armies of the Republic. [Renewed applause.]

I never will vote to violate the promise he made or to repudiate the pledge. The Republican party can not afford, in this or any other campaign, to violate that sacred promise. It is written in the blood of our heroes that fought at El Caney, San Juan and Santiago. It was made in the presence of all Christendom, and it is sealed by the God of battles. [Loud applause.] The Republic can not violate that promise made to this weak and helpless people, without sullying its honor and tarnishing its fame. [Renewed applause.] It is not written in the history of the Republican party that at any time, or anywhere, from the hour of its birth agony, when it sprang into existence, full planoplied as the unconquerable champion of liberty and freedom, under the valiant leadership of the great Pathfinder, it ever violated its plighted faith, or swerved from the path of rectitude and honor.

These are the characteristics which led one of the greatest purists known to our political history to declare:

> I shall not repeat to you the splendid story of the Republican party. It is a story that we never tire of telling and that our children will never tire of hearing, a story which is written in the hearts of all American citizens, because it recounts greater service for liberty, for the country, for mankind, than those of any party, in any other nation, and at any other period of time.
>
> What is the secret of this unparalleled history? It is because the Republican party has always been the party of the best instincts, of the highest desires of the American people. This is its special glory. It has always represented the American instinct of nationality, American patriotism, and a Christian devotion to freedom.

The Republican party can ill afford, upon the threshold of a national election, to enter the campaign violating its faith with Puerto Rico. [Loud applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be allowed to conclude his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine be allowed to conclude his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I thank the committee for their consideration. It is suggested by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LONG], and well suggested, in a speech which it was not my pleasure to hear, but which undoubtedly has increased his reputation and demonstrates his ability, that the treaty contains a provision that Spain can have the same tariff with these possessions that we give to them, and if we give the open door to Puerto Rico we give the open door to Spain. We do it unless—what? Unless we violate the agreement we made with Spain; and it is entirely competent, if the Republic sees fit to do so, to violate that agreement.

But here stand two agreements—one made with Spain, and one

made with the prostrate, helpless, long-suffering, starving Puerto Rico. Which shall be violated? If I had my choice, and were I compelled to determine between them, I would violate our faith with a power which, until we brushed it off the earth as a military and naval power during the last two years, had some ability to protect and defend itself. I would not go before the civilized world upon the proposition that we would break faith with the downtrodden and the oppressed. I would go further than that. I would not break faith with either. I stand behind the eminent gentlemen who negotiated that treaty. I believe they acted in the interest of the Republic, and as faithful representatives of the American people. We can not repudiate the promise made by General Miles on the shores of Puerto Rico. I believe the Republic can afford to keep all of its promises, no matter what the consequences be. It should not violate or repudiate either.

I read now a speech made by General Henry to the alcalde and citizens of Puerto Rico at the close of hostilities and the celebration of peace in Puerto Rico:

ALCALDE AND CITIZENS: To-day the flag of the United States floats as an emblem of undisputed authority over the island of Puerto Rico, *giving promise of protection to life, of liberty, prosperity*, and the right to worship God in accordance with the dictates of conscience. The forty-five States represented by the stars emblazoned on the blue field of that flag unite in *vouchsafing* to you prosperity and *protection as citizens* of the American Union. * * * I congratulate you all on beginning your public life under new auspices, free from governmental oppression, *and with liberty to advance your own country's interests by your united efforts.*

Now they are learning that "protection as citizens of the American Union" was "a delusion and a snare;" that they are not "citizens of the American Union," and it was never intended that they should be; that the "protection" referred to was the protection of the citizens of the United States, in "the American Union," against the people of Puerto Rico. This is reading between the lines with a vengeance. The alcalde, in his innocence and simplicity, replied, in part:

* * * Puerto Rico has not accepted American domination on account of force. She has suffered for many years the evils of error, neglect, and persecution, but she had men who studied the question of government, *and who saw in America her redemption and a guaranty of life, liberty, and justice. There we came willingly and freely, hoping, hand and hand with the greatest of all republics, to advance in civilization and progress, and to become part of the Republic*, to which we pledge our faith forever.

I can not dwell longer upon this painful proposition. I must call your attention to what Secretary Elihu Root, the great lawyer, the honest man, the representative Republican, upon these facts said. He says:

But the highest considerations of justice and good faith demand that we should not disappoint the confident expectation of sharing in our prosperity with which the people of Puerto Rico so gladly transferred their allegiance to the United States, and that we should treat the interests of this people as our own, and I wish most strongly to urge that the customs duties between Puerto Rico and the United States be removed.

Here you have the solemn promise made by General Miles when he conquered these islands, the promise relied upon by them, its construction by Mr. Root, Secretary of War, and the statement of that eminent Republican, that true patriot, William McKinley, when he said it is our "plain duty" to give these people free trade; and yet it is proposed that we shall act contrary to the advice of Davis, contrary to the advice of the delegates, contrary to the advice of Root, contrary to the advice of the President of the United States, in violation of our faith, and that by gentlemen who undertake to know more here than the men know there, about their condition and what ought in justice to be done.

There are two sides to this as a political proposition. I do not want to defend upon the stump—I hope there will be no occasion to do so—I do not want to defend upon the stump the proposition that the Republican party with its eyes open, with its attention called to the fact, persisted in violating the good faith of the Republic. Why, gentlemen here say that we are about to inaugurate a policy of colonial government. I want to ask the gentlemen in this House if they desire to signalize their entry upon a colonial government, in their very first act, by a breach of good faith. Do you remember the history of proud Spain? What is it? What is it that has characterized Spain ever since the sixteenth century, ever since Pizzarro rode ruthless and roughshod over Mexico, and the Duke of Alva filled the Netherlands with carnage, blood, butcheries, and indescribable horrors, in his infamous attempt to crush out the very beginning of civil and religious liberty? What is it that has characterized her and made her contemptible before every honorable nation upon the earth? It is her duplicity and her breaches of good faith.

Will the Republican party, in the teeth of the declaration of the Secretary of War and the President of the United States, signalize its embarkation upon that policy with its first act a breach of good faith? That policy upon the part of Spain, has made her for all time a "hissing and a by-word" and a reproach to all Christian peoples. I stand here, if I stand alone, as a member of the Republican party, the party that I love, the party that has done so much for the liberty and welfare and prosperity and development of the Republic, to enter my solemn protest against such an act.

Even under the guise of "good Samaritanism," even under the guise of "philanthropy" or any guise or subterfuge of any sort, I can not and will not agree to it. I leave that for my friends to discuss and reflect upon. It is hardly worth while for a man who sits in the House, and happens to hear coming from persons, unduly and unnecessarily alarmed, a demand for this legislation, to shut his eyes and think that these things do not exist because he does not then see them. They are here; they will be with us; they will be like the Old Man of the Sea; they will cling to our backs throughout the next campaign and, I fear, through many others.

Puerto Rico kneels to-day, weak, helpless, starving, with her hands held toward us in supplication. She pleads for the fulfillment of this promise. Her prayers may fall upon deaf ears, that will not hear in this House, but there is one tribunal to which I fully believe they may confidently appeal—the enlightened, unselfish, Christian conscience of a great and free people.

LEGAL PHASES OF THE QUESTION.

I have a few suggestions to offer upon the legal propositions involved, and I shall go over them as rapidly as I may. What is the proposition of the Ways and Means Committee? It is:

In case of territory acquired with no limitations upon the power of Congress, its power is absolute and conclusive except in so far as it is limited by the thirteenth amendment of the Constitution, which prohibits the existence of slavery in any place over which the United States has jurisdiction.

In other words no single provision of the Constitution besides this relating to slavery, according to the Ways and Means Committee, applies outside of the limits of the forty-five States of the Union. No other provision of the Constitution controls our action in connection with territory or property. They assert in effect that it is necessary to establish this proposition in order to sustain the bill.

I do not propose to discuss this question exhaustively from a constitutional standpoint. I concede that my opportunities for investigation and examination have not been such as to enable me to so speak. Such a discussion would require the fullest deliberation, the maturest consideration, and the most exhaustive investigation. I shall only discuss the proposition relied upon by the committee.

Let me say at the outset, that so far as I am concerned in discussing this proposition, wherever there is a doubt, I shall resolve it in favor of, and not against, human rights. I think the Republican party will stand better in the next campaign, if it resolves these doubts, where there are any, in favor of, and not against, human rights. Whenever this question may reach the Supreme Court of the United States, I believe it to be their duty to resolve these questions with a view to establishing, and not destroying, the rights of the governed. Considerable was said the other day about the Dred Scott case. What did that case decide? Stop and think of it a minute. The great question which that case decided, which shocked the moral sense of the American people was—what? That Dred Scott was not a citizen, and the court in effect said that persons of African descent had no rights that white men were bound to respect. That proposition overwhelmed with defeat for a generation a great political party and helped bathe our country in blood. The Republican party, it would seem, proposes now to pass this bill, and bring its legislative influence to bear upon the Supreme Court of the United States—for what? In order that they may get from it a deliverance that there are 12,000,000 white and brown people, that we have succeeded in acquiring, who are not citizens, and have no rights that white men are bound to respect.

When I speak of rights, I mean legal rights, existing by virtue of the provisions of the Constitution—not provisions of the Constitution that are torn from it and thrown into a stump speech, made part of a peroration, and then called, forsooth, moral, inherent rights. I speak of rights in the sense that, when they exist, no person, no matter how poor or how weak or how ignorant, can be deprived of them. Why? Because if the legislature, either State or national, undertakes to pass a law that transcends the constitutional prohibitions, the person who suffers from that act has in the courts a remedy—a place to which he can go—where there will be asserted in his behalf rights written in the Constitution—not rights asserted in a stump speech or guaranteed only by a peroration—rights which can be asserted against the power of the Government itself, not rights that are enjoyed at the will of another. That is the distinction between a moral and a legal right.

I wish to call attention to the fact that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] said it would be "grotesque" to suggest that we could govern these people in accordance with the limitations of the Constitution. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] said it would be "impossible" to do so. It thus appears that we have reached a stage, when the leading statesmen of the Republican party stand up and say that unless they can construe the Constitution just as they like, to give them absolute, arbitrary, power, they are incapable of forming a plan of government to take care of these people now under our control.

I submit to those distinguished men that they had better not distrust so early their great abilities. It is a cause for chagrin, if our leaders lie down in the face of these difficulties and cry, "Incapable! Incapable!"

It is true that the difficulties are great, but I believe it to be perfectly feasible to deal with these possessions under constitutional limitations.

CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS.

Let me call attention to some of the rights guaranteed by the Constitution of which citizens of the States are hereafter to have a monopoly.

"Duties, imposts, and excises must be uniform." That is the provision we have now under discussion. Habeas corpus is not to be suspended. Is that so very grotesque? Is that impossible? Private property can not be taken except for public use and upon just compensation. No bill of attainder or ex post facto law to be passed. Would there be anything grotesque about that in the Philippine Archipelago? Or is it a fact that the American Congress wants to have in its hands the power to confiscate the property of the friars of the Catholic Church that is said by some people to be the cause of a great deal of this trouble in the archipelago? The Catholic Church, which, notwithstanding the fact that many of us may not believe in its doctrines, has on so many occasions, and in so many places, and in so many ways, carried forward the banner of education and been in many instances the pioneer of civilization as against barbarism. [Applause.]

No capitation or other direct tax unless in proportion to a census or enumeration. Is there anything grotesque there? No tax or duty on articles exported from any State, a regulation to secure the freedom of interstate commerce.

No law impairing the obligation of contracts. Are we to suppose that the protection of this clause is for us, and not for the people in those islands which we have acquired?

The trial of all crimes shall be by jury. Is there anything so very grotesque in that? Twenty-five per cent of the people of Puerto Rico are intelligent enough to govern themselves as well as we can govern them. Some one has said that would leave the administration of justice in the hands of twenty-five per cent of the people, but I am impressed with the idea that this would be as well and as safe as to leave it all in the hands of one man. The wild tribes in those islands of the sea, where they maintain tribal relations, can be governed entirely in harmony with the provisions of the Constitution, by maintaining their tribal relations, precisely as we govern our Indians. Is there anything grotesque or difficult about that—the elimination as an element of difficulty of every tribe, barbarous or savage, possibly three-fourths of the whole? If the gentleman from New York, or the gentleman from Massachusetts, means that it would be "grotesque" or "impossible" in the light of our history and the success we have had in governing the Indians, pushing them off from this continent into the Pacific Ocean, or in managing the negro problem, I would agree with him on that hypothesis. It may turn out hereafter to be "grotesque" and "impossible," because the history of the Republic discloses many things in this respect in which no honest man can feel any pride.

No bill of attainder or ex post facto law.

No capitation or other direct tax unless in proportion to census or enumeration.

No tax or duty on articles exported from any State.

No preference in interstate commerce.

No law impairing obligation of contracts.

Trial of crimes shall be by jury, held in State where committed; when not committed in a State at such place where Congress may by law have directed.

There shall be no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting free exercise thereof.

Freedom of speech or press not to be abridged.

The right to assemble and petition for redress of grievances and right to keep and bear arms shall not be abridged.

No soldier in time of peace to be quartered in any house without consent of the owner.

Every person is secured against unreasonable search.

Warrants must be upon probable cause and describe the place to be searched.

No person is to be held to answer for capital offense unless on presentment by grand jury; or be subject for same offense to be twice put in jeopardy; or be compelled to be a witness against himself; or be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.

Speedy trial shall be had before an impartial jury. The accused shall be informed of the nature of the accusations against him, confronted with the witnesses, have compulsory process for witnesses, and assistance of counsel for his defense.

Suits at common law where value exceeds $20 trial by jury shall be observed.

Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted. Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

These are civil rights which now exist by constitutional provisions, but they do not exist, according to this proposition, for these subject people. Seventy-five millions of free people jealously guard, and would fight to the death to preserve these rights, but it seems very absurd and "grotesque" to the gentleman from Pennsylvania to even suggest that the unfortunate inhabitants of these islands which we have acquired, are entitled to any of them, except the high privilege of not being allowed to enslave each other. And the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY], the soil of whose State has been consecrated in the struggle for liberty by the blood of the "chattel," Crispus Attucks, insists that we have 12,000,000 people in our possession, and that it is "impossible" to govern them unless we deprive them of constitutional rights without which liberty and freedom are nothing but a name.

There is not a single right guaranteed by the Constitution, that can not be properly and legitimately enjoyed by the people in this archipelago and the people in Puerto Rico except possibly those provisions relating to trial by jury and presentment by grand jury; and the character of their intelligence is such as to indicate that it would be just as safe to trust the trial of a man charged with crime in Puerto Rico in the hands of a people twenty-five per cent of whom are intelligent as it would be to trust it in the hands of one man, sent down there by us, to mete out justice in his own way. [Applause.]

The attention of the House should here be called to this important fact. Citizenship in the American Union to the average man, I take it, implies certain conditions certain circumstances, and a certain status. The average man undoubtedly thinks of a citizen as a voting machine or as somebody to be elected to office, and voted for by somebody else. Please note the fact that the right of suffrage, and the right of holding office are not guaranteed to citizens under the Constitution. You need not be afraid to talk about these people in Puerto Rico, these Caucasians and white men, as citizens, because you fear that they may step up and undertake to outvote you, or that they may disturb the political equilibrium of the country, or that they may undertake to emulate some of our distinguished men and hold an office every time they can get a chance, of whom it has been well said that "few die and none resign." There is a vast distinction between civil and political rights.

I refer briefly to the authorities: "The word citizen in the Constitution of the United States conveys the idea of membership of a nation and nothing more. Women are citizens of the United States. The right of suffrage is not one of the necessary privileges of a citizen of the United States. The fourteenth amendment did not add to the privileges and immunities of a citizen. The United States did not add the right of suffrage to the privileges and immunities of citizenship, as they existed at the time the Constitution was adopted. Suffrage was not coextensive with citizenship in the States at the time of its adoption. It was not intended to make all citizens of the United States voters. The Constitution of the United States does not confer the right of suffrage upon anyone, and the constitutions and laws of the several States which commit that important trust to men alone are not necessarily void." (*Minor* vs. *Happersett*, *21 Wall.*, *178*; *United States* vs. *Cruikshank*, *92 U. S.*, *542*; *Murphy* vs. *Ramsey*, *114 U. S.*, *15.*)

Here is the proposition. Why be afraid of it? Do you want to eliminate the Constitution in order to impose a protective tariff upon your dependencies and for that reason alone? Let me make this suggestion: I submit to the Republicans whether or not the true theory of a protective tariff is not that it is imposed for the purpose of protecting our capital and our labor against foreign capital and foreign labor; protecting it against the labor and capital of aliens—aliens in birth, aliens in spirit, aliens in government, aliens in law, aliens in development, aliens in hopes, aliens in prospects, aliens in success, aliens in everything, and in whose hopes, whose prosperity, and whose success we have no legal interest whatever? That is the proper foundation of the protective tariff.

It is the protection of the American laborer against the laborer in any other land, under any other flag, who lives under any other government, under any other laws, governing himself in his own way, over whom we have and exercise no control.

What is here proposed? We take these people—we do not let them govern themselves as they did practically when they were dependents of Spain, but we take them—and we govern them according to our own sweet will, in our own way, in our own discretion, and then we impose upon them, our people, belonging to us—and if they are not citizens, they belong to us in more senses than one—our own people, who have no control over their institutions, who have no opportunity to protect themselves, who can not make or administer economic laws—we give them laws, we make them as we like, we apply them as we like, and then, if, under those circumstances they can succeed, we put our feet upon their necks and crush down our own people. I fully believe in, and adhere to, the

principle of a protective tariff, but I utterly deny that it is in any sense properly predicable upon such a condition of things.

There is a vast, a glittering dream of empire. That it may be realized, plighted faith is to be broken, the Constitution trodden under foot, human rights ignored. Have a care, gentlemen, have a care. Even as you grasp it—

With hopes, that but allure to fly,
With joys, that vanish while he sips,
Like Dead Sea fruits, that tempt the eye,
But turn to ashes on the lips!

LEGAL PROPOSITIONS RELIED ON.

I now examine briefly some of the legal propositions relied on. The committee say, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] says, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] says, and upon this proposition is based the report of the Ways and Means Committee:

In each and every case it has been thought necessary, in order to modify the *otherwise unlimited powers of Congress*, to make special provisions in the treaty by which the territory is acquired.

Now mark that language: It has been thought necessary to make provisions in the treaty in order to modify *the otherwise unlimited powers of Congress.*

So far as legislation with respect to these treaty-acquired territories has been had, it is to be attributed to the guaranties secured by the terms of the treaty.

The committee make that assertion half a dozen times in their report and my friend from Pennsylvania lovingly reiterates it in his speech. If that means anything it means that a treaty can control the action of Congress. That is one of their *legal* propositions. They say that treaties have been enacted for the purpose of limiting the powers of Congress. Here is what they say, in explaining adverse cases:

They had all to do with territory belonging to the United States acquired for purposes of statehood, and with respect to which the general and plenary powers of Congress—

Now, mark this. I notice the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee smiles. Let him wait and hear the authority I give him—

with respect to which the *general and plenary powers of Congress had been modified by treaty stipulations.*

That is, the general and plenary powers of Congress can be modified by a treaty stipulation. If it should turn out, after examining the authorities, that an act of Congress would repeal a treaty, that proposition would simply be a legal absurdity.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman says that we are bound in our action toward Puerto Rico by the proclamation of General Miles.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. No; I do not claim that we are as a legal proposition.

Mr. PAYNE. Bound in good faith to carry it out. If that is true, why should we not be bound by a solemn treaty to carry it out in good faith?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. That is not a legal proposition. I say we are morally bound. Is not the gentleman able to recognize the distinction between a moral proposition and a legal one? Ask another question. I say here is a *legal* proposition which you set up in your report as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, and *as* a legal proposition. Do not be afraid to look your logic in the face. You make it as a legal proposition, and you ask this Republican House to stand behind you on this, on the ground that a treaty controls the action of Congress as a legal proposition. That is what you say, and you give it as a reason for these cases that have been decided against you over and over again. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] gave it twice or three times in his speech. Now I will read, not from a portion of a stump speech, but from a decision which shows its utter absurdity as a legal proposition:

A treaty, then, is a law of the land, as an act of Congress is, whenever its provisions prescribe a rule by which the rights of the private citizen or subject may be determined. And when such rights are of a nature to be enforced in a court of justice, that court resorts to the treaty for a rule of decision for the case before it as it would to a statute.

But even in this aspect of the case there is nothing in this law which makes it irrepealable or unchangeable. The Constitution gives it no superiority over an act of Congress in this respect, which may be repealed or modified by an act of a later date. Nor is there anything in its essential character, or in the branches of the Government by which the treaty is made, which gives it this superior sanctity.

A treaty is made by the President and the Senate. Statutes are made by the President, the Senate, and the House of Representatives. The addition of the latter body to the other two in making a law certainly does not render it less entitled to respect in the matter of its repeal or modification than a treaty made by the other two.

In short, we are of opinion that, so far as a treaty made by the United States with any foreign nation can become the subject of judicial cognizance in the courts of this country, it is subject to such acts as Congress may pass for its enforcement, modification, or repeal.

(*Head Money Cases, 112 U. S., 598–599.*)

Now, where is your treaty that controls the action of Congress? [Applause.] Let me read again in order that it may be so plain "that he may run that readeth it."

The validity of this act, as already mentioned, is assailed as being in effect an expulsion from the country of Chinese laborers in violation of existing treaties between the United States and the Government of China, and of the rights vested in them under the laws of Congress. The objection that the act is in conflict with the treaties was earnestly pressed in the court below, and the answer to it constitutes the principal part of its opinion. (*36 Fed. Rep., 431.*) *Here the objection made is that the act of 1888 impairs a right vested under the treaty of 1880, as a law of the United States, and the statutes of 1882 and of 1884, passed in execution of it.*

It must be conceded that the act of 1888 is in contravention of express stipulations of the treaty of 1868 and of the supplemental treaty of 1880, but it is not on that account invalid or to be restricted in its enforcement. The treaties were of no greater legal obligation than the act of Congress. By the Constitution laws made in pursuance thereof and treaties made under the authority of the United States are both declared to be the supreme law of the land, and no paramount authority is given to one over the other. A treaty, it is true, is in the nature of a contract between nations, and is often merely promissory in its character, requiring legislation to carry its stipulations into effect. Such legislation will be open to future repeal or amendment. If the treaty operates by its own force, and relates to a subject within the power of Congress, it can be deemed in that particular only the equivalent of a legislative act, to be repealed or modified at the pleasure of Congress. In either case the last expression of the sovereign will must control.

(*Chae Chan Ping* vs. *United States, 130 U. S., 581–611.*)

See also *Whitney* vs. *Robertson* (124 U. S., 190); *Horner* vs. *United States* (143 U. S., 578); *Fong Yue Ting* vs. *United States* (149 U. S., 721).

What becomes of the main proposition of the committee? Ten or twelve lawyers set out in their report before the House, and try to make the House believe, that one of the reasons why dozens of these decisions have been rendered against their proposition is because a treaty controlled the action of Congress and therefore the Constitution applied. It is an absolute legal absurdity without any foundation. It is not worthy to be suggested in the discussion of a great constitutional question involving the rights of 12,000,000 people and millions yet unborn.

I proceed briefly and rapidly and call attention to some cases upon which the gentlemen rely. They have two sets of cases, upon which they rely for establishing the proposition that the Constitution does not extend *ex proprio vigore* outside of the limits of the forty-five States. They discuss it as though the Constitution by virtue of an act of Congress itinerated about the Territories, and landed, now here, and now there, by virtue of such act. They do not stop to think that an act of Congress, when it provides that the constitutional limitations apply to a Territory, has the force only of an act of Congress, and it is precisely the same as though the limitations were specified in the act, the Constitution being referred to only for the purpose of saving the clerical work of writing in the provisions in detail. The act itself under those circumstances is equally as subject to repeal as any other act of Congress.

Not to stop and discuss it here, my theory of the Constitution and the power of Congress thereunder briefly is this: I do not believe for a moment that Congress, the creature of the Constitution, is at any time, or in any place, superior to its creator. [Applause.] I believe that it sits here, and when it undertakes to pass any law in connection with a Territory or possession or any other subject, it passes it here under the ægis of the Constitution from which it derives its power and in which is contained the limitations which control in every instance its exercise.

I wish the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] was in his seat, as in a few minutes I would like to tell him something about Daniel Webster that I think would be interesting to him. [Laughter.]

These two lines of cases are, first, those holding that residents of the District of Columbia and of the Territories are not citizens of a State, and therefore the District of Columbia and the Territories are not a part of the United States; and second, those which sustain the power of Congress, to create Territorial courts, which are courts other than those provided for by the Constitution, and the power of Congress to legislate for the Territories, which has been loosely described as plenary and unlimited, and therefore Congress is unrestrained by constitutional limitations in legislating for territory outside the limits of the forty-five States. If either branch of the proposition falls the whole proposition falls with it.

THE "STATE" CASES.

As to the first branch of the proposition: Their first case is *Sere* vs. *Pitot* (*6 Cranch, 336*). They say the court said:

The power of governing and legislating for a Territory is the inevitable consequence of the right to acquire and hold territory. Could this position be contested, the Constitution of the United States declares that "Congress shall have power to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory of the United States." Accordingly we find Congress *possessing and exercising the absolute and undisputed power of governing and legislating for the Territory of Orleans.* Congress has given them a legislative, an executive, and a judiciary, with such powers *as it has been their will* to assign to these departments, respectively.

This was a case where the action was brought by an assignee of a chose in action, and the court definitely held, before they made the remark quoted by the committee, that the action could not be maintained, saying:

It is the opinion of the court that the plaintiffs had no right to maintain this suit in the district court against a citizen of the Orleans Territory, they being the assignees of persons who were also citizens of that Territory.

It is of so much importance to the people of Orleans to decide on the second objection that the court will proceed to consider that likewise.

Whether the citizens of the Territory of Orleans are to be considered as the citizens of a State, within the meaning of the Constitution, is a question of

some difficulty which should be decided, should one of them sue in any of the circuit courts of the United States. The present inquiry is limited to a suit brought by or against a citizen of the Territory in the district court of Orleans.

Gentlemen have spent hours in this debate, endeavoring to demonstrate that the criticised expressions of the courts in *Loughborough* vs. *Blake* (*5 Wheat., 319*) *and Cross* vs. *Harrison* (*16 How., 201*) precisely in point against their contention, are *dicta*. It was impossible for them to have read the opinion in *Sere* vs. *Pitot* without learning that their quotation was a *dictum*, yet they cite it with an air of authority and without an intimation of its real character. In *Hepburn* vs. *Ellzey* (*2 Cranch., 414*), which was a suit by a resident of the District of Columbia against a citizen of a State, it is true that the Supreme Court of the United States held that the plaintiff was not, within the meaning of the clause of the Constitution relating to jurisdiction, a citizen of a State, and therefore could not maintain his suit. They used on this point the language which they quote:

This depends on the act of Congress describing the jurisdiction of that court. That act gives jurisdiction to the circuit courts in cases between a citizen of the State in which the suit is brought and a citizen of another State. To support the jurisdiction in this case, therefore, it must appear that Columbia is a State.

On the part of the plaintiffs it has been urged that Columbia is a distinct political society, and is, therefore, "a State" according to the definitions of writers on general law.

This is true. But as the act of Congress obviously uses the word "State" in reference to that term as used in the Constitution, it becomes necessary to inquire whether Columbia is a State in the sense of that instrument. The result of that examination is a conviction that the members of the American Confederacy only are the States contemplated in the Constitution.

New Orleans vs. *Winter* (*1 Wheaton, 93*) (*1816*) was a suit by a resident of a Territory against a citizen of a State and the court said:

It has been attempted to distinguish a Territory from the District of Columbia; but the court is of opinion that this distinction can not be maintained. They may differ in many respects, but neither of them is a State in the sense in which that term is used in the Constitution. Every reason assigned for the opinion of the court, that a citizen of Columbia was not capable of suing in the courts of the United States under the judiciary acts, is equally applicable to a citizen of a Territory.

Barney vs. *Baltimore* (6 Wallace, 287) (1867) was a suit under the same clause by an assignee, the assignor residing in the District of Columbia. The court held that the assignment was colorable and fraudulent, therefore void, and, following *Hepburn* vs. *Ellzey* and *New Orleans* vs. *Winter*, held the action could not be maintained. *Hepburn* vs. *Ellzey*, it is seen, is the parent case.

The committee, in commenting upon these cases, make an assertion that is entirely without foundation. I do not say it is intentional. It may have been an inadvertence. I do say it is a palpable misstatement of what these cases hold.

These three cases simply hold, that a resident of a Territory, or of the District of Columbia, is not a resident of a State. The committee says:

Against the dictum of Chief Justice Marshall in the case of Loughborough vs. Blake ought to be set off the express decision of the Supreme Court, when the very point was directly involved, that the term—

Now mark this—

"United States" in the Constitution does not include Territories.

The cases hold that a resident of the District of Columbia or a Territory was not a resident of a State. They do not hold that in such case he was not a resident of the "United States." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

On the contrary, let me read what the committee did not succeed in getting into their report from the opinion in *Hepburn* vs. *Ellzey*. After the court had discussed the proposition and had in effect reached the conclusion that a resident of the District of Columbia was not a citizen of a State, they said:

It is true—

Speaking of the same man they had just held was not a citizen of a State—

that *as citizens of the United States and of that particular District*, which is subject to the jurisdiction of Congress, it is extraordinary that the courts of the United States, which are open to aliens and to citizens of every State in the Union, should be closed upon them. But this is a subject for legislation and not judicial construction.

So far as the term "United States" is defined in these cases it *includes* Territories.

There is your foundation case, in which the great Chief Justice says, that although a citizen of the District of Columbia, and not a citizen of a State, he was at the same time a "*citizen of the United States.*" [Applause.]

The committee in their report did not give us the benefit of the whole opinion. Why search week after week and copy Professor Langdell's article in the Harvard Law Review? If they had taken the time when looking up the cases to read all the court said they would have saved themselves considerable trouble. [Laughter.]

We have Kent cited here by the gentleman from Illinois. I did not hear it, but I read it. We have Story cited here by the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Illinois. I heard it in the speech of the gentleman from New York. I now learn that Mr. Story was an eminent legal authority, a man of undoubted character and ability. I yield to no man either in the legal profession, or out of it, in my reverence for, and admiration of, those great lawyers, Mr. Justice Story and Mr. Justice Kent. I could not but remember however that it is not six weeks since the gentlemen who now come hugging Story up in their arms as a repository of the law were tumbling over themselves in their unnecessary haste to tread him under foot and voted him down as an authority. [Laughter and applause.]

Kent and Story both state in general terms the proposition relied on. I understand the gentleman from Illinois, when he read the extract, read it very eloquently, with that grace of elocution and diction of which he is preeminently capable and he is a man of ability. Kent's Commentaries were written in 1827, and he cites as authority to sustain his text *Hepburn* vs. *Ellzey* (1805) and *New Orleans* vs. *Winter* (1816). In 1833 Judge Story wrote his commentaries, and whom do you suppose he relies upon as authority for his text? Kent's Commentaries. When *Hepburn* vs. *Ellzey* fails on the broad question, this great structure of authority fails with it. Although I have great respect and admiration for Mr. Justice Kent and Mr. Justice Story, I suppose it is possible for these distinguished men to be overruled by subsequent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, especially so when the court has the assistance of discussion by eminent counsel on each side of the case—an advantage which no elementary writer has. I have reached Daniel Webster. I do not see the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] in his seat.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] in his reply to his colleague [Mr. MCCALL] called attention to the fact that the latter gentleman in his speech did not cite from the speech of Daniel Webster an extract, which he put into his report, as a minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. I understood the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] to say that Mr. Webster was not discussing this proposition at that time. He arraigned his colleague for inserting the quotation in his report and intimated that it was purposely omitted from his speech. The omission was an inadvertence. I do not see the gentleman in his seat; but I have the record in my hand. With the record in my hand I make the assertion that Daniel Webster *was* discussing this proposition. I say on this floor, to the country, and to the people of Massachusetts that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] had no right to arraign his colleague for any act of omission or commission. His attack was unjustifiable and uncalled for.

I propose to read what Daniel Webster said in 1848. If any man wants to challenge it now is his time to do it; he will not bother me any by an interruption. If any man who has read that speech is disposed to challenge the accuracy of the statement I make, let him stand up and do so and I will read the whole speech to him. [Laughter.]

Webster was making a speech upon the prosecution of the Mexican war. He took the ground in that speech that the war was a war for the acquisition of territory. He was discussing the precise question pending before this House now, what they would do with the territory after they had acquired it by war. I will read what he said:

I think it is nothing else than the fear of executive power that commits us to the support of this war—

What for?

for the acquisition of territory.

Yet the gentleman from Massachusetts undertook to stand here, if I understood him aright, and say that this subject was not under discussion when Daniel Webster made the speech to which I am calling attention.

Then he goes on to discuss the consequences of the acquisition of territory, and what would be done with it after it had been acquired. I am astonished that, even for the purpose of making an attack on his colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] would make the assertion that I understood him to make on this floor. What did Webster say?

An arbitrary government may have territorial governments in distant possessions, because an arbitrary government—

Mark the language—

may rule its distant territories by *different laws and different systems.*

What are you proposing to do here? Precisely that thing. That is what you have asserted as your reason for this bill. You are going to start in with Puerto Rico. You will have a different scheme for the Archipelago. Does anybody deny it? How many members have so stated on this floor? They can not deny it unless they amend the record. What does Webster say about that proposition?

Russia may govern the Ukraine and the Caucasus and Kamtschatka by different codes or ukases. *We can do no such thing.*

There is the witness called in by the Ways and Means Committee and by this professor of law, whose name has been introduced here as a makeweight for the committee. I will call attention in

a moment to the statement which this professor makes as a part of the foundation of this whole theory.

There is the "Godlike Daniel's" statement. I do not know whether the gentleman from Massachusetts would writhe in his seat if he heard it, and I do not know whether the "Godlike Daniel" will turn over in his grave when he learns that it has been repeated; but it is the solemn truth and so it will stand. It is true he makes the sweeping assertion in another debate, at one point, that the Constitution does not extend to the Territories, but in the same debate, when his theory is tested by a concrete illustration, it fell to the ground by his own admission. Witness this colloquy with Mr. Underwood:

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I say that we are bound, in legislating for the Territories as well as for the States, scrupulously to observe every principle and provision of the Constitution, for we have taken an oath to support it. If we, through inadvertence or design, violate it, then the executive and judicial departments, whether in the States or Territories, and who are called upon to apply and enforce our acts upon the people, are bound by their oaths to disregard everything condemned by the Constitution. Let me put a case by way of illustration. Ours is a Protestant country, in the main, while New Mexico and California are Catholic countries. Suppose we provide by our legislation that nobody shall be appointed to office there who professes the Catholic religion. What do we do by an act of this sort?

Mr. WEBSTER. *We violate the Constitution* which says that no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office.

His answer clearly would not be correct if the Constitution does not control the action of Congress in the Territories. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] informed us that he had read the whole of this debate. If so, he knew of the existence of this fatal admission. Did he give us the information? There is the witness introduced by the committee squarely contradicting himself.

I do not stop to waste any time upon the suggestion that Daniel Webster, in an argument in court, reported by the reporter, is said to have made certain remarks in support of this proposition. I am a country lawyer. I come from the backwoods. I do not have much business to do where I am. I try a few cases in the law courts every year, anywhere from 10 to 19, for the last ten or fifteen years. [Laughter.] I think I can safely say that each case has been reported and the court reporter has made an abstract of my brief. Upon none of the abstracts would I risk my reputation as a lawyer, on his statement of what I said. [Laughter.]

There is not a lawyer in this House who does not know this statement to be true. Yet Daniel Webster's argument in a law case reported by somebody, who may have modified it, or analyzed it, or condensed it, is cited here as the law to determine the rights of 12,000,000 people. I am coming to a citation that will interest the chairman of the committee. But I must take these matters in their order. The law on this point has grown up chronologically, one case following another. *Fleming* vs. *Page* (9 Howard) simply held that the port of Tampico was a foreign port; and why? Because it was in the occupation of the forces of the United States, and never was ceded to the United States. But what did the court say in that case? Briefly, they said, referring to the Florida case:

For after Florida had been ceded to the United States, and the forces of the United States had taken possession of Pensacola, it was decided by the Treasury Department that goods shipped from Pensacola—

Now, mark this language—

before an act of Congress was passed erecting it into a collection district and authorizing the appointment of a collector, were liable to duty.

Before an act of Congress was passed. You are about to pass one, and if you get it passed—I do not think you will, but you are trying to—if you get it passed you will have an act of Congress creating a collection district, and if what the court said in *Page* vs. *Fleming* is true it will then be subject to the provisions of the Constitution. That is the opinion of Judge Taney. By the way, I should say right here a word about an opinion that has been referred to rendered by the appraiser, the Hon. Henderson M. Somerville, a great judge—and I have no doubt he is. I have no doubt he is an able lawyer. His opinion was cited here for the purpose of establishing the validity of this power that the committee invoke under this bill. What does that decision hold? I will not stop to read it. A gentleman on the committee thought it sustained this bill until I called his attention to the fact that it did not. By the way, before I get through with this speech I have no doubt I may, in a feeble way, illustrate a certain passage of the Scripture which reads as follows:

He that is first in his own cause seemeth just; but his neighbor cometh and searcheth him.

I am the "neighbor." [Laughter and applause.]

The decision is by Judge Somerville; I understand they do not propose to quote it. I should not think they would. What does it hold? It holds that the military conditions, that are the residuum of the Spanish war, in connection with Puerto Rico, which authorize the President of the United States by proclamation to create tariffs, are still in existence and can be superseded or terminated only "by affirmative legislation" on the part of Congress. He expressly says that he does not undertake to say what power Congress has. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] labored under a different impression yesterday. This is the opinion, however. I have it here, and I have read it from the copy in the hands of the gentleman from Minnesota.

I wish to call attention to the assertion of the chairman of the committee that Judge Cooley sustains his position. I submit, inasmuch as they introduce Judge Cooley here, and perhaps, independently of that introduction, he is entitled to this statement from me, that no man during the last twenty-five years has undertaken to write upon the fundamental law of this country, who is entitled to as much weight, and as much credit, as Thomas M. Cooley, ex-chief justice of Michigan. [Applause.] The chairman of the committee, by a garbled quotation—note what I say, a garbled quotation—I will ask you to challenge that statement, if you desire, after I get through with it—the chairman of the committee, inadvertently, I presume, by a garbled quotation from Cooley, undertakes to make the House believe that Thomas M. Cooley sustains the proposition that they rely upon in this bill, and he quotes this:

The Constitution was made for the States, not for Territories. It confers power to govern Territories, but in exercising this the United States is a sovereign dealing with dependent territory according as in its wisdom shall seem politic, wise, and just, having regard to its own interests, as well as to those of the people of the Territories.

That sounds pretty well, does it not? That looks as though Thomas M. Cooley meant what the gentleman claimed he meant. Let me go right on and read the very next sentence, which the chairman of the committee, anxious under his duty as a leader of the Republican majority to give to this House the law as it is, did not read. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Is is believed, however, that the securities for personal liberty which are incorporated in the Constitution were intended as limitations of its power over any and all persons who might be within its jurisdiction anywhere, and that citizens of the Territories as well as citizens of the States may claim the benefit of their protection.

How does that sound? [Applause.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. That sounds all right.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Wait a minute. There is more of it which you will not like so well.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I like that.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. If you care to adopt the proposition that I am now about to read from Cooley, you will take your bill under your arm and walk out with it. I am not reading part of this, I am reading it all. Do not labor under any misapprehension.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Oh, I am not alarmed at all. The sound is not hurting me.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. It does not hurt you a mite?

Mr. GROSVENOR. No; it does not.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. You can hear it all without any trouble?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Yes.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Continue to listen. [Prolonged laughter.]

In this dependence of the Territories upon the central Government there is some outward resemblance to the condition of the American colonies under the British Crown; but there are some differences which are important, and indeed vital. The first of these is that the Territorial condition is understood under the Constitution to be merely temporary and preparatory, and the people of the Territories while it continues are assured of the right to create and establish State institutions for themselves so soon as the population shall be sufficient and the local conditions suitable; while the British colonial system contained no promise or assurance of any but a dependent government indefinitely. The second is that above given, that the people of the American Territories—

Mark this—

are guaranteed all the benefits of the principles of constitutional right which protect life, liberty, and property—

Now, this is not in a stump speech or in a peroration. Hear what he says—

and may defend them under the law, even as against the action of the Government itself.

Cooley, Principles of Constitutional Law, 3d ed., pages 37–38.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

How does that sound?

Mr. GROSVENOR. That sounds all right.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. That is precisely in the teeth of the proposition that these gentlemen undertake to establish here. I will now read to you the rest of this citation, also a part which the honorable chairman of the Ways and Means Committee did not read, and which my friend on the right [Mr. GROSVENOR] would not have quoted if he had:

While in the colonies these principles were the subject of dispute, and, if admitted, would be within the control of an absolute imperial legislature, which might overrule them at will. There is also a difference in respect to taxation, which, though not so striking, is still important. The Territories levy their own taxes for all local purposes, *and they are never taxed separately for national purposes, but only as parts of a whole country and under the same rules and for the same purposes as are the States.*

Precisely in point against your contention. Has the committee been frank with the House? Can this branch of their proposition stand upon their own authorities?

TERRITORIES AND TERRITORIAL COURTS.

Now, to the cases that involve the branch relating to Territories and Territorial courts. It is said that inasmuch as Congress creates Territorial courts that are not expressly provided for in the

Constitution, they are either created under that clause of the Constitution which enables it to enact all needful rules and regulations "respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States," or else under this tremendous power which invests Congress with the authority of the National Government and of the State, and therefore enables it to act without limitation, without control, and without constraint, or under both powers, and therefore that in acting for the Territories, Congress is not hindered or controlled by the limitations of the Constitution; its power is plenary and absolute.

This is their second proposition. I will not stop to read in detail the cases. I summarize them generally by that statement, and I think fairly. I will now review what the Supreme Court of the United States has said, in relation to the character of these Territorial governments, and courts, for the purpose of showing to the House that this branch of their case, which they have spent hours, and hours, to establish, has no legitimate weight in determining this tremendous proposition, as the existence of such unlimited powers, is not recognized. *In Insurance Company* vs. *Canter* (*1 Peters, 511*) (*1828*), the court said, speaking by Chief Justice Marshall:

They do not, however, participate in political power; they do not share in government until Florida shall become a State. *In the meantime Florida continues to be a Territory of the United States, governed by virtue of that clause in the Constitution which empowers Congress "to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States."*

Perhaps the power of governing territory belonging to the United States which has not, by becoming a State, acquired the means of self-government may result necessarily from the fact that it is not within the jurisdiction of any particular State and is within the power and jurisdiction of the United States. The right to govern may be the inevitable consequence of the right to acquire territory. Whichever may be the source whence the power is derived, the possession of it is unquestioned.

Mr. Justice Nelson, in *Benner* vs. *Porter*, (*9 How., 242*), said:

They are not organized under the Constitution, nor subject to its complex distribution of the powers of government, as the organic law; but are the creations, exclusively, of the legislative department, and subject to its supervision and control. Whether or not there are provisions in that instrument which extend to and act upon these Territorial governments it is not now material to examine. We are speaking here of those provisions that refer particularly to the distinction between Federal and State jurisdiction.

The Territorial courts, therefore, were not courts in which the judicial power conferred by the Constitution on the Federal Government could be deposited.

In a dictum the court, in *Clinton* vs. *Engelbrecht* (*13 Wallace, 434, 1871*), said:

There is no supreme court of the United States, nor is there any district court of the United States in the sense of the Constitution, in the Territory of Utah. The judges are not appointed for the same terms nor is the jurisdiction which they exercise part of the judicial power conferred by the Constitution of the General Government. The courts are the legislative courts of the Territories, created in virtue of that clause which authorizes Congress to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the Territories belonging to the United States.

Mr. Justice Bradley, in 1873, held that—

The powers thus exercised by the Territorial legislatures are nearly as extensive as those exercised by any State legislature; and the jurisdiction of the Territorial courts is collectively coextensive with and correspondent to that of the State courts—a very different jurisdiction from that exercised by the circuit and district courts of the United States. *In fine, the Territorial, like the State courts, are invested with plenary municipal jurisdiction.* (*Hornbuckle* vs. *Toombs, 18 Wall., 655-656.*)

The court had not yet had occasion to accurately state the constitutional power with reference to Territories, and therefore had contented itself, with the sweeping general statements which my friends have mistaken for the law. In this last case they begin to narrow it down by comparing Territorial with State courts.

Mr. Justice Clifford, in 1879, in *City of Panama* (*101 U. S., 460*), again states the proposition in a general way:

Courts of the kind, whether created by an act of Congress or a Territorial statute, are not, in strictness, courts of the United States; or, in other words, the jurisdiction with which they are invested is not a part of the judicial power defined by the third article of the Constitution, but it is conferred by Congress in the execution of the general power which the legislative department possesses to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the public territory and other public property.

As late as 1898, in an opinion by Mr. Justice Brown, in *Ulter* vs. *Franklin* (*172 U. S., 423*), we have an accurate summary of the legal effect of all these cases. He says:

This court has repeatedly held that Congress has full legislative power over the Territories, as full as that which a State legislature has over its municipal corporations.

As full as what?

As full as that which a State legislature has over its municipal corporations.

Is there a man who ever saw a law book, or heard of a law school, who does not know that the States are controlled, by the constitutions of the States, and of the United States, in legislating upon their municipal corporations? And a judge of the Supreme Court says, in 1898, that Congress has that same power—no more, and no less. Is it necessary for me to go into the history of the law, when the court says it has been "repeatedly" so held? Instead of holding the power of Congress to be unlimited, by necessary inference, it holds that in legislating for the Territories, Congress is subject to the constitutional limitations. Inasmuch as this branch also is absolutely essential to their main proposition, what becomes of the main proposition when the branch utterly fails?

I do not know whether that decision was rendered three days after the argument or not. It seems that in *Loughborough* vs. *Blake*, to which I am now about to call your attention for a moment, my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY], in the exercise of a commendable industry, has discovered that the case was argued on a Tuesday and decided on a Friday, and therefore it is not entitled to any weight before the House of Representatives. [Laughter.] I should like to have the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] inform an eager and expectant profession how long a case must be kept on ice, before the law is good, when it is pronounced. [Laughter.] How many days, in his judgment, would be the limit? Now, that is a most singular proposition. He is a very bright man, and a very able man—I think one of the ablest in this House—and this only shows the exigencies of the case, the doubts that inhere in the proposition, when such suggestions are made for disposing of what they call a dictum.

A few words as to this case, so much discussed in this debate. Chief Justice Marshall there said:

The power, then, to lay and collect duties, imposts, and excises may be exercised and must be exercised throughout the United States. Does this term designate the whole or any particular portion of the American empire? Certainly this question can admit of but one answer. It is the name given to our great Republic, which is composed of States and Territories. *The District of Columbia or the territory west of the Missouri is not less within the United States than Maryland or Pennsylvania; and it is not less necessary, on the principles of our Constitution, that uniformity in the imposition of imposts, duties, and excises should be observed in the one than in the other.* Since, then, the power to lay and collect taxes, which includes direct taxes, is obviously coextensive with the power to lay and collect duties, imposts, and excises, and since the latter extends throughout the United States, it follows that the power to impose direct taxes also extends throughout the United States.

It is now said that this statement of the law by the learned Chief Justice was a dictum; that the case could have been decided upon another ground suggested in the opinion, and therefore the principal theory upon which the opinion is unquestionably based is not good law. It is true that he did refer to the other ground, in three lines, as follows:

If the general language of the Constitution should be confined to the States, still the sixteenth paragraph of the eighth section gives to Congress the power of exercising "exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever within this district."

It is also true that the opinion is saturated from beginning to end with the other proposition, which is so fatal to the contention of the committee. This extract is an illustration:

If it be said that the principle of uniformity established in the Constitution secures the District from oppression in the imposition of indirect taxes, it is not less true that the principle of apportionment, also established in the Constitution, secures the District from any oppressive exercise of the power to lay and collect direct taxes. (Ibid., page 325.)

In this connection, I notice the assertion of Professor Langdell, of the Harvard Law School, in his article in the Harvard Law Review (which seems to have been the foundation for a number of the speeches in support of this bill). He says:

It is however only a *dictum*, as the learned Chief Justice himself admits.

I wrote the learned gentleman, asking him to point out to me the place where the Chief Justice made this admission. In answer he said he did not say that he "expressly" admitted it to be a dictum, and then argued that from his theory of the opinion it was a dictum.

This was all the basis the learned gentleman had for his naked and unequivocal assertion, that the Chief Justice had admitted that the reasons given for a decision were not in fact the reasons. You will not be surprised when I say I have not felt at liberty to accept without investigation the conclusions of any of the gentlemen. Such assertions do not appear to me justifiable in the discussion of grave constitutional questions.

I take no time to discuss this real estate proposition invented by Professor Langdell, upon which my friends rely as a reason for the decisions relating to the District of Columbia—that is, the District of Columbia was once a part of Maryland and Virginia, and while the real estate of the Territory was a part of Maryland and Virginia it was covered by the ægis of the Constitution, as it was then a part of the United States. They do not know whether it carried the Constitution along with it when it became the District of Columbia, but they are under the illusion that the Constitution is ambulatory; that it inheres in some way in the soil, or becomes attached to the soil. A kind of a porous plaster proposition. [Great laughter.] They say it would be difficult to tell why it does not, but has it not occurred to them that it would be more difficult to tell why it does? It is sufficient to say that this novel and interesting proposition has never been suggested, directly or indirectly, by the United States Supreme Court in any of its repeated decisions where it has held that the Constitution applied to the District of Columbia, in effect, *ex proprio vigore*.

The impression is sought to be created that this alleged *dictum* in *Loughborough* vs. *Blake* stands isolated and alone, and has never since been recognized by the United States Supreme Court, as law. The contrary is true. Its reasoning has several times been recognized as correct. In 1868 Mr. Justice Swayne, in *Pacific*

Insurance Company vs. *Soule* (*7 Wall., 446*), cited this case as authority for the statement that "it has been held that Congress may require direct taxes to be laid and collected in the Territories as well as the States." Note the point, "in the Territories as well as the States," the specific proposition held by this alleged *dictum*. In 1871, in *Day* vs. *Buffington* (*3 Clifford, 386*), Mr. Justice Clifford laid down this proposition:

Undoubtedly the power of Congress to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises is coextensive with the territory of the United States, but when properly construed it does not interfere with the power of the States to levy taxes for the support of their own governments, nor is the exercise of that power by the States an exercise of any portion of the power that is granted by the Federal Government—

and cited first *Loughborough* vs. *Blake* as sustaining it. That the Territories, for the purposes of taxation, which is the precise question before us now, were a part of the "United States" seemed to him undoubted.

As late as 1885, the Supreme Court of the United States, in a unanimous opinion by Mr. Justice Gray, expressly declare that this alleged *dictum* was, in fact, the precise point decided. They say:

The objection taken in argument, that the act of March 3, 1877, is unconstitutional because it provides that the tax upon all lands within the District of Columbia, * * * is founded on a misunderstanding of the case of *Loughborough* vs. *Blake* (*5 Wheaton, 317*). The point there decided was that an act of Congress laying a direct tax throughout the United States in proportion to the census directed to be taken by the Constitution might comprehend the District of Columbia.

(*Gibbons* vs. *District of Columbia*, *116 U. S., 407.*)

That is to say, fifteen years ago, it was believed that for the purposes of taxation the term "United States" included the District of Columbia.

It is unfortunate that the United States Supreme Court did not have the benefit of the learning and research of this new school of constitutional lawyers. They would not have made, perhaps, a statement of the law, that does not now appear to be orthodox.

He says what? The gentlemen on the other side contend that this case only holds that Congress had the exclusive power to assess taxes for the District of Columbia. What did Justice Gray, speaking of those peculiar conditions, say?

That the act of Congress laying a direct tax *throughout the United States* in proportion to the census directed to be taken by the Constitution might comprehend the District of Columbia.

But who is likely to know best what *Loughborough* vs. *Blake* decided? Professor Langdell, of the Law Review, the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, any of my distinguished, and able friends, or the judges of the Supreme Court of the United States, whose business it is to pass upon the arguments upon either side, and to lay down the law of the land as it is, without reference to political exigencies, conditions, and circumstances? If *Loughborough* vs. *Blake* is the law of the land, this bill is clearly unconstitutional.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CASES.

In this connection I review the cases which hold that the Constitution controls Congress, while legislating for the District of Columbia. While it is true that in 1871 an act was passed extending the Constitution to the District of Columbia, none of the cases give either that, as reason, or Professor Langdell's discovery that it was once a part of Maryland and Virginia, for so holding. On the contrary, they appear to so hold on general principles.

In 1821, in discussing the power of Congress to establish a lottery in the District of Columbia, the court (Mr. Chief Justice Marshall) held:

In the enumeration of the powers of Congress, which is made in the eighth section of the first article, we find that of exercising exclusive legislation over such District as shall become the seat of Government. This power, like all others which are specified, is conferred on Congress as the legislature of the Union; for, strip them of that character, and they would not possess it. In no other character can it be exercised. In legislating for the District they necessarily preserve the character of the legislature of the Union; for it is in that character alone that the Constitution confers on them this power of exclusive legislation.

(*Cohens* vs. *Virginia*, *6 Wheaton, 424.*)

Since Congress legislates in the same forms and in the same character, in virtue of powers of equal obligation, conferred in the same instrument, when exercising its exclusive powers of legislation, as well as when exercising those which are limited, we must inquire whether there be anything in the nature of this exclusive legislation which necessarily confines the operation of the laws made in virtue of this power to the place with a view to which they are made.

(*Ibid., 426.*)

In this case Webster, of counsel, insisted:

That Congress had not the power, under the Constitution, of establishing a lottery in the District of Columbia for municipal purposes, and of forcing the sale of tickets throughout the Union, in contravention of the State laws—

conceding that as a general proposition the Constitution operated, but insisting that the Constitution did not give this particular power. That the court took the same view is clear from their reference in the opinion to his position.

Second. Is the law constitutional?

If the first question be answered in the affirmative, it will become necessary to consider the second. (*Ibid., 441.*)

The case turned upon the first question.

In 1887 Mr. Justice Harlan, in *Callan* vs. *Wilson* (*127 U. S., 548, 549, 550*), stated the law as follows:

The contention of the Government is that the Constitution does not require that the right of trial by jury shall be secured to the people of the District of Columbia; that the original provision that when a crime was not committed within any State "the trial shall be at such place or places as the Congress may by law have directed," had, probably, reference only to offenses committed on the high seas; that in adopting the sixth amendment the people of the States were solicitous about trial by jury in the States and nowhere else, leaving it entirely to Congress to declare in what way persons should be tried who might be accused of crime on the high seas and in the District of Columbia, etc.

* * * * * * *

Upon a careful examination of this position we are of opinion that it can not be sustained without violence *to the letter and spirit of the Constitution.* * * *

In Reynolds *vs.* United States (98 U. S., 154) it was taken for granted that the sixth amendment of the Constitution secured to the people of the Territories the right of trial by jury in criminal prosecutions; and it had been previously held in Webster *vs.* Reid (11 How., 437, 460) that the seventh amendment secured to them a like right in civil actions at common law. We can not think that the people of this District have, in that regard, less rights than those accorded to the people of the Territories of the United States.

Mr. Justice Field, in discussing an analogous question in 1889, in *Geoffrey* vs. *Riggs* (*133 U. S., 268*), said:

*This article is not happily drawn. It leaves in doubt what is meant by "States of the Union." * * * The term is used in general jurisprudence and by writers on public law as denoting organized political societies with an established government. Within this definition the District of Columbia, under the Government of the United States, is as much a State as any of those political communities which compose the United States. Were there no other Territory under the Government of the United States, it would not be questioned that the District of Columbia would be a State within the meaning of international law; and it is not perceived that it is any less a State within that meaning because other States and other territory are also under the same Government.*

Mr. Justice Gray, speaking for the court in 1898, in *Capital Traction Company* vs. *Hoff* (*174 U. S., 5*), gives the result of all the preceding cases, and emphatically holds in effect, on general principles, without the assistance of any enabling statute, that the constitutional limitations restrain Congress in legislating for the District of Columbia. He says:

1. *The Congress of the United States, being empowered by the Constitution "to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever" over the seat of the National Government, has the entire control over the District of Columbia for every purpose of government, national or local. It may exercise within the District all legislative powers that the legislature of a State might exercise within the State; and may vest and distribute the judicial authority in and among courts and magistrates, and regulate judicial proceedings before them as it may see fit, so long as it does not contravene any provision of the Constitution of the United States.* (Kendall *vs.* United States (1838), 12 Pet., 524, 619; Mattingly *vs.* District of Columbia (1878), 97 U. S., 687, 690; Gibbons *vs.* District of Columbia (1886), 116 U. S., 404, 407.)

It is beyond doubt, at the present day, that the provisions of the Constitution of the United States securing the right of *trial by jury, whether in civil or in criminal cases, are applicable to the District of Columbia.* (Webster *vs.* Reid, 1850, 11 How., 437, 460; Callan *vs.* Wilson, 1888, 127 U. S., 540, 550; Thompson *vs.* Utah, 1898, 170 U. S., 343.)

CROSS VS. HARRISON.

I have a few words now to say about the case of *Cross* vs. *Harrison* (*16 How., 201, 1853*), and I shall say some things about that which have not been said. My friend from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] said some things, that had not been said. He has been engaged in a very extensive research, and he discovered that the treaty that ceded California to the United States contained a provision that made, in terms, that territory a part of the United States, and he insisted, that for that reason, that decision was justified. Bear this in mind, and I shall only read briefly from *Cross* vs. *Harrison*. This is the case nearest in point. It is flatly against the contention of the committee.

I asked the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. MOODY] on the floor, if he pretended that the opinion in that case, gave that as a reason why they held that California became a part of the United States, and he said he did not. I had read the case and I knew it was not there. I have since read the briefs of the counsel. The brief of the counsel for the United States does not state it. He did not rely upon it, and did not mention it either directly or indirectly. The brief of the counsel for the plaintiff cites the Florida treaty, the Louisiana treaty, and a number of other treaties, but does not refer to this recently discovered peculiarity in the treaty ceding California, and I submit that there is no foundation for the assertion that the opinion in that case was based upon any such technical proposition.

The committee in their report handle this case of Cross *vs.* Harrison with gloves. They say:

To the same effect, upon analysis, is the case of *Cross vs. Harrison* (16 Howard, 166). In that case the single question involved was the right of a military governor to collect duties prior and subsequent to the ratification of the treaty whereby California became a part of the United States.

Exercising belligerent rights, a military governor, during the war with Mexico, had levied and collected duties at the port of San Francisco. This he continued to do subsequent to the ratification of the treaty and down until the time when Congress created a collection district and the collector entered upon his duties. It was contended that during all this time no authority existed for the collection of duties, and that, therefore, their collection was unlawful. But the court said:

"Our conclusion, from what has been said, is that the civil government of California, organized as it was from a right of conquest, did not cease or become defunct in consequence of the signature of the treaty or from its ratification. We think it was continued over a ceded conquest without any violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States, and that until Congress

legislated for it the duties upon foreign goods imported into San Francisco were legally demanded and lawfully received by Mr. Harrison, the collector of the port, who received his appointment, according to instructions from Washington, from Governor Mason."

It will be observed that while the committee have given us the conclusion "from what has been said," they take fine care not to inform the House "what has been said" as the foundation for this conclusion. This care is wise, as the reasoning is directly against them. Some specimens of "what has been said" will be instructive. The court said:

By the ratifications of the treaty California became a part of the United States, and as there is nothing differently stipulated in the treaty with respect to commerce, it became instantly bound and privileged by the laws which Congress had passed to raise a revenue from duties on imports and tonnage. * * *

This government de facto will, of course, exercise no power inconsistent with the provisions of the Constitution of the United States, which is the supreme law of the land. For this reason no import duties can be levied in California on articles the growth, produce, or manufacture of the United States, as no such duties can be imposed in any other part of our Union on the productions of California. Nor can new duties be charged in California upon such foreign productions as have already paid duties in any of our ports of entry, for the obvious reason that California is within the territory of the United States.

This statement, it will be seen, fully covers the case under discussion:

Third. Although the Constitution of the United States extends to California.

* * * * * * *

But after the ratification of the treaty California became a part of the United States, or a ceded, conquered territory. (Ibid., page 191.)

* * * * * * *

The best test of the correctness of what has just been said is this: That if such goods had been landed there duty free, they could not have been shipped to any other port in the United States without being liable to pay duty. (Ibid., page 192.)

* * * * * * *

In confirmation of what has been said in respect to the power of Congress over this Territory, and the continuance of the civil government established as a war right, until Congress acted upon the subject, we refer to two of the decisions of this court, in one of which it is said in respect to the treaty by which Florida was ceded to the United States: "This treaty is the law of the land, and admits the inhabitants of Florida to the enjoyment of the privileges, rights, and immunities of the citizens of the United States." It is unnecessary to inquire whether this is not their condition, independently of stipulation. They do not, however, participate in political power; they do not share in the government until Florida shall become a State. (Ibid., page 194.)

*By the ratifications of the treaty, California became a part of the United States. And as there is nothing differently stipulated in the treaty with respect to commerce, it became instantly bound and privileged by the laws which Congress had passed to raise a revenue from duties on imports and tonnage. * * *

Shall one, then, be permitted to land goods in any part of the United States not in a collection district because he has voluntarily gone there with his vessel where an entry of his goods can not be made? * * *

It having been shown that the ratifications of the treaty made California a part of the United States, and that as soon as it became so the Territory became subject to the acts which were in force to regulate foreign commerce with the United States, after those had ceased which had been instituted for its regulation as a belligerent right.* (Ibid., page 198.) * * *

*By the last foreign goods, as they are enumerated, are made dutiable. They are not so because they are brought into a collection district, but because they are imported into the United States. * * *

The right claimed to land foreign goods within the United States at any place out of a collection district, if allowed, would be a violation of that provision in the Constitution which enjoins that all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States. Indeed, it must be very clear that no such right exists, and that there was nothing in the condition of California to exempt importers of foreign goods into it from the payment of the same duties which were chargeable in other ports of the United States. * * *

The plaintiffs have no claim for damages against the defendant in justice or equity. They paid duties to which the United States had a rightful claim, and no more than the law required.*

That opinion is twenty pages in length. Eighteen pages of it is devoted to the demonstration of the proposition involved in the reasoning just indicated. *Cross* vs. *Harrison*, upon that general reasoning, not in cases precisely in point, has been cited in five subsequent cases in the United States courts. As to the power to impose duties, collect revenues by the Commander in Chief in conquered territory it is cited and approved in *The Amy Warrick* (*2 Sprague, 154*), *Hamilton* vs. *Dillon* (*21 Wall., 87*), *New Orleans* vs. *Steamship Company* (*20 Wall., 394*), and generally on that point by *Dow* vs. *Johnson* (*100 U. S., 183*), *Coleman* vs. *Tennessee* (*97 U. S., 536*).

In no instance has its reasoning or authority been questioned or denied. Under these circumstances, this case should control the action of the House, and make the passage of this bill impossible.

TERRITORIAL AND TERRITORIAL COURT CASES.

Moreover, there is an uninterrupted line of decisions which hold that the constitutional limitations are operative upon Congress whenever it undertakes to legislate for the Territories, and therefore outside of the "United States," as it is attempted to be narrowly defined. In no instance which I shall cite, does the court base its opinion, in whole or in part, upon this absurd pretense that a treaty limits the power of Congress, or upon the suggestion that the Constitution itinerates to a Territory, by an act of Congress.

If they are good law, then the Constitution restrains Congress in legislating for Puerto Rico and this bill is unconstitutional. In the *Dred Scott case* (*19 How., 615*) (*1856*), Mr. Justice Curtis, in his dissenting opinion, said:

If, then, this clause does contain a power to legislate respecting the territory, what are the limits of that power?

To this I answer that, in common with all the other legislative powers of Congress, it finds limits in the express prohibitions on Congress not to do certain things: that, in the exercise of the legislative power, Congress can not pass an ex post facto law or bill of attainder; and so in respect to each of the other prohibitions contained in the Constitution.

In 1878 Mr. Chief Justice Waite said:

2. As to the challenges by the accused.

By the Constituiton of the United States (Amendment VI) the accused was entitled to a trial by an impartial jury.

(*Reynolds* vs. *United States, 98 U. S., 154.*)

The Constitution gives the accused the right to a trial at which he should be confronted with the witnesses against him. "Congress can not pass a law for the government of the Territories which shall prohibit the free exercise of religion. The first amendment to the Constitution expressly forbids any such legislation.

Ibid., 162.

In 1879 the same Justice said:

The organic law of a Territory takes the place of a constitution as the fundamental law of the local government. It is obligatory on and binds the Territorial authorities; but Congress is supreme, and for the purpose of this department of its governmental authority has all the powers of the people of the United States, *except such as have been expressly or by implication reserved in the prohibitions of the Constitution.*

(*National Bank* vs. *Yankton, 101 U. S., 133.*)

In the same year Mr. Justice Clifford declared that—

Our Constitution in its operation is coextensive with our political jurisdiction, and wherever navigable waters exist within the limits of the United States it is competent for Congress to make provision for the exercise of admiralty jurisdiction, either within or outside of the States; and in organizing Territories Congress may establish tribunals for the exercise of such jurisdiction or they may leave it to the legislature of the Territory to create such tribunals.

(*The City of Panama, 101 U. S., 460.*)

Mr. Justice Matthews in 1884 stated that—

The personal and civil rights of the inhabitants of the Territories are secured to them, as to other citizens, by the principles of constitutional liberty which restrain all the agencies of Government, State and National; their political rights are franchises which they hold as privileges in the legislative discretion of the Congress of the United States. This doctrine was fully and forcibly declared by the Chief Justice, delivering the opinion of the court in National Bank vs. Yankton County (101 U. S., 129, Bk. 25, L. ed., 1046).

See also American Insurance Company vs. *Canter, 1 Pet., 511); United States* vs. *Gratiot, 14 Pet., 526; Cross* vs. *Harrison, 16 How., 164; Dred Scott* vs. *Sanford, 19 How., 393.*

(*Murphy* vs. *Ramsey, 114 U. S., 44-45.*)

In *McAllister* vs. *United States* (*141 U. S., 179*) (*1890*) Mr. Justice Harlan clearly states the law when he says:

In view of these and other provisions of that act, it is clear that the district court of Alaska was invested with the powers of a district court and a circuit court of the United States as well as with general jurisdiction to enforce in Alaska the laws of Oregon, so far as they were applicable and were not inconsistent with the act and the Constitution and laws of the United States.

This case well illustrates the unsubstantial character, from a legal standpoint, of what has been referred to in this discussion, here, and elsewhere, as inherent, fundamental, magna charta, or moral rights. An alleged inherent or fundamental right was asserted in that case. In relation to it the court said:

An elaborate argument, displaying much thought and extended research upon the part of counsel, has been made in support of the proposition that upon general principles lying at the foundation of our institutions the judicial power in the Territories, exercised as it must be for the protection of life, liberty, and property, ought to have the guaranties that are provided elsewhere within the political jurisdiction of the nation for the independence and security of judicial tribunals created by Congress under the third article of the Constitution.

We have no occasion to controvert the soundness of this view, so far as it rests on grounds of public policy. But we can not ignore the fact that while the Constitution has, in respect to judges of courts in which may be vested the judicial power of the United States, secured their independence, by an express provision that they may hold their offices during good behavior, and receive at stated times a compensation for their services that can not be diminished during their continuance in office, *no such guaranties are provided by that instrument* in respect to judges of courts created by or under the authority of Congress for a *Territory of the United States. The absence from the Constitution of such guaranties for Territorial judges was no doubt due to the fact that the organization of governments for the Territories* was but temporary and would be superseded when the Territories became States of the Union.

And, again:

It was insisted, at the bar, that a Territorial judge, appointed and commissioned for a given number of years, was entitled, of right, to hold his office during that term, subject only to the condition of good behavior. This view was not rested upon any specific clause of the Constitution, but was supposed to be justified by the genius and spirit of our free institutions, and the principles of the common law.

These "general principles lying at the foundation of our institutions" and "justified by the genius and spirit of our free institutions and the principles of common law" were very promptly disregarded, because they did not happen to be written as guaranties in the Constitution. This case clearly discloses the hollowness of the pretense, that proposes to deprive 12,000,000 of people of constitutional guaranties, and give them instead, "general principles lying at the foundation of our institutions." "Moral rights!" A rope of sand in time of need.

Mr. Justice Brewer, in 1890, in an opinion, said:

Under the general Territorial system, as expressed in the various organic acts, the power of taxation is absolute, save as restricted by the Constitution or Congressional enactments.

(*Talbot* vs. *Silver Bow Company, 139 U. S., 441.*)

In *Talton* vs. *Mayers* (*163 U. S., 384*) Mr. Justice White said, in 1895:

The fact that the Indian tribes are subject to the dominant authority of Congress, and that their powers of local self-government are also operated upon and

restrained by the general provisions of the Constitution of the United States, completely answers the argument of inconvenience which was pressed in the discussion at bar.

In 1896, without undertaking to specify the source of the power he was discussing, Mr. Justice Brewer said:

Therefore either the seventh amendment to the Constitution or these acts of Congress, or all together, secured to every litigant in a common-law action in the courts of the Territory of Utah the right to trial by jury and nullified any act of its legislature which attempted to take from him anything which is of the substance of that right.

(*American Publishing Company* vs. *Fisher*, *166 U. S., 464.*)

Mr. Chief Justice Fuller (1896) stated the law as follows:

In these three cases judgments were entered on verdicts returned by less than the whole number of jurors by which they were tried. It has been decided by this court that the Territorial act of March 10, 1892, permitting this to be done (Utah Laws, 1892, page 46), was invalid, because in contravention of the seventh amendment to the Constitution and the act of Congress of April 7, 1874 (18 Stat. at Large, 27, chapter 80).—(American Publishing Company *vs.* Fisher, 166 U. S., 464.)

Springville vs. *Thomas*, *166 U. S., 707–708.*

The question involved was not matter of construction of the Territorial act, but the court discussed its validity; and this depended on the validity of the act of Congress giving it the scope which the court attributed to it.

In this there was error. In our opinion the seventh amendment secured unanimity in finding a verdict as an essential feature of trial by jury in common-law cases, and the act of Congress could not impart the power to change the constitutional rule, and could not be treated as attempting to do so. (Ibid., pages 708–709.)

In 1897 Mr. Justice Harlan again, exhaustively discusses this question:

That the provisions of the Constitution of the United States relating to the right of trial by jury in suits at common law apply to the Territories of the United States is no longer an open question. (Webster *vs.* Reid, 11 How., 437, 460; American Publishing Company *vs.* Fisher, 166 U. S., 464, 468; Springville vs. Thomas, 166 U. S., 707.)

* * * * * * *

It is equally beyond question that the provisions of the National Constitution relating to trials by jury for crimes and to criminal prosecutions apply to the Territories of the United States.

The contention of the Government was that the Constitution did not secure right of trial by jury to the people of the District of Columbia; that the original provision, that when a crime was not committed within any State the "trial shall be at such place or places as the Congress may by law have directed," had probably reference only to offenses committed on the high seas; that in adopting the sixth amendment the people of the States were solicitous about trial by jury in the States and nowhere else, leaving it entirely to Congress to declare in what way persons should be tried who might be accused of crime on the high seas and in the District of Columbia, and in places to be thereafter ceded for the purposes respectively of a seat of government, forts, magazines, arsenals, and dockyard; and consequently that that amendment should be deemed to have superseded so much of the third article of the Constitution as related to the trial of crimes by jury. That contention was overruled, this court saying:

"*As the guaranty of a trial by jury in the third article implied a trial in that mode and according to the settled rules of the common law, the enumeration in the sixth amendment of the rights of the accused in criminal prosecutions is to be taken as a declaration of what those rules were, and is to be referred* to the anxiety of the people of the States to have in the supreme law of the land, and, so far as the agencies of the General Government were concerned, a full and distinct recognition of those rules, as involving the fundamental rights of life, liberty, and property. This recognition was demanded and secured *for the benefit of all the people of the United States*, as well those *permanently or temporarily* residing in *the District of Columbia as those residing or being in the several States.*

"There is nothing in the history of the Constitution or of the original amendments to justify the assertion that the people of this District may be lawfully deprived of the constitutional guaranties of life, liberty, and property, especially of the privilege of trial by jury in criminal cases." "We can not think," the court further said, "that the people of this District have, in that regard, less rights than those accorded to the people of the Territories of the United States."

Thompson vs. *Utah*, *170 U. S., 346, 347, 348.*

To hold that a State could deprive him of his liberty by the concurrent action of a court and eight jurors would recognize the power of the State not only *to do what the United States in respect of Thompson's crime could not at any time have done by legislation*, but to take from the accused a substantial right belonging to him when the offense was committed. (Ibid., 351.)

In our opinion, the provision in the constitution of Utah providing for the trial in courts of general jurisdiction of criminal cases, not capital, by a jury composed of eight persons, is *ex post facto* in its application to felonies committed before the Territory became a State, *because, in respect of such crimes, the Constitution of the United States gave the accused*, at the time of the commission of his offense, the right to be tried by a jury of twelve persons, and made it impossible to deprive him of his liberty except by the unanimous verdict of such a jury. (Ibid., 355.)

Without having had an opportunity to exhaustively investigate this question, I believe that a fair analysis of the authorities upon which the committee rely, shows their contention to be unfounded. With *Loughborough* vs. *Blake* and *Cross* vs. *Harrison*, not only undenied or overruled, but directly, and indirectly approved, and affirmed; with no case holding that, for the purpose of imposing duties and imposts, the term "United States" is confined to the geographical area of the 45 States; and with an unbroken line of decisions holding that Congress, without the qualification or aid of treaties, or acts of Congress, legislates for the District of Columbia and the Territories, always subject to constitutional limitations and restrictions, I submit that the great weight of authority, sustains the proposition that the 12,000,000 of unfortunate people, whose destinies have been united with ours by the fortunes of war, can not be, and of right ought not to be, deprived of the civil rights guaranteed to them by the Constitution. Their weal or woe, and that of millions yet unborn, hangs trembling in the balance. The gravity of the situation transcends the power of the imagination. Upon the law and the facts the House should refuse to pass this bill. The honor, good faith, and integrity of the Republic are at stake.

We hear a great deal in these days about the glory of the Republic, the grandeur of its institutions, its unparalleled civilization. May the action of the House worthily exemplify these lofty sentiments. Then may our flag float over the whole Republic, in the Occident as well as the Orient, over the Pearl of the Antilles, and the Thousand Islands near far-off Cathay, upon land and sea, over schoolhouse and church, the emblem of our integrity and good faith, of liberty and freedom, of the inestimable blessings of a Christian civilization; of human rights guaranteed by the Constitution, not dependent upon the evanescent will of State or national legislatures, too often affrighted by their own shadows; of rights embedded in the Constitution, not floating like empty bubbles upon the perturbed surface of eloquent perorations; rights that are eternal and world-wide, not ephemeral and circumscribed; of opportunity, not oppression, and of regeneration, not repression. Thus, and only thus, will it be and ever remain, by the blessing and favor of Almighty God, the unsullied and untarnished symbol of our honor, our glory, and our splendor. [Prolonged applause.]

Trade of Puerto Rico.

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS M. JETT,

OF ILLINOIS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, February 26, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 8245) to regulate the trade of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes—

Mr. JETT said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am glad of the opportunity to enter my protest against the passage of this bill that the committee now has under consideration, and have had for more than one week. I have listened with much interest to the speeches made here since this discussion began. It has been an interesting discussion to me, as this is the first time, in the brief period in which I have participated in public affairs, that I have heard a question of this character discussed. I have spent much time and labor in investigating, first, as to the right to pass this bill, and, second, as to what the effect of its passage might be, and I have reached a conclusion in my own mind how I shall cast my vote when the roll is called upon the pending bill.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is of much consequence. I regard it as one of the most important bills, so far as the rights and interests of the American people are concerned, that has been before the Congress of the United States since the war between the States; and realizing the importance of this measure, I have endeavored to consider it fairly and impartially, with a view of reaching that conclusion that was in keeping with the institution of a republic as contradistinguished from an empire.

The position taken by the Republican party and its Administration in the support of this measure is one that is inconsistent with the traditions of this country and foreign to the fundamental law of the land. It is a step sought to be taken by the Republican party that makes conservative men tremble for the future welfare of our nation. It is a blow to constitutional government; and when constitutional government is destroyed the liberty of the citizen is likewise destroyed. It discriminates between citizens of the same country, who owe allegiance to the same flag. It places burdens upon one class of citizens for the benefit of another class. It overturns all precedents established since the foundation of the Government, and declares the Declaration of Independence to be null and void.

Mr. Chairman, by this bill it is intended to levy a tariff duty upon all articles of merchandise coming into the United States from Puerto Rico and coming into Puerto Rico from the United States. The question now that presents itself is, Can this be lawfully done? And this depends, as I understand the situation, upon the question of whether or not Puerto Rico is territory of the United States.

Article II of the treaty of peace concluded at Paris December 10, 1898, is as follows:

Spain cedes to the United States the island of Puerto Rico and other islands now under Spanish sovereignty in the West Indies and the island of Guam in the Ladrones or Marianas.

By this treaty Puerto Rico was ceded to the United States, and from the very moment of its ratification and exchange it became

the territory of the United States. We have so recognized it from that time, and now are called upon to legislate for the inhabitants of this territory. If the people of Puerto Rico became subject to the jurisdiction of the United States upon the ratification of the treaty of Paris, they became subjected to Congressional legislation and became entitled to all the rights and benefits of American citizenship conferred by the Constitution of the United States. [Applause.] And now, Mr. Chairman, what right have we to discriminate against the people of this island?

The Federal Constitution authorizes Congress—

To lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

It is, therefore, provided in and by the Constitution that taxation in all its forms must be uniform in its operation "throughout the United States."

The highest tribunal in the land has held that the Territories are a part of the United States; and as the Territories are a part of the United States, it necessarily follows that the injunction of uniformity extends to them equally as to the States themselves.

These clauses of the Constitution received a clear and distinct interpretation by the Federal Supreme Court in the case of Loughborough *vs.* Blake (5 Wheaton). In this case Congress had levied a direct tax, and in its apportionment the Territories and the District of Columbia were included. The contention was that the apportionment could only be made among the States, and that the District of Columbia and the Territories, not being States, were exempt and not subject to this tax.

The following is the opinion of the Supreme Court upon this point, delivered by that great Chief Justice, Marshall:

The eighth section of the first article gives to Congress the power to "lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises," for the purposes thereinafter mentioned. This grant is general, without limitation as to place. It consequently extends to all places over which the Government extends. If this could be doubted, the doubt is removed by the subsequent words which modify the grant. These words are, "but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

It will not be contended that the modification of the power extends to places to which the power itself does not extend. The power, then, "to lay and collect duties, imposts, and excises" may be exercised, and must be exercised, throughout the United States. Does this term designate the whole or any particular portion of the American empire? Certainly this question can admit of but one answer. It is the name given to the people of the United States; but, as an American, I am proud to know that the Government of the United States is not unlimited in its sovereignty.

The people in their aggregate capacity do not make treaties or laws. The people, it is true, act through Representatives, but no act of those Representatives can be performed outside of the Constitution. The Constitution was made by the people as a check upon their Representatives. The people may amend the instrument, but, until changed by them, in the mode provided therein, that Constitution, with all its limitations, operates upon and restrains every act of every department of the Government.

It will be found from the reading of this opinion that the court said that while the District of Columbia and the Territories were subject to the laws of taxation, they were protected from oppression by the constitutional guaranties of uniformity and equality of apportionment in the exercise of the power.

If the position taken by the majority of the committee in advocating the passage of this bill be correct, and Congress has the power to govern territory of the United States independent of the constitutional limitations, it would therefore necessarily follow that the Congress would have the power to impose customs duties and taxes on the products of the Territories of New Mexico, Arizona, and Oklahoma when they were imported into any of the States of this Union.

I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, Congress has any such power, to levy customs duties on the products of our Territories or any of them: but, greatly to my surprise, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], when addressing himself to this subject, said, in response to a question, that Congress could legislate and give free trade to Arizona and give a high protective tariff to New Mexico. This is the first time I have heard this doctrine advanced either in or out of Congress, and I truly hope it may be the last, for I have no faith in such contention.

Again, Mr. Chairman, the authority heretofore cited in support of my position does not stand alone. The Supreme Court of the United States has adhered to the doctrine announced in 5 Wheaton. That opinion does not stand out by itself, but has been followed and accepted by all except the gentlemen on the other side of this House who are trying to force the passage of this bill. Your position is inconsistent with the theory and practice of a Republican form of government. The exercise of such power as you contend for is imperialism in its most complete sense. This country never has held and can not now hold territory as a political dependency and subject to unequal taxation. The blessings of liberty and of free government rest alike upon all our people, whether in the thirteen original States or any other State of this Union or in the latest acquired territory.

It does not matter in what manner territory is obtained or acquired, it is to be held under our Constitution with the object of finally being admitted as a State into the Union.

In support of this contention I submit the following authorities:

In Murphy *vs.* Ramsey (114 U. S. Reports) the Supreme Court of the United States held that—

The power of Congress over the Territories is limited by the obvious purposes for which it was conferred, and those purposes are satisfied by measures which prepare the people of the Territory to become States in the Union.

Again, in the case of Shively *vs.* Bowlby (152 U. S. Reports) that court said:

The Territories acquired by Congress, whether by deed of cession from the original States or by treaty with a foreign country, are held with the object, as soon as their population and condition justify it, of being admitted into the Union as States upon an equal footing with the original States in all respects.

Judge Cooley, whose Commentaries are universally accepted as conclusive interpretations of our constitutional law, summarizes the doctrine as follows:

And when territory is acquired, the right to suffer States to be formed therefrom and to receive them into the Union must follow, of course; not only because the Constitution confers the power to admit new States without restriction, but also because it would be inconsistent with institutions founded on the fundamental idea of self-government that the Federal Government should retain territory under its own imperial rule and deny the people the customary local institutions.

Mr. Chairman, with this I am convinced that Congress has no power or authority to enact this proposed legislation. Authority after authority could be cited to support this contention, but I will content myself with these.

The Congress of the United States is the creature of the Constitution; and if any limitations are imposed upon its powers in general terms, they must be applied to all legislation with which it attempts to deal. It was never intended that Congress should be a despotism in some parts of the Union and a body of constitutional limited powers in other parts. To pass this measure is to acknowledge to the world that we propose to govern Puerto Rico as a dependency, to all of which I am unalterably opposed. To pass this bill would be to deprive these people of their rights. It would be taxation forced upon them without representation. It would mean a renunciation of that great principle that brought on the Revolutionary war and that caused the fathers to enter upon a long and bloody contest. But all these things are forgotten by the Republican party since they have entered on this mad career of imperialism. It is a question of dollars and cents now with our Republican friends, instead of life and liberty.

Again, Mr. Chairman, it is a notable fact that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means introduced on the 19th day of January a bill the provisions of which provided that the laws of the United States should be extended to Puerto Rico and that all customs tariffs should be abolished. This was done in accordance with the suggestion of the President, who recommended that it was "our plain duty to abolish all customs tariffs between the United States and Puerto Rico and give her products free access to our markets." This the President said was necessary because the island—

had been denied the principal markets she had long enjoyed, and our tariffs have been continued against her products as when she was under Spanish sovereignty; that the markets of Spain are closed to her products except upon terms to which the commerce of all nations is subjected. The island of Cuba, which used to buy her cattle and tobacco without customs duties, now imposes the same duties upon these products as from any other country entering her ports. She has therefore lost her free intercourse with Spain and Cuba without any compensating benefits in this market. The markets of the United States should be opened up to her products.

The Secretary of War in his annual report uses the following language:

The highest considerations of justice and good faith demand that we should not disappoint the confident expectation of sharing in our prosperity with which the people of Puerto Rico so gladly transferred their allegiance to the United States, and that we should treat the interest of this people as our own; and I wish most strongly to urge that the customs duties between Puerto Rico and the United States be removed.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to all this, General Davis, who has been in charge as Governor-General of this island, recommended the same as the President and Secretary of War Root. Why this sudden change of heart on the part of the Republican members of this House? Is it to be understood that the President has so suddenly changed his views also? It has been proclaimed by some of the gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber that the President has signified his intention of signing and approving this bill if it passes the House and Senate. It is thought by some that the purpose of this argument is to whip into line some of the brethren who desire to vote on this measure in accordance with the recommendation of the President, given in his message, but many think, as it is a question with two sides, that perhaps he has changed his mind. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, there is a reason for this change of position, as it is well known that the trusts and combinations are dictating and controlling the policy of the Republican party to-day. They have been in the saddle since the beginning of the present Administration. They have fattened and grown; they have had their own way so long that they have become bold and dictatory. They swept down upon leaders of the Republican party and told them that the recommendation of the President in his message should

not be carried out, but that the interests of the sugar and tobacco trusts should be protected and cared for. This explains the reason for this change of heart you gentlemen have so recently experienced.

Mr. Chairman, the treatment sought to be accorded to the Puerto Ricans by this bill is not in keeping with the duty of a great and strong nation such as is the United States. When General Miles landed upon their soil with the American Army, they hailed him as their redeemer, and now when they ask for liberty and equal rights you offer them taxes. You say that they are destitute and in need of food and raiment; we acknowledge this, and are in favor of bettering their condition. What do you offer? Nothing but taxes.

Mr. Chairman, before I conclude I desire to say a few words in relation to the Philippine Islands. The Puerto Rican question is thus linked with the Philippine question. The latter presents the great difficulty in the way of the solution of the relations of our newly acquired possessions. I am frank to say here and now that I am not in favor of holding the Philippines permanently. I am in favor of informing the Filipinos that it is not our intention to permanently hold these islands, but that as soon as they have shown they were capable of governing themselves the islands would be turned over to them and let them establish a republic. We should through treaty relations secure coaling stations and make the best provisions for trade possible. This is the patriotic position for our nation to take, and any other, in my judgment, is contrary to the principle announced when the Spanish-American war broke out. Is not this true, gentlemen?

Let us recapitulate. We go to war with Spain in behalf of an oppressed colony of hers. We solemnly proclaim this to be a war not of conquest—God forbid—but of liberty and humanity. We invade the Spanish colony of the Philippines, destroy the Spanish fleet, and invite the cooperation of the Filipino insurgents against Spain. We accept their effective aid as allies, all the while permitting them to believe that in case of victory they will be free and independent.

Mr. Chairman, it is insisted by our Republican friends that we should permanently hold these islands on account of the trade advantages they would bring to us, regardless of cost or the price of liberty. It seems that some gentlemen on this floor value more highly an opportunity to make money than they do the rights and privileges of the individual citizen or of a people. That we would be benefited in our trade relations by holding these islands is only the merest guess and speculation. The people, on account of their geographical situation, and on account of their customs and habits in these islands, will not, in my judgment, give us a larger market, at least sufficient to equal the great expense they would be to our people and Government in providing for and looking after them, not to say anything about the European difficulties they might bring us into.

It is true a few speculators would be benefited, a few transportation companies would fatten and prosper, a few individuals who would get in and control the franchises would do likewise, but the taxpayers and the great body of our people would have to suffer for the benefit of the few.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] made a very remarkable statement concerning these islands while he was addressing this committee. He said:

> We have these islands and we are going to make all the money out of them we can.

I desire to submit some figures to show the committee and the country the kind of investment this Administration has made for the people. They will show what great expense has been thrust upon us by this military and imperialistic policy. I will show first the appropriations for the Army before this policy was entered upon.

There was appropriated for the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, $23,252,608.09, and for the year ending June 30, 1897, $23,284,902.73; for the year ending June 30, 1898, $23,129,144.30; for the year ending June 30, 1899, $23,193,392, and for the year ending June 30, 1900, $80,080,104.06, and a few weeks ago the deficiency bill that passed this House carried in it for the Army $47,000,000, making the expenditure for the Army alone for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, $127,080,104.06. The present Army appropriation bill carries $111,600,364.55, being the sum appropriated for the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and this is $16,000,000 short of the estimate made by the War Department to defray the expenses of the Army for a single year.

By these figures we are to judge whether this policy is a paying investment to the United States. It will be found by examining into the great additional expense that we are put to on account of this Philippine policy, and comparing this expense account with the amount of trade done annually by these islands, that the expenses will greatly exceed the benefits derived. We are informed that the last year of which we have any account, it being for the year 1897, the value of the Philippine importations and exportations combined did not exceed $34,000,000. I am willing to submit this to the people to say whether it is an investment that meets their approbation or not.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I desire to state that our friends have become very solicitous about the character of legislation that should be had for the Puerto Ricans. They seem to have forgotten the act that permitted the admission of Hawaii with its 100,000 people and only 3,000 of them Americans. By that act territory was taken into the United States that was inhabited by a class of people at least 90 per cent of whom were less capable of self-government than the Puerto Ricans. In the Hawaiian Islands the contract-labor system is in vogue. The Chinese, Portuguese and Japanese laborer is placed in a position to come in competition with our labor here at home. To this I am opposed. I despise this contract system; it should be wiped out. It should not be permitted upon American soil; yet our Republican brethren, being fully aware of the fact of its existence and having the control of both Houses of Congress, have not, so far as I have seen, taken any step to get rid of this great evil, but are attempting to pass a bill that does not give to the Puerto Ricans the benefits given to the people of Hawaii that had this iniquitous labor system in force.

Mr. Chairman, I want to see just laws enacted; laws that are not discriminating in their character; laws that are uniform throughout the Union; but I hope that I may never see the Philippines taken in as a part of our permanent possessions, with their 10,000,000 people to compete with the intelligent people of America in all the various pursuits of life.

Mr. Chairman, long live this Republic! May it ever recognize the rights of the individual citizen and protect all alike who may come in under the folds of the American flag; and may that flag at all times and wherever it may be hoisted represent liberty! liberty! liberty! [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

The Puerto Rico Tariff.

The real question is not tariff. It is not Puerto Rico. But it is the great political question of the right and power of Congress to legislate upon all questions pertaining to the new insular possessions as it may see fit, as limited and authorized by the Constitution and the spirit of our institutions.

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES H. GROSVENOR,

OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, February 28, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 8245) to regulate the trade of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes—

Mr. GROSVENOR said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It may be well, at the conclusion of the debate upon the pending proposition, to place in condensed form a statement of the real issues here involved. The country at large has been wholly misled by the cursory and imperfect statements which have gone forth from Washington, and it would seem that very much of the hostility to the passage of this bill which has been indicated has grown out of the lack of full information.

In the first place, it may be proper to state that never within the memory of any member of this House has there been such an ardent and intense effort on the part of the Democracy to either carry or defeat a measure here as has been put forth to defeat this bill. From morning until midnight, in the House and in the lobbies, in the hotels and in the homes, one undivided, strenuous effort has been made by every Democratic member of this House, with four exceptions, to defeat the passage of this measure. Lobbies of unusual strength, both political and financial, have thronged the city of Washington, and have fought with a desperation worthy of the highest motive. Is it to be believed for a moment that these efforts have been made for the sole purpose of securing equal rights to the people of Puerto Rico? That idea may beguile children in politics, but it can not deceive men of observation and experience. A little investigation as to the potential elements of the future political effect which will flow from the passage of this bill will very clearly establish the true theory of this Democratic outcry.

When the flag was fired on in 1861 the Democrats of the North showed no such anxiety as they do now to defeat this bill. The effect of the sinking of the *Maine* was a zephyr compared with a tornado in the effect had upon the discovery of this situation.

Does anybody suppose that the little question of the levying of a duty of 15 per cent of the Dingley tariff upon certain products of Puerto Rico coming out and the goods being imported in had anything to do with the magnitude of this excitement? If anybody does believe it, he is wonderfully mistaken.

Why, Mr. Chairman, with the limitations of this measure as to its application and duration, its effect for harm will be only upon one class of individuals, and they are abundantly able to bear it. I refer to the speculators who have purchased the surplus of the sugar and tobacco crops of Puerto Rico which are now awaiting free trade for shipment to New York. These men have been represented here and have done their utmost, efficiently and wisely for them, to secure the defeat of this bill, and that we can understand.

First, let me refer to the direct object and purpose of this legislation. Puerto Rico not only suffered by her transition from Spanish tyranny to American freedom and the breaking up of her labor system and the general confusion that necessarily arises from such a condition, but, unfortunately, she was swept almost to a condition of destruction of all her interests by an awful hurricane.

We are told that coffee, upon which there is no tariff, will not be produced in any significant quantity for at least two years. Her sugar product and her tobacco product will be the principal exports of real money value. The Government of the United States has already contributed something like $700,000, as we are informed, to aid the people of Puerto Rico in their distress, and the further information is received that they must have a large sum in addition, and the Ways and Means Committee was called upon to devise some measure by which this money could be raised. There were three ways—three propositions:

First, a tax, local and municipal, upon the property of Puerto Rico. The poverty of the country would have made such a tax inhuman and outrageous, and the Good Samaritans who are shouting around this Chamber, and the preachers who are chiming in all over the country, and the humanitarians of the press, if they will look into it, will discover that to have left the people of Puerto Rico to their own devices to raise money for the carrying on of a local government, the establishment of schools, the restoration of roads and bridges, would have placed them in a condition comparable only with the conditions which drove the farmers of the Berkshire Hills and the men of other sections of the United States following the Revolution into a condition of revolution, riot, and anarchy. It would have been tyranny and oppression beyond human description.

The second course would have been to take from the Treasury of the United States an amount of money, say $3,000,000 a year, for a few years, and give it to the government of Puerto Rico to expend for its own purposes. Would not this have been a fine condition of affairs? Here would have been the cry of the Democratic party: "You have acquired a colonial possession called Puerto Rico, too worthless to protect itself, and you are taking the money of the people of the United States and placing it in the hands of a government of unknown character, unknown ability, and unknown capacity for governing, and you are sustaining that government by taxation upon the people of the United States." Such a measure would have relegated three-fourths of the Republican membership of this House to private life and turned over the Presidential election of 1900 to the Free Silverites. It was not to be thought of. No man dared to make the proposition. Then there was left but a single other resource, and that was proposition three.

Under the decision of the Board of General Appraisers at New York all this sugar and tobacco and whatever else Puerto Rico had to send to the United States is taxed under existing law the full amount of the Dingley tariff act, and the proposition of the Ways and Means Committee was simply to do this: Tax the products of that island coming to the United States 15 per cent of the Dingley tariff act and raise at the custom-houses to be established in Puerto Rico an amount of money equal to 15 per cent upon our exports into Puerto Rico, and then take that money, received at both ends of the line, the money arising from their trade with us and ours with them, and turn it over to be expended for the purposes of Puerto Rico.

Under this system 100 pounds of sugar coming from Germany would pay $1.60; coming from Puerto Rico 24 cents. This at once gives the people of Puerto Rico command of the United States market for their sugar at a handsome profit, and here is a provision that will furnish ready money for the exigencies of a suffering people. There was more humanity in it than in all the opposition that has been made to it. Here was dollars and cents, and there was a cry of the "flag and the Constitution." Now, we favor the flag and the Constitution. It is rather late in the day to accuse the Republican party or the Republican majority on this floor of not favoring the flag and the Constitution, but in the hour of starvation and need we believe that to wave the American flag at those people or shake the Constitution at them is a very bad way of removing the exigencies of their immediate position. So this plan is the only one that is feasible or possible under the present conditions of the country.

But, Mr. Chairman, we do not shut our eyes to another proposition. There is underlying this bill and this vote and the principle upon which this bill stands a mighty political question. It is a question upon the one side of which stood John C. Calhoun for thirty-five years and upon the other side of which stood Daniel Webster and Thomas H. Benton. Those great statesmen fought out the question with varying fortunes to each so long as the issues remained political, and ultimately more than two and a half million of soldiers fought out the question on the battlefield. The issue can be stated very succinctly. Having acquired dominion over Puerto Rico and the fourteen hundred Philippine Islands, can Congress legislate over those islands in the matter of revenue legislation?

That is the important and concrete question involved in this bill, but incidentally the settlement of this point by Congress involves all the future of the Philippine Archipelago. Can Congress fix a tariff on the sugar and the rice and the other articles produced by the cheap labor of the Filipinos as against the productions of the high-grade, well-paid labor of the United States, or must the rice and the cotton and the sugar and the tobacco and the manufactured articles—the long list of articles of every description now manufactured in the Philippine Islands—or must they come into the United States and into competition with our free labor without a tariff duty?

That, Mr. Chairman, is but a small part of the question. Can the ten millions of Malays, Zulus, Filipinos, Chinese, Japanese, and all the conglomerate elements of the population of that archipelago come over in shiploads, by hundreds, by thousands, by tens of thousands, by millions, and as American citizens, clothed with all the rights and immunities conferred upon American citizens by the Constitution, move into the United States and dominate and usurp our labor markets? Here lies the milk of the cocoanut.

Here is the incentive for the enormous Democratic effort to drive Congress into this measure. Here is the whole of it. They care no more about the question of 15 per cent duty than they do as to the number of English sparrows in the shade trees of Washington, but they do care for and pray for the opportunity to go before the people of the United States and say: "Here is a condition fixed by the vote of a Republican House of Representatives that binds Congress to keep hands off and permit the overflow of the Philippine Archipelago into the labor channels of the United States."

Mr. Chairman, I charge that every vote given against this measure which is based upon this idea, which is, in my judgment, the underlying and controlling mainspring of Democratic hostility, is a vote to place the free labor of the United States in direct and acute competition with the cheap barbaric labor of the Philippine Islands. It is to break down all barriers; it is to overwhelm this country; it is to deny to Congress the right to interfere; and when you have reached that conclusion you have solved the problem as to what has been the cause of the activity of the Democracy in this behalf.

If we can not legislate upon the tariff question, we can not legislate upon the immigration question; if we can not exclude the products of Puerto Rico because Puerto Rico is a part of our domain, then we can not interpose any objection to the coming of the hordes of these people, and when they arrive in the United States they enter our courts and demand the rights of citizenship, and directly demand the right to vote. But would it not be a glorious thing for our Democratic friends, now in a stress of weather on a lee shore, if they could hail such a proposition as this to be used in the coming campaign? So the Ways and Means Committee, looking ahead and not backward, decided that we would assert the rights of the American people to dominate and regulate this newly discovered and acquired possession.

In doing so we are following the lead of Jefferson, of Adams, of Jackson, of Marshall, as we are of Webster and Benton, and, we say, of the Supreme Court of the United States. We propose to treat Puerto Rico and the Philippine Islands upon the exact principle that the United States treated the territory and inhabitants of the Louisiana purchase, the Florida territory, the Gadsden purchase, and Alaska and all the other possessions, but there is this distinguishing difference that our friends on the other side do not seem to have fully apprehended or comprehended. Nearly all of those territories were acquired with stipulations engrafted into the treaty as to the future of the inhabitants, by which we acquired ultimate title.

These territories, Puerto Rico and the Philippines, were acquired with the distinct condition placed in the treaty that everything relating to the people of these islands should be settled by Congress. The makers of the treaty declined to touch any conditions and left it all to the uncontrolled action of Congress. "But," say our enemies, "do you say and claim that the Constitution of the United States has no effect upon the Territories?" That is what we say, yes; and then our opponent says, "Then you may legislate for the establishment of religion in these territories; you can deny the writ of habeas corpus by law; you may do all the other things that are forbidden." Not at all.

No man on this floor in this long debate has taken any such position. These negative propositions of the Constitution are limitations upon the power of Congress to act in any condition. Congress shall not pass a law touching religion. Where? Everywhere. It has no power to do it and is forbidden to do it. We adopt all that there is in this instrument upon that point; but we say when the Constitution, after having put in all these limitations and restrictions upon the power of Congress, then moves right out into the open field of authority and says, "Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States," we assume this doctrine to give to Congress the right here sought to exercise, and we will stand by our position until the Supreme Court of the United States in the proper way shall hold otherwise, and then, of course, we shall bow to the wisdom and judgment of that tribunal.

Now, I conclude as follows:

First, we have adopted the only safe and feasible method of raising revenue for the immediate emergency presented by the conditions in Puerto Rico;

Second, we have established, so far as this legislation can go, the right and power of Congress to legislate discriminately upon all the great topics and subjects of legislation which shall arise incident to the acquisition of this territory;

Third, we have placed the Republican party in favor of free labor as against barbaric labor, and the products of free American labor are protected against the products of this other quality of labor;

Fourth, we have opened the door to the expansion of our trade in the east without the limitations and crippling influences that any other system would have brought about; and

Fifth, and preeminent, in this way we establish the right to protect our citizenship against the influx of the people of those territories.

And, Mr. Chairman, out of all this comes to the people of these Territories the blessings of free government. The President has given his assurance over and over again in language forcible and eloquent that the flag carries the principles of this liberty to all the islands of the sea. Persuaded by the principles of American liberty, no oppression to those people can ever be tolerated for a moment; forbidden by the terms of the Constitution to pass laws of oppression, no such law will ever be attempted; impelled by the principles of the Constitution, the liberty of these people will be guarded jealously by Congress, and as rapidly as they show fitness, as rapidly as conditions will justify, they will be lifted up and up and up until the full honor of American citizenship and American political equality of rights shall have been reached by them all.

Trade of Puerto Rico.

All the people of these islands who were the subjects of Spain will become citizens of the United States by the mere act of cession unless the treaty of cession should provide that those who wished could remain subjects of Spain and aliens as to the United States. This has been a necessary rule of international law for hundreds of years, and the rule is founded upon the obvious fact that the people of every country or of any part of it must owe allegiance to and be subject to the government of some sovereign power, be it a tribe or emperor or king or republic, and must, unless they are slaves or serfs, have the rights of such.

But a republic can have no subjects; its people must be either citizens, slaves, or aliens. If aliens, they are the subjects or citizens of some other power, which is bound to protect them. The transfer, therefore, of the sovereignty of Spain over the Philippines to the United States makes all her subjects at once citizens of the United States. If citizens of the United States, they have all the rights that belong to other citizens in the Territories, whether on the mainland or on the islands of the sea. Neither geography nor distance has anything to do with it.—*Ex-United States Senator George F. Edmunds*, ex-chairman of Judiciary Committee of United States Senate.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN WESLEY GAINES,

OF TENNESSEE.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, February 28, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 8245) to regulate the trade of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes—

Mr. GAINES said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The history of the Puerto Rican question presents a spectacle of partisan gymnastics and somersaulting never before exhibited in this Chamber and down the Avenue, and without precedent in all the annals of legislation. It will be profitable to make a verbal map of it; to point out the successive steps, backsteps, and sidesteps, taken at its various stages, so that the country may catch at a glance all its absurdities and doubling backs. It presents a solution of the old riddle, and it now appears that—

> The slimy snake that made the track
> Was both sliding in and sliding back.

On December 5, 1899, the President in his regular annual message, prepared with matured thought and reflecting the profoundest judgment of his Cabinet and advisers, announced this grave proposition:

> Our plain duty is to abolish all custom tariffs between the United States and Puerto Rico, and give her products free access to our markets.

In accordance with this sound injunction, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], the leader of his party upon this floor, on January 19, 1900, ratified and approved the President's message by introducing "A bill to extend the laws relating to customs and internal revenue over the island of Puerto Rico ceded to the United States," giving Puerto Rico "free access to our markets." The laws of the United States relating to customs are founded in the constitutional provision which ordains that—

> The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises. * * * But all duties, impost, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

And this bill—of January 19—was intended to be and was what the President had suggested as a "plain duty"—a free-trade bill.

Something then happened. It is hard to tell exactly what it was that happened, but something then happened. There were scurryings to and fro about the ways and means portals and great commotion reigned in sugardom. Exactly how it was done may never be generally known, but that it was done is plainly sure.

The trusts spake and the waters receded!

On February 8, 1900, just twenty days from the time that he introduced the free-trade bill, this same gentleman, the same chairman of the same committee, the same leader of his party, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], "reported" a bill levying a tariff rate of 25 per cent of Dingley rates upon all commerce between the United States and Puerto Rico. It slapped the "plain duty" pronouncement squarely in the face.

Astonishing to relate, no mortal man has been found with the hardihood to claim the paternity of this bill, whether from shame or fear, no man knows, and it has wandered through this entire debate a misbegotten foundling. It was begotten in the corridors, where the trust emissaries crowded, and its bloated lineaments and the strong smell of sugar and tobacco that hangs about its garments betray its nature.

More astonishing things were yet to happen. The bill confessedly outraged the Constitution; but what of that? The old-faded thing is out of date. It was the tempest of disapprobation it raised within the party in power that wrought consternation among its promotors. They were caught between the upper and the nether millstones. The trusts had commanded and the leaders had yielded, thinking they could drive in the rank and file and deliver all the goods, and now the rank and file out in the country dared to rise in remonstrance.

What was to be done? Groping for a compromise, a loophole, a anything that would gull the people and serve to deliver the promised goods, another absurdity was evolved. The rate was reduced from 25 to 15 per cent of Dingley rates. It never once occurred to them that 15 per cent of wrong is as wrong as 25 per cent; that the difference is only in the amount of the swag. It violated principle and right and constitutional provision as grossly in the one bill as in the other, and to lessen the grade of the steal does not change the spelling of it, and it was a brazen insult to public intelligence in that it assumed that the people could be thus bamboozled and fooled.

And now came the climactic contretemps. The President himself ate his own words—violated the "plain duty" he had himself pointed out. He had to do it or the party was lost. It made no difference what became of the country and the Puerto Ricans and the Constitution, so the party was saved and the trusts held harmless. There was consternation in the ranks of the G. O. P. Recalcitrance was rampant. Never before was the party whip lashed with such hysterical desperation. The trusts had whipped in the leaders, and the leaders had whipped in the committee, and now the party whips must whip in the recalcitrants. There were hurried scurryings up and down the Avenue, and the window panes in the White House rattled with the buzz. It was evident, even if the bill should pass, that the margin would be narrow, and a veto would be fatal.

What else could the President do but veto it after having delivered himself of the "plain-duty" injunction? A veto seemed inevitable, but the resources of the sugar-tobacco combination were not yet exhausted. A veto must not be.

The President must come down off the "plain-duty" perch. Would he come? Could he stultify himself thus? Humiliating as it is to an American citizen to confess it, the President came down. In their desperation a caucus was called on the night of February 26 to whip in and persuade in and frighten in the

recalcitrants, and among the many other things that happened was this. I read from the Washington Post of February 27:

Representative SHATTUC, of Ohio, was one of the first speakers after Chairman CANNON had called the conference to order. "I am willing to defer my judgment to the judgment of the President," said he; "but I want some assurance besides whisperings under somebody's hat that the President is for this bill. If no assurance can be given as to that, I wish to say that I shall not be bound by any decision this conference may reach. I shall feel free to vote as I please on this tariff bill." This brought Chairman PAYNE to his feet. "I saw the President this afternoon," he declared, "and the President told me that he had no doubt of the constitutionality of the Puerto Rican tariff bill. He told me also that if the bill is passed by Congress he will sign it."

There you have it on authority. This report of this caucus proceedings has not to this good hour been disputed. The President had surrendered. He had promised to withhold his veto. It was whispered here that he had gone so far to leeward of "plain duty" as to send for members and ask them to vote for the bill. It at once reveals the power of the trusts and the shame of the American people.

The answer to all this monstrous doing and the condemnation of it will come in November from the people, and the most appropriate criticism that I can pass upon it is to set in apposition to it the great speech of the tribune of the people, William J. Bryan, delivered at Nashville, Tenn., February 24, a few days since, while this farce was being enacted, directly apropos, and falling from the lips of the man who is soon to assume the "plain-duty" function of the Executive office, and who, it may be depended, can not be cajoled nor persuaded nor lambasted into forsaking principle and justice and right for the sake of the trust lords.

The lofty tone and profound expression of sound principle embodied in this great speech, measured beside the pitiable spectacle presented in the history of this bill, pictures a giant beside a pigmy and measures all the distance between statesmanship and jugglery, between right and wrong, between patriotism and perfidy.

The Nashville American says he spoke nearly two hours to an immense and appreciative audience. He justly denounced the gold standard, trusts, and on this bill and imperialism said:

EXPANSION.

But there is a question that is plainer than the money question. The question of imperialism is the plainest question that has been in American politics for a generation. When you discuss a political question you have got to take some principle and apply it to the economical question, and you have got to illustrate it and make it plain; but in the Declaration of Independence our forefathers declared that certain truths were self-evident; and what did they mean by self-evident truths? Truths so plain that every citizen could understand them at a glance. We are to deal in the imperial question with certain self-evident truths. Don't be deceived by the attempt to confuse the public mind in regard to expansion and imperialism. There is a difference between expansion and imperialism. Expansion is the extension of the limits of a republic without a change in the character of the government. An empire is a different thing from expansion; an empire is a different thing from a republic.

We have had expansion in the past. We expanded when we took in Florida. We took in contiguous territory that could be settled by American citizens and build up American States. We expanded when we took in the Louisiana Territory. We took in contiguous territory that could be settled by American citizens and build up American States. But now we are not expanding. We are not crossing an ocean to secure a land for settlement. We are crossing the ocean to secure races for subjugation under the Republic. Under a republic the flag goes where the constitution does not reach. Under a republic the president has the powers conferred by the constitution. Under an empire he has any power on earth that he wants to exercise. [Applause.]

Under an empire a congress is as unlimited as a monarchy with no limits placed upon it. They tell you that we are carrying the blessings of civilization to the Orient. Here that flag stands for people who govern themselves; there it stands for the people who are to be governed by others. Here it stands for people who determine their own taxes; there it stands for people who are to be taxed without representation. And if you want to see the difference between a republic and an empire; if you can not see the difference between that flag here and in the Philippines, let me remind you that after the war an amendment to the Constitution was adopted which provided that no man could own another man on American soil or where the jurisdiction of this country extended, and yet the Sultan of Sulu stipulates that the Sultan will pay this country a certain sum for the privilege of flying the American flag over that country. But here under the American flag, according to the terms of the Sulu treaty, he is not free, but he has a right to purchase his freedom whenever he can make a price. [Applause.]

WHAT AN EMPIRE MEANS.

If you have any doubt as to what an empire means, read the difference between a republic and an empire in the bill recently introduced in the House of Representatives to provide one tariff for Puerto Rico and another for the United States. The Puerto Ricans have not made any complaint, but now, my friends, they are to be told by the Republican party that they are not citizens, but subjects; that they are to be governed as we think best; not as they think best themselves. The President only a few months ago declared it was our duty to give them the advantage of trade with the United States.

My friends, what excuse do you hear given for an imperial policy? I hear three; first, that money is in it; second, that God is in it; and third, that we are in and can not get out of it. [Laughter.]

Have you heard any other? If you will take any speech you have heard in defense of imperialism you will find that every argument will fall under those three heads, and most of the speeches on imperialism cover at least two of these heads.

I will give you the substance of an ordinary speech on imperialism. The speaker starts off by saying that God did it; that God opened the way; that God pointed out the path and commanded us to enter on a march of conquest and scatter civilization through the bursting dynamite bombs; and after laying it all on the Lord, they then say, "and it will pay."

Philanthropy and 5 per cent is the way that Secretary Gage expressed it. He said that philanthropy and 5 per cent will go together; and whenever philanthropy gets tired and rests by the wayside, 5 per cent goes right along and never gets lonesome.

Take those three arguments. Let me call your attention to the first, that there is money in it. Do you know that when a man says there is money in it he assumes the burden of proof to show that we will get more money out of the Philippines than it costs us? The man who says we will get out of it more than it costs us must first show us how much we will spend, and then he must show us how many men we will lose and how much it will cost, and when he reduces it to a money basis he is not prepared to put a value upon human life. If we are going to buy trade for blood, then how much trade ought we to get for blood? I dare the Republicans to put a price upon human lives. Who can measure the value of one human heart full of love for his fellow-man? What man can place the value upon the life of the American soldier? I would not put one American citizen on the auction block and sell him for all the trade of the Orient if we had to buy it with the blood of the American soldier. [Great applause.]

I have been told that there is a sentiment down South in favor of expansion; that some people seem to think that it is going to open the market to cotton manufacturers of the South. If there is a manufacturer who believes we can purchase trade at the cannon's mouth, I want him to go there and purchase it with his own blood, and not sacrifice other people's sons to buy it. [Applause.]

WILL NOT SEND HIS CHILDREN.

He will not go himself; he will not send his sons; he will not send his relatives; he will send somebody else's children. My friends, it is a serious question. When a boy is fighting for what he believes is right, his mother is raising her son for a great sacrifice, and yet the man who says it will pay brings it down to that level. Franklin said that the trade purchased by war was not worth what it cost. He was right. You can not show that the men who help to bear the burden will get the blessing derived from such wars.

But I want to suggest this also, that even if a man was willing to go into a war of conquest to secure trade—I want to suggest that if we secure the Philippine Islands and raise the flag there and hold those people in subjugation, instead of selling them cotton goods, our capitalists will go over there and establish factories there and use the Philippine labor and India cotton in making goods to be sent back to the United States.

You can not afford to do wrong for money. If you do it, you will be so shortsighted that you can not see all the consequences of the act. You can not afford to do wrong, no matter how much it pays.

In the 1896 campaign some people denounced our platform. One preacher said it was written in hell, and another said the devil wrote it, and I felt hurt at the last suggestion, because I helped to write it. [Laughter.]

But no matter what you say about that platform, we will write a platform on the Philippine question so high that no Republican will write one above it—a platform that will declare that this nation can not afford to do wrong no matter how much it pays. But if there is anybody who can not afford to get up on that platform, we will write a low one that will declare that you can not do wrong unless it does pay, and we will challenge him to say that it does pay. [Applause.]

If you think our people will go there to live and work under the sun that shines over those islands, read the experience of other nations. The Netherlands have been dominating Java for years, and yet there are less than 60,000 people of European life out of all nations. Spain dominated the Philippines for years, and yet there are less than 10,000 Spaniards out of 8,000,000 people. England has for a long time dominated India, and yet there are only 100,000 out of many millions, and it takes a native army of 140,000 to help the British army take care of the 100,000, and it is evident that the natives are not glad that the English are there.

England needs soldiers in South Africa, and God grant that she may need more than she will ever be able to send there. She needs soldiers in South Africa, and yet, instead of going to India after them, she calls for volunteers at home. I read a book written by an Englishman, who said that there was not a native paper in India supporting the English Government.

Do you think that we are going to the Philippine Islands to educate people? Why, England has been educating in India for one hundred and fifty years, and little less than 5 per cent of the total population can read and write. Do you think that we are going to the Philippines to educate? England has been preaching a gunpowder doctrine for a century and a half. Do you think we are going to the Philippines to Christianize? It is a Christian portion of the Philippines who are against us, and our hold is most secure in our Mohammedan portion of the island.

My friends, we dare not educate the Filipinos if they are to be held in subjugation. We dare not educate them, lest they learn to read the Declaration of Independence and mock us for our inconsistency.

You convince a man that it is his religious duty to do a thing, and he will do it; convince him that it is his religious duty to give up his money, and he will give it up; but convince him that it is his religious duty to give up his life, and he will give it up; but, more unfortunate still, convince him that it is his religious duty to take another man's money, and he will take it. [Laughter.] Convince him that it is his religious duty to take another man's life, and he will take it. And how many men's lives have been taken by men that declared that God commanded them to kill somebody or to rob somebody?

LINCOLN'S VIEWS OF THE MATTER.

Somebody asked Lincoln if he was not anxious to have the Lord on his side, and he said no; that he was anxious to be on the Lord's side. A Republican Senator said that God opened the door of the Philippine Islands and pushed us in. [Laughter.]

I want to know the hour and the place where God communicated it, and if I find out just exactly where the Senator was when he heard this voice I will undertake to prove an alibi and show that it was somebody else's voice that he heard. [Laughter.]

I do not mean to say that men may not prophesy to-day with divine inspiration. I do not mean to say that God may not speak to the world through human voice, but I voice it as my humble opinion that when God gets ready to speak to the world he will use somebody else than MARK HANNA as his mouthpiece. [Cheers and laughter.]

We read in history that our forefathers in tramping the snows of Valley Forge, with bleeding feet, appealed to God to help them as they resisted the doctrine of taxation without representation, and it is worse than mockery to invoke that same God to help us as we try to force that same doctrine of taxation without representation upon a weaker people because we can do it by force. [Applause.]

I believe, in deciding this question, we shall decide whether this, the greatest Republic in history, shall be a moral factor in the world's progress—shall rise and draw men unto it—or whether it shall step down to the level of the old nations of the world. I would not trade the glory of this Republic for the glory of all the empires that have risen and fallen since time began. [Applause.] For a hundred years this nation has been the greatest power in the world. During the closing years of the eighteenth century this nation was established, and during the nineteenth century the doctrine of self-government planted upon the American soil has grown and grown, and that doctrine of self-government has proven to be more powerful than all the armies and all the navies and all the nations of the world. And now shall we turn back from the place from whence we started? Shall we cast away this omnipotent truth? This question determines whether this nation shall be like all the world or whether it shall tread the path that leads to the grave. I am

not willing to prepare this nation for interment. I am not willing to admit that this Republic must die. Empires must fall when they meet a superior force, but a Republic built upon the Declaration of Independence and administered according to the Jefferson doctrine of equal rights to all and special privileges to none need never die, can never die, and I want this to be such a Republic. [Applause.]

A FIGHT FOR LIBERTY.

Let this nation declare by resolution that we fight not for land, but for liberty. That is what we told the Cubans. Let us tell the Filipinos that. We told the Cubans that we were going to drive the Spaniards out, and that when that was completed they would stand up and be free; and let us tell that to the Filipinos, and we shall protect them from outside interference, as we protected the republics of South America. Let us say to the world that we expect to give independence to the Filipinos as soon as a stable government is established. You tell me you want your flag to be feared. I want that flag to be loved by every human being. [Applause.] You want all people to bow in its presence. I want them to look up to it for hope and inspiration.

This nation has a mission to perform. I do not know what God's plans are. If you tell me it is destiny, I do not know. If you tell me it was the destiny of Cain to kill Abel, I tell you it was the destiny to wear the brand of a murderer forever afterwards.

For more than a hundred years we followed the pathway that leads from the low domain of night to the lofty realm of light. I am not willing to turn back. I want this nation to stand erect. I want it to resist temptation. I want it to show that there is a difference between a republic and a monarchy. I want it to so act that whenever any people anywhere are willing to die for liberty, we can say to them: "God bless you; may you win your fight, and stand upon the principles of self-government." [Great applause.]

We can not do it if we ourselves engage in an imperial policy; and if you have not seen the danger that threatens this nation, let me show you the paralysis that is now creeping over the Republican party because of its policy of imperialism. Now that a fight is on between a republic and a monarchy—a fight where every American citizen must sympathize with those who seek their independence—it is impossible for the Republican party to say one word in behalf of their principle. But I would rather that the Democratic party would go down to defeat fighting for the Declaration of Independence than rise upon the principles that a republic had been destroyed upon American soil. [Great applause.]

Trade of Porto Rico.

We confront our hereditary foe, England!—Republicans false to national honor!

How the blood of Dewey and Schley, of Miles and Lee, and every man who wears the blue must boil with helpless rage at these unresented insults to our flag.

I charge the Republican party with seeking to destroy this Republic, with being false to our national honor, with trampling under foot the Declaration of Independence, and attempting to override the Constitution.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES A. NORTON,

OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, February 28, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 8245) to regulate the trade of Porto Rico, and for other purposes—

Mr. NORTON of Ohio said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: As has been well said on this floor, this is, indeed, a critical time in the history of our country. It is not alone in times of great public excitement, when the waves of popular passion and prejudice are sweeping mountain high over the length and breadth of our land, that the greatest danger always exists, but in the calm before the storm, when the people are lulled into relaxed vigilance and fancied security; then it is more than ever true that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," and we have reason to ask the watchman on the heights "what the signs of morning are."

We have reached a time when the conviction is growing and becoming more fixed in the minds of our people that this Republic—this nation of ours—should be more true to its aims and purposes, should show in the administration of its affairs greater fidelity to the cause and interests of the great mass of the people instead of groveling subserviency to the dictation of a favored few; a time when statesmanship rather than mere partisan advantage, when justice and right instead of avarice, greed, and oppression, should be emblazoned forth as the watchword of the day. In this closing year of the century, soon to take its place in the long line of the past, we should so make history that it may challenge the most glowing epoch of the golden age.

In all times of trouble or danger humanity ever instinctively turns to the strong and powerful for help, and happy is that country whose rulers and leaders are not recreant to the trust reposed in them in such an hour, when there is a responsive and determined action that assures the people that their honor will be maintained and the right upheld.

Bitter indeed is the disappointment that fills the hearts of the American people to-day. In the place of help there is distress; instead of the party in power seeking to relieve the people, it seeks to destroy; instead of being a tower of strength it proves a broken reed. The issues of the day are not fairly met, and there is no relief. It is argued that Congress has the power to commit wrong as well as to allow wrong to exist, but no argument, no act of Congress can make wrong and injustice to become right and equity.

The President, in his annual message to this body last December, declared that Porto Rico was a part of the United States, a portion of our domain, and that the beneficent effects and protection of our Constitution were extended over that island. To-day the trusts and monopolies have made their wishes known, and every interest of right, duty, justice, and humanity is sacrificed at their demand, and famine and starvation stalk over Porto Rico, permitted by the Administration in exchange for the millions to be poured by the trusts into the Republican campaign corruption fund. The leaders of this imperialistic movement should study history, should reread the words of Lincoln:

Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty.

This they should do, but they will not do it; it would be contrary to the orders they receive from their syndicated masters. That would indeed be a changed condition.

Mr. Chairman, we have had exhibited on this floor a strange spectacle. We have had a strange apology and defense of the President from the lips of one who knows him best. The gentleman from Ohio declares that because the policy of the President and Administration was one thing on the 4th of December last that was no reason why it might not be entirely different to-day. In view of the lightning changes made politically by the Republicans, from the President down to the gentleman from Ohio, we ought not to be surprised at any transformation that may take place in their policies. [Applause.]

What have we confronting us in this bill? An arrangement imposing a tariff on Porto Rico products. The gentlemen on the other side take great pride in pointing to the fact that this proposed tariff is only 15 per cent of the tariff rates under the Dingley bill taxed upon goods brought from foreign shores, and that it is imposed out of their great love and tender sympathy for the poverty-stricken Porto Ricans; and here I want to say that the pictures drawn of the terrible woe and want and suffering in Porto Rico have not been in any way exaggerations. To-day the people of that sea-girt isle are absolutely in the direst need, hundreds dying from starvation, and this through no fault of theirs. Desolation and ruin riding on the wings of the tornado and fierce storm swept over their homes, and in their track gaunt specters of misery moaned and with pallid lip and chattering teeth tell their tales of despair.

Now comes this bill and proposes to be kind to these people by degrees. "We will tax you now only"—mark that, only—"15 per cent as much as we might; only 15 per cent as much as Spain taxed you." The pages of history are black with the records of Spanish cruelty and oppressive taxation; and are we to measure our benevolent assimilation by Spanish standards and only prove ourselves a petty per cent better and higher in all the noble impulses of humanity than Spain! Were the Spaniards right in their derisive epithets, calling us "pigs" and "a bargain-counter nation?" I do not so read the great heart of the American people.

When this Government sent relief to the stricken people of Charleston and South Carolina, we asked no per cent tax in return; when we gave to the fire-swept counties of the prairies, we asked no payment in return; when we opened our bounty to the flood-devastated people along the Mississippi, we did not say to them, "Thank God, because we will only tax you 15 per cent on your products for the next two years." No; there were no strings tied to our generous contributions to these suffering ones.

If, under the ratification of the sale of American honor consummated in the peace treaty at Paris, we acquired dominion over the Philippines and over Porto Rico, then we owe to the Porto Ricans in this their hour of distress the same duty that we have so often recognized and discharged toward the people on the American continent. Our responsibilities are as binding to aid and assist the Porto Ricans as they were to aid the stricken people of the Mississippi Valley. Mr. Chairman, if the contention of the Republican leaders ever since the close of the war with Spain be true, then there can be nothing left for the advocates of the passage of this bill to stand on, and free trade between Porto Rico and our other States and Territories must, under and by virtue of our Constitution, be and remain as fixed as free trade between New York and New Mexico. [Applause.]

But they say we must protect our industries from the competition they will meet in the productions of Porto Rico. Does it not seem puerile and foolish, nay, is it not pitiable, that a great nation like ours, a nation which challenged the admiration of the world when it threw down the gage of war for humanity's sake and in the name of humanity alone, should now fear the industrial

competition of a little island, whose area is so insignificant and whose population can never reach 1 per cent of our own? If the gentlemen who are contending for this bill could for a single moment break away from the hypnotic spell that holds them, free themselves from the dominating influences of trusts, and realize the diminutiveness of the island, both in area and population and in lack of capital and labor, they would be ashamed at the position taken by them, if shame is ever felt by abject slaves.

It is not, however, a mere question of commercial magnitude or its immediate effect upon certain trades and industries of our land. If that were all, we might afford to try the experiment, but there is a principle involved that is pernicious and dangerous to our Republic. We do not approach the discussion of this question from any partisan spirit, seeking only party advantage, but as true Americans, lovers of right and justice, advocates of doing that which is right in the right way, and we recognize with pleasure that all the members on the other side of the House have not surrendered their manhood, their honor, and their conscience to the debasing halter and slavery of trust domination. I believe that there are yet among the Republicans a few men who would rather "be right than to be President;" men who put right above expediency. The great lack of the Republican party is that these men are not the leaders. The misfortune of that party is that it has no leadership founded upon principle.

Washington and Lincoln have passed away, but alas, their mantles have not fallen upon any of the men in charge or control of the Republican party to-day. If President McKinley was a higher and truer statesman than he was pictured to be by the gentleman from Ohio a few days since on this floor, he would never, it would be impossible for him to reach such a condition, that "nothing would give the President greater sorrow and regret than the defeat of this bill," after having not later than the 4th of last December said to us: "Our plain duty is to abolish all customs tariffs between the United States and Porto Rico, and give her products free access to our markets."

It must be that the gentleman from Ohio has failed in his diagnosis of the President's conditions, or the President has missed taking at its flood the tide of opportunity which comes so rarely to the nation's Executive to make the right prevail. He took his stand firm upon the rock of truth, and pointed out to Congress the path of duty; but, then, weakly, ignominiously, he faltered, hesitated, and was led away by the false leaders around him holding before him the dazzling, iridescent, glittering bubble of trust contributions to his campaign for reelection.

Mr. Chairman, if we set up the doctrine and it is established that we have the right to tax the people of Porto Rico, and impose upon them tariff and customs duties that are not uniform with the rates, duties, and taxes in other parts of our dominion, then we establish the right to do anything else to them and with them that we see fit to do, and not only to them but to all other people under our jurisdiction, and we become no longer a Republic but an empire. Imperialism, indeed, would be enthroned and our starry banner, instead of being an emblem and messenger of benediction and peace, would fly as the symbol of cruelty, outrage, and despotism. [Applause.]

It may be, Mr. Chairman, that Cæsar is already in power and imperialism firmly established, but there is hope that with the ides of November will come other "changed conditions," and with the passing of another twelvemonth will pass away forever from our fair land the hideous gloom of wrong and injustice that covers it; and that the domination of greed, avarice, usurpation, and oppression shall be forever done away. The advocates of this measure are shrewdly using, as it were, "the livery of heaven to serve the devil in." They are trying to form a combination, wherein if the syndicates can tax Porto Rico, the friends and supporters of the Nicaraguan Canal may have the aid and assistance of the syndicate's lobbyists.

Out upon such a bargain; for with their support would be forced the approval of the treasonable treaty just concluded between our English Secretary of State and the British minister, in which our American birthright is sold and bartered away for a miserable mess of pottage. Again we are face to face with our hereditary foe, and again we are at a disadvantage by not having "only Americans on guard." In many a bloody battle, on sea and on land, the prowess and valor of the soldiers of the Union have been proven when arrayed against the British flag. By their blood our heroic armies have attested their devotion to their country's cause, and by their undying bravery and courage have beaten back by trial at arms the British foe, and proven that the free air of America gives birth to greater heroes, braver, truer manhood, than all the boasted Anglo-Saxon can produce.

Beaten at open warfare, true to her instincts, England seeks, by underhanded diplomacy and secret understandings, backed up by British gold, to wrest from the United States conditions and privileges which would nullify the fruits of many a hard-won victory. England seeks to steal from us territory in Alaska and privileges and rights in Nicaragua. Her whole history has been one of arrogant contempt of all principles of honor. She has trampled treaties under her feet whenever they stood in the way of her foul designs. From the beginning of our history down to the present day England has been our enemy, open or secretly, still our enemy, and it is time that a halt should be called in her thievery and aggression. Without the shadow of a right, or the slightest pretense of a claim, the British Government is seeking to add to Canadian territory miles and miles of our unquestioned rich mineral lands and valuable coast lines in Alaska, and while fortifying her possessions in the tropic seas guarding the entrance to the proposed Nicaragnan Canal, seeks to impose upon our Government a prohibition to control and protect the canal, should we build it.

Base England, red with freeman's blood,
And black with perfidy and sin.

[Applause.]

The official literature of England teems with studied insults toward us. There comes to me now the language of one Commander Bedford Pim, of the royal navy, also a fellow of the Royal Geographical Society and an associate of the Institute of Civil Engineers, who has written two or three books. In one of these books, Dottings on the Roadside in Panama, Nicaragua, and Mosquito, he calls England the "Protector of Mosquito," and a little further on speaks of our civil war, saying, "Our bullying cousins begun to let blood among themselves." Now, this illustrious author, who calls us "his bullying cousins," in his book, The Gate of the Pacific, says:

Early in the seventeenth century the Mosquito Indians allied themselves with the buccaneers, and from that period their friendship for the English may be dated.

Here is a remarkable specimen of unintended candor. When it is remembered that the definition of a buccaneer is "a robber on the sea; a pirate; a term applied especially to the piratical adventurers who made depredations on America in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries," we are unconsciously reminded of the old saying that "birds of a feather flock together," and are not surprised at the friendship between the natives and their English "protectors," when the greatest pleasure of Britain's leading navy officers at that time was in scuttling ships and cutting throats.

From those days down, England has sought to crush freedom wherever it could be done, in every corner of the earth, and now the groans of struggling liberty in South Africa are rising in mighty agonizing prayer to the God of Heavens. Grant that those prayers may not rise in vain! [Applause.]

To wish for the success of England in South Africa is to desire the triumph of the pirate on sea and the footpad on land—is to wish for the downfall of human liberty and the triumph of the most cruel injustice and greed.

Where is the spirit of Washington, of Jackson, or of Lincoln? Behold, our vessels stopped on the high seas and searched by British officers, and our Government authorities are silent. Our consuls placed at England's bidding, and our official correspondence opened, delayed, censored, and destroyed, and this British-loving, craven diplomat at the head of our Department of State tamely submits.

How the blood of Dewey and Schley, of Miles and Lee, and every man who wears the blue, must boil with helpless rage at these unresented insults to our flag. The men in the Navy, the men in the Army, the men in the workshops and on the farm, Americans, patriots everywhere, want to know what is this secret understanding with England that causes our truckling to her behests. Is this Administration so recreant to all the teachings of our history, has it fallen so low as to enter into an alliance with that nation, whose flag is found, as Labouchere, in the Truth, of London, says:

And the winds of the world made answer,
North, south, and east, and west:
"Wherever there's wealth to covet,
Or land that can be possess'd;
Wherever are savage races
To cozen, coerce, and scare,
Ye shall find the vaunted ensign,
For the English flag is there!

* * * *

"Where is the flag of England?
Go sail where rich galleons come,
With shoddy and loaded cottons,
And beer and Bibles and rum:
Go, too, where brute force has triumphed,
And hypocrisy makes its lair,
And your question will find its answer,
For the flag of England is there!"

The daughters of the American Revolutionary heroes have just been in session in this city, and they have recalled the days when France sent us Lafayette, sent us money and men and munitions of war, but for which we might be English colonists to-day, or else struggling like the Boers. Russia has ever stood close to us whenever there was need; and we have ever found in her government a friend. All the countries of the world, save England

and Spain, have been friendly to us. The rabid Anglomaniacs of the East have sought to create the impression that England stood in the breach and kept the other powers from interfering in behalf of Spain during our late war; but their claims were not only never substantiated, but clearly disproved by those who were in position to know, and we are under no obligations to England for anything.

That such a condition can exist to-day, and in the United States, shows how far we have been led from the ancient landmarks, how the evils of imperialism have corrupted the head of the nation. It perhaps is but the logical sequence of the policy adopted by the Administration of entering upon a colonial system, fashioned after that of Great Britain, a complete departure from the fundamental doctrines and principles of our Republic.

Mr. Chairman, every consistent American hopes that this Congress will do that which is right. The people look to us with deep anxiety. From every pulpit in the land there rises prayers that our deliberations may be marked with wisdom and our conclusions founded on the principles of truth, justice, and right. The Christian, American sentiment of to-day earnestly desires that the Philippine question may soon be settled on an American basis, and that we upon whom the solution devolves under the Constitution may proclaim to the world that the time has not yet come when an American Congress shall deny to any people the right of self-government, or that we will ourselves palliate the crime against liberty shown by our criminal aggression and government by force. The simple question of the national independence or the complete subjugation of the Filipinos is not all that is at stake. American honor, good faith, and loyalty to republican institutions are to be tested before the world.

It can not be that the United States can safely acquire territory inhabited by 10,000,000 people who are never to be given a share in political power, because this country can never exist in a divided state. A house divided against itself can not stand, and a nation can not have absolute despotism in one portion of its borders and remain a free republic in the remainder. If we take the evidence of Admiral Dewey and those who, like him, have had opportunity for observation and are competent to judge, then the people of the Philippine Islands are better fitted for self-government than the people of Cuba, and we should assure them that the independence for which they have so long contended and which we promised to aid them to secure will not be denied them.

If, on the other hand, we ignore Dewey and the official reports of our Army officers, and accept the tales of scheming, truckling placemen, and syndicate-bound commissions, then, I ask, would it be wise and prudent to annex 10,000,000 of "outlaws, Malays, heathens, and barbarians" to our voting population? I believe that the people of the Philippines should be left to work out their own destiny under the directing care of divine Providence. They are struggling to-day, they are suffering the horrors of war—war, not rebellion, but war—with all its agonies, that they may indeed have their native country free, rather than that the virgin acres of their island homes should be prostituted to and mortgaged for all time to the bonded slavery of the syndicates of greed, which alone is guiding and directing this war.

Do you speak to me of the honor of our flag and the honor and glory of the American soldier? Such words from the lips of the advocates and defenders of this policy of imperialism are sacrilege and, in verity, blasphemous. To no man do I yield in my love of and devotion to my country's flag; to none do I give place in bestowing the full meed of glory and honor to the American soldier. Only a few days since I stood on this floor in his defense, when the agent of the great trusts sat silent in his seat, submitting to insults cast upon the boys in blue; scarce a fortnight since I said in this Chamber:

> The soldier of the United States stands unique in the history of the world. The records of the ages show us no such sacrifices, no such devotion, no such love of country, and no such heroic achievements as the history of the American soldiery presents.

I was a soldier myself, and I know from experience—from my association with thousands of my comrades—how the soldiers love and honor the flag, and what their valor is. I am honored by a son in the United States Navy, and palsied would be my tongue ere I would say a word or harbor a thought against our glorious Navy, over which floats the Stars and Stripes.

But if that starry flag could speak, if it could give utterance to the true sentiments which it symbolizes, if it was endued with sentient being, it would droop with shame and its tones would wail on the breezes of the Orient saying, "How are the mighty fallen. I came to wave here, not from mercenary motives, not for gold or diamonds or conquest, but for humanity's cause. I came to bring to you glad tidings of great joy, that the great country where I had my birth had on the wings of destiny sent me to shower the blessings of freedom and independence upon you and aid you in the spread of education, virtue, temperance, and patriotic devotion to country throughout every isle in this beautiful archipelago. Alas, how vain my hope! I behold a land deluged with blood, ravaged by disease and death, not alone of the Filipino's loved sons, but of, oh, so many of our dear, precious, brave American boys. I see a sight ne'er known before on Luzon's shores—400 saloons. I see Christians murdered and warred upon by order of those who have throttled the wishes of my people, while they court and dally with the pagans in the harems of the Sultan of Sulu. I wave the emblem of liberty over a government of slaves."

All this and more could be said in very truth, and yet, knowing all this, the champions of unholy greed and despotic imperialism dare to profane their lips by invoking the flag and appealing to the sacred cause of liberty. O tempora! O mores! O Liberty! what crimes and treasons are committed in thy name! Now, let me quote a few words spoken by the consul-general of the United States, Spencer Pratt, at Singapore, on June 8, 1898, when presenting an American flag to the Filipinos of Singapore, at a meeting held to express their gratitude to Admiral Dewey for assisting Aguinaldo to secure "independence under the protection of the United States." Mr. Pratt said:

> This flag was borne in battle and is the emblem of that very liberty you are seeking to attain. Its red stripes represent the blood that was shed for the cause, the white the purity of the motive, the blue field the azure of the sky, the stars the free and independent States of the Union. Take it and keep it as a souvenir of this occasion.

What a sad awakening from the dream of hope inspired by the representatives of American honor came to these Filipinos when there came the proclamation of President McKinley telling them that his intention was to "benevolently assimilate" them. From the Executive Mansion here in Washington, at the dictation of the associated syndicates and trusts—whose greed and corruption panted after the treasures of Luzon greater than the "hart panteth after cooling streams," and hungered for franchises more than the Israelites of old "longed for the fleshpots of Egypt"—William McKinley signed his name to the proclamation prepared for him by these same syndicates, a proclamation so brazenly unjust and cruel that even Otis was moved to blue pencil and modify before he dare publish it. Shameful is our record! [Applause.]

> There is the moral of all human tales;
> 'Tis but the same rehearsal of the past.
> First freedom, and then glory—when that fails,
> Wealth, vice, corruption—barbarism at last.
> And history, with all her volumes vast,
> Hath but one page.

Centuries come and centuries go. Nation after nation rises to commanding influence and heights of glory, and then decay. We, as a people, have reached a preeminence beyond all that the most enthusiastic dreamer or prophet of the past ever hoped for. Shall we maintain our leadership and press onward, marking in our advancement the dawn and oncoming of the millennium, or shall we, too, pass away and our record be put down upon the annals of time as a failure?

That failure can only come to us as a people through our own actions. If we are faithful and true to the principles of truth upon which our Republic was founded; if justice and right shall so move upon the hearts of the people as to cause them to rise in their strength and say, "We will not follow after strange gods," then there is hope for our future.

We have but just celebrated the birthday of Washington. Shall we revere his memory and depart from his teachings? But if we follow the schemes of the Republican leaders of to-day we most assuredly will be led away from the plain paths of duty and right.

The Administration and its friends seem to be afraid of calling their course and policy by its right name. They try, under cover of the word "expansion," to hide their imperialism. That, too, while they try to make possible the "divine right" to govern confined to a few. They try to teach that "The king can do no wrong," that the king and State are one, and therefore opposition to the passing McKinley is treason to our country. This is the result which Senator HANNA and his syndicate backers are seeking and striving to accomplish.

It is indeed a far cry from HANNA to Lincoln, yet I am reminded as the Republican speakers have been eulogizing Lincoln at banquets so recently, that it was Lincoln who, in speaking on the "Spot resolution," announced his "uncompromising antagonism to the course of the Administration in regard to the war on Mexico." Mr. Lincoln was denounced by the representatives of the shoddy contractors then, as "taking the side of the common enemy of the country," even as the patriots of to-day who can not indorse the acts of HANNA and his associates, as represented in the imperialism of McKinley, are denounced as "traitors." For me, I would rather choose to be called a "traitor" in company with Washington, Lafayette, Lincoln, and HOAR, than to be such "patriots" as Benedict Arnold, HANNA, Quay, and the trust bosses of the present day. [Applause.]

This Government was not organized to promote corruption, to go into the real-estate business, to barter and sell, nor to maintain an open slave market; neither did our fathers design that we should go into partnership with polygamy; and yet that is exactly what this Administration has been doing, and seeks to

defend by well-turned phrases and hypocritical "moral reasons." Well has that aged statesman of England, John Morley, said:

First, you push on into territories where you have no business to be, and where you had promised not to go; secondly, your intrusion provokes resentment, and in these wild countries resentment means resistance; thirdly, you instantly cry out that the people are rebellious and that their act is rebellion (this in spite of your own assurance you have no intention of setting up a permanent sovereignty over them); fourthly, you send a force to stamp out their rebellion; and fifthly, having spread bloodshed, confusion, and anarchy, you declare, with hands uplifted to the heavens, that moral reasons force you to stay; for, if you were to leave, this territory would be left in a condition which no civilized power could contemplate with equanimity or composure.

If our President had followed his natural desires and his religious instincts, this terrible arraignment would not, could not, have been made, but under the malignant influence of his evil advisers, at the sacrifice of the highest national welfare, he has adopted a policy that has cast a dark and damnable stain upon our national honor, and should bring about the overthrow of the party he has sought to serve. As I believe that God reigns, I believe that the continuance of this purpose and policy will not only result in our national mortification, but will mark the beginning of our national downfall.

In our own land the natural sequence of this policy is seen in the bloody scenes in Kentucky and in the military reign of terror in Idaho. It is also found in the advent of leprosy on our shores, in the coming of the dread bubonic plague, in the long death roll of our brave American boys, and the still longer roll of emaciated, diseased, and insane victims of neglect and exposure, made so by the inefficiency of the epauletted sycophants in our army in the Philippines, who care naught for the private in the ranks, but lick the hand of the Administration and permit no news to come to this country that might "hurt the Administration."

A few days ago, here in our capital city, the funeral services of the gallant Lawton were held, and in two beautiful cities of the West brave Logan and Armstrong were laid to rest. At Lawton's funeral the President and his Cabinet were present, and well might they be there as chief mourners. Methinks, as the slow cortège passed along, as the solemn dirge echoed on the clear air, as the volleys for the dead resounded over Arlington's hills, there must have been a moment when their hearts were thrilled and touched at the thought that upon them and upon their heads alone rested the blame of this needless sacrifice. If, however, for one moment humanity held sway over their hearts, it was only for a moment. Greed, avarice, covetousness, and ambition speedily resumed their domination, and the untold agony, the useless slaughter, in comparison with which millions of treasure were but a bagatelle, was forgotten in the glamour of the imperial crown. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I plead for peace, but only for peace with honor. Give to the struggling Filipinos liberty and independence; send them messages of good will; help them to establish on their hilltops and in their valleys the American schoolhouse, wherein liberty, virtue, honor, and truth are taught in common with science, art, and literature, and a brighter aureole of glory will shine around our name than all the gold and treasure of the whole world could purchase.

Mr. Chairman, I hope for and confidently expect Democratic success at the coming election, but I would willingly forego party triumph if in the ascendency of the Republican party even a fair modicum of justice to the great body of the American people were assured, but, judging by its recent record and history, its success would be the bitterest cruelty to America, its triumph would be the fastening of the chains of industrial slavery upon my compatriots, and the enthronement of syndicates and trusts of foreign breed and foreign hearts. [Applause.]

The Republican party exists to-day solely by virtue of the immense fund raised for its preservation by the protected trusts, to whom it has given legislative authority to practice robbery. These trusts, in their turn, from their ill-gotten hoards, still are expected to keep in power the organized party of corruption, that only panders to their greed and rapacity. Trusts are unlawful combinations in restraint of trade. They reduce, by destroying competition, both producers and consumers to commercial helplessness and servitude.

This Government has an anti-trust law on its statute books that our Supreme Court has declared constitutional and operative. But the Administration has an Attorney-General from the trust miasmatic State of New Jersey, and it is his duty to prosecute and enforce that law. Does he do it? No, indeed. He sits in the council of the nation, representing the Department of Justice, a mockery. He is a member of the Cabinet of a President whose election was secured by these identical trusts; and if he dared to move against them, he would be attacking his creators, striking the breasts that gave him sustenance, and fighting the very life and hope of his party. There is no hope for relief from the trust evil through the Republican party, because that party and the trusts are bound together by the umbilical cord of common interests and mutual plunder. There can never come hope for the people for relief from the ravages of this hideous wrong and injustice until the Democratic party is in power to make and enforce law. [Applause.]

This Republican party in the ship-subsidy scheme propose to build up another trust and compel the taxpayers of the land, under compulsion, to contribute to the development and maintenance of a huge monopoly.

To-day there are already vast protected corporations which overshadow the Government itself. In the suit recently instituted between two of the "infant-industry" rogues, Carnegie and Frick, in the papers filed, Mr. Frick's attorney says:

The business from 1882 to 1900 was enormously profitable, growing by leaps and jumps from year to year, until in 1899 the firm actually made on low-priced contracts in net profits, after paying all expenses of all kinds, $21,000,000. In November, 1899, Carnegie estimated the net profits for 1900 at $40,000,000, and Frick then estimated them at $42,000,000. Carnegie valued the entire property at over $250,000,000 and avowed his ability in ordinarily prosperous times to sell the property on the London market for £100,000,000, or $500,000,000.

And this showing by a firm capitalized at only $25,000,000.

This party still keeps in operation the war tax; their necessities in carrying out their imperialistic policy demands it, and as a consequence the old soldier, the veterans of the civil war, are denied their just dues, and thousands all over our land are feeling the galling humiliation of charity or suffering the woes of starvation, sacrifices to Republican greed.

Internal improvements are stayed, and our public buildings are becoming a byword and are pointed to with shame by the progressive citizens of our land. Our harbors are being neglected and are fast becoming menaces to our shipping, instead of places of refuge and safety, and all that the lords of the Republican party may have their sweet will and pleasure.

They have laid their hands upon the money of our country and defrauded the people out of one-half of their just currency. I can not characterize this action better than the following quotation:

Mr. Cleveland during all his years as the head of the Government was dishonoring one of the precious metals, one of our own products. He endeavored even before his inauguration to office to stop the coinage of silver dollars, and afterwards and to the close of his Administration persistently used his power to that end. He was determined to contract the circulating medium and demonetize one of the coins of commerce, limit the volume of money, make money scarce and therefore dear. He would have increased the value of money and diminished the value of everything else—money the master, everything else the servant. He was not thinking of "the poor" then. He had left "their side." He was not "standing forth in their defense." Cheap coats, cheap labor, and dear money; the sponsor and promoter of these professing to stand guard over the welfare of the poor and lowly! Was there ever more glaring inconsistency or reckless assumption?

Whose words are these? Who so eloquently championed the cause of the money of the people? William McKinley. At a "Lincoln banquet" in Toledo, Ohio, in 1881, before he had been hypnotized by Hanna. [Laughter.] Now, while I am quoting from "Philip sober," let me refer to a spirited attack upon McKinley's policy of imperialism in the Philippines, the act of "Philip drunk." At the New England dinner in Philadelphia, in 1890, William McKinley, then Congressman, declared that "human rights and constitutional privileges must not be forgotten in the race for wealth and commercial supremacy." That would almost fit the discussion of the Porto Rican question.

Then, again, hear the eloquent words that fall from his lips:

The government of the people must be by the people, and not by a few of the people; it must rest upon the free consent of the governed, and all of the governed. Power, it must be remembered, which is secured by oppression, or usurpation, or by any form of injustice, is soon dethroned. We have no right in law or morals to usurp that which belongs to another, whether it is property or power.

Now, these quotations may make my remarks "treasonable" and forbidden the mails, but in 1881, in 1890, and down to his election in 1896, there was not a more bitter enemy of the single gold standard or of imperialism than Mr. McKinley; but to-day, to-day, "What a fall is there, my countrymen." [Laughter and applause.]

For over a century as a people we have toiled and labored in the building of a nation. We have bled, have oft drank the blood of other nations, and once drank deeply of our own. Our hopes, our aspirations, and all our struggles have been to build up a nation which should be to all mankind—

The land of the free
And the home of the brave—

within whose borders no wrong or injustice could remain unrighted, where human liberty and freedom should be enthroned to remain as long as human liberty should be. Our fathers planned foundations deep and broad, and in the fabric of the superstructure builded all that was best and true. To us the heritage came, and to our posterity we should hand it down unstained and undimmed by aught that might pale its luster, lessen its glory, or lower its crown of virtue and honor.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud of my country. I love it and her institutions; but, sir, I fear for its perpetuity. I arraign the Republican party as seeking to destroy this Republic. I charge it with being false to our national honor, with trampling under foot the Declaration of Independence, and attempting to override the Constitution. I charge it with endeavoring to stifle liberty and

oppress humanity, with betraying the hopes of the people and consigning them to the serfdom of financial slavery. I charge it with the desire to institute imperialism and militarism in our free Republic and bring upon our people all the horrors and burdens of a large standing army and forced conscription. I charge it with making covenant with "those twin relics of barbarism," polygamy and slavery, and bringing them under the protection of the United States and our flag. And yet I cling to the hope that an outraged people will speedily awake, cast off their chains, and in the power of their glorious manhood assert their strength, driving forever from power and opportunity to do evil this party which so dishonors our national flag.

When our embattled farmers stood
With their proud flag unfurled,
And in the name of Freedom fired
The shot heard round the world,
The flag that thus they lifted high
For all mankind to see
Was christened in their patriot blood
The Banner of the Free!

Long wave the flag so nobly borne
By freemen stanch and true,
The finest flag in all the world,
The old Red, White, and Blue!
God grant above no conquered race,
Whose rights unheeded be,
Shall float the flag we love to call
The Banner of the Free!

[Applause.]

The Late Garret A. Hobart.

REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES H. GROSVENOR,
OF OHIO,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Friday, January 26, 1900.

The House having under consideration the following resolutions:

"*Resolved*, That the House has received with profound sorrow the intelligence of the death of GARRET A. HOBART, late Vice-President of the United States.

"*Resolved*, That the business of the House be suspended in order that the public services and private virtues of the deceased may be appropriately commemorated.

"*Resolved*, That the Clerk of the House be directed to communicate these resolutions to the Senate"—

Mr. GROSVENOR said:

Mr. SPEAKER: The death of GARRET A. HOBART brings forcibly to our minds some features of our political history which, aside from the personal consideration, are of profound importance. The office of Vice-President has not been considered by our people as possessing that degree of importance which it would seem ought to appertain to that position. Death has more than once laid low the President of the United States and opened that great office to the constitutional successor. Six different Vice-Presidents have died in office—George Clinton, Elbridge Gerry, William R. King, Henry Wilson, Thomas A. Hendricks, and now GARRET A. HOBART. I wish to call attention to an event in our history curious, interesting, and important. It reflects upon the necessity of careful arrangement in the matter of succession in high office.

Thomas A. Hendricks, who had been elected Vice-President with Mr. Cleveland at his first term, died during a vacation of Congress. In other words, he died when there was no House of Representatives in existence as an organized body. Mr. Hendricks had studiously prevented the election of a President pro tempore of the Senate. The construction given to the constitutional provision that "in the absence of the Vice-President or when he shall exercise the office of President of the United States" the Senate might elect a President pro tempore operated to permit the Vice-President to preside so constantly in the Senate that no temporary presiding officer could be elected. And so it was that when Mr. Hendricks died there was no President pro tempore of the Senate. Nor was there a Speaker of the House of Representatives; for the House of Representatives had expired on the 4th of March preceding. The effect of this was to leave but one life between organized government and chaos; and that life was the life of Mr. Cleveland.

Mr. Cleveland did not go to the funeral of his vice-presidential associate. There was very considerable criticism in the press and everywhere throughout the country because of what seemed to be an indifference manifested by Mr. Cleveland. Afterwards the real reason came out, and was complimentary to the kindly nature and generous heart of Mr. Cleveland. He was preparing for the long journey in the inclement weather of November to attend the funeral at Indianapolis, when the question suggested itself to some one—not the President, as it was understood—that it was hardly the right thing for him to do, to travel all the way to Indianapolis, exposing himself to the danger of railroad accidents and other contingencies, and upon the advice of gentlemen of both parties Mr. Cleveland withdrew his engagement and remained in the city of Washington.

It is easy to see how wise was his precaution. Had he been killed in an accident or in any other way lost his life, there was no chart to guide the people of the country in supplying his place. Thereupon, and for this reason, and growing out of this very circumstance, as I understand, Congress passed the existing law cutting off the succession of the Speaker of the House and conferring it (following the Vice-President, the successor by the terms of the Constitution) upon the Secretary of State and successively upon the other members of the Cabinet in the order named in the statute. This covers all the members of the Cabinet except the Secretary of Agriculture, an office created since the passage of that law and which, therefore, was not enumerated by the act. And so we have assured safety again.

GARRET A. HOBART brought the office of Vice-President to a higher degree of value than it had ever had since we were acquainted with the operations of the Government. He was a man of strong personality, a man of high business qualifications, thorough political training and sagacity, genial-minded, warm-hearted, a lovable and admirable personality. And he came to his high office with a purpose to cooperate, not segregate, the office. His nomination at St. Louis was not the accident of political movements by any means. To a great many men who participated in the preconvention politics of 1896 the nomination of HOBART was as well assured before Congress adjourned as it was after the ballot was declared.

He was a fitting coadjutor of the splendid Administration of William McKinley. This is no time nor place, perhaps, to eulogize the current Administration. It may be proper, however, to say that in all its personality, in all its conduct of affairs, the mode and manner of its procedure, the contact of its officials with the public, the dignity and bearing of the Chief Magistrate and those about him, this Administration has been popular and admirable. And there was not one feature of the Administration, aside from the great personality of the President, that was so attractive to the people of the United States as was the personality and participation of HOBART.

As I have said, he did not come here to isolate his office and simply be the presiding officer of the Senate, but he came here to become of the Administration, to be of its councils, to be of its advisers. And the President gladly availed himself of the wisdom, the knowledge, and the administrative ability of the Vice-President. Their friendship was as the friendship of brothers. The proximity of the residence of the Vice-President to the Executive Mansion made association easy, and all forms of dignified distance and ceremonial intercourse were for the most part set aside. A close association between the President and the Vice-President was one of the great features of the period.

Mr. HOBART stamped himself upon the results of legislation. He had no vote, but he had a voice, and his judgment commended itself to Senators and Representatives. During his incumbency of the Vice-Presidential office more than one great event in legislation happened. The enactment of the Dingley law and the ratification of the Spanish treaty were two most memorable contests; and no man outside of the President had more to do with carrying those measures to a successful issue than did GARRET A. HOBART. His wisdom, his just appreciation of others, his kindness of heart, his magnetism, and his personality in general made him a great factor in reaching the results that grew out of those matters.

Of his social life I had but limited personal knowledge; yet I came to be impressed, as others did, with the warmth of his character, with his geniality. He came in contact with American citizens as an American citizen. He had no pride of place that compared with his pride and love of home and home ties. Others will speak more fully of these characteristics. As husband and father, as citizen and politician, as Vice-President, and as a high official in other places his life was above criticism, his efficiency beyond disparagement, and his memory will be to us all a benediction.

Mr. Speaker, I bow with reverence and humility before the awful blow that Providence delivered upon the American people in the untimely death of HOBART. I seek to look beyond the darkness of the clouds that lower upon us, and have faith to believe that beyond them there shines the light of the countenance of the Father of us all, who "doeth all things well." But it is difficult sometimes to feel that degree or reconciliation that is due; we naturally come back to the human standard, and wonder while we bow our heads. We must be rescued from a condition of revolt by the assurance, which we must take with blind faith, "He doeth all things well."

Trade of Porto Rico.

"A great empire and little minds go ill together."

SPEECH

OF

HON. TOWNSEND SCUDDER,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, February 28, 1900,

On the bill (H. R. 8245) to regulate the trade of Porto Rico, and for other purposes.

Mr. SCUDDER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Something higher than party politics, something nobler than campaign expediency, is demanded of the President and the Congress of the United States by the American people.

Expansion has not been accepted by the great body of intelligent citizens of our country with unqualified satisfaction. It is fair to assume that but a small majority would have supported the proposition by their votes had the present extension of the jurisdiction and the resulting responsibilities of the Republic been presented at the polls.

The situation confronting us was not of our choosing. We were drawn into it by the force of circumstances fresh in the minds of all; I need not dwell upon them; a situation incident to our life as a great nation, attended by difficulties, by complications, and by dangers, it is true, but as a people we have no cause for alarm provided we be true to ourselves and true to our obligations to those whose lot has been cast with our own henceforth and forever. Conditions are to be accepted as they exist. The time for protestation has passed. We have expanded. Now is the time to act wisely and in keeping with the lofty motive which justified our interference in the affairs of Cuba, justified the war we waged with Spain, the war we gloriously won.

We destroyed the Spanish fleets in the Pacific and in the Atlantic; we stormed her cities and captured her armies; we drove her from the west and from the east; we took Porto Rico and the Philippines by way of indemnity for the cost of the war, and we paid Spain $20,000,000 to boot—just why I have never been quite able to understand. All this was accomplished by the sovereign will of the American people expressed through their agents in Congress. Porto Rico and the Philippines are ours by virtue of a title recognized by every civilized nation—the title of conquest. The wisdom of taking these islands is no longer a question of practical concern. That they are ours is a fact. Their retention is assured, and it should be recognized that they are to be permanent possessions of the United States, disqualified to be admitted to our Union as States, because we did not take Porto Rico, nor the Philippines, nor Hawaii to make States of them. Neither should we make a State of Cuba, in the event of her wishing to be annexed to this country.

Mr. Chairman, the Constitution was made by the States, and is for the States, and for them alone. Territories are the property of the United States, and Congress can dispose of them as it pleases. This does not mean that the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness is denied to the inhabitants of Territories. They can have, under local regulations, every personal property and business right and protection enjoyed by our citizens under the laws of the Republic, but they can not come into our Union, be represented in the Federal House or the Senate, and take part in the making of laws for the Union or in the election of President and Vice-President of the Republic. These are privileges reserved for States. Statehood is not for them, and should not be for them, and will not be for them with the approbation of the people of the United States; and all this because our Government can not endure permanently half white, half black, red, brown, and mixed; half civilized and educated, half pagan and barbarian; half northern and western, half tropical and oriental; half naked, half clothed; one-half a homogeneous continent, the other half numberless islands extending half way around the globe, striving all to join harmoniously in the government of this land of ours, freed by our fathers with their lifeblood and bestowed upon us as a sacred legacy.

No; statehood is not for these possessions, this new property that has come to us unsought; to statehood they are not entitled, nor for it are they qualified. Justice, however, is their due and justice must be done them. It is the duty of Congress to decide quickly what is needful and proper in respect to each outlying possession by itself considered. Mr. Chairman, it is the case of Porto Rico, which is now before us, and our duty is plain to decide what is needful and proper for that island by itself alone considered. In my opinion this bill should not pass, but free trade with Porto Rico should be established. If a deficit be found in the revenues of the island, an appropriation of moneys should be made out of the general fund in the National Treasury to meet that deficit.

Free trade will benefit the producers in Porto Rico; it will benefit the consumers in the United States; it will go a long way toward simplifying the problem of government in the island.

The high protectionists who are objecting to free trade between the United States and our territory in Porto Rico, and those who are quibbling about the constitutional power of Congress over national territory, would better turn their attention to the history of the continental colonies and to the events of the past twenty years in the West Indies and in the Philippines. The inciting cause of revolution and of insurrection has been taxation. The school children know that the American Revolution was provoked because the Government in London taxed the colonies, now forming part of the United States, for its benefit and exploited them for the enrichment of the home country. The British had not yet learned that colonies can not be retained by any such plan. The modern colonial policy of intelligent nations is one which gives to the colonies and dependencies the greatest possible liberty and independence and which lays upon them no burden of taxation not necessary to their government. Great Britain follows such a policy, and that is why Canada and Australia remain loyal to the home country and why they are sending soldiers to fight her battles in South Africa now, where an attempt is making to extend the same liberties and privileges to the English-speaking people there.

Spain, which is not a modern nation, but rather a survival from mediævalism, consistently treated her colonies as the private game preserves of the mother country. No poachers were allowed. She raised tariff barriers between the United States and Cuba and Porto Rico so high that the Porto Ricans and the Cubans were forced to trade with Spain, and what they could not buy there they had to get here, and pay twice or three times as much for it as it cost the Americans. Yet Cuban and Porto Rican sugar and tobacco were sold largely in this market, in competition with the product of men who paid less than half as much for their flour and their meat as the West Indians paid. The islands in the Caribbean Sea belong in the commercial system of the United States. Spain attempted to force them from that system by discriminating tariff and shipping laws. It was rebellion against this crime against nature which caused the Cuban insurrection and which led the United States to interfere in the interests of humanity. And from this interference has come our possession of Porto Rico and the Philippine Islands.

Now, we regret to see that there are high protectionists so blind to the teachings of experience that they would have the United States repeat the fatal blunder of Spain in Porto Rico and in the Philippines. They are talking about the ruin that will be wrought on American tobacco growers and beet-sugar growers if the free-trade bill framed by the House Committee on Insular Affairs extending the tariff and revenue laws to Porto Rico shall be passed. If that bill or something like it is not passed, the people of the United States will be guilty of one of the gravest economic and political crimes of the century. We have taken Porto Rico from Spain, and by that act have deprived her of the benefit of the trade relations which she enjoyed with that country, and we have not opened our markets to her nor her markets to our food stuffs. To-day there is a wall around her; she is isolated; and her last state is worse than her first. It is too late now to consider whether a group of producers in the United States will benefit or suffer by free trade with Porto Rico.

If that question were not considered and decided before Porto Rico was taken, it must be regarded as decided now and decided in favor of the Porto Ricans. No man with a comprehension of the problem involved can for a moment advocate anything else than the freest trade relations between the United States and their territory in the West Indies. The establishment of such relations was a moral obligation that we assumed the moment we took the territory from Spain. And if we do not establish these relations, we have annexed a rabbit warren of insurrections justified and excused by the same unjust exploitation of territory for the benefit of the home country that excused and justified the rebellion against Spanish extortion in Cuba. A fatal mistake will be made if we allow the bigger problem of statesmanship to be obscured by consideration of petty questions of Federal revenue or by the demand of one or two interests for protection against competition with people living under the same flag with them.

I am quoting freely from editorials in the Brooklyn Eagle, which seems to me most sound on this Porto Rican problem.

In the popular mind the Porto Rican case is different from that of Cuba or the Philippines. It came under the protection of the Stars and Stripes more than willingly—gladly. We can not

afford to forget that we sent an army under General Miles to conquer Porto Rico. That army went prepared to meet the fiercest resistance, not only from the soldiers of Spain, but from the inhabitants of the island. What was the fact? From the landing at the port of Ponce to the entrance into San Juan the resistance was nominal and the welcome was generous. General Miles and his armies were everywhere greeted as deliverers. When they entered San Juan the children, dressed in white, strewed flowers before the feet of our marching soldiers.

Suppose, when we were expanding so blithly in August, 1898, when the Porto Ricans were scattering flowers before our invading armies and shouting, "Vivan los Americans!" some cynic had said: What fools! These people have seen their best days. Spain has been their true benefactor; Spain has made them prosperous. Under American rule their industries will decay, their laborers will starve, their crops will rot on their wharves; the Americans will let them go to ruin, lest they bother them in their markets. What should we have said to that base libeler of this country?

Mr. Chairman, the present condition of Porto Rico would have been absolutely incredible and inconceivable to Americans of two years ago.

Porto Rico has become American territory. The President of the United States, the Secretary of War, and the Governor-General of the island, after careful study of the situation, were of one mind—that we should abolish all customs tariffs between the United States and Porto Rico and give her products free access to our markets. Here was a remarkable concensus of opinion among the men who were in the best position to judge what was due to Porto Rico and what was due to ourselves, to our good faith, and to our sense of justice. It was hailed by the people of Porto Rico with delight as the measure of relief and help which they ardently desired and sorely needed. The Ways and Means Committee gave support to the proposition of the President and his advisers and brought in a bill for free trade with Porto Rico.

But, Mr. Chairman, suddenly a change came over the members of this committee—their free-trade bill is withdrawn and this bill introduced, placing the people of Porto Rico in the position of foreigners toward the great Republic under whose flag they so eagerly sought refuge. I do not dispute the legal right to enact this law. I believe that Porto Rico and the Philippines are Territories, in other words, property, of the United States; that Congress can do what it pleases to them, or with them, or for them, or against them, and that whatever it does will neither be constitutional nor unconstitutional, because the Constitution is not for Territories, and Territories are not under or within the protection and rights of the Constitution, unless or until Congress, by law, may choose to put them there.

Congress has not chosen to put them there, and probably will not, because that would place them in a condition of incipient statehood, which, when it materialized into statehood, would authorize for them representation in the House and in the Senate and participation in the election of President and Vice-President. The inhabitants of those territories are citizens of that Republic of which the name is "the United States," and in that respect are "citizens of the United States," but they do not have the rights of citizens of States, and will not have until the islands are made States, an event very unlikely to occur in a long while, if ever.

I oppose this bill because it will perpetrate a wrong; because it taxes these impoverished people unjustly, taxes their necessities, among them rice, the principal food of their poor, 25 per cent of its value. I oppose the bill because it is an unwarranted and unrighteous exercise of the power I concede to be vested in Congress, but which Congress can not exercise in this way with honor or credit to the American people.

Against Porto Rico we have closed the markets of Cuba. Those of Spain are also closed to her as a result of the war, and now this bill proposes to close her only remaining market—that of the United States.

To these oppressed people our President issued some few months ago a proclamation:

> We have come to bestow upon you the blessings and immunities of the liberal institutions of our Government.

Is this the beneficent rule we promised her under the Stars and Stripes? Is this the prosperity we held out as a relief from Spanish oppression? Are these export and import burdens the "immunities of our liberal institutions?"

In the light of recent events this Presidential proclamation has a hollow ring.

Dispatches from Porto Rico show that the condition of that island, which welcomed our troops so enthusiastically, is most deplorable. There is no money to plant new crops or to pay laborers, thousands of whom are on the point of starvation. The local press expresses the opinion that the conditions were better during the darkest days of the Spanish régime.

Imagine that, and try to put yourself in the place of the American citizen who is willing to have that shame remain upon the American flag because he thinks that if the starving Porto Ricans were allowed to sell their products freely in our markets, as the President has recommended, his profits might be diminished by their competition.

The President in his message favored free trade, which is only another name for good faith, with Porto Rico. That was to his honor, and it will remain so until he retracts it, especially, if not retracting it, he should reiterate it to the Congress of the United States.

We are now told the President favors this bill.

It is not dignified for a President of the United States, after pointing out for the information of Congress and the country the course demanded by "our plain duty," straightway, from terror inspired by the protected clique, to leave the people in doubt whether or not he continues to think so. It is not dignified in him to allow himself to be quoted, or to be quotable, on both sides of a question which, according to his own declaration, is a question of public morals as well as of public policy.

This bill is branded with meanness, with perfidy, with cruelty. It is un-American, foreign to the temperament of our people, repulsive to their sense of justice. Being unworthy of them, it will, and justly, be condemned by them.

Mr. Chairman, our honor as a nation demands that our faith pledged to Porto Rico be kept. Statehood we did not promise her. We can afford no admixture upon an even footing in our body politic of Porto Rican, Hawaiian, Cuban, or Philippine ignorance and superstition. We did promise Porto Rico the "blessings and immunities of the liberal institutions of our Government." First amongst these ranks justice. We can be just to ourselves only by being just to our dependents.

When our duty appears so clear, why has the Committee of Ways and Means gone back upon the recommendations of the President and of the Secretary of War and of the matured opinion of its own members, as embodied in the first bill for the relief of Porto Rico? What was the influence more powerful than that of the Administration which has induced it to bring in a bill which is not what the Porto Ricans asked for?

What can the opposition be to this demand of "our plain duty" and of our plain interest? What can it be but the fear that when the wall of the tariff is once taken down in one place the whole heterogeneous fabric is bound to collapse? But do the subsidy hunters and the pap hunters really imagine that, lest they should lose some part of their hold upon our commercial legislation, Congress will deny the just claims of the people of Porto Rico, who have already deserved so well and suffered so grievously at our hands, and that the people of the United States will sustain Congress? I think they mistake the people's mind. The fact is, our high protectionists have been napping. The President thought them safely tucked in and decided to go it alone; he sent his message to Congress without consulting them. Theirs was a rude awakening! While they slept the country had drifted into troubled waters.

Here was danger of bringing in from a weak, petty island a certain amount of tobacco and sugar and oranges free of duty. So they "organized" and sent a delegation to Washington to remonstrate with Mr. McKinley.

It is a matter of indifference to this favored coterie whether the islanders are to be citizens or subjects. The political status of Porto Rico is nothing to them. Taxation without representation, or with it, is quite immaterial from their point of view. What they will not put up with in any event is the admission of Porto Rican products to the United States free of duty. If they could only realize how small the island really is in productive area and in population, and how its industries are crippled by want of capital and organization and effective labor, they would laugh at their own apprehensions.

The theory that any of the products of Porto Rico can come into destructive competition with business interests in the United States is an exaggeration. Even were it true, a measure of consideration by our people for the interests of humanity and of morals, with a willingness to let business interests take their chances under conditions created for this country as a trustee of the world and of liberty in an epoch significant to freedom and to progress, would be a grateful change-off from a commercialism of spirit of which there can be something too much and from which this Administration has not been free.

Truly this protected clique are needlessly alarmed. Long ago they lost their heads; now their hearts are gone as well.

There seems to be something about the influences of protection which, beginning by robbing the beneficiary of his independence, ends by robbing him of self-respect. Protection at best is a demoralizing thing and tends to pauperize the manhood of those dependent on its favors; but in the past we have had at least the excuse that its evils fell on the heads of those who had the right to vote against it. In this case the injury and wrong are done to

helpless people whom we are pretending to rescue from the rapacity of a mediæval power.

Now, the safety of the United States in the task that it has undertaken in the Pacific, as well as in the Caribbean, lies in the capacity and willingness of our Government to administer the affairs of the new possessions for the best possible interest of their present and future inhabitants. If we can not and will not do that, we shall fail ignobly and disastrously. It will be a moral failure, and therefore painful for those who are sensitive as to the honor of the country. But it will also be a material failure, and will bring us an endless series of troubles. It is as fully established as any truth of governmental experience can be that the only solid and trustworthy basis for the rule of dependencies is the substantial content of the people. With that steady advance in prosperity is possible. Without that there is no limit to the expense, difficulty, strife, and confusion that the governing power must encounter, with no compensation whatever. The duty as well as the necessity of scrupulous respect for the interests and rights of the dependent people is increased in direct ratio that they are politically limited. Every act of injustice, of greed, on the part of the governing power is a weapon with which to resist its authority and thwart its purposes.

We must administer our new dependencies so as to gain their confidence, their faith, and good will. Along these lines we have been put to the test in the past and have met with success. There is no barrier to success now if we keep in view correct principles.

The policy we should pursue toward our possessions is this: Give them an honest and intelligent form of government; as they progress extend the system of local government; teach them to govern themselves until finally they shall be as free as is one of our Territories. This policy should include every effort to teach progress and to produce prosperity. Schools, railroads, good roads, public institutions—all these things must come as rapidly as possible. We must hold them close to us commercially, but to make them an integral part of the United States at the present time, which is practically another way of calling them and treating them as States, is absurd. It may be that the time will never come when it will be desirable to make States of them. Awaiting such time, we should bind these islands to us with the closest ties, both of governmental and commercial relations.

For generations this is as much as they can expect; it is all we promised them, all they are fitted and prepared to receive. I can not lend myself to the idea that races so distinct from our own can ever be admitted to a closer relationship with us.

Ours is a Union of equal and sovereign States, containing a homogeneous population, belonging to a race trained for centuries in the arts of self-government. It was by the slow and tedious processes of evolution that there were developed in the minds of the Anglo-Saxon the science of freedom and the ability to assert and maintain independence.

Centuries must come and go before these childish foreign races that have come under our jurisdiction and protection can qualify themselves to meet the responsibilities of our form and system of popular government to be administered by themselves for themselves.

Until that day we bear the burden; we can not shift it. Over Porto Rico the control of the United States has been substituted for that of Spain. As yet it has not been contended seriously—and may grounds for such contention never exist—that this change is for the worse. If we be true to our institutions, true to ourselves, true to the principles of the fathers who laid the foundation of this glorious nation of ours, the absolute tyrannically exercised power under which our acquired territories have groaned during centuries of Spanish misrule will have departed from their islands with the scattered remnants of the armies of Spain. May it be our proud boast that where we found an oppressed, weeping, starving people, we sowed seeds of hope, freedom, happiness, and plenty.

To our guidance and protection have these people been transferred and intrusted. Our responsibilities to them are great; greater should be our determination to quickly open to them the channels of education, of religion, of benevolence, of investment, of sanitation, of enterprise and commerce, and this so unselfishly, so generously, that all the world may have additional proof of the sincerity of our profession that humanity and not gain was our inspiring spirit and genius when we deserted the plowshare for the sword. Excepting in blessing the Stars and Stripes should never wave over land or sea. The enactment of this Republican bill into law will be a breach of faith on the part of a powerful nation with the distracted people of a little island, a breach of faith the less pardonable because we are so strong and the island so helpless. Let us not fall into that error lest our flag loose its gift of benediction. Gentlemen of the majority on the other side of the House—

"The question with me is not whether you have a right to render your people miserable, but whether it is not your interest to make them happy." [Loud applause.]

Trade of Puerto Rico.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN W. MADDOX,

OF GEORGIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, February 23, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 8245) to regulate the trade of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes—

Mr. MADDOX said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Committee on Ways and Means—that is, a majority of them—after much investigation have come to the conclusion that the term "United States" as used in section 8 and Article I has reference only to the States that constitute the Federal Union, and does not include Territories. The section construed by the Ways and Means Committee is as follows:

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Now, in order to justify the tariff bill before the House providing for duties on goods interchanged between this country and Puerto Rico there must be some way to circumvent the Constitution; so the Ways and Means Committee have come to the conclusion that this section of the Constitution does not apply to the Territories; therefore the provision which requires all taxes, imposts, duties, etc., shall be uniform throughout the United States does not apply to the bill under consideration. They contend that Congress has plenary power over the Territories and that we have the power to pass one law for New Mexico, a different one for Oklahoma, and still a different one for Puerto Rico. But the question is, Shall we accept their construction of the Constitution or shall we look elsewhere for light on the subject? I am glad to say that identical question has been decided by the Supreme Court of the United States and this section of the Constitution construed. Chief Justice Marshall, speaking for that court in the case of Loughborough *vs.* Blake, in 5 Wheaton, 660, said:

The power to lay and collect duties, imposts, and excises may be exercised and must be exercised throughout the United States. Does this term designate the whole or any part of the American empire? Certainly this question can admit of but one answer. It is the name given to our great Republic, which is composed of States and Territories. The District of Columbia or the territory west of the Missouri is not less within the United States than Maryland or Pennsylvania, and it is not less necessary, on the principles of our Constitution, that uniformity in the imposition of imposts, duties, and excises shall be observed in the one than the other.

This decision has been cited and affirmed by that court again in a later case, and attention has been called to it on this floor, and there is no decision of the courts that seemingly conflicts with this ruling, yet, on the other hand, is indirectly sustained by numerous decisions. Then the question naturally arses, Is Puerto Rico a Territory of the United States or not? If so, then, according to the decision of the Supreme Court, the term "United States" as used in this section does apply to the Territories, and our majority members of the Ways and Means Committee must be mistaken.

It will be observed that Chief Justice Marshall says that the term "United States" as here used is the name given to our great Republic, which is composed of States and Territories, and it is not less necessary on the principles of our Constitution that uniformity in the imposition of imposts, duties, and excises shall be observed in one than the other. So, if this be true, how can we levy a duty on the products of Puerto Rico? If Puerto Rico is not a part of the United States territory, what is it? It has been ceded to us by Spain, our flag floats over it, our Government is supreme there, and the inhabitants acknowledge their allegiance to us; and if they are not of us, who are they and what right have we to legislate at all for them?

Mr. Chairman, it is perfectly clear to me as to our duty in this matter. We have sworn to support and defend the Constitution, and with a due regard for that oath no man can afford to vote for this bill. Puerto Rico is undoubtedly United States territory, and Chief Justice Marshall says that the Territories are a part of the United States, and that duties and imposts must be uniform applies to Territories the same as to States.

Then this bill is in the very teeth of the Constitution. But I desire to call attention to the report of the committee again. They say that the term "United States" as here used in the Constitution has reference only to the States that constitute the Federal Union and does not include Territories; and yet, after deliberating on that question for days, they report this bill now under consideration, and it will be observed that they provide that a

duty of 25 per cent shall be levied on all goods imported into the United States from Puerto Rico and the same amount shall be collected on all goods exported from the United States into Puerto Rico. The word "Territory" does not appear in this bill. Now, if the gentlemen are correct in their construction of this section of the Constitution, what is to prevent the Territories of New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Indian Territory from shipping their goods free of duty into Puerto Rico, and Puerto Rico into the Territories? You have said and continue to say that the term "United States" as here used does not include the Territories.

I challenge you to show how this bill can prevent free trade with the Territories when you provide a tariff only from and to the United States. You do not say the United States and Territories thereof, as required in the report you have presented to this House. You say that the United States does not include the Territories. Then I will inquire if you purposely left out the Territories, proposing to give them free trade with Puerto Rico? If you did not, then in framing this bill you should have said, under your reasoning, that all imports from the United States and the Territories thereof entering the ports of Puerto Rico must pay a duty, etc., and all imports from Puerto Rico entering into the ports of the United States and Territories thereof shall pay so and so, but you do not say that. Now, if you stand by your report and your construction of the Constitution, in order to have made your bill apply to the Territories of Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma and the Indian Territory you were bound to refer to them as Territories, because you say that the United States as here used does not include Territories; therefore, following your contention, there is nothing in this bill to prevent free trade with the Territories.

But you say that the Dingley rate will apply to all other countries, and you can collect that duty from the Territories. My reply to that is that they are not of another country, for you say in your argument that the Territories, geographically speaking, are in the United States; therefore they are not from another country. But in my opinion you originally framed this bill to read "the United States and Territories thereof," but it occurred to you, no doubt, that it would not look well from your standpoint to have a Territory collecting export and import tax from itself and would be absolutely ridiculous to the world, but your logic leads you gentlemen into these incongruities; your foundation is false, your conclusions are false.

But, Mr. Chairman, to show that the gentlemen who are insisting on the proposition that the term "United States" as here used does not include the Territories is an entirely new theory and never brought forward by any other statesman in this country, we have only to refer to the numerous acts that are now of force in this country which apply to the Territories and States alike and are being enforced in both States and Territories, where you will find the United States only used in the verbiage of these laws. The word "Territory" is not used at all; yet no court, no lawyer, no statesman until now ever found out that the United States did not include the Territories. The internal-revenue acts, under which we are now collecting the war tax, is absolutely inoperative in the Territories and District of Columbia, if the contention of the majority on the Ways and Means Committee is correct. Yet the Government is collecting its revenue from the District and Territories with clocklike regularity. Yet the word "Territory," or "Territories," does not appear in these laws. If you are right, gentlemen, by what authority do you collect these taxes?

I would ask you, further, how many men have been tried and convicted under statutes in the Territories passed by Congress in which the word "Territory" does not appear. Yet if you are correct, these men were illegally convicted. There are hundreds of just such statutes that would be rendered inoperative in the Territories, and your construction of the Constitution, if correct, would produce untold confusion. But what does that amount to when you intend to override the Constitution and the laws of the land in order that you may find some pretext to justify the imperial policy upon which you have just started? But gentlemen on that side of the House first started out on the theory that they must lay this tariff on Puerto Rico or it would be taken as a precedent for future legislation with regard to the Philippines, but when called down on that by showing that the precedent was already set by giving free trade to Hawaii, then they shifted their sails, and now claim that they must raise a revenue in this way for the purpose of building roads, establishing schools, and to aid the poor Puerto Ricans. Gentlemen, this last plea is nothing but hypocritical cant of the most transparent type.

When General Miles landed in Puerto Rico, he issued this proclamation:

PROCLAMATION OF MAJOR-GENERAL MILES.

HEADQUARTERS OF THE ARMY,
Ponce, Puerto Rico, July 28, 1898.

To the inhabitants of Puerto Rico:

In the prosecution of the war against the Kingdom of Spain by the people of the United States in the cause of liberty, justice, and humanity, its military forces have come to occupy the island of Puerto Rico.

They come bearing the banner of freedom, inspired by a noble purpose to seek the enemies of our country and yours and to destroy or capture all who are in armed resistance. They bring you the fostering arm of a nation of free people, whose greatest power is in its justice and humanity to all those living within its fold. Hence the first effect of this occupation will be the immediate release from your former political relations and, it is hoped, a cheerful acceptance of the government of the United States. The chief object of the American military forces will be to overthrow the armed authority of Spain and to give to the people of your beautiful island the largest measure of liberty consistent with this military occupation.

We have not come to make war upon the people of a country that for centuries have been oppressed, but, on the contrary, to bring you protection, not only to yourselves, but to your property, to promote your prosperity, and bestow upon you the immunities and blessings of the liberal institutions of our Government. It is not our purpose to interfere with any existing laws and customs that are wholesome and beneficial to your people so long as they conform to the rules of military administration of order and justice. This is not a war of devastation, but one to give to all within the control of its military and naval forces the advantages and blessings of enlightened civilization.

NELSON A. MILES,
Major-General, Commanding United States Army.

When these ringing words went out to the inhabitants, they thought he, as the representative of this great Republic, meant what he said, and they welcomed our forces with open arms and aided them to drive the Spaniards out of that island. They are here to-day, acting through their various committees, asking us to live up to our promises. They represent every condition on that island—bankers, merchants, farmers, and even the politicians are represented—and they with one accord decline to ask alms of this country. They have suffered many misfortunes since the American forces occupied their island, but they ask nothing but the rights of American citizens—free trade with this country and a civil form of government with authority to borrow money on their own assets—and they would take care of themselves.

The President, in his message to Congress, when we first assembled, said it was our plain duty to give them free trade; the Secretary of War recommended it; the provisional governor of that island recommended it; the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee drew up a bill to authorize and carry out these recommendations; but things have changed all at once. The chairman now offers a substitute for his own bill levying a tariff on the products of Puerto Rico, a complete about face. The whole country is astounded. Who caused this change? Who is it that can stand aside the President, the Secretary of War, the governor, and turn the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee topsy-turvy? Gentlemen have attempted to account for this by saying if we grant free trade with Puerto Rico it must be extended to the archipelago. Was not that fact just as true, if true at all, when the President made his recommendation, concurred in by all the officers under him who were charged with the duty of looking after Puerto Rican affairs?

You have set aside any such argument by contending that you are authorized under the Constitution to legislate for these Territories as you please; that you can make one law for New Mexico, another for Oklahoma. Why talk about precedent when you can do as you please? If precedents are to control, then all the precedents are one way so far as our Territories in the geographical part of the United States are concerned, as you would say, but you have set the precedent by giving Hawaii free trade also; why do you not follow your precedent? When you are driven from this position, you say that you must raise revenue to support the island. Anyone who knows anything about the exports and imports of this island must know that this bill will not raise one-third of the amount necessary to be expended there, and you know as well and better than anyone else that that plea is but a mere subterfuge. Everything went well for these people until the sugar trust, tobacco trust, and other organizations who furnish campaign funds for the Republican party put in their appearance; then came the change.

Who is a President of this great Republic, a Cabinet officer, a governor, a chairman of the greatest committee of this House, when one of these vampires on the body politic calls a halt on legislation? Kings, emperors, and potentates never had the power in any age that enthroned wealth exercises in the Republican party. The Constitution of a free people must be overthrown at its behest. The highest and most exalted officers must stultify themselves at its command. These very facts should and doubtless will convince the country that if the Republic is to be maintained and our free institutions preserved, the Republican party must be retired from power.

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen have quoted from decisions of the Supreme Court rendered by men who have long since passed off the stage of action. They have quoted from dead statesmen. I send to the desk a letter from a living one which I desire read.

QUITMAN, GA., *February 17, 1900.*

Hon. JOHN W. MADDOX, *Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SIR: I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of February 12, in which you do me the honor to ask my views of the bill "to regulate the trade of Puerto Rico" (H. R. 8245), of which you send me a copy together with the report of the Committee on Ways and Means recommending its passage.

This bill proposes to levy upon all articles imported into the island from countries other than the United States the same duties that are required by

law to be collected upon articles imported into the United States from foreign countries. As these duties were desired for the protection of manufactures as well as for revenue, and Puerto Rico being an agricultural country, the island under this provision of the bill would feel only the burdens of the tariff and none of its beneficence, so called. It is true that sugar and cigars are made in Puerto Rico, and fruits are from there; but nobody, I presume, would ever wish to import these articles into the island, for obvious reasons.

But this infliction, burdensome and daring as it will be to a people unfamiliar with its terms, to the making of which they had no part—still it might have been expected as an incident of annexation, or as the fate of war.

Being thus in large part cut off from their accustomed trade with foreign countries, this bill also proposes to levy 25 per cent of these tariff duties upon articles carried from the United States to the island, and from the island to the United States. In other words the inhabitants of Puerto Rico, by this bill, would have to pay what we pay under the general tariff, and in addition 25 per cent on their trade with us. By the majority of the committee this project is justified on the pretext that Puerto Rico and its people merely belong to us and form no part of us. The contention is that we are sovereign, and the Puerto Ricans are our subjects and vassals. This revolutionary scheme of government is based on a new theory of the Constitution, while the Constitution provides that "all duties, imports and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States," it is insisted that the phrase "United States" has reference only to the States that compose the Federal Union, and does not include Territories.

To this startling view it ought to be sufficient to say that Chief Justice Marshall and Chief Justice Taney and their associates on the Supreme Bench established a different doctrine. The cases are familiar. It ought also to weigh against this new and dangerous assumption that all the acts of Congress proceed upon the contrary hypothesis. If in all cases in which our customs and revenue laws and penal statutes refer to the United States without more, the Territories are not included, this construction would result in very surprising confusion. As one illustration among a thousand of like character, let it be remembered that the first section of the act, commonly called the war-revenue act of 1898, the tax of $2 is imposed on all beer, ale, porter, and other similar fermented liquors brewed, manufactured, and sold or stored in warehouses, or removed for consumption or sale within the United States. Will it be contended that Congress meant to exclude the Territories, and that beer should be taxed as formerly only $1 in the Territories? It is needless to multiply these citations. I can not think that this absurd effort to stultify itself will be sanctioned by Congress.

What good reason can be given for overturning the judicial and Congressional precedents of a hundred years? It is conceded in the report of the majority of the committee that the free importation of Puerto Rican sugar and tobacco would not affect prices of these articles in the great volume of our trade; but it is said ultimately that it is the purpose of this bill to set a precedent against free trade with Cuba and the Philippine Islands. If uniformity of taxation is not desirable between the States and Territories, or maintainable as a constitutional requirement, why should uniformity be necessary in taxes and excises imposed on the Territories? The Hawaiian Islands already furnish an example of a Territory not subject to such an imposition.

Indeed, precedents seem to have very little weight in this new contention. If a Territory is outside of the Constitution, as claimed, then each might be treated according to its own circumstances. There is nothing in the condition of the people of this island to invite this oppressive exaction. They have lost their trade with the mother country and have been driven from their profitable trade with Habana. They did not resist our armies. The storm of last August destroyed the accumulation of years. Last year after the storm we were called upon to send contributions, through Government agencies, to prevent the people from starving. Shall we at the beginning of this year lay taxes upon their meat and bread? And to do this inhuman thing we must disregard the recommendations of the President, the well-considered views of the Secretary of War, and of all the official persons whom the President and Secretary have charged with responsibility in the island. Such an edict by Congress would be akin to the reconcentrado policy of General Weyler.

Spain had promised these people autonomy: they already had deputies to represent them in the Spanish Cortes. I would, of course, select the intelligent class of the island and give them a form of home government with power to propose their own taxes, and I would give them a Delegate in Congress, to be heard as their representative whenever taxation is there proposed. I would also try to impress them with that other fundamental American doctrine that they are to be governed by their own consent as long as they remain a part of this great Republic.

I have written very hastily and imperfectly, but you are at liberty to use this letter as you please.

With great respect, I am,

Very truly, yours,

HENRY G. TURNER.

The Puerto Rico Tariff.

With a due regard for the habits, customs, conditions, and characters of the new peoples and possessions placed in our charge, this nation will legislate for them in justice, humanity, and wisdom.

SPEECH

OF

HON. W. L. JONES,

OF WASHINGTON,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, February 28, 1900.

On the bill (H. R. 8245) to regulate the trade of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes.

Mr. JONES of Washington said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Much has been said of the bill under consideration. It has been denounced as an act of tyranny, oppression, outrage, perfidy, and breach of faith. Those who have denounced it, however, have been very careful not to call the attention of the people to its terms. It is easy to accuse, denounce, and condemn. It would seem, however, that the American people would begin to look with suspicion upon those who are always accusing, condemning, and denouncing.

When our people stop to think, they will feel that no set of men, no matter to what party they belong, will willfully propose an iniquitous measure. The men of one party are just as honest, just as humane, just as devoted to liberty and justice as those of any other party. Every fair-minded man will agree in this. Let us, then, consider the bill. In doing so, it is well to know something of the people for whom we are called to legislate. We should know something of their conditions and wants, immediate and future.

Puerto Rico is about 3,600 square miles in area, and has from 800,000 to 1,000,000 people. The people are merchants, planters, and laborers, or peons. The latter class includes the great majority of the people. The merchants and planters are the well-to-do classes. Many of them, however, are woefully ignorant. Only about 12 per cent of the people can read and write, and about 5 per cent can write. The great mass of the people are poor, ignorant, and simple. They live in huts of the poorest character, eat but little, wear but little, and receive but little for their labor. From 15 to 30 cents per day is their wages.

Captain Macomb, in his report as to the conditions of the inhabitants of the island, says:

> The ignorance of the laboring classes is beyond American comprehension. Reading and writing are unknown to them. Their food is less nourishing than that of convicts in our most severe penitentiaries—food that would sustain life in an idle person, but which means anæmia and slow starvation to the workingman, whose tissues require daily renewal.
>
> The wages of the "peon," the farm laborer, is from 2 to 4 reals—that is, from 15 to 30 cents, American money—per working day. These peons are usually married and have families, sometimes more than one wife. I say "married," but the legal ceremony has in many cases been omitted, from the entire lack of means with which to pay the charges of the priest and the Government.
>
> They live in huts made of sticks and poles covered with thatches of palm leaves. A family of a dozen may be huddled together in one room, often with only a dirt floor. They have little food worthy of the name, and only the most scanty of clothing, while children of less than 7 or 8 years of age are often entirely naked. A few may own a machete or a hoe, but more have no worldly possessions whatever. Their food is fruit, and if they are wage-earners, a little rice and codfish in addition.

The quoted remarks of James Anthony Froude, in General Davis's report, apply with full force to these people:

> Morals in the technical sense they have none, but they can not be said to sin, because they have no knowledge of law, and therefore they can commit no breach of law. They are naked and are not ashamed. They are married, but not parsoned. The women prefer the looser tie, that they may be able to lose the man if he treats her unkindly, yet they are not licentious. * * * The system is strange, but it answers. * * * There is evil, but there is not the demoralizing effect of evil. They sin, but they sin only as animals, without shame, because there is no sense of doing wrong. They eat the forbidden fruit, but it brings with it no knowledge of the difference between good and evil. * * * They are innocently happy in the unconsciousness of the obligations of morality. They eat, drink, sleep, and smoke, and do the least in the way of work they can. They have no ideas of duty, and therefore are not made uneasy by neglecting it. (See General Davis's report, pages 17 and 18.)

This is what Seaborn G. Chiles, first lieutenant, Eleventh Infantry, commanding at Aguadilla, says in his report of September 20, 1899:

> The city employees were paid at irregular intervals, often going for months without a cent other than what they were able to obtain on duebills. It was impossible for the municipal government to be at all satisfactory or just, owing to the great rivalry between the two political parties. Those in power favored only their friends, while everything possible was done to injure their political enemies. On the other hand, the defeated party did all it could to annoy and give trouble to those in power. This state of affairs is now continually giving trouble, and will continue to do so until the present political parties die out altogether. Another great abuse of this power was the system by which a favored person could imprison his personal enemies on trumped-up charges. When the Americans took charge of the island all the jails were found crowded with prisoners, some of whom had been confined for great lengths of time, with only the most trivial charges against them. They had never been given any kind of a trial, and from all indications there appeared to be no prospect of their ever being brought to trial. There were a number of cases where men had been confined for many months, when even if they had been convicted of the charges against them the limit of the punishment was only a few days' confinement.
>
> The result of all this on the people has been to make them unambitious, deceitful, and dishonest. A more helpless and worthless set of people it is hard to imagine. In my opinion they are far inferior to our Southern negroes, and but little, if any, better than our Indians. They certainly have all their vices, with none of their virtues.
>
> After the hurricane of August 8, instead of going to work and trying to help themselves, they made no effort whatever to do anything, but simply sat down and speculated on how much the Government was going to do for them. A great many of them, for fear they would not receive the full benefit of the Government's charity, made no attempt to repair their houses, but continued to live in them as they were left by the storm. They also look upon the help they are receiving as their right and as a matter of course, and they are totally devoid of anything approaching gratitude. They even go so far as to complain of the kind of food they are getting, and demand, and even expect to get, what they wish. The people themselves, and even those in authority—the local boards of charity and alcaldes—thought it a great hardship when the able bodied men were required to work for what rations they received, notwithstanding the fact that the work is being done on the towns and they are the ones who are receiving the benefit of it. The sudden change from the most grinding oppression to absolute freedom has been too much for them, and they expect entirely too much.
>
> I merely mention this to give some idea of the character and disposition of the people. To make any material changes in the present government is, I think, a hopeless task. They are certainly not capable of self-government, and, in my opinion, it is a question of many years before they will be. Only

by the most liberal system of education applied to the coming generation, with a thorough introduction of American ideas, can we hope for any beneficial results. The people naturally are a very restless and turbulent race, always ready and eager to engage in any plunder and excitement that may be proposed by anyone who for the moment has succeeded in catching their ears.

One of the worst misfortunes the Americans had to deal with, immediately after taking possession of the island, was the plunder and burning all over the country by these people, who seemed to have no object whatever in doing this, but simply did it on account of the unsettled condition of affairs at the time. They are very easily led by anyone who is able to attract their attention, and the person who has succeeded in doing this can get them to believe anything he wishes to tell them, and can do with them whatever he pleases. They have no ideas or opinions of their own, and have never been taught to think for themselves. It has been said that they will do everything in their power to elevate a popular idol to the highest position, and once he has reached that position will do everything possible to pull him down again. It is all due to their restlessness and desire for change.

The mode of life among the lower classes is very low indeed, being not a great deal better than savages, and corresponding in many respects to our Indians. Their houses are made of anything they can get to piece together—principally palm leaves—and it is a very common sight to see six or eight persons, or even more, living in a little hut hardly large enough for two. There can be no privacy in such an arrangement, and, consequently, the scale of morality is very low. It is another common sight to see any number of children, some 8 or 9 years old, running naked on the streets. But the most noticeable of all was the total lack of any sanitary arrangements whatever. In anything that was done this seems never to have been considered at all. When the Americans took possession the accumulation of filth and dirt in the towns was simply beyond description, and the only wonder is that disease and epidemics were so few. (See report of General Davis, pages 332 and 333.)

These are the people for whom we must legislate. Are they citizens now? If so, by what act have they become such? Does the flying of the flag there make them such? I think not. The flag floats over the Yakima Indian Reservation, near my home. There are from 1,200 to 2,000 Indians there. Are they citizens? They are not treated as such. They are not citizens; they will not be citizens, either, until this Government sees fit to clothe them with this priceless privilege. Do you believe the people above-described should at once be made citizens of this great Republic? They are but little better, if any, than the Indians. Do you think they should have the same privileges as yourself? Do you think the same law that governs you would be sufficient for them? I do not. And I believe that we have the right and power to govern these people, not only in a way for our own good, but also for theirs. These statements have been confirmed by further reading and investigation. The more I read the more I become convinced that it is not so much American citizenship that they want as it is a helping hand, elevating examples, and guiding, directing, encouraging laws. They need the help of a father, and not the toga of citizenship.

It is said that this bill is unconstitutional. Who always raise this objection? The Democrats! Is any new legislation proposed they say "it is unconstitutional." From the very foundation of our Government we have always had a party under some name or another opposing legislation because of its unconstitutionality. It is quite safe to conclude that when the Democrats allege a bill to be unconstitutional the Supreme Court will decide the other way. Why do they say this bill is unconstitutional? Because they claim that this island is a part of the United States and the people there all citizens, just as much as you or I, and therefore no tariff duties can be imposed upon their products. How did this island become a part of the United States? Through the war with Spain the island was ceded to our country. Does this make it a part of the United States in the sense that Washington is a part thereof? I think not. This island is the property of the United States; it belongs to the United States just as a military site or a public building belongs to the United States.

This country is a nation itself, an entity above and beyond its component parts. As an individual nation it is supreme—imperial, if you please. In its relations to and with other nations it is controlled only by international laws, and its own sense of right is reflected by its constituent parts. In its relation to the individuals that compose it, it is limited by the restrictions that those individuals have themselves imposed. It can own property, sell and dispose of it without restraint. This island belongs to the United States, but has not yet been taken into it, and until this is done the United States can control it as it sees fit. If this be not so, then this country is not a nation; it is not a sovereign, and that great instrument, the Constitution, instead of being the palladium of our liberties, is our dealiest enemy. We dare not resent an insult, because the fruits of victory may be the seeds of death.

No; as a nation, we are supreme. We can control this island as we see fit, and we can take these people in as citizens whenever we elect to do so. That we will do this when they are fit to become citizens I have no doubt. We are a just people; we will continue to be so. We can safely trust ourselves to care for these people. We will assist them, direct them, educate them, and, when worthy, citizenize them. I care not to argue the constitutionality of this measure; I have no doubt of its constitutionality.

But they say, "Wherever the flag goes the Constitution goes, and all over whom the flag floats are citizens." Is this so? As I have said before, the flag floats over the Yakima Indian Reservation, near my home, containing from 1,200 to 2,000 Indians. Are they citizens? No! At least we do not treat them as such. If this contention is correct, then they are entitled to citizenship; are citizens now and have been for years and years, and our nation has been guilty of a most grievous crime against them. No one contends, however, that they are citizens. If they are not citizens and we are not willing to give them citizenship, why should we give citizenship to those in Puerto Rico who are but little if any better than our Indians? We must face these conditions as we find them and not as we would have them. Law good for a child may not be good for a man.

It is objected to this measure that it is unjust, inhuman, and oppressive. Is this so? I think not. I believe that a simple inspection of the bill itself will show that this is not the case.

The following is the bill as it was passed by the House of Representatives, and I ask everyone who reads this bill to read it carefully:

An act temporarily to provide revenues for the relief of the island of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes.

Whereas the people of Puerto Rico have been deprived of markets for a large portion of their products, and have lost property and crops by severe and unusual storms, whereby they are impoverished and are unable to pay internal revenue and direct taxes; and

Whereas temporary revenue is necessary for their schools, their roads, and their internal improvements, and the administration of their government: Now, therefore,

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the provisions of this act shall apply to the island of Puerto Rico and to the adjacent islands and waters of the islands lying east of the seventy-fourth meridian of longitude west of Greenwich, which was ceded to the United States by the Government of Spain by treaty concluded April 11, 1899; and the name Puerto Rico, as used in this act, shall be held to include not only the island of that name, but all the adjacent islands, as aforesaid.

SEC. 2. That on and after the passage of this act the same tariffs, customs, and duties shall be levied, collected, and paid upon all articles imported into Puerto Rico from ports other than those of the United States which are required by law to be collected upon articles imported into the United States from foreign countries.

SEC. 3. That on and after the passage of this act all merchandise coming into the United States from Puerto Rico and coming into Puerto Rico from the United States shall be entered at the several ports of entry upon payment of 15 per cent of the duties which are required to be levied, collected, and paid upon like articles of merchandise imported from foreign countries; and in addition thereto upon articles of merchandise of Puerto Rican manufacture coming into the United States, and withdrawn for consumption or sale upon the payment of a tax equal to the internal-revenue tax imposed in the United States upon the like articles of merchandise of domestic manufacture; such tax to be paid by internal-revenue stamp or stamps to be purchased and provided by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and to be procured from the collector of internal revenue at or most convenient to the port of entry of said merchandise in the United States, and to be affixed under such regulations as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall prescribe; and on all articles of merchandise of United States manufacture coming into Puerto Rico, in addition to the duty above provided, upon payment of a tax equal in rate and amount to the internal-revenue tax imposed in Puerto Rico upon the like articles of Puerto Rican manufacture.

SEC. 4. That the duties collected in Puerto Rico in pursuance of this act, less the cost of collecting the same, and the gross amount of all collections of duties and taxes in the United States upon articles of merchandise coming from Puerto Rico, shall not be covered into the general fund of the Treasury, but shall be held as a separate fund, and shall be placed at the disposal of the President, to be used for the government and benefit of Puerto Rico until otherwise provided by law.

SEC. 5. This act shall be taken and held to be provisional in its purposes and intended to meet a pressing present need for revenue for the island of Puerto Rico, and shall not continue in force after the 1st day of March, 1902.

Is there any injustice in this bill? Is it not by its very terms a most generous measure? It levies duties upon articles imported from Puerto Rico into this country and upon articles taken from this country to Puerto Rico; but what becomes of those duties? Do they go into our Treasury for our benefit? No! Every cent that is collected over and above the cost of collection is used for the benefit of the people of Puerto Rico. Is there any injustice in that? Is this an outrage upon the Puerto Ricans? If so, in what way?

In framing this bill the Republican party had to take into consideration the condition of the people of Puerto Rico. We were confronted with new conditions. We must have new legislation. It must be suited to the people, their needs and conditions, mental, physical, and financial. The Republican party must bear the responsibility. We must propose and enact the legislation. The Democrats will do nothing but criticise and oppose. This they have always done. It is easy to do. We may make mistakes, but we will do something. They will do nothing. We have proposed this legislation, we will enact it, and we will justify it.

This legislation is for the benefit of the Puerto Ricans. In what condition are they? When the war with Spain closed their products were shut out of Spain and Cuba. Our tariff laws have been continued in force against them. They have had no markets for their products. On August 8, 1899, a terrible hurricane swept over the island. It destroyed their coffee crop and did an immense amount of damage to their other property. The loss of their markets and this damage to the crops have caused great suffering and distress throughout the island. Without markets, with houses demolished, and crops destroyed, poverty and distress stalk through the island, and the misery and desolation is simply

indescribable. What do they need? They need markets and revenues. Markets for their products will bring prosperity to the home. They will furnish labor for the idle. With this will come food to the starving and clothing for the naked. With revenues will come a civil government, roads will be repaired, and schoolhouses will be constructed.

Thus the objects of this bill are twofold—first, to provide revenue, and, second, to provide a market. A revenue to defray the expenses of the government of Puerto Rico, to construct roads, to build schoolhouses, and other necessary improvements, and a market for their products, so as to bring prosperity to the inhabitants of the island.

How can these changes be best accomplished? That is the question that this legislation was enacted to answer.

Those who oppose the bill do so mostly because the President, the Secretary of War, and General Davis all recommended free trade with the island. No one has a higher regard for their opinions than I have. They, however, are not infallible. Their judgment is not unerring. It is not unusual for Congress to go contrary to a President's desires. He may be sometimes right and they wrong. They may be sometimes right and he wrong. How seldom do the Democrats think him right. That is one sign that he may be wrong.

Let us see just what General Davis did recommend. He did not recommend free trade alone. He realized that in addition to markets for their products they must have revenues. On page 9 of his report of September 5, 1899, he says:

> Free trade with the United States would, however, deplete the revenues, and if such a measure should be applied, probably all the custom-house collections would of necessity inure to the United States Treasury. Then the island would have no source of income save internal taxation, and from this very little could be expected until the industrial recuperation became general. Deficits would ensue for two or three years.
>
> It is not easy to state more than approximately the probable cost of the civil government, but unless public works on present scale were suspended and school expenditures largely curtailed the total would not fall below $1,750,000.

Again he says:

> But assuming free trade with the United States and all customs receipts dropped from the insular treasury, the situation would be something like this, reliance being placed solely on internal revenue:

	Annual expenses.	Annual revenues.	Deficit.
1900	$1,750,000	$500,000	$1,250,000
1901	1,750,000	1,000,000	750,000
1902	1,750,000	1,500,000	250,000
1903	1,750,000	1,750,000	
Total	7,000,000	4,750,000	2,250,000

> Total deficit for three years, $2,250,000.

And now this is his other suggestion in addition to free trade, and I beg you to note it carefully:

> Therefore it is that the island would be obliged to borrow to carry on the functions of government until such time as the income from internal revenue should equal the outgo.

Money would have to be borrowed! Think of Democrats advocating the borrowing of money! This has been their nightmare for years, and yet they want this island that has not a dollar of indebtedness to start out at once to borrowing.

With free trade there would be deficits. That is truly Democratic, and may be the reason why they want it so badly. They thrive on deficits. The Republicans usually guard against these, however, and they have done just what General Davis thought would be done. A "scheme has been worked out for bridging over this period" of deficits which would exist under free trade with the island. We do not want this island to borrow money, but we do want it to have markets and revenues. We want individual property and roads repaired and schools built and other internal improvements that are so badly needed.

How could this be done best? By free trade and borrowing money, by free trade and high internal-revenue taxation, or by a system of indirect taxation with practical free trade? Borrowing would not be thought of for a moment, even though recommended by General Davis. In the present condition of the people internal revenue would be most offensive and oppressive. We, in our prosperity, do not like the internal or "infernal" (as it is sometimes called) taxation. Hardly a day passes that I do not receive a resolution or memorial or request asking for the removal of some of our internal taxes. We do not like them. They hit everyone, rich and poor, and it has only been a short time since our Democratic friends were talking themselves hoarse about the iniquities of our internal taxes, and now they want this system used against the poor Puerto Ricans. How long since they were condemning them in their platforms as war taxes and demanding their repeal? They forget the past in their haste to make party capital for the present.

This bill accomplishes both objects. It puts the rate of duty so low as to make practically free trade between the island and ourselves. At the same time it raises a fair amount of revenue that can be used in the needed improvements on the island. This revenue is paid by those who can afford to pay it. This is one beauty of this system. The men who have products to export to this country can afford to pay a slight duty.

Who are they?

Not the laborers, not the small farmers, but the merchants who have taken these products in payment of debts. I say, let these men pay the taxes instead of the poor and starving. That is what this bill requires. It is practically free trade. The tariff is so low that it gives them a great advantage over others. Remember, the tariff is not a 15 per cent tariff, but is 15 per cent of the present tariff. Their principal products are tobacco and sugar, upon which a duty is paid.

We import great quantities of each—far more than we produce. In 1888 we imported 2,700,284,282 pounds of sugar and in 1897 4,918,905,733 pounds. From Puerto Rico in 1888 we imported 115,653,809 pounds of sugar and in 1897, 86,607,317 pounds. So that after buying all of Puerto Rico's product we must still buy a much greater quantity from the rest of the world. If, for example, the duty on sugar under the Dingley law is $1.60 per hundred pounds, under this bill the Puerto Rican will have to pay a duty of 24 cents per hundred, while the German importer will have to pay $1.60. With such an advantage, why can not the Puerto Ricans more than compete with the rest of the world? Why does not this give him our market to the extent of his product and leave him almost all the profit on his products? I confess that I am so stupid that I can not see why this is not practically free trade.

We are told that it is a breach of faith. And why? Because General Miles told these people that they would have all the immunities of American citizens. Did that mean that they would be free from taxation? Did that mean they would not have to contribute toward improving the island? Surely not. But that is all they are required to do by this act.

We are told that the act is unjust to the Puerto Ricans. In God's name, how? The well-to-do pay the tax, and the whole amount, save collection charges, goes back to them to defray the expenses of the government and for necessary improvements. If this be unjust, what is our treatment of the people of Alaska? They are taxed as the Democrats would tax Puerto Rico. Everybody but the barber and preacher is taxed for engaging in honest work, and the money is paid into the National Treasury, and but little of it ever goes back to them. There is no weeping for them. No indignation is aroused for them. No thunderbolts of wrath are hurled at the truly "infernal" law under which they live. If this act is unjust, what term shall be applied to the Alaskan law?

But they say it is for the benefit of the sugar trust and the tobacco trust. No legislation can be enacted now but there is an octopus in it or to it. They are floating around here as thick as mosquitoes about a swamp on a summer evening. Our Democratic friends eat them raw, fried, on the half shell, and every other way three and four times a day. They see them by night and by day, waking and sleeping.

Is this act for the benefit of the trusts?

The importation of sugar and tobacco from Puerto Rico will not affect the price of either in this country, because the demand is much greater than they can supply. If the trusts own the sugar and tobacco, they will sell it for the same after the passage of this law as before. If there were free trade, all the tariff would be clear gain. If some tariff is left on, it is a clear loss over free trade, so that our Democratic friends are like the thief who hollowed "Stop thief!" While they "chew up" the trusts in their wrath, they advocate a policy most profitable to the trusts. "Consistency, thou art a jewel."

There are about 3,000,000 pounds of sugar and thousands of pounds of tobacco in Puerto Rico waiting to come to the United States with free trade. Who owns this? Not the poor, starving people, but the wealthier class. Do you not think it a good plan to make them pay a little toward good government? Do you not think it a good idea to clip the toes of this octopus just a little bit? I would not be surprised if you do not think the tariff should be higher than it is. I will say frankly that the more I learn of the character, condition, and needs of these people the more I am convinced of the justice and wisdom of this measure.

Our Government will be just what our people make it. As long as we are a just, humane, and liberty-loving people, so long will our Government be just, humane, and dedicated to the principles of freedom. We Republicans are just as humane as you Democrats. We love liberty just as much as you do. Our history has been just as true to freedom and liberty as yours. There is no more danger of our going astray than there is that you will go astray. These fears, croakings, and evil forebodings have been made ever since our Government was founded, and, I suppose, will continue as long as we have two parties. You ease your minds in this way. It makes you feel better, I suppose. It was so in Washington's time. You called him a despot; you said that

he, who had elevated liberty, was going to strike her down. Our nation was to become a despotism. But it did not; nor will it now. We will go right along treating our new territories with all the justice and humanity for which we are noted.

Two-thirds of your anxiety is for political effect. You are endeavoring to strike some popular cord. You are trying to draw the people off after "strange gods." You do not care for the Puerto Ricans nearly so much as you do for your party. Were we to take all the money we have already collected and turn it over to them you would oppose it.

You can not deceive the people more than once. You deceived many in 1896, but they will be on their guard now. They know what justice is and they know what injustice is. When they brush aside your denunciations and see the purposes and objects of this bill, they will see its superlative justice and will be amazed at your mendacity. I will be much surprised if they are not indignant at your audacious attempts to deceive them and the nearness that you came to success.

With a due regard for the habits, customs, conditions, and character of the new peoples and possessions placed in our charge, this nation will legislate for them in justice, humanity, and wisdom.

Aldrich vs. Robbins.

SPEECH

OF

HON. GASTON A. ROBBINS,

OF ALABAMA.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, March 6, 1900.

The House having under consideration the contested-election case of William F. Aldrich against Gaston A. Robbins, from the Fourth district of Alabama—

Mr. ROBBINS said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not expect to take part in this debate until the message came that Judge FOX, a member of the committee in charge of the case, could not be present. This unfortunate circumstance forces me into the argument; and I undertake to speak in plain words upon the merits of the case, and in behalf of the people whom I have the honor to represent.

Moreover, I undertake to confine my remarks to the law and the facts of this particular case. It is admitted that the House is not bound by its decisions in former cases; but I contend that this is a judicial proceeding, requiring that the statutes of the United States relating to contested-election cases be enforced; that the unbroken line of decisions of this House be reaffirmed; and that the established rules of evidence be applied. Strike from the record all illegal, irrelevant, and immaterial testimony. Let the decision rest upon the evidence of record in the case under consideration. Find who received a majority of the votes cast, and as impartial and nonpartisan judges declare the result. Without an election by the people I do not want a seat in Congress.

Sirs, you are a court by virtue of that clause of the Constitution which declares that "each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns and qualifications of its own members"—a court of original and final jurisdiction over both the law and facts. Each member acting judicially must find the facts and decide the law, and by vote of the majority a verdict is rendered.

The main statutes applicable to such cases are, Revised Statutes, section 105:

Whenever any person intends to contest an election of any member of the House of Representatives of the United States, he shall, within thirty days after the result of such election shall have been determined by the officers or board of canvassers authorized by law to determine the same, give notice in writing to the member whose seat he designs to contest, of his intention to contest the same, and in such notice shall specify particularly the grounds upon which he relies in the contest.

And section 121:

The testimony to be taken by either party to the contest shall be confined to the proof or disproof of the facts alleged or denied in the notice and answer.

The decisions of the House relating to the notice of contest uniformly hold that the allegations contained in the notice must specify the number of votes cast, for whom polled, where and when polled. It must appear from the face of the notice that the contestant was elected, and the facts must be stated in such a way, if admitted by the contestee, it would appear, not as a matter of argument, but as a matter of fact, that the contestant received a majority of the votes cast. (Paine on Elections, section 824; McCrary's Law of Elections; Brightly's Leading Cases, section 334; Mann *vs.* Cassiday; 1 Brewster, 11; Thobe *vs.* Carlisle, Mobley's Digest, 525.)

Examine the notice of contest in this case, and test the allegations which it contains by the statutes and these decisions. As to the contested precincts, the averment is that the contestant received "more" votes and the contestee "less" votes than were allowed; and the notice nowhere states the number of votes received by each candidate at the several precincts, or the total number of votes received by each candidate, and does not state that the contestant received a majority of the votes cast. Like the plaintiff who goes into court with a summons and complaint, alleging that the defendant is indebted to him, and fails to state the amount of the alleged indebtedness.

By enforcing these statutes and applying the decisions you will obstruct the dishonest contestant in beginning such proceedings, and discourage frivolous and farcical contests. Proceeding further with an analysis of the notice in this case, I call attention to the allegations made by the contestant as to River and Pine Flat precincts. Respecting the election in each of these precincts his charges are repeated in the same words, to wit:

There was no election held on the 8th day of November, 1898. I claim and charge that this failure and omission to hold an election was with the fraudulent intent on the part of the officers appointed to hold said election, who were your partisan friends, allies, and supporters, to deprive the qualified electors of said precincts of an opportunity to cast their ballots at said election; and I further charge and claim that I was, by said fraudulent action on the part of your said partisan officers of said election, deprived of a majority of not less than 273 votes at River precinct, and of a majority of not less than 91 votes at Pine Flat precinct.

Serious charge, indeed, if true, and vilely wicked, if false. Examine the election law of Alabama, and the testimony offered by both the contestant and the contestee, and see whether or not these charges were honestly and truthfully made:

Code of Alabama, section 1591: If there should be no inspector or returning officer present by the hour of 8, at any polling place, then any three qualified electors who are entitled by law to vote at that polling place in the election, then to be held, may open the polls and act as inspectors during the election.

The charge is that the fraudulent conduct on the part of those appointed as officers of the election, in omitting to hold an election, deprived him of a majority of not less than 273 votes in River, and of a majority of not less than 91 votes in Pine Flat precinct; and the contestant comes before this House, as may be seen by referring to contestant's brief, pages 55 and 56, and claims a majority of 273 votes in River, and a majority of 91 votes in Pine Flat precinct. Are the charges sustained by the testimony? Where in the record is the proof? Turn to the testimony respecting these charges; and first, to the testimony introduced by the contestant himself. G. B. Dean (Record, page 893), contestant's campaign manager, appears as a witness in behalf of the contestant and says:

On one of my trips to Dallas County the week before the election I was informed that there were some cases of smallpox in River, Pine Flat, and some other adjoining beats. Thinking it possible that an election might not be held in Pine Flat and River beats, where I had instructed the full strength of the vote to be cast, I issued an order for the Republican vote to be cast in Cahaba beat, where I had previously ordered it suppressed.

This testimony was brought out in the time allowed for taking rebuttal testimony only, and after the contestee had introduced the quarantine proclamation about smallpox in these precincts. This witness is the same person who served the notice of contest, and who, together with the contestant, served the amended notice upon the contestee. Both the original and the amended notice are signed by the contestant in his own handwriting.

Next turn to the testimony offered by the contestee respecting these charges. Dr. B. B. Rogan (Record, page 700) testifies that smallpox prevailed in the fall of 1898 in River and Pine Flat precincts; he was secretary of the board of health of Dallas County, and attaches to his testimony as Exhibit A (Record, page 701) the quarantine proclamation of the board of health, which is in the following words:

Whereas there has been for several months an outbreak of smallpox in the southern portion of the county:

Resolved, That the city of Selma quarantine against all persons in River, Pine Flat, and King's beats who shall not show evidence of successful vaccination,

JOHN A. MCKINNON, M. D.,
President.

B. B. ROGAN, M. D.,
Secretary pro tempore.

Mr. MANN. If it will not interrupt the gentleman from Alabama, I would like to ask him a question.

Mr. ROBBINS. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. What is the date of that quarantine?

Mr. ROBBINS. That quarantine proclamation is dated about the 1st of December, 1898. Hear it again:

Whereas there has been for several months an outbreak of smallpox.

I am glad the gentleman from Illinois called my attention to the date. Turn to the testimony of Will Gordon, on page 702 of the record. He testifies that he lived in Pine Flat precinct, and that smallpox was raging there at the time of the election, and had been for fourteen months, "and they had stopped the churches up."

The statute requires that the testimony shall be confined to the proof or disproof of the facts alleged or denied. But this law does not contemplate that the contestant shall make an allegation and disprove it himself. Answer, is it honest to make such charges

against honorable men, and after the quarantine proclamation is offered in evidence say: "The week before the election I was informed that there were some cases of smallpox in River, Pine Flat, and some other adjoining beats. Thinking it possible that an election might not be held in Pine Flat and River beats, where I had instructed the full strength of the vote to be cast, I issued an order for the Republican vote to be cast in Cahaba beat, where I had previously ordered it suppressed?"

This analysis of the allegations contained in the notice of contest is made for the purpose of demonstrating the falsity and dishonesty of the charges made by the contestant. I do the majority of the committee the justice to say that they do not allow either party any votes from these precincts.

The contestant alleges that he did not have full representation at the polls in the appointment of the officers of the election, and I proceed to discuss this charge under the law and facts.

Code of Alabama, section 1588: The judge of probate, sheriff, clerk of the circuit court, or any two of them must, at least thirty days before the holding of any election in their county, appoint three inspectors for each place of voting, two of whom shall be members of opposing political parties, if practicable, and one returning officer for each precinct; and it shall be the duty of the sheriff to notify such inspectors and returning officers of their appointment.

SEC. 1594. Upon opening the polls the inspectors must appoint two or more markers or assistants for illiterate and disabled electors, one from each of the opposing political parties who may have candidates to be voted for at the election, and each of whom must be a discreet person, able to read and write, and the inspectors, or any two of them, shall, in like manner from time to time as often as may be necessary to give every illiterate elector and every physically disabled elector an opportunity to vote, appoint a marker who must be selected as provided for in the selection of the first two.

SEC. 1595. Clerks and markers must be appointed from a list of persons, not less than six nor more than ten in any one precinct, who may be suggested for that purpose by the duly constituted authorities, respectively, of the opposing political parties having candidates to be voted for at the election, and the opposing political parties shall each have the right to suggest a list of names, not less than six or more than ten in each precinct, to act as clerks and markers. If no lists are furnished, the inspector shall appoint clerks and markers from opposing political parties.

The contestant proceeded under a misapprehension of the law in serving the appointing board with a list of persons to be appointed as inspectors. He makes an effort to apply the law relating to the appointment of clerks and markers to the appointment of inspectors. There is no provision of law providing for such proceeding. The act of appointing inspectors of an election is a judicial one and not a ministerial act. It is the duty of the appointing board to know from their own knowledge, or by proof brought before them, that the persons appointed inspectors possess the statutory qualifications. (Taylor *vs.* Kolb, 100 Alabama Supreme Court Reports, page 603; United States *vs.* Paxton, 40 Federal Reporter, page 136; United States *vs.* Chairs, 40 Federal Reporter, page 820.)

The statute is perfectly clear as to the right of each candidate, or the constituted authorities of each political party, to suggest a list of names of not less than six nor more than ten persons to be appointed as clerks and markers. The testimony shows that the controversy was not about the appointment of clerks and markers. These were appointed for each candidate wherever a list was presented in due form.

Mention is only made about the appointment of a clerk from the contestant's list for the City precinct; and the testimony of Inspector R. D. Walker fully describes the circumstances of the appointment of clerks and markers for the city of Selma precinct. He testifies that at the time the list was presented to the inspectors a request was made for the appointment of O. O. Moore as marker; that nothing was said about the appointment of a clerk; that other persons whose names were on the list presented by the supporters of the contestant were not present, and that the opening of the polls was delayed until a clerk could be sent for in the business part of the city.

Again, referring to the notice of contest and the contestant's charge that he was not allowed representation in the appointment of inspectors, he alleges that out of 31 precincts in Dallas County he was denied representation in 15 precincts.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. ROBBINS. Certainly; anything you wish to ask.

Mr. MANN. I understood the gentleman——

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHATTUC). Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. ROBBINS. I do.

Mr. MANN. My statement was that there were 11.

Mr. ROBBINS. I was not speaking of the statement that was made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] in his argument.

Mr. MANN. I misunderstood you, then.

Mr. ROBBINS. I was analyzing the notice of contest and calling attention to its falsity. Its allegation is, as appears in the record, that the contestant did not have representation in 15 precincts of Dallas County. The list of persons suggested by the contestant for appointment as inspectors is in evidence, and also a list of those who were appointed by the board. By comparing the names on these lists it will be seen that the identical persons suggested by the contestant were appointed in 20 out of 31 precincts. As to the precincts where the board did not appoint the persons suggested, I read the testimony of two members of the appointing board.

Judge P. G. Wood testifies as follows:

Q. When the appointing board met how were the inspectors appointed?

A. Mr. Lumpkin, the sheriff, Mr. Milhous, the clerk, and myself met up in the court-room of Dallas County, and appointed three inspectors and a returning officer for each precinct in the county. The names of these inspectors and returning officers were taken for the most part from the lists—the list put in evidence—and the Democrats also had a list in. Some were selected from each list, and possibly some from neither.

Q. How was the list or record of those who were appointed inspectors for the various precincts by the board made out, and to whom then delivered?

A. Before the meeting of the board a blank list of the several precincts in the county was made by Mr. Milhous, I think, on which was a column for inspectors and a column for returning officers. The appointing began at beat No. 1. The inspectors and returning officer of that precinct were appointed, and then these officers for precinct No. 2, and so on through all the precincts. When an inspector or returning officer was agreed upon by the board for any precinct, Mr. Milhous wrote the same on the said paper—the paper so prepared in blank. When the appointments were concluded, said paper was signed by the sheriff, clerk, and probate judge, and the same was taken possession of, according to my recollection, by the sheriff. I and the clerk officially had nothing further to do with it, as the duty of notifying and summoning was put by law upon the sheriff; and I think, therefore, that the sheriff kept the said paper.

Sheriff J. H. Lumpkin testifies as follows:

Q. Were you present at a meeting of the board when the inspectors were appointed to hold the election for November, 1896?

A. I was present.

Q. Who was present at that meeting?

A. The probate judge, circuit clerk, and myself.

Q. Was there or not a list made up that day of three inspectors and returning officer for each precinct in Dallas County to hold the election for Congressman in November?

A. There was; also a deputy sheriff for each precinct.

Q. To whom was that original list given by the board?

A. To myself.

Q. Have you it?

A. I have.

Q. What was served on them?

A. The notice of their appointments as inspectors, returning officers, and deputy sheriffs. A printed form was served on each one of them separately.

Q. At what time were these notices served?

A. Soon after the board made out a list of the appointments. It was within the time appointed by law.

Q. Did or not you notify each one of the persons appointed of their appointment?

A. I had it done by deputies.

Q. How was it done?

A. I make out regular slips for that purpose; I made them out myself.

Q. How were they notified of it?

A. Served on them by deputy.

Q. What was served on them?

A. The notice of their appointments as inspectors, returning officers, and deputy sheriffs. A printed form was served on each one of them separately.

Q. At what time were these notices served?

A. Soon after the board made out a list of the appointments. It was within the time appointed by law.

Q. How long before election were they given notice of their appointment?

A. About two or three weeks.

Q. Was or not any list of names furnished the appointing board from which they were requested to appoint inspectors by the different parties?

A. I don't know that it was furnished the board, but I think each member of the board had a list furnished him separately.

Q. Did or not anyone representing Mr. Aldrich furnish you with a list, requesting the appointment of certain persons as inspectors?

A. They did.

Q. Who was it gave you the list?

A. George R. Mason.

Q. Were or not any number of inspectors appointed by the board from the list furnished by George R. Mason?

A. There were.

Q. If you remember, state about how many were appointed from that list.

A. Somewhere between 18 and 22.

Q. Did you or not have any conversation with Mr. George R. Mason after he gave you the list in reference to not appointing certain persons who were requested on that list?

A. I did.

Q. State what he said to you.

A. One of the appointments was a city appointment—J. E. Golson. He said he would not serve. I had this list several days before the board met, and I notified him Golson said he would not serve and asked him to name some man in his place that he wanted in the city. I also tried to get him to take the place. He positively declined, and said that if Golson would not serve he had nobody to recommend.

Q. Then the board met and appointed Golson?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you have any other conversation with Mr. Mason before the board met about appointing inspectors?

A. I did.

Q. State what was said in that conversation.

A. It was about a negro, Smith, in Valley Creek.

Q. State what was said.

A. I told him Smith had been a fractious person about the polls in other elections, and asked him to name some other person; that he was a disagreeable negro.

Q. What did he say?

A. I went on to tell him that in a previous election he had sworn to a great many falsehoods, and asked him to name some other party in his place.

Q. What did he say?

A. To the best of my recollection, that he would try to furnish me some name for Valley Creek.

Q. Did he ever do it?

A. I don't think he did. Then we had a conversation about Dr. Tom Sellers, in Brown's.

Q. State the substance of that conversation.

A. I notified him that Mr. Sellers said he would not serve. He said that he would see him and let me know before the board met. He said that after his

conversation with Sellers he had agreed to serve. I believe there was something said by a fellow in Lexington beat. I suggested to him to name some one in the place of J. Gilbert Johnson, on the grounds that there was a good deal of feeling in that beat against him. I don't remember what his reply to me was about Gilbert Johnson.

Q. Do you or not know Jordan Hatcher, of Orrville beat?
A. I do not.
Q. Do you or not know J. H. Brown, of River beat?
A. I do not.
Q. Do you or not know Wesley Williams, of Portland beat?
A. I do not.
Q. Do you or not know Samuel D. Mitchell, of Cahaba beat?
A. I do not.
Q. Do you or not know J. S. Jones, of Carlowville beat?
A. I do not.
Q. Did or not, of your knowledge, the other members of the board know them?
A. Not of my own knowledge.
Q. Was or not every man requested by Mr. Aldrich to be appointed inspector, appointed unless there was objections to them?
A. Yes.

I submit this testimony, and you here have a full account of the proceedings of the appointing board in making these appointments. After this testimony was introduced by the contestee as to the appointment of inspectors, the contestant offered no testimony in rebuttal; and after the sheriff said that he did not know some of the persons asked for by the contestant he introduced no testimony establishing the identity or residence of those who were not appointed, or that they possessed the statutory qualifications.

The contestant says that he addressed a letter to the judge of probate and requested that he be furnished a list of the persons who had been appointed inspectors. Judge Wood testifies that the list of appointees was turned over to the sheriff, and Sheriff Lumpkin testifies that he took charge of the list and had the inspectors served with notice of their appointment. This information was furnished to G. R. Mason, contestant's manager for Dallas County, as is shown by the conversation between the sheriff and Mason. Moreover, there are several letters in evidence written by Mason, dated in October before the election, in which he gives the names of some of the persons who had been appointed as inspectors.

In this campaign the contestant adopted the policy of requesting the colored voters in Dallas County to remain away from the polls. Letters were written and messages sent to the supporters of the contestant requesting them not to vote in Dallas County.

I read one of these letters:

SELMA, ALA., *October 25, 1898.*

MY DEAR SIR: You suggested Jim Richardson as a suitable man to represent Mr. Aldrich's interest in election, and he has been appointed inspector. Please say to Jim it is the desire of Mr. Aldrich that the colored people should not vote in this election in his precinct, and request him to so notify them. He has utmost confidence in Jim's ability to keep them from polls.

Mr. Robbins does not expect the colored people to vote for him, and he ought not object to having them remain from polls. Tell Jim Mr. Aldrich will remember him in future for his services in this election. He has an opportunity now to show his loyalty to the party. Tell him to come to Selma Saturday; I think Mr. A. will be here.

You know if negroes are allowed to vote, nine out of ten will vote the Republican ticket, and if Mr. Aldrich is willing to risk his chances with white voters Mr. Robbins ought to.

Please attend to this matter, and oblige,
Yours, truly, G. R. MASON.

Col. A. J. MARTIN, *Martin Station, Ala.*

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. ROBBINS. Of course I will.

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. Was there any answer given by Mr. Richardson to the letter in evidence?

Mr. ROBBINS. This letter was written by G. R. Mason and addressed to Col. A. J. Martin, who was to communicate its contents to Jim Richardson. I have read the letter as it appears in evidence, and I hope the gentleman from Illinois will investigate for himself the main points, at least, of the case.

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. Is it admitted by the majority that Mr. Richardson is a friend of the contestant?

Mr. ROBBINS. Yes, sir. He acted as an inspector at Martin's precinct. He was appointed as such upon the request of the contestant. He appears as a witness and testifies that he voted for the contestant and that the election was honestly held. After these letters were introduced in evidence by the contestee the contestant offered, in the time allowed for taking testimony in rebuttal only, the testimony of G. B. Dean as to the orders that he issued to the supporters of the contestant.

Dean testified that he ordered them to vote in 11 precincts, and not to vote in the remaining 20 precincts. But, in fact it, was generally understood in all the precincts of Dallas County that the supporters of the contestant were not to vote. William T. Cook testified that Mason came to his place and stated that he was going through certain precincts for the purpose of instructing contestant's supporters not to vote; Cæsar Foster, one of contestant's managers, testified that he sent such instructions to certain precincts in the southern portion of the county; and several other witnesses testified that the request for his supporters not to vote was common knowledge in the precincts of their residence.

A table of the census of 1890 of the six counties composing the Fourth Congressional district of Alabama is copied in the report submitted by the majority, and attention is there directed to the relative voting strength of the white and colored population residing nine years ago in Dallas County. This is the basis of an attack against the correctness of the official returns, and is also made the basis of a claim that the contestant received or would have received, under other conditions, the votes of the colored electors.

This anomalous position and inconsistent claim are answered by the evidence, admitted to be true, that the contestant requested the colored voters to remain away from the polls, and by the testimony of several hundred colored voters who voluntarily appeared as witnesses and testified that they voted for the contestee. The report submitted by the majority and the report submitted by the minority of the committee agree in finding that the official returns are correct throughout the district, excepting ten precincts in Dallas County; therefore further discussion may be confined to these ten contested precincts.

Cahaba.—According to the findings of the majority of the committee the official returns from this precinct are rejected, and 163 votes are counted for Aldrich and 8 votes for Robbins. This is an error, and the majority must have overlooked or ignored the correction of the testimony upon which it is based. P. Ulmer alone testifies to these figures, which are accepted by the majority. On page 161 of the record he says: "I was ticket marker on the day of election, and marked 123 tickets for Mr. Aldrich, and my recollection is that 40 or 50 colored men voted there that day who marked their own tickets." P. Ulmer was recalled as a witness, and on page 742 of the record he says:

Q. Were you examined at Stanton by the contestant?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. What, if any, official position did you hold at Cahaba last November?
A. Marker.
Q. Do you or not remember how many tickets you marked that day for Mr. Aldrich?
A. I don't know how many there were.
Q. Did you or not keep any memorandum that day?
A. I did not.
Q. How many tickets did you testify to marking for Mr. Aldrich when at Stanton?
A. I think it was 122 or 123.
Q. Why did you say then that you marked 123 for Aldrich?
(Counsel for contestant objects to this question and moves to exclude the answer, for it calls for the reason of the witness and not the facts.)
A. Green ask me how many there were, and I told him I did not know; that I had gotten up a list after the contest and had left the list at home.
Q. Was that Green Kornegie that you speak of?
A. It is.
Q. What did Green then say to you, if anything?
A. He ask me did I have any idea how many there were, and I told him some hundred odd, and he then said, "You can just say 123."
Q. Did you or not keep account on the day of the election how many you marked?
A. I did not; I did not have time.
Q. When did you get up that list you mentioned?
A. About two weeks after the election.
Q. Was it from that list that you got up that you based your estimate upon?
A. Yes, sir.

This count is obtained by adding 123, the number of tickets that Ulmer first said he marked for Mr. Aldrich, and 40, the number of colored men whom he thought could mark their own tickets, and the 8 votes for Robbins, making the total number of votes 171. The official poll list is found on page 252 of the record, and contains the names of 182 electors who voted at Cahaba for a member of Congress. The official returns, Aldrich 54 and Robbins 127, are sustained by the testimony of other witnesses, including the officers of the election. Deduct the figures which are withdrawn by Ulmer, reinstate the official count of the votes cast at Cahaba precinct, and grant all other findings of the majority, for the sake of this calculation, and the result is a majority for the contestee in the district.

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. ROBBINS. Certainly.

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. In this last computation that you make, do you allow to the contestant all the votes counted for him by the majority of the committee?

Mr. ROBBINS. All, excepting Cahaba precinct.

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. And you arrive at a majority for the contestee by amending the returns in that one precinct?

Mr. ROBBINS. Yes, sir; and unless that is done the count of the votes of Cahaba precinct will rest upon the testimony of Ulmer, which he has withdrawn.

Mr. BARTLETT. Allow me a moment, if you please. The official return, as I remember, from this precinct—I will give the figures in a moment.

Mr. MANN. I will assist the gentleman. The return was, for Aldrich 54, for Robbins 127.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am obliged to the gentleman. I want to be accurate, and I would have found the figures in a moment. The return is, for Aldrich 54, for Robbins 127. The majority of the committee, upon the testimony of P. Ulmer, changes the return so as to give Aldrich 163 and Robbins 8. Now, if the testimony

of this witness is discarded and the return permitted to stand, the result must be 22 in favor of the contestee.

Valley Creek.—The officers of the election appear as witnesses and sustain the correctness of the official count and the truthfulness of the returns. Among them was an inspector who the contestant introduced as a witness, but only asked him for whom he voted. On cross-examination the contestee asked him to state all the facts relating to the election in this precinct, and his answers corroborate the returns. But the contestant is unwilling to be bound by the testimony given by his own witness. He introduced 116 witnesses from this precinct who testify that they voted for the contestant, and the official returns are for Aldrich 44 and for Robbins 158.

I call special attention to the method by which this testimony was obtained. The contestant employed men to see the electors whose names appeared on the poll list as voting, and those who would testify that they voted for Aldrich were given railroad tickets to Stanton, where a commissioner was taking testimony for the contestant. On the train en route for Stanton a negro was seen distributing cards to the negro witnesses by Rev. J. W. Shoaf and T. D. Kemp, intelligent white gentlemen and highly esteemed in the community where they reside. Mr. Kemp secured one of these cards, and here it is in evidence [pointing to record of original testimony] identified and made an exhibit to Mr. Kemp's testimony (Record, page 318).

Mr. TALBERT. Will the gentleman kindly state what was on those cards?

Mr. ROBBINS. I will gladly read the card.

Instruction card for voters.

OFFICAL BALLOT.

Federal election Tuesday, November 8, 1898.

Make a cross mark (X) before the name of candidate of your choice, as below.

For Representative in the 56th Congress of the United States from the Fourth Congressional district of Alabama:

(Vote for one.)

× WILLIAM F. ALDRICH.

GASTON A. ROBBINS.

And I also read the official ballot, of which the card is an imitation:

Official ballot, election November 8, 1898.

Make a cross mark (X) before the name of the candidate of your choice.

Vote for one	For member of the Fifty-sixth Congress from the Fourth Congressional district of Alabama:
	W. F. ALDRICH.
	GASTON A. ROBBINS.

These witnesses were placed on the stand and asked: "For whom did you vote?" "How did you vote?" They all answered, "I voted for Aldrich;" and in the words of the instruction card, "Make a cross mark (x) before the name of candidate of your choice as below." Of these witnesses 51 could not read and write. Sirs, can you believe their testimony after the disclosure of the process by which they were instructed how to mark tickets three months after the election and testimony drilled into them on the morning of the day of their examination as witnesses in the case? In his rebuttal testimony the contestant does not offer a word in explanation.

Orrville.—The vote at this precinct is entirely rejected by the report of the majority. The contestant requested the appointment of Jordan Hatcher, an unknown person, as an inspector, and issued orders for his supporters to remain away from the polls. Only one witness, Andrew King, is offered to impeach the returns. He testified that he marked the tickets of 10 voters for Aldrich and gave the names of the persons whose ballots he marked; and later he reappeared as a witness and testified that $7 per day for three days' attendance as a witness induced him to swear that he marked 10 ballots for Aldrich.

Afterwards the contestee introduced seven of the persons named by Andrew King, and three of them testified that they voted for Aldrich and four testified that they voted for Robbins, and the other three names do not appear on the poll list as voting at all. The report of the majority refers to previous elections and proceeds to disfranchise every elector who voted. In Valley Creek precinct the votes proven aliunde are counted by the majority; but in Orrville precinct, where the contestee received a large majority, the aliunde vote is rejected.

If this method is approved, the contestant may direct that votes be counted in the precincts where he has a majority and rejected in precincts where the contestee has a majority.

Lexington.—As to the election in this precinct, the contestant offered one witness who testified that he remained around the polls all day, and that about 50 men came to the polls. He also gave his opinion about existing conditions and the voting strength of the political parties.

But the supporters of the contestant were instructed not to vote at this precinct. The official returns are 3 for Aldrich and 54 for Robbins. So it appears that the testimony of contestant's only witness corroborates the official returns as to the number of votes cast; and the inspector, who voted for Aldrich, testifies that the returns are correct. The majority refer to previous elections in this precinct and reject all the votes cast in this precinct and decline to count the votes proven aliunde.

Burnsville.—At this precinct, after the polls were closed, a dispute arose as to whose duty it was under the law to count the ballots, which ended in an agreement that the ballot box should be intrusted over night to A. Thompson, an inspector appointed upon the request of the contestant. Next morning Thompson produced the ballot box, which had been left with him unlocked, and in the presence of all the officers of the election the ballots were counted—44 for Aldrich and 83 for Robbins—and accordingly the returns were made up and signed by all the inspectors, including Thompson.

Three months afterwards Thompson appeared as a witness, and testified that he counted the ballots in this box at 3 o'clock during the night after the election, while the box was in his keeping, and that he counted 113 for Aldrich and 22 for Robbins. The contestee introduced as witnesses J. H. Burns and J. S. Campbell, inspectors; J. S. Dilburn, clerk; and Jack Robinson, who was a marker appointed from a list suggested by the contestant, each of whom testified that they were present; that the votes were correctly counted; that in the presence of each other the returns were signed by all the inspectors; and that Thompson made no remark about having counted the ballots during the night while they were in his charge; that he did not object to signing the returns, and that he said nothing indicating that the ballots had not been correctly counted and returned.

The majority of the committee accept the count made by Thompson in his dream, and the minority reject the returns because the ballot box was left, unlocked and unguarded, in his custody, and the ballots not counted until the next day after the election.

Union.—The returns from this precinct are attacked by the testimony of Jackson Waugh alone. He testifies that he marked about 90 tickets for Aldrich, and that according to his judgment there were about 40 who marked their own tickets. His testimony is contradicted by J. A. Carson and J. F. Orr, inspectors; C. D. Harrison, marker, and William Smith, the Republican clerk, and each testified that the ballots were correctly counted and truthfully returned.

The contestee called as witnesses 10 of the voters whose tickets Jackson Waugh said he had marked for Aldrich, and each testified that he voted for Robbins. Furthermore, several witnesses testified that they would not believe Jackson Waugh on oath. In the time allowed the contestant to take rebuttal testimony he did not introduce a single witness to establish Jackson Waugh's character for truth and veracity, or contradict the testimony of those who had impeached the character of Jackson Waugh, his only witness.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHATTUC in the chair). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I will yield such additional time to the gentleman from Alabama as he may desire to conclude his remarks.

Mr. ROBBINS. I will consume no more time than is necessary to present the law and evidence.

Pence's.—An attack is made upon the integrity of the official returns from this precinct by two witnesses, J. C. Coleman and Charlie Brown, who testify that they live in the precinct; that they did not vote at this election, and that the names of several persons appear on the poll list who are unknown to them as residents of Pence's precinct. Upon this testimony the majority reject the official returns.

The contestee took testimony at the voting place in Pence's precinct, and there, in the presence of their neighbors, J. C. Coleman and Charles H. Brown, who were not the same persons appearing under the same names at Stanton as witnesses for contestant, testified that they were present in person at the election in Pence's precinct and voted. In the ten days allowed for taking rebuttal testimony the contestant had an opportunity to identify

his witnesses "J. C. Coleman" and "Charlie Brown;" but he offered no explanation about suborning witnesses.

Marion Junction.—The official returns from this precinct are sustained by the testimony of all of the inspectors, who testify that the returns are correct. In this precinct the supporters of contestant were instructed not to vote, and not one of his supporters appeared at the polls or offered to vote for him. The report of the majority rejects the entire poll of this precinct and does not count the votes proven aliunde.

King's.—In this precinct the contestant's supporters were ordered to remain away from the polls, and the report of the majority rejects all the votes cast in King's precinct. To discredit the returns from this precinct the contestant offered the testimony of witnesses whose names are similar to names appearing on the poll list, and who testify that they did not vote. The value of this kind of testimony may be determined by referring to an unbroken line of authorities. In Letcher *vs.* Moore (Clark & Hall, page 479) the rule is stated:

> That while this kind of evidence is admissible for what it is worth, it is manifest that its value must depend upon circumstances. If the district or territory within which the voter must reside is large or very populous and the witness has not an intimate and extensive acquaintance with the inhabitants, the evidence will be of little value, and standing alone will avail nothing.

The mere statement of a witness that a voter was or was not a resident, without giving facts to justify his opinion, is not sufficient to throw out such vote. (Paine on Elections, section 761; McCrary on Elections, section 756; Gooding *vs.* Wilson, Smith Digest, page 79.) This kind of testimony is not sufficient to cast suspicion on the returns; they must be proven fraudulent, and nothing but the most credible, positive, and unequivocal evidence should be permitted to destroy the credit of the official returns. (American and English Encyclopedia of Law, volume 6, pages 354, 356, and notes 2 and 3; Judson *vs.* Hill, 50 New Hampshire, 140; Dodge *vs.* Brooks, 2 Congressional Election Cases, page 81).

City.—The official returns of this precinct are in evidence, signed by all the inspectors—J. L. Clay, R. W. Walker, and J. E. Golson. Both Clay and Walker appear as witnesses, and give testimony sustaining the returns. Golson was appointed inspector at the request of the contestant. The majority of the committee find that the official vote is correct in other precincts where representation was allowed to the contestant as requested.

Apply this rule adopted by the majority to the City precinct, where the official returns are sustained by all the inspectors, including Golson, who served as the representative of the contestant, not that they are true, but for the purpose of this calculation only; admit all other findings of the majority and reinstate the official returns of the City precinct, and the result in the district is a majority of 200 for the contestee.

The majority of the committee refer to a number of voters whose names appear on the poll list and allege that they were not registered. By comparing the poll list with the registration list it will be seen that errors were made in the spelling of names and writing the initials of persons on these lists. To illustrate, I call attention to a few discrepancies. John B. Erwin, jr., was registered, and Jno. B. Irwin voted. P. C. Keipp was registered, and E. C. Keipp voted. Rich. Suther was registered, and Richard Suther voted. Pettus I. Golding was registered, and Ike Golding voted. Horace Griffin was registered, and H. S. Griffin voted. J. M. Etheridge was registered, and J. M. Eskeridge voted.

Errors of this kind have never been considered in any judicial or legislative inquiry as evidence of fraud at all tending to affect the validity of the election or integrity of the official returns. The hurry, bustle, and noise around the polls when the election is taking place make such discrepancies a matter of course, and their entire absence would be a more suspicious circumstance than their presence. There is no authority for rejecting the poll because the names of unregistered voters appear on the poll list. On the contrary, the decisions of the courts and House of Representatives uniformally hold that the vote of a precinct will not be rejected on account of unregistered voters. (Paine on Elections, sections 362, 363; McCrary on Elections, page 445; Clark *vs.* Robinson, 88 Ill., page 498; Dale *vs.* Irwin, 78 Ill., 170; Fenley *vs.* Walls, Smith Contested-Election Cases, page 367.)

Sirs, enough has been said to give an understanding, if that is desired, of the law and evidence of the case. On one side ignorant negroes, without character or respectability, appear as witnesses. On the other intelligent white men, of high character and morality, appear as witnesses, and since an attack is made upon the integrity of the official returns by the testimony of the former, and sustained by the testimony of the latter, I claim that the truth is that contestee was elected by 1,230 majority.

Briefly, I must refer to the aliunde evidence offered in this case. The original plan adopted by the contestant in attempting to prove a case was to call the individual voters whose names appear on the poll list of all the precincts in Dallas County against the official returns of which he had made charges in his notice of contest. Of this character of testimony the contestant offered 324 witnesses, and each testified that he voted for Aldrich. In answer the contestee introduced 1,331 witnesses from the contested precincts, and each testified that he voted for Robbins.

Now, make a calculation based upon the aliunde proof, if the official returns are to be ignored, and the result in the district is as follows: Vote for Aldrich in uncontested precincts, 5,293; add the number of witnesses testifying or vote proven aliunde, 324; total for Aldrich, 5,617. Vote for Robbins in uncontested precincts, 4,477; add number of witnesses testifying or vote proven aliunde, 1,331; total for Robbins, 5,708, and 191 majority.

Mr. LATIMER. Will it interfere with the gentleman's argument to ask a question?

Mr. ROBBINS. No, sir.

Mr. LATIMER. If I understand the gentleman, he says that in Dallas County, where there is a charge of fraud, at all the polling places where fraud has been charged if you leave out the boxes and take the witnesses that were called he has a majority in Dallas County and in the district.

Mr. ROBBINS. I have. That is what I stated.

Mr. LATIMER. And what is your majority?

Mr. ROBBINS. One hundred and ninety-one votes, if the count is made on that basis.

Mr. LATIMER. Now, if I understand the contention, there are six counties in the district represented by the gentleman, and that there are five in which there is no contest.

Mr. ROBBINS. Yes; that is right.

Mr. LATIMER. There is only one county where fraud has been charged, and in that county you claim if all the boxes in the county are thrown out, and take the witnesses who swore as to how they voted, that you have a majority of 191 in the district.

Mr. ROBBINS. You have correctly stated the last proposition that I made. The rule relating to the vote proven aliunde is correctly stated in Mann *vs.* Cassidy (1 Brewster, Pennsylvania Reports) that when the official poll is rejected and the integrity of the returns destroyed, due and adequate proof must be demanded of each vote relied upon, and the true vote may be proven by calling the electors whose names are on the poll list. (American and English Encyclopedia of Law, pages 356, 357; Paine on Elections, section 596, page 502; Bisbee *vs.* Finley, 2 Ellsworth, page 172; Ried *vs.* Julian, 2 Bartlett, 822; Washburn *vs.* Voorhees, 2 Bartlett, 54.)

If the official returns are accepted from the precincts about which the majority and the minority of the committee agree, and the vote proven aliunde from the ten precincts about which they disagree, be added, the result in the district is as follows:

Vote for Aldrich agreed upon by majority and minority reports	5,380
Vote for Aldrich proven aliunde from ten contested precincts	303
Total for Aldrich	5,683
Vote for Robbins agreed upon by majority and minority reports	5,143
Vote for Robbins proven aliunde	929
Total for Robbins	6,072

A majority of 389 for Robbins.

Under a government like ours the highest duty of a Representative in Congress is to protect the people in their right to elect their Representatives. Here and now this right is directly involved. Sirs, will you not guard your own record in a contest like this? In the future whose title to a seat in this House would be secure should you establish this precedent? My people look to you as lawmakers of high standing, sitting in a judicial capacity, and only ask for justice and that you render your decision according to the law and the facts.

The gentleman from Illinois, who opened this debate, taunted me with favoring self-government. His statement is true; and if it will strengthen his position, he may add a word thereto, for I admit that I am and always will be in favor of local self-government. Along the line of his remarks I also admit that I am in favor of Caucasian rule; and if I did not believe that I received a majority of all the votes cast, and also a majority of the white votes of the district, you would have had my resignation to deal with instead of these proceedings.

If it were my place to give testimony, I could speak volumes about the right of suffrage and the "white man's burden" in the South. But these remarks are reserved for a future occasion. I have made an effort to confine my argument to the law and facts of this particular case. However, be assured that I will not go to Africa for votes or to Hindostan for religion. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Justice to Puerto Rico is Safety for the United States.

SPEECH

OF

HON. DAVID A. DE ARMOND,

OF MISSOURI,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, February 27, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 8245) to regulate the trade of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes—

Mr. DE ARMOND said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not arise to address the committee in the belief that I can really add anything material to the discussion on the pending bill. I believe that those who speak at this late stage of the debate are likely, if they argue the question under consideration, to merely repeat in their own way arguments already made. Certainly, without very careful, not to say exhaustive, investigation it would hardly be possible for anyone to add anything to the sum of those arguments; and yet the issue is so fundamental and so far-reaching, the results may be so great for the weal or the woe not only of the people of the little island of Puerto Rico but of the people of the great United States, that those who realize its importance need not apologize for addressing themselves to it.

The question of how the Puerto Ricans shall be dealt with—if that were the only question, the question of justice to them, of right in dealing with a people related to us as they are—is large enough to command the best attention of the Congress, that it may be decided as it should be decided. But that question is small and inconsequential in comparison with the mighty question which affects the people of this Republic and, it might not be exaggeration to say, free institutions and the philosophy of free government the wide world over.

The Puerto Ricans came to us in a way that would suggest fair treatment for them, as proper recipients of everything that it is in the power of this Government, without depriving our own people of anything to which they are entitled, to grant them. When our armies invaded that island they found the Puerto Ricans friendly and not hostile; welcoming us; not trying to repel us. We met with no opposition from the people of that island. The expectations of these people are not unnatural and ought not to be disappointed. They expected, and had a right to expect, that they would be treated by the great American Republic justly; they believed that their fortunes were cast in with ours, and that whatever of liberty and equality of right we have under our Constitution and laws would be theirs also.

Not only that, but by the visitations of Providence their island was swept by extraordinary storms, and their property destroyed. Their relations with the mother country, cruel as it was (better relations than they now sustain to this country), were dissolved. Their markets are gone. They are at the point of starvation.

Our navigation laws have been extended to the little island, so that its inhabitants can not ship their products to this country upon the best terms attainable. They can not employ the "tramp" vessel at a low rate, but must take the American ship at a high rate. Already they are the victims of the owners of the American coasting marine.

The President, in his annual message of last December, urged upon Congress, as a "plain duty," the passage of a law for absolute free trade between Puerto Rico and the United States, as between the States, and between States and Territories. There was no hint of a purpose to hold Puerto Rico in vassalage; it had become part of our territory, and the President thought our duty plain to hasten to make the tariff law apply to Puerto Rico as to Oklahoma.

The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the leader of the Republican side of the House, introduced a bill to carry out that policy. Later, suddenly, and without warning, that policy was abandoned. The McKinley tariff, in fractions, is to oppress both American and Puerto Rican, and Puerto Rico is to be governed as a province.

We have not far to go and it is not difficult to determine what influences really prompted and brought about that rapid and great change upon the part of the Republican leaders. There was a time when the Republican party and those who formed it, when they chose to disregard the Constitution, impelled by their consciences, as they claimed to set it aside, proclaimed that there was something higher and better than the Constitution, appealing to what they called the "higher law." We are brought now in this day and generation, at this very hour, to behold others who claim to be disciples of the creators of the Republican party and the exemplars of its virtues following, not the "higher law," but falling back upon and following the lower law of greed, the lowest and meanest law that controls human action.

The Constitution is about to be set aside, so far as these gentlemen have power to set it aside, not in order that they may do something philanthropic, something for the relief of any section of mankind, something to elevate any race found in hard straits, but to establish partial if not complete slavery; in the interest of wrong, clear and palpable; wrong not to be apologized for, not to be accentuated. This has been brought about, as certainly must be evident to all who choose to consider it, by the influence of a few mighty agencies in this country. It is suggested that the tobacco interests in Connecticut and the sugar interests so potent at certain times of their own choosing, have effected this change of front. And what may become of the hundreds and thousands of poor Puerto Ricans, what their fate may be, how their hardships may be multiplied, how the gloom of despair may be brought down upon them thicker and heavier—these considerations are matters of no concern, provided always, however, that the powerful interests which control a powerful party gain by this legislation.

What difference that the Constitution and its interpretations of a hundred years by the master minds of our country stand in the way? What difference that, according to the message of the President and the mighty chorus of the other leading Republicans, complete free trade should exist between this country and Puerto Rico? A few agents of a few mighty monopolies need only, in their own good time and in their own effective way, appeal to those who are in control in this House and in the Government of this country, and straightway all this fine talk is thrown to the wind, and legislation is pitched, not upon the supposed high plane of some "higher law," but, as I said before, upon the low plane of greed, the meanest law that controls or directs human action.

I shall not quote from the numerous decisions of the Supreme Court, since others who have spoken have, by referring to and quoting from the law books, enabled the House and the country to enjoy the benefit to be derived from a study of these authorities.

The first proposition necessary for the proponents of this tariff bill to maintain, providing they choose to rely upon reason and authority, and not to proclaim, as perhaps they will do later on, that they will recklessly follow their predetermined programme in disregard of the Constitution—the first proposition for them to maintain is that Congress can legislate outside and independent of the Constitution. If that be not true, all the remainder of their arguments, all their deductions upon constitutional or other grounds in support of the legislation here proposed, must fall and fail miserably. Can Congress legislate beyond the Constitution, outside of the Constitution, independent of the Constitution? If so, then the question of expediency alone remains.

There is a great deal said about "extending the Constitution to the Territories," and some gentlemen have amused themselves in the apparent belief that they were witty or humorous by talking about "the transmigration of the Constitution," "the skipping and jumping of the Constitution." Those gentlemen on the other side who have argued this matter seriously have, it seems to me, fallen into error; those who have disposed of it flippantly have merely illustrated what they illustrate time and again—their real disregard of the Constitution. It was left for the ablest men on the other side, in arguing for the passage of this Puerto Rican tariff bill, to declare that they have no particular regard for written constitutions; that the flag covers it all; that the flag answers in place of the Constitution; that it does not make very much difference anyway about constitutions or adherence to them.

Why this indifference about our written Constitution? The written Constitution which we have is the ripe fruit, the residuum, the prize, of seven years of dreadful warfare in the Revolution. It is the culmination, the gathering together, of the fruits of that conflict for the liberties of the people of this Republic; the crystallization of the Declaration of Independence; the charter of American liberty; the guide for American statesmanship. It is a restraint upon those who govern for the American people. But the wisdom of the fathers is to be thrown to the winds, the experience of a century of national life must be disregarded, correct principles are to be discarded, the traditions of our people departed from, our whole course as a nation reversed—all this that the way may be clear for the proposed Puerto Rican tariff.

Sir, a written Constitution such as we have is not to be sneered out of existence. On the contrary, it deserves the veneration and support of all who love liberty or desire that the Republic shall continue its mightiest exemplar, and that our career shall be onward and upward to a higher civilization, to greater conquests of freedom, instead of down, down to the pit into which all peoples who have forgotten the correct principles embodied in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States have ultimately fallen.

Written constitutions, it appears, are not of much account, providing the flag is "there." And the principles of liberty have grown up, these gentlemen tell us, as the product of the civilization

of ages; and these principles of liberty will be enough for the Filipinos, enough for the Puerto Ricans, enough for us. Wherefore trouble ourselves about a written constitution? Why be hampered by its prohibitions? Why be restrained by its spirit? Why accept instructions from its philosophy and from the experiences of our people under it? Oh, the flag is made to typify a great many things, varying as these gentlemen dispose of the flag and have uses for it!

The American flag is worthy of the veneration of American citizens and the representatives of the American Republic, only when it symbolizes the principles embodied in the Declaration of Independence and preserved in the Constitution. If the sad day ever shall come when it is to float, in token of lasting dominion, over conquered provinces, when it is to be the emblem of an empire in essence whatever it may be in name—if that day ever shall come, then the American flag will no longer represent the history, the glory, the aspirations of American freemen, or commend itself, as it did in the years of the past and does now, to liberty-loving men not only in this land but throughout the wide world. [Applause.]

Can Congress legislate outside of the Constitution? Some gentlemen talk as though Congress legislating for the Territories were transported across the States, and in the case of the Philippines and Puerto Rico, across the ocean. The fact, however, is that Congress, upon whatever it may legislate and however it may legislate, sits here under the Dome of the old Capitol—one branch in this Hall and the other branch in the Hall just over the way. They must be talking about the Congress here in the American Capitol; the Congress which sits here and acts upon one subject with the same warrant of authority and the same power, restrained by the same limitations, from the same source, as upon another—the Constitution over all—all the time.

I am willing to rest my argument and the whole case upon the single proposition that Congress has no power to legislate outside the Constitution. Indeed, I believe the whole contention must terminate with the settlement of the correctness of this proposition.

Every one must admit that, in general, Congressional action is subject to the control of the Constitution. That being so, an exception must be found, or the conclusion is inevitable and irresistible that all Congressional action must be within constitutional limits and subject to constitutional control. Now, who can point to the exception? It is not to be found in the Constitution. Where, then, is it to be found? Whence is it to be derived?

The Constitution created the Congress. It is absurd to contend—and still more absurd to assume—that the creature is superior to the creator. Nor is it enough to say that the creature *could* be made superior to the creator, for if that were conceded, it still would be necessary to show that what could be done (however unnatural) had in fact been done.

Our Government is one of limited powers, while the Constitution is of supreme power over it. It will not do to resort to that much-abused doctrine of implied power, for implied power must be coupled with a power not implied, but actually granted.

What could influence the Constitution makers to grant to Congress power unrestrained, undirected, by the Constitution? And why would they select this particular subject for that upon which the Congress, so carefully restrained elsewhere, should be a law unto itself? I believe no reason can be found—certainly none has been given. And if the makers of the Constitution, wise and great as they were, meant that in legislating for the Territories, Congress should be free from constitutional control, is it not passing strange that they did not make known their purpose by something in the Constitution itself? Is it not more than probable that if they meant that Congress, with respect to the Territories, should exercise extra-constitutional power—that is, power beyond the grant contained in the Constitution as it is—they would have changed the Constitution so that the power would exist under it? Why would they lift the Constitution from Congress instead of enlarging the power of Congress, in the desired particular, in and by the Constitution? And who has found in the debates in the Constitutional Convention, or in the writings of the fathers, or in the decisions of the courts, or anywhere else, except in the "expansion" utterances of the last few months, so much as a syllable claimed even as calculated to raise a suspicion that the makers of the Constitution contemplated any Congressional action whatsoever, outside of or beyond the Constitution?

Until some one appears with some evidence or some reason for the contention that Congress is above the Constitution, instead of the Constitution being superior to Congressional enactments, I shall cling to the ancient faith that the Constitution is the supreme law of the land, of any land and every land over which or in which Congressional action may be operative.

But surely I need not now argue at greater length a proposition so plain, so fundamental. The simple fact is that this new philosophy about the power of Congress to legislate outside the Constitution is merely the corollary of a reckless, not to say wicked, purpose to do that which not only must ever lack constitutional sanction, but that which is abhorrent to every respectable conception of the Constitution known to our history or our jurisprudence.

Whenever we come to deal with anything by legislation, I care not what it is or where it is, we are to be directed and restrained by the Constitution. There is not a thing that can be done by law that can be done outside of the Constitution without its violation. Where is there a single power possessed by any branch of the Government that is not in subordination to and in harmony with the Constitution? Where is there one?

There is found in that instrument a clause providing that—

> The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

This is supposed to confer some extraordinary power over Puerto Rico and the Philippines. Can we dispose of either, or make needful rules and regulations respecting either, contrary to the Constitution of the United States? Can we dispose of the Constitution in order to dispose of the territory? Who ever gave the Constitution that reading? Where can there be found in the decisions of the courts or in the writings of text writers deserving respect a solitary syllable that warrants any such construction or any such conclusion?

Congress, in dealing with the territory of the United States, whether it be much or little, whether it be near or far away, is the same Congress that is authorized under the Constitution and by the Constitution to legislate upon all subjects concerning which it may legislate at all, whatever they may be, mighty or small, important or trivial.

Then there is a notion that the nation has suddenly expanded into a "world power," and thereby got beyond the Constitution. Gentlemen speak of this as though the United States were trivial and inconsequential until within the last year or two. According to them we are no longer provincial. We are no longer a little bit of a republic, tucked away in a corner of the Western Hemisphere, but now we are a great and mighty nation—a "world power;" and somehow—of course they jump the process—somehow, according to their philosophy, material changes have taken place, not only in the standing of this nation in the world, but in the effect of its Constitution here at home.

Why, my friends, it was the honest belief and the proud though modest boast of our grandfathers that they had erected and maintained here, under great difficulties and against great obstacles, a nation which was a world power. It was the belief of our fathers who took part in the tremendous civil strife of 1861–1865 that a mighty world power here, divided for the time being into hostile armies, was engaged in deadly conflict.

The truth is—not to dwell upon a subject so insignificant—the truth is that this great Republic of the United States, from the hour that our people emerged from the American revolution to this hour, has been the mightiest world power upon this planet; has done more for the progress of civilization, more for the amelioration of the condition of mankind, more toward the advancement of correct principles and the eradication of evil ones, than any other nation upon the footstool.

A world power! This is a phrase, a mere phrase, behind which gentlemen hope to shelter themselves in their efforts to swerve this great Republic from its true course and to turn it adrift, a lawless body in a lawless space, ignorant or unmindful of the many dangers that threaten.

It is contended that, being a "world power," our nation possesses all the powers that any other nation possesses, and that therefore this nation can do anything that any other nation can do. Dealing with other nations, other members of the family of nations, we do possess, because we are able to assert and maintain, equal rights with the best of them. Whatever our rights there, and whatever we chose to do against a foreign foe or in our relations with foreigners, our institutions at home remain distinct and American, sheltered under and protected by the Constitution as completely as if all of the world except that which is under our dominion were to sink into the sea; as if all of this old planet except that over which the American flag floats were to cease to exist.

The power that we have to wage war is given by the Constitution. The power that we have to form treaties of peace, treaties of commerce, treaties of whatever character, is given, too, by the Constitution. These powers have nothing to do, so far as the outside world is concerned, with our own domestic affairs and their management.

But it is said that it is an incident of warfare, often necessary and sometimes inevitable, to acquire territory; and because other nations, having different systems of government, moving to different ends by different ways, choose to hold conquered territory as subject provinces, and the people inhabiting it as possessed of no rights except such as the conqueror chooses to yield, therefore, being a "world power," we have a right to do likewise; and in

order to measure up to the full requirements of a world power, we must do the same thing. Calling the United States a world power falls far short of enlarging the power of Congress or lessening the binding obligations of the Constitution. The so-called argument based upon the parrot prattle about "world power" is not merely lame—it is absolutely worthless.

It may be conceded that the United States possess full right and power to acquire territory, either by conquest or by treaty, and yet there must remain the question as to the power of the lawmaking branch of the Government over the territory when acquired. When the power of legislating for the territory is to be determined, the source of all legislative power in the Government, the fountain head of such power, must be found; and there is but one source, one fountain head, the Constitution. We make no question about the right to acquire territory, though even that was doubted by so great a man as Jefferson. The question is, What can be done with the territory when acquired? For answer to that question, it being one of legislative power, we must go to the Constitution, the source of all such power.

Some try to deduce imperial power from a consideration of the powers of the several colonies or States of which the Union is formed. They say that if the Constitution never had been adopted and the Union never had been formed, each of the thirteen colonies or States which united in adopting the Constitution and forming the Union would possess ample power to acquire territory and to govern it in any manner or by any means whatsoever; and, they say, since the colonies, now States, have parted with all this power, surely the General Government formed by them, the United States, must possess it, and must have the right to exercise it.

Without stopping to consider what any of the States might do if the Union had not been formed, it is a fact that the Union was formed, and that the Constitution measures the powers possessed, as well as the powers that may be exercised, by the General Government or any of its branches, or by any State.

The contention is that, as the States (thirteen of them formerly colonies) no longer have any power to acquire territory, either by treaty or conquest, such power now must reside in the General Government. The vice of the argument lies in treating nation and government as equivalents. Powers not granted to our Government are reserved to the States or the people. To make anything out of the argument it must appear that if each of the thirteen colonies or States could govern as it might see fit to do any territory which it might acquire, the General Government, as it is under the Constitution—not as it might be—must possess the same power and right. This can not be shown, for it is not true. The General Government is restrained in its operations by the Constitution, and can not escape from that restraint except by amending the Constitution in the manner prescribed therein. The case at most is the familiar one of the State whose legislature could do yesterday what it can not do to-day, because of a constitutional restraint which became operative to-day, but had no existence yesterday. Upon the soundness of this reasoning and the correctness of this conclusion I am content to rest.

We must not forget that much of the power of the sovereign people of the United States is reserved in and by the Constitution:

> The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people. (Article IX.)
> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people. (Article X.)

Let those who can not find in the Constitution the powers which they covet to enable them to do something so un-American as the subjugation of alien people into obedience to the decrees of a colonial empire, try to amend the Constitution into what they wish it was, but what surely it is not—the chart of a government of absolute and arbitrary power.

We hear much about "extending" the Constitution to the Territories; about Congress legislating into this Territory or withholding from that Territory the supreme law, by virtue of which Congress itself "lives, moves, and has its continual being." The Constitution makes Congress, and then Congress takes charge of the Constitution and peddles it around as to Congress, from time to time, shall seem appropriate. It is said that some reptiles occasionally swallow their young to get them out of danger, and when the danger is past bring them forth again. Here we have a case of the offspring swallowing the parent, to come forth again when and where the dutiful child concludes to give the parent a little fresh air.

The Congress of the United States is not called upon to "extend" the Constitution anywhere. It can not annul the Constitution—can not of right annul it—though some seem to believe it may do so by a mere arbitrary exercise of power. It can not extend, withdraw, or amend the Constitution. Regarding its duty, it can obey the Constitution; disregarding that duty, it can violate it. But whatever our acts of Congress may be, whatever part of the territory subject to our control may be affected by them, those acts are and must be always (or they are and must be invalid) under the Constitution and in accord with it.

But treaties, according to some gentlemen, have a sacred function and a vast power and control over us. By the treaty under which we derive our claim, and whatever of right we have to Puerto Rico and the Philippines, it was provided that—

> The civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants of the territories hereby ceded to the United States shall be determined by the Congress.

Therefore, by virtue of the treaty, say these gentlemen, we have absolute power to legislate as we please respecting these possessions and these people.

The conditions and terms of cession, they insist, are entirely different from those under which we acquired territory heretofore, and being unrestrained by this treaty with Spain, we have a right to do precisely as we please with the islands and their inhabitants. And yet it is an absolute fact, determined by the Constitution and by reason as applied to it, as well as by the decisions of the highest court in the land, that a treaty, in its effect, is simply a law—nothing more, nothing less—subject not only to modification, but to be entirely abrogated and swept away by the legislative power of the nation. Whatever is in the treaty has the force of law, unless repugnant to the Constitution; and whatever might have been put into the treaty, in harmony with and in subordination to the Constitution, may be enacted into law by Congress, with the same effect as if it were contained in the treaty.

I am not going to take the position that the very moment that Spanish treaty was ratified all the people who dwelt in these scores of islands became American citizens. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that a government like ours, under constitutional restraints such as bind our Government in all its operations, in the course of a war or by the treaty of peace concluding it, may acquire territory, leaving it to the Congress, the lawmaking power, to determine what the disposition of it shall be; that is, whether it shall be part and parcel of the United States, or shall not be retained but parted with. But that we can hold these islands or legislate for and govern their inhabitants otherwise than under the Constitution, or can retain the territory except as a part of the Republic, in preparation for statehood, no man can show either by the Constitution or by the decisions of the Supreme Court of these United States.

The momentous question then is, Shall our legislation be for the retention or the disposition of the islands? Or shall we retain some of them and part with others? This question may be answered by another: Do we desire that a particular island or group of islands shall be admitted into the Union of sister States, the inhabitants thereof to be American citizens, entitled to all the rights and privileges which we enjoy? If not, then our legislation should be for the disposition and not for the retention of such island or islands. A prompt decision will save us from the shame of casting off American citizens, of dismembering the Republic.

Those even who believe we would be better off without Puerto Rico—and with them I have no quarrel—look upon it as our territory, just as Arizona is ours; not to be held for a specific purpose as a military or naval reservation is held, or as the Nicaragua Canal strip, a like reservation, should be held; not to be held temporarily until it can be disposed of, but permanently, as a part and parcel of our territory. That being true, and Congress coming to legislate for Puerto Rico, it can legislate concerning it only as it can legislate concerning Arizona or New Mexico.

The legislation of Congress divides itself naturally into two branches; one, that which is general, Federal in its nature, and relates to the whole Union in all its parts, States and Territories, laws of general application, laws that go over the realm and apply everywhere; the other, local, as legislation within a State is local. In legislating locally—that is, for a particular Territory—Congress is under less restraint than a State legislature; for while each must legislate in conformity to the requirements of the Constitution of the United States, the State legislature must also conform its acts to the requirements of the State constitution, while Congress must bow to but one supreme law, the Federal Constitution. So we see that while the Constitution of the United States must remain the supreme law of all the States and Territories, Congress, in legislating for a Territory, is free from the restraint upon local legislation which, in the States, exists by virtue of the State constitutions.

Congress may make for one Territory laws differing widely from those which it may see fit to make for another. It may make for one Territory laws the like of which no other Territory has. But this is true only with respect to local laws. The laws of one Territory may be as unlike the laws of another Territory as the laws of one State are unlike the laws of another State. All, however, whether State laws or Territorial laws, must be tested by the one supreme law—the Constitution of the United States.

Extending a law of the United States to a Territory is nothing more and nothing less than passing the same law, in due and regular form, for the Territory. Some laws are so essentially and necessarily general in their scope and purpose that they become operative in newly acquired territory immediately upon its acquisition.

Such, for instance, was the tariff law of the United States in force when the treaty of peace with Mexico was ratified and California and other territory thereby acquired, as was held in Cross against Harrison. The only difference between the case of California and the case of Puerto Rico lies in the difference between the two treaties under which, respectively, these possessions were acquired. By the treaty under which California came to us the purpose to hold it for statehood was made manifest, while the treaty with Spain does not disclose what disposition we meant to make of Puerto Rico, or whether we had determined what we would do with it. Less was provided in the Spanish treaty respecting the territory ceded and the inhabitants thereof than was provided in other treaties ceding territory to us; but the power of Congress with respect to the Spanish territory covered by the late treaty is neither less nor greater than its power over territory acquired under any former treaty.

A nation ceding territory to us, under a treaty containing stipulations respecting the disposition to be made by us of the ceded territory, and the rights to be guaranteed to its inhabitants, might have just ground of complaint if we should fail or refuse to conform our action to the requirements of the treaty stipulations; but our power and legal rights over territory and people would not depend upon the treaty, but would be measured and determined by the Constitution. If this were not true, the Constitution itself might be amended by a treaty with some foreign nation, even to the extent of destroying every one of its guaranties of freedom for the citizen, and every one of its limitations upon the power of Congress or the Executive or the judiciary, not only in the Territories, but in the States as well. Indeed, if the treaty could affect the Constitution at all, State lines might thus be obliterated, the form of government be entirely changed, and the empire made to take the place of the republic, in name and form as well as in substance. So, as respects the legislation here proposed, the treaty with Spain can cut no figure.

Suppose it had been stipulated in the treaty with Spain that the territory acquired thereby should be held by the United States permanently, but should never be formed into States, and that the inhabitants never should enjoy any of the rights guaranteed by the Constitution, but that they should be held in perpetual slavery. Would those stipulations be binding? If not, why not? To the first question I answer: No. To the second I answer: Because the Constitution of the United States, supreme over treaties as well as laws, forbids.

Suppose it had been provided in the treaty that there should be no trial by jury in Puerto Rico; could jury trial then be denied the Puerto Ricans? Suppose it were provided that ex post facto laws could be passed by the Congress of the United States with reference to Puerto Rico; do gentlemen contend that that could be done? The Constitution of the United States determines it all.

But they say of the right of trial by jury, the protection of life and property, that those things are fundamental; that they have grown up out of a civilization of thousands and thousands of years; and, of course, wherever the flag goes, wherever American institutions are installed and the American power reaches, they must be and will be respected. That is begging the question. Just as well repeal all laws against murder, arson, robbery, burglary, upon the theory that surely nobody would commit those offenses; that the protection of life and property is the result of the growth of moral law, the advancement of thousands and thousands of years, many lives illustrious for their goodness teaching and admonishing us that these crimes are destructive even to those who seek to profit by them; and therefore there is no need for laws against them, because the civilization of thousands of years has demonstrated that people can not profitably, and that the masses of the people will not at all, commit murder or other grave crimes.

Ridiculous as that argument would be, it is, in effect, the argument for throwing aside the Constitution and relying upon our own sublimated disposition and civilization. Looking to the steadfastness of the Administration party, standing two or three months by their own professed philosophy of free trade for Puerto Rico, and then in a night switching to the policy of this tariff bill, certainly that could not be done unless the Constitution is to be torn to shreds and thrown to the winds.

Now, then, proceeding upon the theory that Puerto Rico is to remain a part and parcel of the territory over which the United States flag floats, that territory over which Congress is to legislate, that territory for which officers are to be appointed, directed, controlled, or removed by some agency of the Federal Government, it follows irresistibly and inevitably—and there is no escape from it except by getting rid of the Constitution, getting rid of the decisions under it—that Puerto Rico must be governed as the Constitution requires, and must be held and legislated for with a view of bringing it ultimately into statehood; that the people there must have the rights which belong to American citizens. Those rights can not be denied and shall not be denied unless the Constitution be overturned and the Supreme Court decisions of more than a century, without a break, without variance, without question, sustaining the constitutional doctrine, are all to be disregarded.

But it seems, if one may judge from the reports in the morning papers (I do not know whether they are true or not), that it may do, in the estimation of certain leading Republicans, to have a lower rate of duty for a short time; that is, that Congress may not have the right to put upon the Puerto Ricans, upon the American people with respect to trade between them, 25 per cent of the duties laid under the Dingley bill, but can righteously put on 15 per cent for a period of two years, or some other period.

To the man who believes in the general policy of this bill, who believes in that way of treating things, who has lifted himself—no, I will not say that; I was about to say who had lifted himself over the Constitution—who has debased himself enough to crawl under it [applause on the Democratic side]—to that man, the question of 15 per cent or 25 per cent may be a matter of substance. I think I can see how, in some minds, there may be some degree of compromise in limiting to two years the life of this unconstitutional legislation—abandon the Constitution for two years and see how it will work. In two years a large proportion of these Puerto Ricans may starve out; in two years, maybe, their extremely fertile lands may be gobbled up by syndicates. The syndicates may thrive upon American legislation that is un-American; the Puerto Ricans may be despoiled; the poor may die; the rich may be robbed, and the end may be accomplished—all in two years. But as to the constitutional question, as to the question whether the Constitution shall prevail, Congress is as powerless to suspend the Constitution for a minute as to bury it in oblivion for an age. It is as powerless to rob the Puerto Ricans by piecemeal as it is at one fell stroke to deprive them of life, liberty, and property.

Mr. Chairman, whatever may be done with this bill, the people of the American Republic will be aroused by the fact that for the first time in the history of this country, for the first time in the progress of this great Republic, a political party here is striving desperately to hold territory in some other relation than that in which our Territories have been held heretofore; a party which controls the votes of hundreds of thousands of black men upon the claim that it freed them and their ancestors thirty or forty years ago. The descendants of the party of Lincoln—and there might be a great emphasis upon "descendants"—the descendants of the same party are now here struggling desperately, against precedent, against reason, against authority, against the Constitution, against themselves—in gulping down their own declarations and philosophy not many moons old—all, all to inflict upon the Puerto Ricans, notwithstanding all their claims to our chivalrous regard, a tax law as unjust, arbitrary, and odious as any known in the realms of the Sultan of Turkey.

But they will administer it gently! Give them the power to rob, and they will not rob; give them the power to kill, and they will not kill; give them the power to despoil, and they will not despoil. Sweep away the Constitution, and they will put in its place the flag; sweep away the legends of the flag, and they will write others upon it. [Applause.]

What has driven the Republican party to all this? One has not far to go nor much search to make to learn that the majority of the party seem to have determined blindly and greedily—greedily for what they can make out of it—to hold the Philippine Islands. It is not so much a question about Puerto Rico. They are crucifying the Puerto Ricans to authorize them to raise crosses in the Philippines.

They have determined to hold the Philippines. The country is opposed to admitting the islanders to an equality with our American citizens. If they hold them they must either hold them as part and parcel of the American domain, or must hold them in a subject state, in actual slavery, with just as much mitigation as from time to time they choose to throw in. They have covenanted to maintain in the Sulu Islands the vices, the evil tendencies, the polygamy, the degradation of the Orient. In the hope that they can make a little money out of it, in the hope that a favored syndicate here and there will do better for their party, they are ready to bring in anything and everything, and hold those people in chattel slavery, with just such mitigation, as I said before, as they choose to vouchsafe.

Let me say right here that the Philippine problem, in my judgment, is susceptible of two solutions; and I believe that the right solution will have to be applied soon, or the only solution otherwise possible will be made by the current of events, by the force of law, by the mandate of the Constitution. We can part with the Philippines; we can turn those islands over to their inhabitants; we can withdraw our soldiers from the archipelago. By proclaiming that we do not seek to retain those islands we can very

speedily restore peace; and in the shadow of peace, in the quiet and serenity of peace, we can easily and in order withdraw from the islands and leave the inhabitants to work out their own destiny; 10,000,000 people in the far away Orient—10,000,000 people under a tropical sun—to work out their own destiny in their own way. That we can do; and that, in my judgment, we ought to do and ought to declare at once that we will do. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It is the Philippine scheme which gentlemen who are advocates of this bill really have in view, which in large part, I must submit, shapes their action upon this question; because I can not think that they would wantonly wrong the Puerto Ricans. I can not think they would oppress and crush those poor people merely for the sake of violating the Constitution. In my charity, I can not believe implicitly that even for the favor of the syndicates which control so much of their action, and the monopolies to which they are so much indebted, they would perpetrate this great outrage upon those people under other circumstances—rivaling cruel Spain in ignominy. They are prompted now and here by what they feel to be the necessity of the programme upon which they have entered in the Philippines.

The other course is to hold the Philippine Islands, and just as certainly as they are held, just so certainly must they be held and governed under the Constitution. Then the Filipinos must be American citizens, entitled to all rights as such. Then that prolific land under a tropical sun will soon be teeming with American citizens, black, brown, and yellow. The Philippines, if admitted as States, would be entitled to representation upon this floor on the basis of their population—would have more than twice as many Representatives as all New England. And because some Representatives from New England, seeing, as no doubt they do, the graver problem confronting the country, and respecting the Constitution and the courts, have the patriotism and the ability to express, as real statesmen, their views in opposition to the passage of this bill, small statesmen, statesmen of small capacity and attainment [applause] and smaller performances, fancy they are doing something in the supposition that they are making attacks upon the New England giants.

The day is not far distant, I think, when the Republicans of conscience, the Republicans who stand by the Constitution, the Republicans with backbones not made out of angleworms [laughter] will be held as the saviors of their party, if there be any salvation for it.

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. I would like to ask the gentleman a question, if it will not interrupt him.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Go on; I am about through, at any rate.

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. Am I correct in assuming that in the second contingency to which the gentleman refers he holds that Congress would have no constitutional power to enact a discriminating tariff against the Philippine Islands?

Mr. DE ARMOND. Of course it would not. If we hold the Philippine Islands, they become part and parcel of the United States, to be legislated for under the Constitution. We must hold and govern them for statehood, or we must cease to have dominion and control over them. If we part with them, get rid of them, turn them over to the island people themselves, the temptation to degrade our citizenship or to disregard our Constitution and establish a colonial empire will be gone. There can be no discriminating duties between the Philippine Islands and this country if we hold those islands; there can be no discrimination between the cheap labor of the Philippine Islands, retained by us, and the intelligent labor of this country; there can be no bar by law to prevent those people, and the people who go there and utilize them, from gorging our markets with their serf-made products and competing in the fields of labor with our own people, unless we get rid of the islands instead of holding them.

A few propositions which, to me, seem as plain as our duty to the Puerto Ricans once seemed to the President may be stated in summing up.

The Congress can not legislate at all except under the Constitution.

The Constitution, the purpose in framing and adopting it, the Revolution which made it possible, the Declaration of Independence, the decisions of the Supreme Court—everything in our history—preclude the idea that territory can be acquired, held, and governed with any other view than the formation of new States for admission into the Union of States.

Congress has the power and is charged with the duty, under the Constitution, of legislating for a Territory both generally, as for the entire Republic, and specially or locally, as for the embryo State.

The treaty by which territory is acquired is—subject, of course, to the Constitution—the law of that territory as well as of the Republic until otherwise ordained by Congress.

Extending laws of the United States to a Territory is nothing more nor less than making the same laws for the Territory.

Congress, having no power to extend, withdraw, amend, or annul the Constitution, can have no power to extend it to or keep it from any Territory. The act of Congress extending the Constitution to a Territory can not be more than making the Constitution part of the statutory law of the Territory, subject, like other laws, to be amended or repealed.

Territory acquired by the United States must be held as part of the domain of the Republic for the formation of new States, and governed under the Constitution, or it must be parted with. If not to be held for the formation of new States, the intention to part with it ought to be declared promptly, and the disposition determined upon should not be delayed.

If we have acquired Puerto Rico to be retained, it is part of the domain of the Republic, and within that domain free trade must prevail.

If we have acquired Puerto Rico to dispose of, to part with and not to retain it, then there is no constitutional warrant for any legislation concerning the island, except that appropriate for parting with our title to it.

If Puerto Rico is to be regarded as foreign territory, we have no right whatever to legislate concerning it, and any duty laid by Congress upon any article taken from this country to that island, whether to be collected here or there, is an export duty, expressly prohibited by the Constitution.

I hope that the wisdom of the American people, that even their selfishness—not the greedy selfishness that is blind, but the more intelligent selfishness that sees—may realize the dangers that impend over us in connection with this Philippine problem.

And what a glorious spectacle it would be for the American people to grant to those far-off inhabitants of the Philippine Islands the boon of independence; to declare now our purpose to do it, and thus bring the war to a close; to see a government there established, with the yellow man and the brown man in control; to make with them such trade arrangements, and such arrangements for coaling stations and naval stations as may be desirable; to stand in their estimation as their best friend, and have the advantages of trade relations with them by virtue of their good will; and to have the proud distinction in history of being magnanimous to them, while actually doing what is safest, wisest, and best for ourselves.

We never can gain by departing from the Constitution. We never can profit by trampling it in the dirt or by rending it. We never can profit by the hungry greed that destroys, but we will profit in the present and in the future, profit in every way—in the building up of free government, in the extending of free institutions, in the encouragement to men to strive for freedom everywhere—by directly the opposite course.

Our commerce grows under the flag when it flies in peace. Our commerce grows because we can outstrip others. Commerce is a pursuit of peace.

It is a sad reflection that now, even in a few short months, we have been swerved so far from our ancient moorings, have gone adrift already so far upon a dangerous sea, that not an official voice can be raised, not an official resolution can be passed in this body or in the one at the other end of the Capitol, in recognition of the patriotism and valor or in sympathy for the sacrifices and sufferings of those heroic Boers in South Africa, who to-day are fighting the good, but I fear the hopeless, fight against the foremost exemplar of that "civilization" of thousands of years; the civilization that destroys; the civilization that murders; the civilization that is tyrannous; the civilization that is shooting down husband and son and father, aye, and sister and wife and mother; the civilization that would overthrow republican institutions everywhere; the civilization that is crushing the Boers by the brute power of vast superiority in numbers and resources; the civilization that is prated about here as superior to the Constitution; the civilization on account of which gentlemen upon the other side say we may dispense with the Constitution. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Let us be Americans as our fathers were. Let us, like them, be devoted to our institutions. Let us make our way in the world by merit. Let us spread our commerce, because we are able to do it, in peaceful competition with all the people of the earth. Let us, while maintaining liberty here at home, deprive no race or man of liberty anywhere. Let us get rid of that which is about to pull us down. Let us direct our commerce to the Philippines, as to the four corners of the earth, but let us not extend the Government of our fathers, our Government, the Government of our children, to the far-away islands of the sea. Let us not hold that Philippine country. Let us not wrong the Puerto Ricans. Let us be Americans, true to the Constitution, and then we can face the future without repudiating the past. Then we may hope to solve the problems of the present and the future. Then we may go forward with confidence, guided by the lamp of experience, instead of doing, as some gentlemen are now doing, extinguishing the lamp of the Constitution and plunging along in the uncertain light of that "higher civilization" about which they prate. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Trade of Puerto Rico.

SPEECH
OF
HON. JULIAN M. QUARLES,
OF VIRGINIA.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, February 27, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 8245) to regulate the trade of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes—

Mr. QUARLES said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The island of Puerto Rico is distant from our shores about 1,050 miles and is one of that chain of islands that lies between the Atlantic Ocean and the Caribbean Sea, known as the West Indian Islands. It lies in the Western Hemisphere, in American waters, and belongs naturally to the American Continent.

It is comparatively a small island, a parallelogram in form, and measuring 100 miles east to west and 40 miles north to south, containing about 3,600 square miles. In territory it is not larger than some of our counties. It is traversed from east to west by a range of mountains 1,500 feet in average height and rising in one peak 3,878 feet above sea level. From the base of the mountains rich alluvial tracts extend to the sea, and there are numerous well-wooded and abundantly watered valleys. The soil is very fertile. The principal crops are sugar, coffee, and tobacco of the finest quality, and cotton remarkable for length of fiber, tenacity, and whiteness. Cattle and sheep are there extensively reared of a quality superior to any others in the West Indies. The population of this island, according to the last census, was 900,000, of whom about 582,000 were white.

Puerto Rico was ceded to the United States by Spain under the treaty of Paris, dated December 10, 1898, which was ratified in 1899, and while it came to us an incident of the recent war with Spain, the inhabitants of the island were willing to the cession. They indeed rejoiced in their deliverance from Spanish tyranny and gladly transferred their allegiance to a republic with a written constitution guaranteeing protection to life, liberty, and property, as they thought, throughout the entire extent of the republic. This island in time of war with a foreign power will be of great value to the United States from a strategic point of view. Our Navy in possession of it will command the Caribbean Sea, and thus protect the eastern entrance of the interoceanic canal, should it be built, whether it shall be the Nicaragua or Panama. This is one of the advantages that will be derived from the ownership of this island.

Mr. Chairman, the third section of the bill under consideration reads as follows:

SEC. 3. That on and after the passage of this act all merchandise coming into the United States from Puerto Rico and coming into Puerto Rico from the United States shall be entered at the several ports of entry upon payment of 25 per cent of the duties which are required to be levied, collected, and paid upon like articles of merchandise imported from foreign countries; and, in addition thereto, upon articles of merchandise of Puerto Rican manufacture coming into the United States customs duties equal in rate and amount to the internal-revenue tax which may be imposed in the United States upon the same articles of merchandise of domestic manufacture; and upon articles of United States manufacture coming into Puerto Rico customs duties equal in rate and amount to the internal-revenue tax which may be imposed in Puerto Rico upon the same articles of Puerto Rican manufacture.

This section creates a tariff barrier between the United States and Puerto Rico. It imposes a duty upon all merchandise coming from Puerto Rico into the United States and going from the United States into Puerto Rico, to be paid before entered at the several ports of entry. This is so though Puerto Rico is as much a part of the United States as is New Mexico, Arizona, the District of Columbia, or any of its Territories.

The President, in his annual message sent to Congress in December last, said:

Our plain duty is to abolish all customs tariffs between the United States and Puerto Rico and give her products free access to our markets.

This recommendation the country approved, not only because it was just, but because it was constitutional and in accordance with all precedent. This island had been swept by a great hurricane from end to end on the 8th of August, 1899, reducing over 100,000 people to absolute want. They were homeless and without the necessaries of life. This being the condition of that unfortunate island, the President did but a "plain duty" in recommending that the markets of the United States be opened up to its impoverished inhabitants. The leader of the other side on the floor of the House [Mr. PAYNE], adopting the suggestion of the President, introduced a bill on the 19th of January last providing for free trade between the United States and Puerto Rico. In a letter to a constituent this distinguished gentleman presents the claims of Puerto Rico very clearly. I will read that portion of the letter which I find published in a newspaper:

To sum up, then, Puerto Rico is ours without a dissenting voice anywhere. Her people are impoverished by reason of the hurricane which destroyed the greater portion of two annual crops. She has no markets, being deprived of them by annexation to the United States. Commercially and industrially, without some aid from Congress, she is without hope for the future. A free admission of her products to the United States would give her relief. It will not hurt us, but, on the contrary, will give us a market for $10,000,000 annually, largely of the products of our farms, which will increase as American prosperity comes to Puerto Rico.

This letter, let it be known, was penned by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Now, Mr. Chairman, on the 8th day of this month the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee reported a substitute for his free-trade bill, imposing a tariff tax upon the "impoverished" Puerto Ricans. And why this change in the distinguished gentleman from New York? It is said that the President has changed too; that he now earnestly desires the passage of this substitute bill and would deplore its defeat. Some of the majority party in this House oppose this measure, but the great power of the Administration is being, we are told, brought to bear to constrain members to support it, and it will doubtless be carried through by the free use of the "whip and spur." It is a party measure and has become the policy of the Republican party, and it is said it must not fail of enactment. But what was the necessity of this sudden change in the policy of the Administration and the Republican party in respect to this matter?

This "somersault backwards" is easily explained when it is known that Mr. Oxnard, a representative of the sugar trust, appeared before the Ways and Means Committee and made it appear that it was to the interest of the sugar trust for this country to have a tariff tax on Puerto Rico products. The conversion was sudden, and I doubt not profitable. Mr. Chairman, viewing this proposed bill in its moral aspect there never was a piece of legislation attempted more un-American, heartless, and cruel. Such a law would be monstrous, and I submit would be clearly unconstitutional. I will read a part of section 8, Article I, of the Constitution:

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises; but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

The proposed law I contend is within the plain inhibition of this section of the Constitution. But gentlemen on the other side argue that the term "United States" as used in the Constitution does not embrace the Territories, but only the States, and that it is in the power of Congress to rule and legislate for the Territories of the United States without constitutional restraint—in other words, that Congress can rule Puerto Rico outside of the Constitution, and therefore the section just quoted does not apply, and "all duties, imposts, and excises" are not required to be uniform throughout the States and Territories.

Let us examine this proposition. In the first place, it has been decided by the Supreme Court of the United States, through Chief Justice Marshall, in Loughborough *vs.* Blake (5 Wheat., 317), that the term "United States" in the Constitution includes the Territories of the Union as well as the States. The court said:

The power, then, to lay and collect duties, imposts, and excises may be exercised and must be exercised throughout the United States. Does this term designate the whole or any particular portion of the American empire? Certainly this question can admit of but one answer. It is the name given to our great Republic, which is composed of States and Territories. The District of Columbia or the territory west of the Missouri is not less within the United States than Maryland or Pennsylvania, and it is not less necessary, on the principles of our Constitution, that uniformity in the imposition of imposts, duties, and excises should be observed in the one than the other. Since, then, the power to lay and collect taxes, which includes direct taxes, is obviously coextensive with the power to lay and collect duties, imposts, and excises, and since the latter extends throughout the United States, it follows that the power to impose direct taxes also extends throughout the United States.

The court thus holds, Mr. Chairman, that this Republic is composed of States and Territories, and the term "United States" is a name given to the Republic, and that a Territory is not less within the United States than a State; and that "it is not less necessary, on the principles of our Constitution, that uniformity in the imposition of imposts, duties, and excises should be observed in the one than in the other." This decision has never been overruled.

I know it is argued on the other side of this House by some gentlemen that the Government of the United States possesses an "inherent sovereign right," existing independently of the Constitution, to acquire territory, and that in the right to acquire territory is found the right to govern it; and that as the right to acquire is sovereign and inherent the right to rule is sovereign and inherent and not limited by the Constitution. The objection to this logic is that it is based on a false premise. It is not true that the right to acquire territory is sovereign and inherent, existing outside of and independent of the Constitution. The Government has no powers that were not delegated to and conferred upon it,

and all that were not delegated were necessarily reserved in the States and people. The first article of the Constitution declares:

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States.

The inference is irresistible that Congress has no powers except what were granted to it by the Constitution; and that being so, the powers not granted remain with the States and the people. As was said by Senator HOAR in a speech delivered in the United States Senate in 1898:

Mark the clear distinction between the sovereign powers of the States and those belonging to the United States. The powers of the United States must be affirmatively delegated, or they do not exist. The powers of the States must be expressly prohibited, or they do exist.

The Government of the United States is one of enumerated and limited powers, and those powers being conferred by the Constitution, the Government has only such powers as are affirmatively granted thereby. It follows from this that the Government of the United States has no inherent sovereignty. The Government is but a mere agent with certain powers conferred, and this view is wholly inconsistent with the idea of inherent sovereignty. We look to the Constitution to ascertain the powers of the Government, and they can be found nowhere else.

The rule for determining the powers of a State government is just the reverse of that for ascertaining the powers of the Government of the United States. A State government has inherent powers and those powers continue to exist until prohibited by either its own or the Federal Constitution. But the seat of all power is with the people and there it remains until parted with by them.

The tenth amendment to the Constitution, which is one of the amendments proposed to the First Congress and was ratified by the last State on December 15, 1791, would seem to settle the question I am now discussing:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people.

Here is a distinct recognition of the fact, in this early amendment to the Constitution, that the powers of the Government are "delegated," and those that are not delegated or prohibited to the States are "reserved" to the States, respectively, or to the people. Then how can the Government of the United States have any other powers than those "delegated?" And if the Government can have and has no other powers than delegated powers, it is absurd to talk about it having inherent powers. I say, then, Mr. Chairman, that the Government has no inherent power to acquire territory, but the power to acquire territory is conferred by the Constitution, and it has been so decided by the Supreme Court of the United States.

The rules for interpreting the Constitution is well settled by the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States and the great statesmen of our country, and to these I wish to call attention.

Chief Justice Marshall, in Martin *vs.* Hunter's Lessee (1 Wheat., 304-326), said:

The Government of the United States can claim no powers which are not granted to it by the Constitution, and the powers actually granted must be such as are expressly given or given by necessary implication.

And the same great jurist, in Givens *vs.* Ogden (9 Wheat., 1), in speaking of the Constitution, also said:

This instrument contains an enumeration of the powers expressly granted by the people to the Government.

Daniel Webster declared the same doctrine in his "Reply to Hayne," made January 26, 1830. He said:

The National Government possesses those powers which it can be shown the people conferred upon it and no more. The people erected this Government. They gave it a Constitution, and in that Constitution they have enumerated the powers which they bestow on it. They have made it a limited Government. They have defined its authority. They have restrained it to the exercise of such powers as are granted.

It is a Government of strictly limited powers; of enumerated, specified, and particularized powers; and whatever is not granted is withheld.

In a letter to the Barings dated October 16, 1839, this great statesman wrote:

This General Government is a limited Government. Its powers are specified and enumerated. The State legislatures, on the other hand, possess all usual and extraordinary powers of government, subject to any limitations which may be imposed by their own constitutions, and with the exception of the operation on these powers of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. Webster, in his "Reply to Calhoun," made February 16, 1833, said:

The sovereignty of government is an idea belonging to the other side of the Atlantic. No such thing is known in North America. Our governments are all limited. In Europe sovereignty is of feudal origin, and imports no more than the state of the sovereign. It comprises his rights, duties, exemptions, prerogatives, and powers. But with us all, power is with the people. They alone are sovereign; and they erect what governments they please and confer on them such powers as they please. None of these powers is sovereign in the European sense of the word, all being restrained by written constitutions.

He, as late as June 27, 1850, in the Senate, in his speech "On the Constitution and the Union," said:

Sir, we mislead ourselves often by using terms without sufficient accuracy, or terms not customarily found in the Constitution and laws. * * * The term "sovereign" or "sovereignty" does not occur in the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution does not speak of the States as "sovereign States." It does not speak of this Government as a "sovereign Government." It avoids studiously the application of terms that might admit of different views, and the true idea of the Constitution of the United States, and also of the constitution of every State in the Union, is that powers are conferred on the legislature, not by general, vague description, but by enumeration. The Government of the United States holds no powers which it does not hold as powers enumerated in the Constitution or as powers necessarily implied.

The proposition that the Government of the United States has no powers that are not enumerated and specified in the Constitution or necessarily implied from the grants of power is maintained by Mr. Webster with a power of logic that can not be resisted.

Alexander Hamilton entertained the same views. He said in response to the objection of Mr. Randolph, Attorney-General, that the power to incorporate a bank could not be implied from the "nature of the Federal Constitution:"

This proposition is not precisely or even substantially that which has been relied upon. The proposition relied upon is that the specified powers of Congress are in their nature sovereign. That it is incident to sovereign power to erect corporations; and that, therefore, Congress have a right, within the sphere and in relation to the objects of their power, to erect corporations. It shall, however, be supposed that the Attorney-General would consider the two propositions in the same light, and that the objection made to the one would be made to the other. To this objection an answer has already been given. It is this: That the doctrine is stated with this express qualification, that the right to erect corporations does only extend to cases and objects within the sphere of the specified powers of the Government. * * * A particular legislative power implies authority to erect corporations in relation to cases arising under that power only.

I have quoted the views of these two eminent statesmen, not only because of their great ability and profound learning in constitutional law, but because they were liberal constructionists and favored a strong government and were not at all jealous of its powers. They were not strict constructionists.

Not only have we, Mr. Chairman, the Supreme Court and the opinions of Daniel Webster and Alexander Hamilton sustaining the position for which I am contending, to wit, that the Government has no inherent powers, but the leading text writers on constitutional law uphold it.

In Cooley on Constitutional Law, it is said:

The Government created by the Constitution is one with limited and enumerated powers, and the Constitution is the measure and the test of the powers conferred. * * *

It is manifest that there must be a difference in the presumption that attends an exercise of national and one of State powers. The difference is this: To ascertain whether any power assumed by the Government of the United States is rightfully assumed the Constitution is to be examined in order to see whether expressly or by fair implication the power has been granted, and if the grant does not appear the assumption must be held unwarranted. To ascertain whether a State rightfully exercises a power, we have only to see by the Constitution of the United States it is conceded to the Union, or by that Constitution or by that of the State prohibited to be exercised at all. (Pages 29-31.)

The same doctrine is laid down in Hare's American Constitutional Law, volume 1, pages 94, 95.

The proposition that the General Government has inherent powers existing outside of and independent of the Constitution is a vagary without the slightest foundation either in authority or in reason. This idea was never seriously advanced until now. It is found supported in no decision of the courts, nor in any deliberate utterance of any of our great statesmen. But it is condemned by every decision of our highest court when taking it under consideration; and all the great statesmen who have spoken or written upon the subject have likewise condemned it as untenable. It may be a necessity with the Republican party to hold this view, but necessity, Mr. Chairman, is always the tyrant's plea.

I think I may fairly claim that the authorities that I have quoted establish conclusively two propositions: First, that the term "United States" embraces the Territories as well as the States; and second, that the Government of the United States has no inherent sovereign powers and has only such powers as are delegated and expressly enumerated in the Constitution or implied from the grants therein.

With the first proposition established, it follows that Congress can not enact a constitutional law imposing a duty upon products from Puerto Rico different from the duty imposed upon products from other Territories or from the States. Such a law would contravene the constitutional provision that "all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States." If we have the power to levy a duty upon Puerto Rican products, we can levy a duty upon the products from New Mexico or Arizona or any other Territory belonging to the United States. Indeed, we have as much right to levy a duty upon the products of one of the States as upon the products of one of the Territories.

The second proposition, that the Government possesses no inherent powers, is established by an overwhelming weight of authorities. Our Government is one of limited and restricted powers.

It is true that Jefferson, Webster, and other statesmen at one time thought that the Government had no power in the Constitution to acquire territory; but the Supreme Court of the United States years ago settled this question, and held that the Government has power under and by virtue of the Constitution to acquire territory. Mr. Jefferson never for a moment thought that the Government had any inherent power to acquire territory. He suggested that the Constitution be amended, giving the Government such power. This, however, was unnecessary and was never done, as the Supreme Court held that it had the power conferred upon it by the Constitution. I repeat that gentlemen on the other side who contend that the Government has an inherent power to acquire territory, and therefore to legislate for such territory outside of the Constitution, rest their argument upon an unsound and false premise. The authorities which I have cited, extending over years and dating almost from the foundation of this Government, demonstrate this.

Now, Mr. Chairman, since the term "United States" embraces and takes in the Territories, and the Government has no inherent power to rule them independent of the Constitution, I affirm that it is clear that the Constitution extends to and over the Territories as well as the States, and that Congress can not legislate for Puerto Rico or any other Territory without constitutional restraint.

The Supreme Court of the United States has expressly decided this question in a number of cases.

In the case of Loughborough *vs.* Blake (5 Wheat., 317 [1820]) Chief Justice Marshall, speaking for the court, held that the general power of Congress to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises extends to all places over which the Government extends, including the District of Columbia and all the Territories of the Union, as well as to the States, and that direct taxes may be apportioned among them. And this is so held because the Constitution extends to the Territories.

The court said:

> The eighth section of the first article gives to Congress the "power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises," for the purposes thereinafter mentioned. This grant is general, without limitation as to place. It consequently extends to all places over which the Government extends. If this could be doubted, the doubt is removed by the subsequent words, which modify the grant. These words are, "But all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States." It will not be contended that the modification of a power extends to places to which the power itself does not extend.

I have already read to the House that portion of the opinion of Chief Justice Marshall in this case which decides that the term "United States" "is the name given to our great Republic, which is composed of States and Territories," and "on the principles of our Constitution, that uniformity in the imposition of imposts, duties, and excises should be observed" in the Territories as well as in the States.

In the case of the United States *vs.* More (3 Cranch, 160) the same doctrine was substantially declared. This case is a very old one, being decided in 1805. The Court said:

> The Constitution was made for the benefit of every citizen of the United States, and there is no citizen, whatever his condition, or wherever he may be, within the territory of the United States, who has not a right to its protection.

Coming down to a later period, we have the Dred Scott decision, reported in 19 Howard, 393, which most explicitly lays down the doctrine on this subject. Chief Justice Taney in that case declared:

> The power of Congress over the person and property of a citizen can never be a mere discretionary power under our Constitution and form of government. The power of the Government and the rights and privileges of the citizen are regulated and plainly defined by the Constitution itself. And when territory becomes a part of the United States the Federal Government enters into possession in the character impressed upon it by those who created it. It enters upon it with its powers over the citizen strictly defined and limited by the Constitution, from which it derives its own existence, and by virtue of which alone it continues to exist and act as a government and sovereignty. It has no power of any kind beyond it, and it can not when it enters a Territory of the United States put off its character and assume discretionary or despotic powers which the Constitution has denied to it. It can not create for itself a new character separated from the citizens of the United States and the duties it owes them under the provisions of the Constitution. The territory being part of the United States, the Government and the citizen both enter it under the authority of the Constitution, with their respective rights defined and marked out, and the Federal Government can exercise no power beyond what that instrument confers, nor lawfully deny any right which it has reserved. * * *
>
> The powers over person and property of which we speak are not only not granted to Congress but are in express terms denied, and they are forbidden to exercise them. And this prohibition is not confined to the States, but the words are general, and extends to the whole territory over which the Constitution gives it power to legislate, including those portions of it remaining under Territorial government as well as that covered by the States.

Mr. Justice Curtis, dissenting upon some of the points decided, concurred in these propositions. He in part said:

> I confess myself unable to perceive any difference whatever between my own opinion of the general extent of the power of Congress and the opinion of the majority of the court, save that I consider it derivable from the express language of the Constitution, while they hold it to be silently implied from the power to acquire territory. Looking at the power of Congress over the Territories as of the extent just described, what positive prohibition exists in the Constitution which restrained Congress from enacting a law in 1820 to prohibit slavery north of 36° 30′ north latitude?

So, Mr. Chairman, we see that the whole court in the Dred Scott case decided in 1856 that Congress had the power to legislate for Territories belonging to the United States, but subject to the limitations of the Constitution. This decision upon this point has never been overruled, but has been frequently affirmed by the Supreme Court.

Mr. Pomeroy, in his work on Constitutional Law, page 317, says of the part of the opinion of Chief Justice Taney which I have quoted:

> The position assumed by the court that Congress in the exercise of its legislative function for the Territories is bound by the restrictive clauses of the Bill of Rights can not be successfully attacked. Indeed, it can make no difference whether that body proceeds under the express grant of Article IV, or under its power implied in the capacity to acquire and hold additional soil. In either case it is equally hedged around and trammeled by the safeguards of individual rights that are contained in the first eight amendments.

I wish to call attention to more recent decisions of the Supreme Court on this question.

In the National Bank *vs.* County of Yankton (101 U. S., 129) the court, through Chief Justice Waite, held:

> All territory within the jurisdiction of the United States not included within any State must necessarily be governed by or under the authority of Congress. * * * The organic law of the Territories takes the place of a constitution as the fundamental law of the local government. * * * But Congress is supreme, and for the purposes of this departmental authority has all the powers of the people of the United States, except such as have been expressly or by implication reserved in the prohibitions of the Constitution.

We also find the same doctrine enunciated by the court in the case of Murphy *vs.* Ramsay (114 U. S., 45). The court stated:

> The people of the United States, as sovereign owners of the National Territories, have supreme power over them and their inhabitants. In the exercise of this sovereign dominion they are represented by the Government of the United States, to whom all the powers of government over that subject have been delegated, subject only to such restrictions as are expressed in the Constitution, as are necessarily implied in its terms or in the purposes and objects of the power itself. * * * The personal and civil rights of the inhabitants of the Territories are secured to them as to other citizens by the principles of constitutional liberty, which restrain all the agencies of government, State and national.

Chief Justice Waite, for the court, in Reynolds *vs.* United States (98 U. S., 145) held that both the first and sixth articles of amendment to the Constitution applied to the Territory of Utah. The court declared in that case:

> By the Constitution of the United States the accused was entitled to a trial by an impartial jury.

The accused was a citizen of the Territory of Utah. And in the same case it was further said by the court:

> Congress can not pass a law for the government of the Territories which shall prohibit the free exercise of religion. The first amendment to the Constitution expressly forbids such legislation. The question to be determined is whether the law now under consideration comes within this prohibition.

It was decided in the case of Springville *vs.* Thomas (166 U. S., 707), by Chief Justice Fuller, speaking for the court, that an act of Congress giving to the local legislature of the Territory of Utah the power to provide that verdicts in civil cases might be rendered by less than the whole number of jurors was unconstitutional, as violating the seventh amendment to the Constitution. Chief Justice Fuller said:

> In our opinion the seventh amendment secured unanimity in finding a verdict as an essential feature of trial by jury in common-law cases, and the act of Congress could not impart the power to change the constitutional rule, and could not be treated as attempting to do so. It has been decided by the court that the Territorial act of March, 1892, permitting this, was invalid because in contravention of the Constitution and the act of Congress.

In the case of Thompson *vs.* Utah (170 U. S., 343) it was declared by the court:

> That the provisions of the Constitution of the United States relating to the right of trial by jury in suits at common law apply to the Territories of the United States is no longer an open question. It is equally beyond question that the provisions of the National Constitution relating to trials by jury for crimes and to criminal prosecutions apply to the Territories of the United States.

The Supreme Court, in the case of Callan *vs.* Wilson (127 U. S., 540), held that the third article and the fifth and sixth amendments to the Constitution applied to the District of Columbia, and said, in part:

> There is nothing in the history of the Constitution or of the original amendments to justify the assertion that the people of the District may be lawfully deprived of the benefit of any of the constitutional guaranties of life, liberty, and property. * * * We can not think that the people of this District have in that regard less rights than those accorded to the people of the Territories of the United States.

Mr. Justice Brewer, in the case of Fong Yue Ting *vs.* United States (149 U. S., 738), in delivering his dissenting opinion, said:

> The Constitution has potency everywhere within the limits of our territory, and the powers which the National Government may exercise within such limits are those and only those given to it by that instrument.

The case of Cross *vs.* Harrison (16 How., 181) is directly in point. The question in that case was whether customs duties and tonnage dues which had been imposed upon imports and tonnage as military contributions by direction of the President in the exercise of the belligerent rights of a conqueror in Upper California and collected by the military authorities at the captured port of San Francisco between February 3, 1848 (date of the treaty of

peace with Mexico), and November 13, 1849 (when the regular collector of that port entered upon the duties of his office pursuant to an act of Congress passed March 3, 1849, "to extend the revenue laws of the United States over the territory and waters of Upper California, and to create a collection district therein"), were illegally exacted and recoverable by the importers.

This case was decided in 1853, and the court in part said:

By the ratifications of the treaty California became a part of the United States. And as there is nothing differently stipulated in the treaty with respect to commerce, it became instantly bound and privileged by the laws which Congress had passed to raise a revenue from duties on imports and tonnage. It was bound by the eighteenth section of the act of 2d of March, 1799. The right claimed to land foreign goods within the United States at any place out of a collection district, if allowed, would be a violation of that provision in the Constitution which enjoins that all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Upper California was acquired and held precisely as Puerto Rico was acquired and is now held. The case therefore applies directly to the point which I am discussing. It must be manifest to the House that if this bill shall become a law it will be unconstitutional and void.

How could any question be more clearly settled by decisions of the Supreme Court than this one? It has been decided time and again that the General Government has no inherent powers, and it has been repeatedly decided in cases extending over nearly a hundred years that the Constitution extends to every place, whether in a Territory or State, where the Government extends its powers and authority by statute. And in the case of Cross *vs.* Harrison, which I have cited, it was held that the Constitution extends ex proprio vigore to and over a Territory. In that case no statute was enacted to extend the Constitution to Upper California.

It can not be that the highest court in our country has been wrong upon this question for nearly a hundred years.

Must it not strike gentlemen on the other side as difficult to conclude that Congress can rule outside of the Constitution, when it is created by the Constitution and derives all of its powers therefrom? The force of every statute enacted by Congress is traceable back to the Constitution as its source. Wipe out the Constitution and Congress is without power and its statutes are nullities. There can be no such thing as a live statute and a dead Constitution, but the Constitution may be alive and the statute may be without force. Wherever the Government extends its power by law, it is so extended by virtue of the Constitution and the Constitution is therefore necessarily there with the power. It is there, too, with its limitations and restrictions.

But, Mr. Chairman, it is apparent that the doctrine contended for by gentlemen is contrary to the genius of our institutions. How can it be imagined that our fathers intended to establish a government with a policy—an imperialistic policy, such a policy as England had, and against which they rebelled and fought? They did not so intend. They founded a Republic in spirit and every principle the purposed enemy of imperialism.

The Territories are infant States. Their people need the protection of the Constitution of the United States more than even the people of the States. The States have constitutions of their own, whereas the Territories, if the Constitution of the United States does not apply to them, have no constitution and are without the guaranty of protection to life, liberty, and property. They are under tutelage for statehood. Can they better be taught the principles of free government by giving them the protection of the Constitution or by giving them imperialistic rule? That the annexed land is held in trust for future States and the Territories are in a state of preparation for statehood is well determined.

Chief Justice Marshall, in Loughborough *vs.* Blake (5 Wheaton, 317), says:

The difference between requiring a continent, with an immense population, to submit to being taxed by a government having no common interest with it, separated from it by a vast ocean, restrained by no principle of apportionment, and associated with it by no common feelings, and permitting the representatives of the American people, under the restriction of our Constitution, to tax a part of the society which is either in *a state of infancy advancing to manhood, looking forward to complete equality as soon as that state of manhood shall* be attained, as is the case with the Territories, or which has voluntarily relinquished the right of representation and has adopted the whole body of Congress for its legitimate government, as is the case with the District, is too obvious not to present itself to the minds of all.

Chief Justice Taney, in the Dred Scott case, said:

There is certainly no power given by the Constitution to the Federal Government to establish or maintain colonies bordering on the United States or at a distance, to be ruled and governed at its own pleasure, nor to enlarge its territorial limits in any way except by the admission of new States.

* * * * * * *

The power to expand the territory of the United States by the admission of new States is plainly given, and in the construction of this power by all the departments of the Government it has been held to authorize the acquisition of a territory not fit for admission at the time, but to be admitted as soon as its population would entitle it to admission. It is acquired to become a State, and not to be held as a colony and governed by Congress with absolute authority; and as the propriety of admitting a new State is committed to the sound discretion of Congress, the power to acquire territory for that purpose, to be held by the United States until it is in suitable condition to become a State upon an equal footing with the other States, must rest upon the same discretion.

Justice McLean, of the minority, said:

In organizing the government of a Territory, Congress is limited to means appropriate to the attainment of the constitutional object. No powers can be exercised which are prohibited by the Constitution or which are contrary to its spirit, so that, whether the object may be the protection of the persons and property of purchasers of the public lands or of communities who have been annexed to the Union by conquest or purchase, they are initiatory to the establishment of State governments, and no more power can be claimed or exercised than is necessary to the attainment of the end. This is the limitation of all the Federal powers.

Mr. Justice Field, in Weber *vs.* Harbor Commissioners, 18 Wallace, 65, says:

Although the title to the soil under tide waters of the bay was acquired by the cession from Mexico equally with the title to the upland, they held it only in trust for the future States.

In the case of Knight *vs.* United States Land Association, 142 U. S., 183, says:

Upon the acquisition of the territory from Mexico the United States acquired the title to the tide land equally with the title to the upland, but with respect to the former, they held it only in trust for the future States that might be erected out of such territory.

In Shively *vs.* Bowlby, 152 U. S. Reports, 48, Justice Gray held the same doctrine.

The island of Puerto Rico, Mr. Chairman, is held in trust for a future State, and is entitled to the benefit and protection of the Constitution.

Gentlemen on the other side must know that this proposed legislation is revolutionary in its character. It will not stand the test without subverting the fundamental principles of our Government.

Should this bill become a law it will be the first step by Congress in the transformation of this Republic into an empire—into a monarchy. It will mark the distinction between expansion as heretofore had by this Government, carrying with it the Constitution and the blessings of liberty to the newly acquired people, and imperialism pure and simple, as once practiced by the Cæsars and now advocated by the leaders of the Republican party as a tenet of their political faith. It will establish the policy of imperialism which will ultimately and inevitably destroy the principle of human liberty upon which this Republic was founded and without which no free republic can exist.

I am not so much concerned about how much duty this bill imposes, though I believe it to be an outrage upon the people of Puerto Rico, as I am about how this imperialistic policy will affect our institutions and the future of our country. The policy is that Congress shall rule the Territories without constitutional limitations; that the people of the Territories, which, to suit gentlemen on the other side, may be more appropriately called colonies, shall have no guaranties, by a written constitution, of protection to life, liberty, and property, but that they shall be subject to the despotic will of man unrestrained; that the Territories shall be dependencies and their inhabitants subjects. I declare, Mr. Chairman, in all seriousness, that I would prefer, infinitely prefer, the rule of a king to that of a Congress without a constitution, dominated by a political party obeying in every act the mandates of the trusts and syndicates.

But gentlemen may say that the imperialism will be against the people of the Territories and will not affect the people of the United States. My answer to this is in the words of Abraham Lincoln: "Destroy this (the spirit of liberty) and you sow the seeds of despotism at your own doors." This is a great truth. A ruler, I care not who he may be, who will plunder and despoil the distant people of his dominion will plunder and despoil at the first opportunity his people at home. If the Constitution can be withdrawn from the people of the Territories and they be made subjects and vassals to meet the requirements of a political party, how long will it be before it will be trampled under foot and ignored in order that monarchy may have a free hand at home? The government with an imperial policy for part of its people will in time extend that policy to the whole people. Imperialism can not be restrained. We are safe only in its destruction.

We hear gentlemen on the other side say that no harm is intended; that all that is wanted is to raise money so that the Puerto Ricans may be given schools and other good things. The progress of a republic to monarchy has always been under the leadership of pretended patriots.

History teaches us a lesson which we may heed with profit. Rome was once a republic and became an empire, and its decline and fall followed. Our great country is now a republic, and became great by being a republic, and there are gentlemen here who would convert it into an empire to be attended with the same fate as Rome.

There is much in what Gibbon in his Decline and Fall says that is apposite, instructive, and warning:

The tender respect of Augustus for a free constitution which he had destroyed can only be explained by an attentive consideration of the character of that subtle tyrant.

When he framed the artful system of imperial authority, his moderation was inspired by his fears. He wished to deceive the people by an image of civil liberty, and the armies by an image of civil government. The names

and forms of the ancient administration were preserved by him with anxious care. The usual number of consuls, prætors, and tribunes were annually invested with their respective signs of office and continued to discharge some of their least important functions. Cæsar—

Continues Gibbon—

had provoked his fate by ostentatiously taking the title of king, while he might have reigned as such under the title of consul or tribune. Augustus was sensible that mankind is governed by names; nor was he deceived in his expectation that the senate and people would submit to slavery, provided that they were respectfully assured that they enjoyed their ancient freedom. To explain, in a few words, the system of the imperial government, as it was instituted by Augustus and maintained by those princes who understood their own interest and that of the people, it may be defined as an absolute monarchy disguised by the forms of a commonwealth. The masters of the Roman world environed their throne with darkness, and humbly professed themselves the accountable ministers of the senate, whose supreme decrees they dictated and obeyed. The face of the court corresponded with the forms of the administration.

As late as the age of the Antonines the Greek historians say that "although the sovereign of Rome, in compliance with an obsolete prejudice, abstained from the name of king, he possessed the full measure of regal power." As imperialism became more fully established the forms and shams were dispensed with. "The fine theory of a republic," says Gibbon, "insensibly vanished."

This brief account from Roman history must at this time impress the American citizen. Do we see in what is happening in this country a parallel to what happened to the Roman Republic? Are not gentlemen on the other side playing the arts of the wily Augustus? Do they not say that there is no imperialism in our Government, and yet is not the proposed legislation imperialistic? Do they not call our Government a Republic, and yet would they not rule it as an empire? Do they not say our Government is a free Government, and yet are they not trying to make vassals of the inhabitants of our Territories? Did not the President declare that the war against Spain was for the sake of humanity and that forcible annexation was criminal aggression and was not to be thought of, and has not the close of this war been followed by a war of conquest?

Did not the President do what no other President ever did, declare war against the Filipinos, when the Constitution says only Congress can declare war? Has he not professed devotion to the Monroe doctrine, and yet by the Hay-Pauncefote treaty would he not abrogate that doctrine, so dear and important to the American people? Let not, Mr. Chairman, the people of this country be deceived. "Philosophy teaches us specially by the examples of Roman history." "Marius and Cæsar," says Gibbon, "subverted the constitution of their country by declaring themselves the protectors of the people;" and Augustus pretended to be a servant of the people while destroying their liberty and making himself a dictator. He established "an absolute monarchy disguised by the forms of a commonwealth." "His successors for a while observed his constitutional fictions," but the "republic insensibly vanished."

The President some months ago asked, "Who will haul down the flag?" The question has gone unanswered until now. The Republican party answers the question by the introduction of this Puerto Rican bill. This party would haul down the flag as it floats over this Republic, the emblem of liberty, justice, and humanity, and float it over an empire, the emblem of tyranny, oppression, and wrong.

Mr. Chairman, I would have the people of this country to read again of the oppression and outrages from which our forefathers suffered under the rule of monarchy. We should not forget the wrongs inflicted upon them lest we forget what imperialism means. They were ruled by a king and a parliament unrestrained by a written constitution. And, Mr. Chairman, what is the difference between the rule of a king and his parliament without a constitution to restrain and the rule of a president and his congress without a constitution to limit?

Let us see what were some of the wrongs visited upon the people of this country by King George and his Parliament. I read from the Declaration of Independence, and the charges are against King George: "He has erected a multitude of new offices and sent thither swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance. He has kept among us in times of peace standing armies without the consent of our legislatures. He has affected to render the military independent of and superior to the civil power. He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our Constitution and unacknowledged by our laws; giving his assent to their acts of pretended legislation:

"For quartering large bodies of armed troops among us:" "For cutting off our trade with all parts of the world: For imposing taxes on us without our consent: For depriving us in many cases of the benefits of trial by jury: For transporting us beyond seas to be tried for pretended offenses." "He has abdicated government here by declaring us out of his protection and waging war against us. He has plundered our seas, ravaged our coasts, burnt our towns, and destroyed the lives of our people."

These are but a few of the crimes committed by King George against the American people—his people.

Are we to give to our Territories such a rule as this? I say no; not as long as the words of the immortal Henry, "Give me liberty or give me death," are remembered. These words tell how liberty is to be valued, and they, too, like Henry, are immortal. They were in the hearts and on the lips of our forefathers for seven long years of bloody warfare. And they are upon the lips of every oppressed people struggling for freedom. We hear them from the lips of the farmers of the Transvaal in their heroic struggle for the preservation of their Republic. We hear them from the lips of the Filipinos in the jungles of Luzon. And, Mr. Chairman, in view of the imperial policy inaugurated by the present Administration and the threatened destruction of our institutions, it is time the American people were taking those words afresh upon their lips.

Never before in the history of our country were there greater questions pending before the people for solution. The money question is one of vast importance. The trust question is another of deep interest and concern to the people; but there can be no greater or more momentous question than the question whether or not this great Republic shall be preserved, thereby preserving our liberties, or shall perish from the face of the earth. The people can not and will not be recreant to their duty. We hold this Government in trust for generations to come. Should we prove faithless to the trust, we will commit a crime against ourselves and against posterity. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Trade of Puerto Rico.

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. RYAN,

OF NEW YORK.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, February 28, 1900,

On the bill (H. R. 8245) to regulate the trade of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes.

Mr. RYAN said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us at least be honest. This is the place and the present the time when the members of this House, irrespective of the side to which their political belief has assigned them, should discuss frankly, fairly, and thoroughly all the conditions, constitutional, commercial, legal, and practical that the cession of these islands to the United States has brought before Congress. The people demand frankness of us. We owe it to our constituencies. I owe it to a constituency whose Christian teachings prompt them to revere the Ten Commandments, particularly that commandment which says "Thou shalt not bear false witness." I owe it to a constituency a portion of which has come in the tide of progress to make up the great population of foreign born, who have suffered all the privations of imperialistic government and the hardships of the large standing army.

We are now confronted with a problem which reaches far into the future, and whether we solve it rightly or wrongly so will we be praised or censured by the next generation and the multitude unborn. It is therefore of vast importance that we be honest. Let us be honest as to the importance of this step; we owe that to ourselves. Let us be honest with the Puerto Ricans; we owe it to those dusky burnt children of the tropical clime, who, struggling to be freed from the tyrannical rule of Spain, greeted General Miles with open arms—greeted him as a savior who had come to bring them out of the house of bondage and into the land of the free—honest to those little ones who scattered flowers in the path of our soldiers as they marched to San Juan. Let us be honest to the people of our own country. Let us be honest to the laboring man of these United States, who is vitally interested in our course with reference to these new possessions.

The legal and the technical sides of this question have been discussed. My able colleague from New York [Mr. PAYNE] has viewed it in its commercial light, but the fanciful twists of his giant brain, that have even gone so far as to give expression to his belief in two measures of diametrical sentiment, have placed his ideas in the deadly parallel and caused him to exclaim, "If we do not put a tax on the products of this island we are commercially doomed, and if we do put a tax on the products of the island we are doomed also." To relieve the strain I would suggest to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee that he introduce a third measure authorizing the President to sever what appears to be our imperialistic connection with Puerto Rico. I am neither a lawyer nor an Ohioan, so I will not presume to expound the Constitution in its bearing on this question.

I have, however, enjoyed the privilege of being a student of

those able minds who have expounded the Constitution in its bearing on this particular question, and I shall ask the indulgence of your time and attention later on to quote to this House passages from the opinions handed down by Chief Justice John Marshall, by Justice Cooley, and by Justice McLain, whose memories have been kept green and whose opinions have been revered by all men in all times until the present moment. Our Republican friends have made it imperative that we contrast these opinions with those of my friend from New York, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee; with Mr. GROSVENOR, of Ohio, and those other stanch party leaders on this floor, who now ask us to take a radical step in the opposite direction to which we have been taught to walk, and in opposition to that course which has, until this time, maintained our grand institutions and made us a happy and a contented people, enjoying life in the blessedness of freedom.

As this debate has been open for some time, I shall not endeavor to bring into it at this period any new topic of discussion, but still I do not intend to vote against the measure without first laying before the House my views on the subject. Mr. Chairman, what is the status of the case as we now have it?

To go back to the beginning and picture the landing of our victorious arms on the shore of the island. It is not for me to say at this time what the sentiment of our people toward the island was at that period. Neither shall I assume to tell this House what feeling prompted the Puerto Ricans to their demonstrations of enthusiastic greeting. Instead, I read from the report of General Miles, commander of the army of invasion:

HEADQUARTERS OF THE ARMY,
Ponce, Puerto Rico, July 28, 1898.

To the inhabitants of Puerto Rico:

In the prosecution of the war against the Kingdom of Spain by the people of the United States in the cause of liberty, justice, and humanity, its military forces have come to occupy the island of Puerto Rico.

They come bearing the banner of freedom, inspired by a noble purpose to seek the enemies of our country and yours and to destroy or capture all who are in armed resistance. They bring you the fostering arm of a nation of free people, whose greatest power is in its justice and humanity to all those living within its fold. Hence the first effect of this occupation will be the immediate release from your former political relations and, it is hoped, a cheerful acceptance of the government of the United States. The chief object of the American military forces will be to overthrow the armed authority of Spain and to give to the people of your beautiful island the largest measure of liberty consistent with this military occupation.

We have not come to make war upon the people of a country that for centuries have been oppressed, but, on the contrary, to bring you protection, not only to yourselves, but to your property, to promote your prosperity, and bestow upon you the immunities and blessings of the liberal institutions of our Government. It is not our purpose to interfere with any existing laws and customs that are wholesome and beneficial to your people so long as they conform to the rules of military administration of order and justice. This is not a war of devastation, but one to give to all within the control of its military and naval forces the advantages and blessings of enlightened civilization.

NELSON A. MILES,
Major-General, Commanding United States Army.

This was followed in the succeeding month by the signing of the protocol under which hostilities between the United States and Spain ceased. The treaty of peace between the two countries was signed by the commissioners in December of that year and was ratified by the Senate of the United States in February, 1899. By the terms of the treaty the island of Puerto Rico was ceded to the United States.

Section 8, Article I, of the Constitution of the United States, says:

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

The powers and limitations of Congress under the Constitution have been placed before this House plainly and strongly, and it is not of moment that I go into them in the limited time I have at my disposal. I shall, however, as briefly as possible quote from able constitutional authorities to show that this action is without precedent.

First of all, I read from the resolution passed by Congress prior to the declaration of war with Spain. I do so because it has been stated that the action of the Democrats in that Congress caused the nation to go to war and brought on this question. For the part the Democratic party took in urging the Administration to that war in humanity's cause, I honor it. I desire to show, however, that Congress did not desire or intend that the Constitution should be violated in providing government for whatever territory may, or was to come, into our possession by reason of that war. The resolution reads:

The United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island [Cuba] except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people.

The resolution says Cuba, but it is plain to even a careless observer that the intention of Congress was to demonstrate that we were not entering into a war of conquest.

Chief Justice Cooley has given to us an opinion that I feel is particularly pertinent to the topic. It leaves no ground for equivocations, and it is brief and to the point. He says:

The Constitution itself never yields to treaty or enactment; it neither changes with time, nor does it in theory bend to the force of circumstances. It may be amended according to its own permission; but while it stands, it is "a law for rulers and people, equally in war and in peace, and covers with the shield of its protection all classes of men, at all times, and under all circumstances." Its principles can not, therefore, be set aside in order to meet the supposed necessities of great crises. "No doctrine involving more pernicious consequences was ever invented by the wit of man than that any of its provisions can be suspended during any of the great exigencies of government."

Justice Cooley has been careful in reaching this decision. He would rather that the Constitution be paramount to the greatest crisis that time might bring, so that men would not err in the heat of nerve-raking scenes. Such judgment must be listed as the soundest judgment. Having dispelled any hesitancy that I may have entertained in a feeling that the present time was one when we should not look back to the wise judgment of those able jurists—and I assure the gentlemen that I entertained it but briefly—let us proceed to other authorities which say that we can not place a tax on one part of the country and allow another part to go free. Chief Justice Marshall has held that—

The power, then, to lay and collect duties, imposts, and excises may be exercised and must be exercised throughout the United States. Does this term designate the whole or any particular portion of the American empire? Certainly this question can admit of but one answer. It is the name given to our great Republic, which is composed of States and Territories. The District of Columbia or the territory west of the Missouri is not less within the United States than Maryland or Pennsylvania, and it is not less necessary on the principles of our Constitution that uniformity in the imposition of imposts, duties, and excises should be observed in the one than in the other.

Justice McLean could have written nothing more apropos to the discussion of this week, even if he were a member of this House and was present at this time, than is contained in the following opinion as to the limitations of Congress:

No powers can be exercised [by Congress] which are prohibited in the Constitution or which are contrary to its spirit.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to discuss a little of the history of our advent into Puerto Rico, and view, as well as I can, the island as we found it. It was not aggression or force by which our arms marched victoriously to the seat of government in Puerto Rico.

The flame of our cannon and the swish of the Mauser did not blaze the way. Our gallant soldier boys trampled over no dead comrades nor climbed blood-stained heights 'mid hazy smoke of battle to plant the Stars and Stripes on the topmost peak of the island, where all nations might see its folds float flauntingly and gloriously in the breeze. Puerto Rico did not come by conquest. It came because we had given to the world a mandate of manliness and were known to the extreme ends of either hemisphere as the nation of humanity, the defender of the oppressed, and our homes were the mansions of the "free and the brave." We were simply greeted to possession, and in that word I would embody the purest sentiment of anticipated enjoyment. General Miles was received as an emancipator. The Puerto Ricans felt that he was to make them free. They pictured contentment and equality with all men as their future lot. They viewed a new era for their country. They gloried in the government to come, and, if we are to believe the reports, which we have no just cause to doubt, they welcomed our Army, believing that they were throwing wide their portals to the Constitution and the Government of the United States.

From what I have learned and have heard here stated that is the prima facie case of our material acquirement of the territory. The report of General Miles bears it out. It is my purpose to show in this regard that we should clear ourselves of any charge of deceit. If we do so, we are doing naught but being honest. Does this measure carry out our promise? Mr. Chairman, I regret to say that it does not. We have but two ways to give to those people what we promised them amid the chaos of war, when men and nations usually speak as man to man and nation to nation. What are these two things? Surely they are not the benefits of the unwritten constitution that a colleague pictured so brightly and said existed in the human mind or human conscience. No, Mr. Chairman, not that. We must give the Puerto Ricans the privileges and benefits of the Constitution, that great state paper penned by Jefferson when we were a Puerto Rico in principle, or we must give them their independence and allow them to bring forth a new Jefferson and a new constitution, which will be sufficient to their conditions and bring them their expected happiness.

We can not ask these people of our new possession, the Pearl of the Antilles, to take a step backward in the tide of time and give them poorer trade and governmental relations than those which they enjoyed prior to the signing of the treaty of Paris, prior to the war with Spain. I appeal to this House, and particularly to you, my Republican friends, to allow no cloud of trust smoke to so dim your view that you may not see this comparison of conditions as they existed under the rule of Spain and as they will exist under the views of the Republican majority of the Ways and Means Committee that are to be forced upon the country. But I am glad to say that the conditions to come are not sanctioned by the Constitution, controvert it as you will. [Applause.]

We have these facts from reports of Mr. Davis and others who have investigated the subject Puerto Rico has an area of about

4,000 square miles, and about a million of inhabitants, over 800,000 of them being white people of mixed nationalities—Americans, Irish, English, French, Spanish, Italians, and Portuguese—and the information I have warrants me in saying that about one-fourth of the people can read and write. They are not savages, Mr. Chairman. They know a good government from a bad government—right from wrong. They are law-abiding and thrifty, and the great majority follow agricultural pursuits for a livelihood. What rights and privileges did they enjoy under Spanish rule? Let us see. The first thing we note is that they were given equal representation with the other provinces of that government in the Spanish Cortes. That was just and honest.

At the time they became a part of this country by treaty they had not only no public debt but one million and a half dollars in their treasury. For the five years previous to this statistical report the exports of the island were worth nearly $85,000,000, the imports about $70,000,000, leaving a trade balance in their favor of nearly $15,000,000, which would mean about $3,000,000 per year. The chief products of the island are sugar. coffee, and tobacco. The annual average production of sugar is about 58,000 tons. The great quantity of their sugar was exported to Spain, the tobacco to Cuba and there mixed with Cuban product and sold in foreign markets. We gather from these facts that the island can pay its way from its own resources. In average times it is more than self-supporting. Last year was an extraordinary year in the island. The hurricanes wrecked the plantations, strewing devastation broadcast, and destroying millions of dollars' worth of crops in the field and in storage. The work of the elements has left them, especially the poorer classes, in a degree, dependent upon the charity of this country.

Our course should not be one of forcing further hardships upon these people. Would it not be preferable to be as liberal as possible in our dealings—trade relations—with the island under these conditions, especially when we can do so in strict conformity with the Constitution? But the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] says that the duty will be placed upon the sugar trust, as that corporation controls all the sugar there is on the island at the present time. Then, in theory, I step across to the other side of this House, where I find I am outside of the Constitution, and I ask: If this tax on importation is levied against the sugar trust, why are we reducing it from 25 per cent of the Dingley tax to only 15 per cent of that tax?

Gentlemen, if your side of the House ever decides that it wants to tax the sugar trust, tax it to the limit and tax it every day, or it will take you until the end of time to reimburse this nation for the taxes it has dodged. Giving due attention to what the gentleman from Illinois has to say about the sugar trust, I will assume for the present—and feel safe in my assumption—that the tax is on the Puerto Rican, as, with the assistance of nature, he has produced the sugar. We can afford to be fair and liberal and give to these people a demonstration that they have benefited by the unfurling of the Stars and Stripes on their island. Let the Constitution follow the flag.

Though I am not an admirer of President McKinley in the policies he has mapped out for this Government, and on the majority of his themes I am diametrically opposed to him, still I would be less a man and no Democrat at all if I did not heartily concur in his sentiment as regards our commercial treatment of this island. I quote here from his annual message and ask for the attention of the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee while I read it:

> It must be borne in mind that since the cession Puerto Rico has been denied the principal markets she had long enjoyed, and our tariffs have been continued against her products as when she was under Spanish sovereignty.
>
> The markets of Spain are closed to her products except upon terms to which the commerce of all nations is subjected. The island of Cuba, which used to buy her cattle and tobacco without customs duties, now imposes the same duties upon these products as from any other country entering her ports. She has, therefore, lost her free intercourse with Spain and Cuba without any compensating benefits in this market. Her coffee was little known and not in use by our people, and therefore there was no demand here for this, one of her chief products.
>
> Our plain duty is to abolish all customs tariffs between the United States and Puerto Rico and give her products free access to our markets.

Now note what the Secretary of War has to say:

> The highest considerations of justice and good faith demand that we should not disappoint the confident expectation of sharing in our prosperity with which the people of Puerto Rico so gladly transferred their allegiance to the United States, and that we should treat the interest of this people as our own; and I wish most strongly to urge that the customs duties between Puerto Rico and the United States be removed.

In addition to these statements and the statements of able men well versed in the conditions of the island at the time of the cession, I call attention to the fact that during this session Mr. PAYNE of New York, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, introduced a bill following these lines. It is natural to presume that he was prompted by the sentiment that stirred the President and was acting in accord with the policy of the Administration when he did so. Here we stop suddenly. Mr. PAYNE withdraws his bill and substitutes a measure that will place a tax of 25 per cent of the Dingley tariff on all imports and exports of Puerto Rico. We have no ground for believing that the President has ordered this or intimated that it was his desire. He has, however, offered no resistance. Now, I ask, why this radical change? I pause for a reply.

What is this done for? Where is the necessity of going outside of the Constitution when we can give these people just and equitable government within the limitations of that great paper? There must be a cause for this change of sentiment on the part of the Ways and Means Committee. If not, why this unprecedented, unwarranted, and, I believe, unconstitutional action of Congress? What is there in it for the great mass of people of this country known as the working class? Is it the intention to have citizens in one part of the country and subjects in another? Is it not dangerous for the American people to allow the flag to be planted where the Constitution can not follow? I say, as we treasure the liberty that this Government of ours affords us, guard well the principles that have been handed down by Washington, by Jefferson, and by Lincoln—the principles that have made it possible for this country to maintain its proud position among the nations of the globe.

I do not for an instant believe that this bill is meant solely to settle the question of our relations with Puerto Rico. I shall go further and say that I do not believe there is a majority of the members of this House who so believe. The framers of this measure, whoever they may be—and I regret that its parentage should be lost in obscurity—know that its effects will reach through Puerto Rico and away to the Philippines, where Aguinaldo is still playing the character of the squirrel and the fox. If this bill was unshod of any intention to stretch out its arms to the Philippines there would be no such strenuous action on the part of the Ways and Means Committee.

Politics would be eliminated to a great extent, and we should be compelled to face only the proposition of what is best for Puerto Rico. This measure embodies more than all that. It is the first step in the direction of imperialistic government. It leads from the republic to the empire; and, gentlemen, if you still insist on the adoption of this unwarranted and unconstitutional measure, if you insist on making the Philippines part of the United States, you must eventually, judging by your efforts to date, in direct opposition to the opinions of the Supreme Court and of all the Secretaries of State, find yourselves in the vexing position of fixing one rate of import duty for Puerto Rico, another for New York, another for Florida, and another for Manila.

Is it not enough that we strain every timber in the Constitution to reach some kind of a settlement of this question, or must we pay out millions of dollars annually as well, and secure no benefit from the commercial relationship that we may enjoy therefrom? It is proved beyond peradventure that we can secure no advantage in any equitable trade relation that we may establish with the islands in the oriental seas. From the reports of the Treasury Department it is shown that the entire import and export trade of the entire archipelago amounts to $30,000,000 per year. Presuming that no other nation traded one dollar's worth with the islands; that we received all the trade, and figuring a reasonable profit from it, you would expend three and one-half times as much to maintain a standing army of 25,000 men, which all authorities agree must be maintained after order has been restored. And you would put in direct competition with American labor 12,000,000 brown and yellow men of the far east.

We are now maintaining an army there of 65,000 men at an annual expense of $65,000,000. History shows us that every government on the earth which has acquired colonial possessions and holds them has found it necessary to establish a large standing army of occupation. I shall not enter into the deplorable conditions wrought upon European countries by the great army appendage, primarily because I have not the time, and because I have no desire to bring to my Republican friends more anguish and dismay than has come to their lot through the agency of this iniquitous measure. They are dodging now the storm that is sure to appear as soon as they feel themselves safe enough to declare to the country that through their majority in Congress they intend to enact the large standing army bill into law. But to follow a line of commercial inquiry.

It is an admitted fact that our labor can not compete with the labor of the Philippines. If we hold the islands there can possibly be no benefit to the American workman, either direct or indirect. There can be no benefit to the country, because our expenses would far outweigh our receipts. Who, then, will benefit by such acquirement? The American workman has the answer to this question from Hawaii. Capitalists now have the control of that Territory. They went there with improved machinery, hired Chinese, Filipino, and coolie labor at the munificent sum of 15 cents a day, and this labor is now thrown in competition with the white labor of our Western and of our Southern States. Six dollars a month is considered good pay in the Philippines. For the harvest season $1.50 per week is excellent remuneration for labor.

This is the pay and this is the class of laborers that the Americans will be compelled to compete with if we take the Philippines. Capital will control it as surely as it controls Hawaii, and capital is always seeking the cheapest labor.

No American workman can go to the Philippines and mingle with the laborers of that territory. Puerto Rico, however, is not identical in this regard. The Puerto Rican is as superior to the Filipino as the Cuban is superior to the Costa Rican. All are equally entitled to be free. While the Constitution is a heritage to us, for which our fathers bled and died that we might forever remain a free and independent people, still I would like to see all nations enjoy its benefits, or rather the benefits that we enjoy, and especially would I glory in the freedom of the oppressed.

I admire the gallant Boer as he battles for his liberty in the Transvaal, and my sympathies from the bottom of my heart are with him; the sympathy of the American people is with him, and to no greater extent than it is with the Cuban and the Puerto Rican; and I now repeat that this country is not truly represented, neither in sentiment nor in principle, when you vote through this Congress a heavier burden for the men of the Antilles than they carried under Spain. Not only is your action unconstitutional, according to the opinions of the great jurists of the past, but it is also unjust. [Applause on Democratic side.]

Policy Relative to the Philippine Islands.

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALEXANDER S. CLAY,

OF GEORGIA,

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

Thursday, March 1, 1900,

On the joint resolution (S. R. 53) defining the policy of the United States relative to the Philippine Islands, introduced by Mr. BEVERIDGE January 4, 1900, as follows:

"A joint resolution (S. R. 53) defining the policy of the United States relative to the Philippine Islands.

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the Philippine Islands are territory belonging to the United States; that it is the intention of the United States to retain them as such and to establish and maintain such governmental control throughout the archipelago as the situation may demand."

Mr. CLAY said:

Mr. PRESIDENT: In addressing myself to the resolutions which have just been read, I speak from the standpoint of one who voted in favor of the ratification of the treaty. The remarks which I shall make, however, will be perfectly consistent with the views I entertained and expressed before and at the time the treaty was ratified. The reasons which induced me to cast that vote were fully explained at the time, and I do not deem it necessary to reiterate those views. I took occasion then to announce on the floor of the Senate that I favored a declaration on the part of Congress setting forth fully that it was not the purpose of our Government to hold and govern the Philippine Islands permanently against the consent of their population, but, on the contrary, we should give to them every assurance by legislative action that our purpose was to grant them independence and to assist them in forming a government which shall be free and independent, one suitable to their conditions and surroundings, one capable of maintaining law and order, one fully capable of discharging international obligations, and a government that would enable them to realize the best aspirations of the people of those islands.

During the discussion of the treaty no Senator, so far as I remember, belonging to either political party contended on the floor of the Senate that our Government should permanently retain these islands and govern them against the will of the inhabitants. If such a purpose was entertained by either the President or any member of the Senate, no expression indicating such purpose can be found in the record of the public debates or in any official paper from the executive branch of the Government.

I remember well the resolution that came from the House of Representatives declaring war against the Government of Spain. That resolution passed the House of Representatives without making any provision for the independence of Cuba. It came to the Senate and was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and came back from that committee with both a majority and a minority report. My friend the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] joined our Democratic friends on this side of the Chamber, and the majority report was not only in favor of independence for the people of Cuba but recognized the de facto government existing on that island. It was on that occasion that the distinguished Senator from Ohio made one of the most eloquent and forcible speeches ever delivered in the Senate in favor of liberty, independence, and self-government. It reminded us of the early days of the Republic and breathed the same spirit of liberty which fired the soul of Patrick Henry. In concluding this most remarkable speech, which attracted the attention of the entire country, what did our friend say, having reference to the war with Spain? He said:

Business interests may be interfered with, loss of life may occur, all apprehended evils may result, but no matter what the cost, in the presence of this commanding duty we must go forward. The time, I repeat, for diplomacy has passed. The time for action has come. Let the doubting, the opposing go to the rear, while the virile, strong-minded, patriotic, liberty-loving masses of American people, coming from all sections and all pursuits and avocations of life, rally as one man around our gallant Army and Navy, and, taking the flag of our country, carry it on to triumphant victory.

This was not all the distinguished Senator said. He declared:

A victory, Mr. President, for civilization over barbarism; a victory for the right and capacity for man to govern himself; a victory for the Western Hemisphere; a victory for Cuba; a victory for freedom, liberty, and independence; a victory worthy the descendants of the heroic men who achieved our independence and worthy of the successors of those heroic men who have since preserved and perpetuated our priceless heritage.

I wonder whether the distinguished Senator thinks that the course we are now pursuing toward the people of the Philippine Islands is in favor of freedom, liberty, and independence. Those were patriotic words; and if they were applicable to the people of Cuba, why are they not applicable to the people of the Philippine Islands?

Mr. FORAKER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. CLAY. With a great deal of pleasure.

Mr. FORAKER. The Senator from Georgia has spoken so kindly of the remarks I made a year ago that I dislike even to appear to be taking exceptions to anything he may state; but I do not want him to pass from this subject until I say to him that I have not changed the views that I expressed one year ago, but entertain the same now; and I do not understand that anyone else has changed views since then, but that the ultimate purposes which we were talking about are still entertained and will be pursued.

Mr. CLAY. Those purposes may be entertained, but I see no evidence that there is any intention of carrying out such purposes. I will say in my opinion we are further to-day from granting independence and self-government to the people of the Philippine Islands than we have ever been since the ratification of the treaty. The very resolution which we are now debating contemplates the permanent retention of these islands. Has the party in power shown any disposition to favor the policy indicated by the Senator from Ohio?

The Senator from Ohio, always eloquent, logical, and consistent, and in favor of liberty, freedom, and independence, had something to say on the ratification of the treaty.

I remember well the substance of an expression that came from the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER], and which apparently met the approval of those most ardently in favor of the ratification of the treaty. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD contains the language of the honorable Senator. I repeat his exact words:

I do not understand anybody to be proposing to take the Philippine Islands with the idea and view of permanently holding them and denying to the people there the right to have a government of their own, if they are capable of it and want to establish it. I do not understand that anybody wants to do that. I have not heard of anybody who wants to do that. The President of the United States does not, I know, and no Senator in this Chamber has made any such statement.

Now, mark you, Mr. President, this is very strong language, coming from the distinguished Senator from Ohio, the home of the President, and used on the floor of the Senate just before the vote was taken on the ratification of the treaty. Mark you, the Senator declared that he knew that the President of the United States did not intend permanently to hold these islands and to deny to the people the right to have a government of their own.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HANSBROUGH in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. CLAY. With pleasure.

Mr. FORAKER. I dislike to interrupt the Senator from Georgia, but it seems to me he ought, in giving our positions, to say that it was expressly stated by each and every Senator. I have not any doubt about it. I know it was by myself, not that we would be in favor of granting independence immediately upon the ratification of the treaty and taking possession of the islands, but so soon in the course of events as it should be found these people were capable of self-government, and meanwhile, from the beginning and until that time, we should grant them the fullest measure of local self-government possible.

Mr. CLAY. I would be glad to see the faith of those who say they favor such policy demonstrated by works. We have no substantial evidence showing that this policy is to be pursued, but, on the contrary, every indication points in the opposite direction.

The junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] delivered an eloquent and forcible speech in favor of the ratification of the treaty.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. CLAY. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I think I ought to call public attention to the fact, before the Senator proceeds to quote anything from my colleague, that my colleague is detained from the Senate by reason of a severe domestic affliction.

Mr. CLAY. I desire under no circumstances to make any improper reference to the Senator's colleague.

Mr. HOAR. I have made this general statement, not because I supposed the Senator from Georgia would for a moment be forgetful of that fact, but that the public might understand if any quotation was made from my colleague, the reason why he did not reply to it, if necessary, on the spot.

Mr. CLAY. I so understood, Mr. President.

I have taken the trouble to read it most carefully, and the language used upon the occasion could have but one interpretation. After the treaty was ratified, his views, as expressed at that time, were in favor of legislation by Congress granting to the Filipinos the right of self-government. To show that my construction of his language is correct, I quote from his speech delivered in the Senate his exact language as to the future government of the Filipinos. He said:

> Suppose we ratify the treaty. The islands pass from the possession of Spain into our possession without committing us to any policy. I believe we shall have the wisdom not to attempt to incorporate those islands with our body politic or make their inhabitants a part of our citizenship. I believe we shall have the wisdom, the self-restraint, and the ability to restore peace and order in those islands and give their people the opportunity for self-government and for freedom under the protecting shield of the United States until the time shall come when they shall stand alone.

The junior Senator from Massachusetts also said in the same speech:

> I want no subject races and no vassal States. That we had by the fortunes of war assumed a great responsibility in the Philippines; that we ought to give to those people an opportunity for freedom, for peace, and for self-government.
>
> I want to get this country out of war and back to peace. I want to get the disposition and control of the Philippines out of the hands of the war power and place them where they belong—in the hands of Congress and the President. I want to enter into a policy that shall enable us to give peace and self-government to the natives of those islands. The rejection of the treaty makes all of these things impossible.

Every Senator who spoke in favor of the ratification of the treaty in legislative sessions except two, who delivered constitutional arguments, contended at that time that Congress should take action in favor of self-government for the Filipinos after the treaty was ratified. The senior Senator from Colorado, who was an able and earnest advocate of the ratification of the treaty, took strong grounds at that time in favor of future action by Congress granting independence to these people. He said:

> There are few people in the world incapable of self-government. I believe the people of Luzon are capable of self-government now. I believe the people of some of the islands are. I do not know but all are. Mr. President, I keep in view this truth which I have stated, which I believe to be a truth, that the people are entitled to a government of their own making, and that we have no right to say, "Your standard is so low you will create a government which we can not affirm; therefore you can not have a government of your own." They are entitled to only such a government as they themselves can maintain; it must be one producing order and protection to persons and property, for otherwise it is not a government at all.

This is not all he said. He continued:

> We shall make a mistake if we make up our minds that we are going to govern these people from here, that we are going to govern them with Anglo-Saxons whom we send out there from here to administer the affairs of that country. You will need 50,000 soldiers; in a little while you will need more, for they are a great people. They are a people who are willing to contend for their liberty, and I believe it also to be an axiom that a people who will fight for their liberty and who are willing to die for it are capable of maintaining it.

Mr. TELLER. Will the Senator from Georgia allow me to interrupt him for a moment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. CLAY. With pleasure.

Mr. TELLER. I would like to say to the Senator from Georgia, who has done me the honor to quote my remarks, that I have not changed my views in the slightest degree; and I think, if anything, that I am stronger in that belief now than I was then.

Mr. CLAY. I so understand.

To further demonstrate that those who contended that the treaty should be ratified gave assurances immediately afterwards that legislation would follow declaring it our purpose to deal with these people as we had dealt with Cuba, I quote from the speech of the junior Senator from Colorado, who said:

> There are no questions, Mr. President, raised by these resolutions or their amendments that could not be equally well and satisfactorily dealt with after the treaty shall have been ratified.

The senior Senator from New York, who made a speech in favor of the ratification of the treaty, declared in the same speech that there was no reason why an American Senator should misunderstand that we would approach the Philippine problem with any other than the most benevolent intentions concerning the Filipinos and their future. He said in substance that there is no American in all this broad land who wishes any other fate to any single native of the Philippine Islands than his free enjoyment of a prosperous life.

In the exciting debate on the resolution declaring war against the Government of Spain the senior Senator from Vermont, who had just returned from the island of Cuba, delivered a remarkable speech on the situation in that island, in which he said:

> I am not in favor of annexation, not because I would apprehend any particular trouble from it, but because it is not a wise policy to take in any people of foreign tongue and training and without strong guiding American elements.

The distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. THURSTON], speaking on the same subject, declared that—

> I am unalterably opposed to any departure from the declared policy of the fathers, which would start this Republic, for the first time, upon a career of conquest and dominion, utterly at variance with the avowed purpose and manifest destiny of our republican Government.

If such strong language could be used in regard to the population of Cuba, how much stronger would be the force of an argument against the permanent retention of the population of the Philippine Islands. If the views of Senators are consistent with utterances heretofore made on the floor of the Senate, a majority of the members of the Senate are against the permanent retention of the Philippine Islands. The counsel and wisdom of President Garfield was at one time highly esteemed by the Republican party. Would it not be well for us to reflect and remember that he said:

> We occupy a portion of the great North American zone which girdles the world, and which has been the theater of the greatest achievements of civilization, especially in the history of the Anglo-Saxon races, but should we extend our possessions into the tropical belt we would weaken the power of our Government.

The junior Senator from South Carolina [Senator MCLAURIN] before the treaty was ratified delivered a most forcible and logical speech against a colonial system of government and against the permanent retention of the Philippine Islands, and I regret to see the wonderful change in his views in regard to our policy with these islands. In that remarkable speech he said:

> It is idle to speak of Americanizing a tropical country 8,000 miles away. Our people will never consent for the people of that far-off land to ever have a voice in the affairs of our country. Therefore, to govern them we must inaugurate a military or colonial system utterly at variance with the principles of our Republic. But even if by a strained construction of the Constitution the power is vested in the United States to inaugurate a colonial system, I am utterly opposed, as a matter of policy, to the acquisition of any territory that can not be Americanized and brought into harmony with our institutions. I believe the time is not far off, and I gladly welcome its approach, when our flag will float over every foot of North American soil, but it must come naturally and peacefully—by the consent of the governed, not by the rude hand of war.
>
> But when it comes to thrusting our rule upon 10,000,000 people on another continent by force of arms, I hold that such a policy is unwise as well as at variance with the principles upon which our Government is founded. Taxation without representation is as much tyranny as when King George's tea was dumped into Boston Harbor. To govern the people of the Philippines without their consent is as much government without the consent of the governed as it was when we were under the rule of Great Britain.
>
> In a commercial point of view, I believe the importance of the Philippines per se is greatly exaggerated. They are chiefly valuable as the key to the Orient, but we need not colonize to obtain that advantage. The exports of the Philippines, according to the statistical abstract, in 1896 amounted to $50,806,250. If this entire trade was monopolized by us it would be insignificant. We will have to teach them to wear shirts and breeches before we can trade with them much.

I feel sure that my friend from South Carolina will some day say the words above spoken were full of wisdom to the American people, and that the error of his life was when he departed from their teachings.

During the debate on the ratification of the treaty the senior Senator from Delaware, probably closer to the Administration at that time than any other Democratic Senator, speaking of these islands, said:

> Now we have them, it does not follow that we are committed to a colonial policy or to a violation of those great principles of liberty and self-government which must always remain American ideals if our own free institutions are to endure. No country, and this country least of all, can afford to trample on its ideals. I have no fear that it will do so.

The distinguished Senator did not stop here, he went further:

> I assure you, with some knowledge of whereof I speak, that the President is committed to no policy calculated to discourage, much less strike down, the aspirations of liberty-loving people all over the world.

The Senator was a member of the Peace Commission negotiating the terms of peace at Paris, and was an earnest, able, influential Senator in favor of the ratification of the treaty. At that time all those who spoke for ratification took the position that when

Spain relinquished her sovereignty over the Philippine Islands and ceded them to the United States such a course cleared the way for the recognition of a Philippine republic by our Government.

No one contended that such ratification precluded our Government from taking immediate action favorable to the independence of those people, but, on the contrary, freed us from complications with Spain, settled the war, and thus cleared the way for favorable action by Congress for the future government of the Filipinos. It is only of recent date that the secret purpose of those who now declare that our Government shall change the policy of a lifetime and deprive the people of their long-cherished hopes, has been known to have existed from the beginning. I cast my vote in favor of a declaration of policy looking forward to the independence of these people, and subsequent events have demonstrated that we made a serious blunder when we failed to pass such a resolution. But, Mr. President, I do not care to devote too much of my time to the past, but it is essential to understand the past in order to prepare for the future. Let us trace the interesting history of our connections with the Philippine people since the commencement of the war with Spain, and let us see what were our relations with this people from the time we met them until the breach occurred, and let us probe to the bottom and ascertain the causes which led to hostilities, and then let us see, even at this late day, if we can not apply a remedy that is just, that will restore peace and preserve our honor and free institutions, and at the same time grant justice to a struggling, helpless people.

Dewey destroyed the Spanish fleet May 1, 1898. The city of Manila surrendered to our Government on August 13 following. The treaty of peace was ratified February 6, 1899. It has been more than twelve months since the ratification took place, and while it was openly avowed by those who led the fight in favor of ratification that so soon as the treaty was ratified then would be the time for Congress to take action for an independent government for these people, not a word or line has come from them fulfilling this promise. They now have changed their plans and openly avow that we shall maintain permanent dominion over the islands and govern them forever as our dependencies by Americans and absolutely denying them the right of self-government. No fair and impartial mind can reach any other conclusion than that the want of a fixed and just policy in keeping with the principles of our Government, pointing out the manner in which we intended to deal with this people, showing that we were a just and liberty-loving people, is the prime cause of all the trouble heretofore and now existing between the insurgents and our Government.

I have already said that Dewey destroyed the Spanish fleet May 1, 1898. When he was ordered to Manila the common American mind knew scarcely anything about the Philippine Islands and their population. We knew nothing about the relations existing between the Government of Spain and these people. We soon ascertained that practically the same condition of affairs existed between the Filipinos and Spain that existed between Cuba and the Government of Spain. We soon learned that the Filipinos for hundreds of years had been rebelling against the Government of Spain and were now, like the Cubans, fighting for their independence. A temporary peace had been made and the leader of the insurgents was then in exile, but in reality a condition of war existed between the insurgents and the Government of Spain. Intracing our relations with this people let us remember that shortly after Dewey destroyed the Spanish fleet our consul-general, Mr. Pratt, wired the Secretary of State, Mr. Day, after holding a consultation with General Aguinaldo, that Aguinaldo, at his (Mr. Pratt's) instance, had gone to Manila to organize an insurgent army to crush the Government of Spain on those islands and to arrange with Dewey for cooperation with the insurgents. He also wired, at the same time, Commodore Dewey that General Aguinaldo would go to Manila and cooperate with American forces if desired. We all know that Dewey replied promptly:

Tell Aguinaldo to come as soon as possible.

Our consul-general assured the Secretary of State that this insurgent leader was a man of ability and courage and worthy of the confidence that had been placed in him. General Otis tells us that the insurgent forces entered the city of Manila with our troops on August 13—the day the city surrendered—and held joint occupation with our forces. Up to this period the most cordial and friendly relations existed between the insurgents and our soldiers. Both made common cause of battle against the army of Spain. The leaders of the insurgents spoke most touchingly and feelingly of the services rendered the Filipinos by the Americans. They openly avowed that the Americans, not from mercenary motives, but for the sake of humanity and the lamentations of so many persecuted people, have considered it opportune "to extend their protecting mantle to our beloved country."

They spoke of Americans as their brothers and as their liberators. These people expressed to the United States, time and again, their deep and sincere gratitude for the efficient and disinterested protection which our country had given them to help them shake off the yoke of the cruel and corrupt Spanish domination. Thus far, at every stage of our intercourse with these people, the most amicable relations existed, and there was not the least possible friction. Even as late as the 22d of October, 1898, the insurgents declared that more than ever the Filipinos desired to live in peace and perfect harmony with the Americans. Their leaders declared that when it was possible for a formal convention to pacify and harmonize the interests of the two peoples, then the suspicion of the masses of the insurgents would disappear. Actual hostilities between the insurgents and our army did not commence until February 5, 1899, the day before the peace treaty was ratified.

Let us, however, Mr. President, not forget that our Government knew before the army of the insurgents cooperated with our soldiers to destroy Spanish sovereignty in those islands that the Filipinos aspired to independence. At every step in the history of the cooperation of the American and insurgent forces the representatives of our Government were put on notice that the Filipino people would expect and demand at the hands of Americans their absolute freedom and independence when the Spanish Government ceased to have authority and jurisdiction over the islands. General Otis said to them: "I will assure the people of the Philippine Islands the full measure of individual rights and liberties which is the heritage of a free people." Every communication addressed to our consuls or generals put our Government on notice that the Filipino people would never be satisfied with anything less than absolute independence. We knew this fact when Aguinaldo was landed in our war ship. We knew it when we asked him to organize the insurgent forces and to cooperate with our Army. We knew it when both armies cooperated together and forced the surrender of the city of Manila, and the leaders of the insurgents were encouraged by the representatives of our Government, especially by Consul-General Pratt and our consul, Mr. Williams, as well as by General Anderson and General Otis.

While it is true that Secretary Day notified the representatives of our Government not to enter into any alliance with the insurgents which might in any way complicate our Government and disavowed such acts of our representatives, these facts were never communicated to the leaders of the insurgents. Silence upon the part of our Government under such circumstances was calculated to lead the Filipino people to expect that their most cherished hopes would be realized, and good faith on the part of our Government demands that we shall not in any manner thwart their laudable aspirations.

Mr. President, why did the Filipino people become suspicious of the Americans? Why did the suspicion ripen into anger and hate, culminating in open hostilities between the insurgents and our soldiers, resulting in the loss of many precious lives and the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars? Could Congress have, by a timely, wise, and conservative course, prevented this deplorable condition of affairs? Can Congress now, by prompt and decisive action, preserve the honor of our Government, save untarnished our free institutions, and at the same time put an end to this war?

I will confess that the complications are more serious at this time than they were on the 6th of February last, but still prompt action upon our part even at this late hour will solve this complex problem. Mr. President, I do not insist that all of the suspicions the Philippine people entertained against our Government were well founded, but we must remember that these people had been oppressed by the Spanish Government for nearly three hundred years. They were suspicious, jealous, almost crushed, and distrustful, and a brave, generous, and patriotic people like the Americans should have made proper allowances for their many weaknesses. Intelligent and thoughtful public officials of our Government should have taken into consideration all the surroundings of these people—their prejudices and peculiar environments—in every step taken after we landed upon these islands until all differences between the insurgents and our Government had been fully settled. But I must answer the question, Why did they become suspicious and turn from friend to enemy?

I will let one speak in answer to this question, an American general, who was on the islands, came in contact with these people daily, was fully acquainted with their habits and aspirations. He certainly ought to be better authority on this subject than the eloquent junior Senator from Indiana, who spent a few weeks conversing with the Filipinos within the ranks of our own Army, and who knows absolutely nothing of the rural population or those in rebellion against our Government. General Otis ought to be good authority on this subject. After going on to state that the Filipino people had grown more suspicious of the friendly character of the Americans and were gradually becoming hostile to our soldiers and Government, he summarizes the causes of their gradual estrangement to our soldiers and Government, and he tells us—I quote his exact words:

Repeated conferences were held by us with influencial insurgents, whose chief aim appeared to be to obtain some authoritative expression on the

intent of the United States with regard to the Philippines, and complained bitterly that they were unable to discover anyone who could speak ex-cathedra. They asserted that theirs was a government de facto, which had the right to ask an expression of intent from the United States Government.

They insisted after the war was over and Spain ceded the islands to the United States that they wanted an expression on the part of our Government as to what disposition we proposed to make of them—what assistance we proposed to give them in organizing a government. They asked specially that we deal with them in the same friendly and magnanimous way in which we declared we would deal with Cuba. They did not insist that we withdraw our Army or our Navy from those islands. All they asked was an expression of opinion on the part of our Government that we intended to grant them independence and self-government. They complained that the United States offered nothing advantageous to the Filipinos, who had expended so much blood and treasure for their independence. They began to have suspicions that the United States were to replace the odious domination which Spain had exercised for centuries.

They discussed among themselves the silence on the part of our Government as to the course we intended to pursue, and, whether right or wrong, they reached the conclusion that they had exchanged a Spanish for an American master. General Otis tells us again that the masses of these people believe that certain words, as "sovereignty of the United States," had peculiar meaning disastrous to their welfare and significant of future political domination like that from which they had been recently freed; that this arose because they insisted that the United States had not shown by affirmative action the policy we intended to pursue toward them. Trace, if you will, the reports of every respectable representative of our Government from the time Dewey won his famous naval victory till the conflict between the insurgents and our soldiers, and but one conclusion can be reached, and that conclusion is that the great bulk of the Filipino people are a unit against annexation and in favor of a Filipino government, formed and put in operation by their own people. Mr. Wilcox, paymaster in the United States Navy, also Mr. Sergeant, whose high character is vouched for by Admiral Dewey, tell us that there is much variety of feeling among the Filipinos with regard to the debt of gratitude they owe the United States.

In every town they said we found those who said our nation saved them from slavery and others who claimed that without our interference their independence would have been won. These same gentlemen tell us that on one point, however, they are united, viz, that whatever our Government may have done for them it has not gained the right to take their islands and annex them. General Otis tells us in his reports that this feeling is so strong among the natives that even the women gave him to understand that after all the men were killed off the islands they were prepared to shed their patriotic blood for the liberty and independence of their country. In the same connection he says the leaders of the insurgents have made repeated efforts to secure some marks of recognition for their government from American authorities, that their cry for liberty and independence and the vile aspersions of the motives of the United States have stirred up distrust and fear of the Americans. They claim not to understand the silence on the part of our Government.

Our paymasters of the Navy, Mr. Willcox and Mr. Sergeant, who traveled more than 600 miles through these islands, coming in daily contact with the natives, and traversing more than seven provinces, endeavoring to obtain an accurate account of the resources of the country as well as to familiarize themselves with the habits, disposition, intelligence, and every possible characteristic of the people, make a report worthy of the thoughtful consideration of every patriotic, liberty-loving American. In describing the sentiment among those people toward Americans they said: Already the hope was fading that freedom from Spain meant freedom of government; that the feeling toward Americans was changing, and we saw its effect in the cold manner of the people and in their evident desire to hustle us along by the most direct road to Manila. These gentlemen tell us that at first these people had absolute confidence in Americans and hailed us as the champions of liberty. Gradually they drifted away from us, lost confidence in our patriotic purposes, all because the American Government gave them no positive assurance of final independence.

If every voter of the United States could read and understand the desire and struggles of these oppressed people, their appeals to us for that liberty for which our fathers fought, the tyranny and oppression which they had suffered and endured at the hands of Spain, and could then pursue closely their conduct and deportment from the surrender of Manila till hostilities begun, the American people, true to the traditions of our fathers, would grant to them, not grudgingly, but cheerfully and willingly, justice, liberty, and the right of self-government. I assert now, after careful consideration of the reports of General Otis, General Merritt, Admiral Dewey, as well as the reports of every other respectable representative our Government had on those islands, that hostilities could have been prevented if our Government at the proper time had given positive assurances that we intended that this people should be free and independent. Congress has now been in session for months. The President said that this problem was one for Congress to solve. If we adjourn without taking action, those who have charge of the Government and are responsible for its administration will not only be responsible for the continuation of this war, but will by their silence have continued the perpetration of an irreparable wrong upon a helpless, struggling people, and will have traduced the good name and character of a Republic that has illustrated constitutional freedom in all its beneficence and power and which has always been our priceless inheritance.

Mr. Burke, in his celebrated speech in favor of conciliation with America, declared that when England crushed out the aspiration of her colonies for liberty she struck a serious blow at her own institutions. Who can forget the famous words of the immortal Burke, when he said:

> For in order to prove that the Americans have no right to their liberties, we are every day endeavoring to subvert the maxims which preserve the whole spirit of our own. To prove that the Americans ought not to be free, we are obliged to depreciate the value of freedom itself; and we never seem to gain a paltry advantage over them in debate without attacking some of those principles or deriding some of those feelings for which our ancestors have shed their blood.

Will not Americans endanger the free institutions of America and depreciate the value of freedom and republican institutions when we wrench from 10,000,000 people their country and arrogate to ourselves the right to appoint their public officers, to make and execute their laws, against the will and consent of the inhabitants? These islands contain a population more than three times as large as ours when we won our independence from England. Do you suppose this vast population will consent for the United States to appoint their officers, to own their country, to make and execute their laws without a struggle for years? If you do you have not been observant of the history of nations. The senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] told us the other day that God made all nations of the world capable of being influenced by the same motives, and that the love of liberty does not depend upon the color of the skin, but depends on humanity. The Senator declared that these people were God's children, and that a universal Father had implanted in their bosoms the same love of liberty and justice that we possess. The sentiments so beautifully expressed ought to find a ready response in the hearts of the American people.

I believe, even at this very hour, if Congress, with the approval of the President, will declare that the United States will assure the people of the Philippine Islands the full measure of individual rights and liberties which is the heritage of a free people, this wise, just, and friendly action will immediately end the war and secure to us the lasting gratitude and the honorable friendship of this people. If such action fails to accomplish this purpose, then we shall have done our duty and our course will be in keeping with reason and justice. In the solution of this question we are bound to consider the temper and character of these people. A love of freedom is the predominating feature which marks their lives since their early history; they are suspicious and restive, especially whenever they believe an attempt is being made to deprive them of self-government. These facts must be taken into consideration in dealing with these people.

Two remarkable speeches have been made on the other side of this question, one by the junior Senator from Indiana, discussing the commercial side of this question, and the other by the junior Senator from Vermont, reviewing the situation from a legal and constitutional standpoint. Together they reached the conclusion that these islands are a rich and promising country, that the United States must keep and govern them forever, and can do so without any constitutional limitations whatever. The Senator from Indiana spoke eloquently of the salubrity of the climate, fertility of the soil, and the great mineral wealth of these possessions, but in the same connection he tells us that the ten millions of people who inhabit these islands are a barbarous race. Continuing his remarks, he says the Filipino is the South Sea Malay put through a process of three hundred years of superstition and religion, dishonesty in dealing, disorder in habits of industry, and cruelty, caprice, and corruption in government. He does not stop here; he gives it as his own belief that there are not a hundred men among this vast population capable of comprehending what Anglo-Saxon government means.

If the Senator's information be reliable, does he calculate for a minute what a responsibility our Government assumes when we become responsible for the future government of this barbarous and ignorant race on the other side of the world, 10,000 miles away from our Capitol; especially, Mr. President, when this people have been conquered by our soldiers and have become embittered against the American people and look upon us with the same jealousy and hatred they have so long cherished toward Spain? Why, the eloquent Senator tells us that these people have fought

Spain so long for their liberty that insurrection has become a fixed habit with them.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator from Georgia, in quoting me, should quote me exactly right. I did not say they had been fighting Spain for three hundred years for their liberty, but that on account of the way Spain conducted her military operations, on account of the fact that she never did the thing thoroughly in war or in peace—a spurious peace, as I called it—that on account of the fact that she was weak and never thorough in war, treating rather than fighting, and that in peace she was cruel, corrupt, and capricious, therefore they had continued insurrection until it had become a Filipino habit. I did not say that they had been fighting Spain continuously for three hundred years for liberty.

Mr. CLAY. That is the speech my friend makes to-day. It is not the speech the Senator made on the occasion to which I refer.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I will not ask the Senator, of course, to extend his remarks by inserting my speech as a part of his speech in the RECORD, but if he will only kindly turn to my speech and read that particular part of it he will find I am right.

Mr. CLAY. My friend said that insurrection had become a fixed habit with these people. He will not deny that. I believe I know his speech now better than he does, but he knew it better when he made it than I did.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Since the Senator is doing me the very great honor of referring to my remarks, and since I insisted a moment ago that he should quote me correctly, as I know he wants to do, and since he insists that he knows my speech better than I do myself, wherein I am highly honored and complimented, because it shows a studious reading of it, and in view of the difference of opinion between the Senator from Georgia and myself as to what I did say, I ask the Senator's permission to read that particular part of my speech.

Mr. CLAY. I have no objection.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. It is as follows:

> This, too, has been Spain's course in the Philippines. I have studied Spain's painful military history in these islands. Never sufficient troops; never vigorous action pushed to conclusive results and a permanent peace; always treating with the rebels while they fought them; always cruel and corrupt when a spurious peace was arranged. This has been Spain's way for three hundred years, until insurrection has become a Filipino habit. Never since Magellan landed did Spain put enough troops in the islands for complete and final action in war; never did she intelligently, justly, firmly administer government in peace.

Mr. CLAY. It is stronger than I thought it was.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. It is a compliment that I hardly expected and that I gratefully acknowledge.

Mr. CLAY. I am glad my friend the Senator from Indiana saw fit and proper to read from his speech.

Did the Senator ever contemplate that when we take the islands, together with their rivers, harbors, their minerals, and all the wealth so graphically pointed out by him, we necessarily take with them the very population which he describes as ignorant, barbarous, dishonest, indolent, corrupt, treacherous, and incapable of understanding the elementary principles of Anglo-Saxon government? You can not separate the country from the population; when you take one you become responsible for the other.

I will not say, however, that I place the same low estimate on this people as the Senator from Indiana does. Neither does his estimate correspond with the great weight of testimony of those who have made extensive investigations as to the intelligence, education, character, and capacity for self-government of the population of these islands. Our consul, Mr. Williams, said in his report to the Secretary of War:

> While the Spaniards barbarously and cruelly slaughtered the Filipinos, even women and children, the insurgents, on the contrary, followed American example—protected the helpless, nursed, fed, and cared for Spaniards taken as prisoners and for the wounded as they cared for those who had fallen from their own ranks.

Admiral Dewey, in his report to the Secretary of War, said that in his opinion these people are superior in intelligence and more capable of self-government than the natives of Cuba, and said he was familiar with both races. He declared:

> The greater number seem to be able to read and write. In Manila are many thousands of educated natives who are merchants, lawyers, doctors, and priests. They are well informed and have accumulated property.

It can not be contended that we are to hold these islands for future homes for the American citizen. A careful study of the territory and its population will show this to be impossible unless we should exterminate the natives, or, by reason of our cruelty toward them, they should abandon the islands.

The present density of the population precludes the idea of American homes and American communities being built up there. These islands have been variously estimated at from 1,200 to 1,800 in number. The important ones, however, are less than a dozen in number. Two-thirds of the population reside on six islands. All of the islands except about a dozen are exceedingly small and are of no value. The important islands are as follows: Luzon, Panay, Cebu, Leyte, Bohol, and Negros, with an area of 59,800 square miles and with a population of 5,422,000. It can be readily seen that the population of the islands named is nearly 50 per cent greater than in Illinois or Indiana. We are told that in many of the provinces the density of the population exceeds 200 per square mile, and is greater than any of the United States, except Massachusets and Rhode Island. This is not a vast wilderness, uninhabited, where the American youth, by enterprise and industry, is to build cities and plant American homes. The present population precludes any such idea. Suppose the views of the junior Senator from Indiana should triumph, and we conquer these people and force them to submit to American arms and to receive American government, how long, Mr. President, does the honorable Senator think they will stay conquered?

Remember, the population is between eight and ten millions and they have surrendered to American authority and accepted American government by the force of an American army and navy. Sixty-five thousand American soldiers and sailors crossed the ocean and conquered them. I admit that we can conquer them, but how long will they stay conquered? How long before we will have to conquer them again? They will remain in subjection to our Government just so long as we keep an army on the islands and a navy in their harbors strong and powerful enough to keep down insurrection. When our ships sail home freighted with our gallant soldiers, this conquered race of Malays will rise up again in insurrection against American rulers, American authority, and kill and murder your governor-general sent there to make and execute laws for them against their will. You will find it necessary to send an army to conquer them again and again. Experience will demonstrate to us the necessity of keeping them perpetually conquered. Sir, do we want a race of people that we must keep perpetually conquered by arms? Do we want a race of people that are hostile to our Government?

Do we want a race of people annexed to the United States and governed by the United States who will be perpetually at war with us, continuously in a state of insurrection against our Government and against our laws and sovereignty? Do we want a race of people that can never become American citizens, a race of subjects that shall never be the recipients of our free institutions, just and equal laws? Our matchless progress we owe to our representative free institutions, with equal rights, equal justice, and equal laws for every possible condition of our fellows. The laws of inequality should find no place upon our statute books. Here a homogeneous people are devoted to the flag of their country. They obey the laws, meet patriotically every duty they owe their country, because the spirit of justice, liberty, and equality has marked every step in our career. The Senator from Indiana made another remarkable statement on the floor of the Senate. He claimed to have studied Spain's military history on these islands. To my surprise, he tells us Spain's military operations were too lenient, not sufficiently vigorous and aggressive to conquer these people. He complained that Spain was always treating with the rebels while they fought them. The inference to be drawn from his argument is that Spain should have been more cruel, more exacting, and more oppressive in her military operations against this helpless people.

The Senator tells us that the United States must not adopt the lenient course pursued by Spain, but we must be firm and rule them with an iron hand. Is it possible, Mr. President, that we have sounded such a depth in the decline of political administrations that we complain of the mercy, kindness, and leniency of the Spanish Government toward her struggling colonies and point out a pathway of tyranny, oppression, fire, and sword for the future control and government of the Philippine people? Less than two years ago the senior Senator from Vermont returned from Cuba and fired the hearts of the American people on account of the cruelty, suffering, starvation, and death inflicted by the Spanish soldiers on the helpless women and children of the Cuban people. The wires flashed this tale of horror and suffering to every American home, and the American people, true to their traditions, responded in purse and blood to save this struggling, starving people from the cruelty of Spain.

Now, Mr. President, in less than two years the Senator from Indiana tells us that the American people must not tread in the pathway of leniency pursued by the kind, generous, and merciful Government of Spain, but, on the contrary, while we went to war and sacrificed hundreds of lives and millions of money to give freedom to Cuba, we must reverse our conduct in dealing with the Filipinos, who were struggling under the same burdens and abuses that had cursed the people of Cuba. Such inconsistency is without a parallel, and brands the statement as false and hypocritical that the United States Government went to war for the sake of humanity.

Mr. President, I prefer the remedy suggested by the senior Senator from Massachusetts, "Justice, righteousness, duty, and freedom the only sure foundation of empire," to the remedy of fire and sword pointed out by the eloquent Senator from Indiana. The junior Senator from Indiana intersperses his argument with numerous Biblical quotations, but there is an entire absence

throughout his remarkable speech of that blessed spirit of our Lord and Master which characterized His memorable Sermon on the Mount, "Therefore, all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do you even so to them, for this is the law and the prophets." It may be possible in this day of avarice, greed, selfishness, and commercialism that this Golden Rule shall no longer measure the conduct of either individuals or nations. The Senator from Indiana tells us that just beyond the Philippines are China's illimitable markets. He asked the question, "Where shall we turn for consumers of our surplus?" He says, "Geography answers the question; China is our natural customer; the Philippines," he claims, "give us a base at the door of all the East." He also said, "Nothing is so natural as trade with one's neighbors." He then tells us that the Philippines make us the nearest neighbor of all the East, and that nothing is more natural than to trade with those you know. He closes this part of his enticing picture with the statement that the Philippines bring us face to face with the most sought-for customers in the world. This fanciful and illusory picture will not stand the test of logic and reason. There is quite a difference between commercial and territorial expansion. One does not necessarily follow the other. I favor commercial expansion, but oppose the latter where applied to territory beyond the Western Hemisphere. The proposition that we must own vast tracts of land, populated by a race of people that can never assimilate with our people, adjacent to Asia, across the Pacific, to induce the teeming millions of China to become our customers is absurd and is not supported by the laws of trade and commerce.

No Senator upon this floor is more anxious to enlarge our markets and to induce the vast population of China to purchase our surplus products of farm and factory, so as to give employment to labor and enhance the value of both the raw material and finished product of producer and manufacturer, than myself. Wars, entangled alliances, domestic insurrection, are not the proper means to induce foreign consumers to buy our goods and wares and to become our customers. The laws of business, commerce, and trade, friendly alliances, cheapness and quality in comparison with other countries contending for the same trade and business, are elements that must shape and regulate the volume of our business with other countries. Jefferson taught us that peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations went hand in hand together. But they tell us now that the teachings of Jefferson are not applicable to the times. These teachings are not in keeping with the advanced ideas of our political bosses. We can not surpass Europe in the race for wealth and foreign trade by exhausting our resources in internal quarrels, or in unjust and unprofitable wars, waged to acquire and govern uncongenial races who can never become adapted to our laws and political institutions. If we desire the trade of China, we must make it to the interest of her people to trade with us. We must study their markets, the wants and demands of their people. We must cheapen transportation by the construction of the Nicaraguan Canal; build up our merchant marine; take every possible advantage of the laws of trade and commerce to meet promptly the keen competition of England, Germany, France, or any other foreign country seeking to extend its trade to the markets of China.

These rules, applicable to business principles and common sense, are the only means that will give to the American farmer and manufacturer foreign markets for American products. Neither do I agree to both propositions that if we keep the Philippines we will be neighbors to China and that it will be natural for our neighbors to trade with us. The course that we are pursuing toward the Philippine people will be just the reverse of the proposition stated by the Senator from Indiana. Certainly we can not expect to enlarge our volume of business with the Philippine people by waging war against them. A magnificent opportunity came to us when Spain surrendered her claim to the Philippine Islands to the United States for us to lay the foundation for large and continued commercial dealings with the population of the Philippine Islands. These people at that period, full of gratitude for the services which we had rendered them in achieving their supposed independence, would naturally have come to our markets to make purchases rather than to any other country in the world. They then esteemed us with that affection which we felt toward France at the close of the Revolutionary war. If we had granted to them their most cherished hopes, given them our sympathy, encouragement, and aid in framing a constitution and putting in operation a government suitable to their wants, demands, and conditions, then the laws of gratitude would have made these people our customers against the markets of the world for all time to come.

They are neighbors to China, coming almost in daily contact with the Chinese markets. Trading daily with the United States, and recognizing us as their friends and benefactors, they would have planted the good name, high character, and commercial advantages which we enjoyed at the hands of the Philippine people into the hearts, consciences, and business of the population of China. Does any reasonable man contend that we can enlarge our business and commercial transactions with the Filipinos by waging war against them, embittering them against us now and for all time to come? Is it possible for any student of the laws of trade and business to contend that if the Filipino people are conquered and kept in subjection to American authority by our soldiers, that such a course would enlarge our trade with China? If this population of 10,000,000 people should learn to hate us, constantly being in insurrection against us, charge us with being their oppressors, as they did Spain, would it not be natural for this feeling of hate and distrust to be transplanted upon the shores of China, who in all probability would sympathize with their struggling neighbors? If we desire the trade of the Philippines and the trade of China, let us by all means keep the Filipinos our friends and treat them as our neighbors. The argument advanced by the Senator from Indiana falls to the ground when brought to its final analysis, and the reverse of the proposition stated by him would certainly follow. It is conceded on all sides that this population is never to be organized into States and to be treated as American citizens, but we are to hold them, make laws for their future government, appoint Americans for their officers to cross the ocean and rule this people.

This 10,000,000 of population, located 10,000 miles away from our capital, are to be wards without any right to have an organized government of their own, but, on the contrary, their laws are to be made and their rulers appointed at Washington, on the opposite side of the world from them. It is not denied that never in the history of our Government has such a problem been presented to us for solution; never before have we undertaken to acquire territory and govern a race of people to whom we did not intend to extend all of the privileges granted to American citizens. Until during the present time the proposition to acquire a people foreign to us in race, foreign to us in religion, unsuited to American institutions, and to force a government on them that they did not want, would not have been tolerated by the American people. A desire for liberty, justice, self-government, freedom, and equality gave birth to this Republic. If we now change the only Government in the world that guarantees absolute freedom and equality to all of its citizens, recognizing the right of any people to form their own government, then, Mr. President, this Republic, that has been reared by more than a century of patriotic labor and sacrifice, will no longer be the Government of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Jackson, and Abraham Lincoln. The spirit of justice, equality, and freedom which has characterized its history, resulting in the noblest achievements ever recorded in man's struggle for self-government, will no longer be our blessed heritage.

Mr. President, we do not want to retain permanently a nation and be responsible for their government who never can participate in our free institutions. We can not afford to take a hundred thousand soldiers from the peaceful pursuits of life and send them across the ocean to maintain military government on the Philippine Islands at a cost of a hundred millions of dollars a year to our people. We can not afford to do it, because it will be an injustice to the American people and because it revolutionizes the entire scope and purpose of our Government and will inflict a great wrong upon a helpless, struggling, inferior race. I do not believe in a government that does not emanate from those to be governed and where the lawmaking power does not come in contact with the people to be affected, for the reason experience has demonstrated that a watchful and jealous constituency is essential to maintain honest and faithful public officials. Seven thousand miles of ocean lie between us and this people.

No power on earth, Mr. President, can prevent the effect of this distance weakening government. Spain felt it in the administration of her colonial policy in her South American possessions and in Cuba and the Philippine Islands; and now, Mr. President, we are undertaking to do something that destroyed Spain's navy and bankrupted her treasury.

It is absolute folly to undertake to force and maintain a government for an uncongenial race of people that occupy a territory that does not come within 7,000 miles of your coast and within 10,000 miles of your capital. Let us take warning, and remember that this new departure is contrary to the teachings of Washington, Jefferson, Monroe, Lincoln, Garfield, Blaine, Sherman, Edmunds, Reed, Carlisle, Cleveland, and Bryan.

We have three resolutions pending before the Senate relating to the disposition and government of the Philippine Islands. One by the senior Senator from Wisconsin, which vests in the President the right to govern the islands until Congress directs otherwise. The resolution of the junior Senator from Indiana, which declares that the islands are ours forever, and that we shall keep them and govern them as dependencies. The bill introduced by the Senator from Wisconsin leaves the policy of our Government toward these people to the future action of Congress. They are left in doubt and uncertainty as to what they may expect from our Government. The second resolution contemplates that we will exercise permanent dominion over the islands, appointing

their officers, making and executing their laws. The third resolution, introduced by my colleague, disclaims any intention on the part of our Government to maintain permanent dominion over this territory or to incorporate the inhabitants thereof as citizens of the United States, or to hold them as vassals or subjects. This resolution concedes the fact that these people fell to us as the result of war, and that we must restore peace and maintain order throughout the islands until a government shall be established by the people there, with our assistance, capable of protecting the people from violence and maintaining law and order. It provides that our military forces shall be kept on the islands until the insurrection is suppressed, and until a stable government can be put in operation.

This resolution bears the blessed message to the Filipinos which they have so long sought in vain, namely, that it is the purpose and intention of the United States, when the insurrection is over, when peace and order shall be restored and a stable government established, that then we will withdraw our land and naval forces from the islands, reserving to our Government such harbors and tracts of land as may be needed for coaling stations and governmental purposes, and transferring to the government of the Filipinos all other rights and territories secured in said islands under the treaty with Spain, and leave the future control and dominion of the islands to the Filipino people.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I desire to ask the Senator this question: Since he favors the resolution which intends to turn the government of the islands over to the people, yet at the same time keeping our military forces there, and establishing, as he says, order, how does he reconcile the one with the other? If he is going to hand the government of the islands over to the people themselves after he has crushed them out, as he says, not as I say, after he has established peace, why not do it now? Why should you fire another gun if, after you have fired all the guns you want to fire, if, after you have carried on all the war you wish to carry on, if, after you have established peace, you are to turn the government over to the people of the islands? Why do you not hand the government over to the natives at present?

Mr. CLAY. I want to say to my friend from the State of Indiana that if you pass a resolution of this kind and this fact goes to that people and they understand the course we intend to pursue—that we are going to give them liberty, independence, and self-government—in my opinion such a resolution, in keeping with their desires and aspirations, will settle the war itself, and not another gun will be fired, and in less than six months a government will be established there. Why not? Look at Cuba. We went to war with Spain, I say, on account of conditions in the island of Cuba. We declared that we did not intend to take their country or to interfere with self-government there; that we intended to give them an independent government. When the war was over the Cuban people accepted the situation and did not fire a single gun against our Government. Why, is it not true that a like declaration on the part of our Government toward the people of the Philippine Islands would have led them at once to accept conditions and to hail with joy this blessed message from the American people?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. May I have the indulgence of the Senator from Georgia to ask him another question?

Mr. CLAY. With a great deal of pleasure.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. If that is the logic of the Senator who offered the resolution and of those who support the resolution, why do you not make the resolution go directly to the point and call for the withdrawal of our troops at once and leave at once the establishment of this government to the natives, whom you claim are capable of establishing and exercising it?

Mr. CLAY. We went to the Philippine Islands and cooperated with the insurgent forces in destroying the Government of Spain. The people of those islands at that time had in existence a government throughout those islands. We have gone there with our soldiers, and we have been at war with those people for nearly twelve months, resulting in the loss of more than 2,000 Americans and the expenditure of $150,000,000. Now, I say, we having destroyed the only government the insurgents had, and the demoralization necessarily following war, it is essential that we stay there until conditions are such that a good government will be put in operation, one that will establish law and order.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Pardon me, again. Now, the Senator's contention is that these natives are capable of conducting, but not of establishing, a government. Is that it, and that it is our duty to establish a government for them and then turn it over to them? Is that your position?

Mr. CLAY. I answer my friend by asking, Are not we on the island of Cuba trying to assist those people to establish a government there? We are on the island of Cuba to-day. We have our American officers there trying to establish a government for the people of Cuba. We are assisting them and cooperating with them. We are informed every day that they are cooperating with us because they believe we are their friends and do not intend to take their country.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. We are now discussing the Philippine Islands. I respectfully ask the Senator to answer the question whether his position is that the natives are capable of conducting, but not of establishing, a government, and therefore whether his position is that we must establish a government and then hand it over to them?

Mr. CLAY. I believe that a large part of them are capable of establishing and maintaining a government.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Now, then, I will ask——

Mr. CLAY. Let me answer the question. I desire to say if they were assured that we intended to give them their country and assured that we intended to cooperate with them in establishing a government of their own, they would most gladly receive any aid we offered to them; but when we say to them, "We are going to take your country and govern it by Americans," the situation is quite different.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I will ask the Senator whether or not, since he said we should cooperate, he has any evidence that they ask us to cooperate? Do they ask us to retain our military forces there? Do they ask us to assist them in establishing their government?

Mr. CLAY. I desire to say that I hardly think that at this time they are asking us to retain our military forces there. They are trying to get our military forces away.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Does the Senator think they want to establish a government of their own?

Mr. CLAY. I certainly do.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Then, if that is true, why does not the resolution be frank and logical enough to go directly to that point and ask for the withdrawal of our forces, and, as the Senator from Louisiana says, leave it absolutely to them; to use his very descriptive expression, "Get out and leave it to them." Why does not the Senator go diretly to the point?

Mr. CLAY. I am in favor of our forces staying there until a government is established that will maintain law and order; and I tell you now, I give it to you as my opinion, that when you say to these people that we will be just to them, we will aid them in putting into operation such a government as they desire, in my opinion they will cooperate with us at once, and there will be no further trouble.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Now, may I ask the Senator another question? It is whether he is in favor of retaining our forces there until the government is established, because, first, he thinks they are not capable of establishing it themselves, and, secondly, because they ask our assistance; and if not, on what ground?

Mr. CLAY. I have stated to the Senator that I was in favor of doing it because we had destroyed the only government they had, and they probably need our assistance in putting in operation a government at the present time. The war resulted because we failed to point out the manner we intended to deal with these people, showing them we intended for them to have a government of their own.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Now, I will ask the Senator further——

Mr. CLAY. I decline to yield further to the Senator, because my time is limited.

The resolution is most carefully guarded, discharges faithfully every duty we owe this people, as well as to carry out the obligations and duties we owe to foreign governments resulting from the war.

First, this resolution provides for the suppression of the insurrection; second, that we will assist these people in putting into operation a government of their own that will maintain law and order; third, it protects the interests of the Government of the United States by reserving the necessary coaling stations and land needed for governmental purposes; fourth, it provides that until a stable government is established on the islands the President is empowered to maintain law and order there; fifth, that so soon as such a government shall be established by the people of those islands, with our assistance, we will withdraw our land and naval forces, leaving the future control to the people thereof.

If these resolutions do not cover every phase of the case, I do not understand the English language. Pass them and give them the effect of law, and then we will have pursued a course in the solution of our troubles with this people which will be in keeping with the principles of our Government. I do not believe we will ever reach a satisfactory solution of this problem, a solution in harmony with the principles of our Government, by pursuing any other course than one substantially as above outlined. Mr. President, this course meets my approval, because humanity, reason, and justice dictate such a policy. I realize that if we force a military government upon these people against their will, the alienation existing between us will be an incurable one. I am unalterably opposed to the permanent retention of these islands with the view of forcing American government upon them by Americans, because I believe such government will cost the people of the United States a hundred and fifty million dollars a year to pay the increased expenses of our Army and Navy to maintain military government there, a tax of $2 per capita annually for every man, woman, and child in the United States. This does

not take into consideration the sacrifice of human life that must necessarily follow in maintaining military government on those islands. It is a fact that can not be disputed that the expenses of maintaining our Army has already increased more than six-fold.

The demoralization that follows war and the military spirit is always to be deplored. I am opposed to it again, Mr. President, because history teaches us that sovereignty acquired by the sword must be maintained by the same means and that power acquired by conquest and wealth gained by robbery are certain in the end to weaken and corrupt the possessor. This rule applies to nations as well as individuals. I am opposed to it again because by such a course we revolutionize our Government, which was intended for a free Republic and self-governing people and not for subjects or vassal states without representation in the making and execution of our laws. I am opposed to it because it shatters the Monroe doctrine from top to bottom. I am opposed to it because I believe that at no distant day such a course will involve us in European and Asiatic quarrels. I am opposed to it because all of the habits, traditions, surroundings, experience, education, and aspirations of this people are opposed to our theories of government. I am opposed to it because such a course would be a repudiation by our Government of the principle that all governments must be founded on the consent of the governed.

I am opposed to it because such a course is not calculated to advance the interests and promote the happiness of this people. Self-government does not mean that these people are to have such a government as we possess, but that these people shall have a government in keeping with their desires and suitable to their conditions. It has been said that greatness does not lie in coffers or territory, but it lies in the men and women of a nation and their ideals and acts, and that a nation is great as it clings to its ideals. A great bishop said: "The end of all worthy struggle is to establish morality as the basis of individual and national life, to make righteousness prevail, to make justice reign, to spread beauty, gentleness, wisdom, and peace, to widen opportunity, to increase good will, to move in the light of higher thoughts and larger hopes, to encourage science and art, to foster industry and thrift, education and culture, reverence and obedience, purity and love, honesty, sobriety, and disinterested devotion to the common good—this is the patriot's aim, this his ideal." If we should strive for this purpose and work in this spirit, the Republic of our fathers will never perish.

The Interests of Labor in the Puerto Rican Question.

"Surely in vain the net is spread in the sight of any bird."

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES H. GROSVENOR,

OF OHIO.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, February 28, 1900,

On the bill (H. R. 8245) to regulate the trade of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes.

Mr. GROSVENOR said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: "Surely in vain the net is spread in the sight of any bird."

Our Democratic friends and those of our own party who have been beguiled into the support of free trade between the United States and our newly acquired insular possessions will do well to halt before their action has carried them to a condition that is irretrievable, and look about them to see what is the legitimate result and necessary effect of the establishment of the doctrine sought to be established by the defeat of the pending measure.

I shall avail myself of the generous indulgence of the House to offer, as a kind of supplement to the remarks which I have made heretofore, some comments upon the attitude of organized labor to the dogma of the Democratic party. I shall address myself substantially to the Democratic position on this subject. I am not unaware that there is a strong sentiment in certain localities among hitherto Republicans who favor the Democratic position, and I could, I think, if personalities were not odious in connection with a matter of national politics, point out some curious incidents explaining the attitude of certain gentlemen upon this question, but everything of that character shall be avoided.

From the very beginning of the contest growing out of the war with Spain it has been entirely manifest that selfish interests would cut an important figure in the position which men would take upon these questions. We have seen the representatives of great interests, manufacturing, industrial, and otherwise, scurrying about the islands to ascertain the effect that annexation first, and legislation afterwards, would have upon their interests; and this is human nature exemplified, and nobody can complain about it. But I now want to point out how the laboring men of the United States are to be affected by the future of our legislation and how they are looking at it at present and how they will continue to look at it in the coming elections. The issue here presented was sharply drawn in the early days of the Republican party.

The question, and the sole question, here involved is the question of the right and power of Congress to legislate in reference to the internal affairs—the question of taxation by imports and otherwise upon the territories lately acquired from Spain. To put it sharply, it is this: Is Congress bound by the limitations of the Constitution in the matter of levying taxes upon importations into or out from these newly acquired possessions? The position that we have planted ourselves upon is a very simple one. We say Congress may legislate in relation to these territories without any reference to the provisions of the Constitution, excepting that Congress can not do a thing forbidden by the Constitution. To illustrate, we admit that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof;" nor can it pass any law "abridging the freedom of speech or of the press," nor forbidding the people "peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances," nor can it quarter soldiers upon the owner of property in time of peace, nor prevent the people from bearing arms, nor shall it involve the homes of people in the matter of searching for papers, etc.

All these things which Congress is forbidden by the Constitution to do we say it can not do anywhere, neither in the United States nor in the Territories or anywhere else. We stand upon these limitations of the Constitution as sharply as do our friends on the other side, but we do say, and we will stand by it, that it is Republican doctrine, old as the Republican party itself, that the Constitution goes nowhere into newly acquired territory except by the act of Congress itself, and that these Territories are all open to such action as Congress may determine. When did this doctrine start? The controversy pended for thirty-five years prior to 1856, and the Republican party in its platform of June 17, 1856, used this language:

Resolved, That the Constitution confers upon Congress sovereign power over the Territories of the United States for their government, and that in the exercise of this power it is both the right and the duty of Congress to prohibit in the Territories those twin relics of barbarism—pologamy and slavery.

That is where this doctrine started against the Democratic dogma that the Constitution went everywhere ex proprio vigore. Then came the sharp contest of 1860, and here we have it:

That the new dogma, that the Constitution of its own force carries slavery into any or all of the Territories of the United States, is a dangerous political heresy, at variance with the explicit provisions of that instrument itself, with contemporaneous exposition, and with legislative and judicial precedent; is revolutionary in its tendency, and subversive of the peace and harmony of the country.

That settled the question which Calhoun had spent thirty-five years in educating the South to understand, and we then went into a bloody war, and at the end of four long deperate years we settled it that the Constitution went nowhere but by the operation of its extension through the action of Congress, and this has been argued until it has become wearisome.

I want now to make this application to the practical politics of to-day. From Maine to California the labor organizations of the country are on the alert. Some Senators may not know it; some Representatives may not hear from them. I do. I have the honor to represent a district in which there are 9,000 coal miners, now employed at splendid prices for their labor. Their wages have advanced under the McKinley Administration from 45 cents a ton to 80 cents a ton, and their working time is every day in the week, if they desire to work, as against the half weeks heretofore. That district lies right across the Ohio River from the great body of the coal-mining industry of the State of West Virginia; magnificent industry, making happy homes and well-fed and well-clothed and well-educated possibilities for a host of laboring men. It would seem that the gentlemen in the House and in the Senate who represent these great bodies of laboring men do not understand the situation as well as I do. Those laboring men are on the alert, and this is what is on their minds.

The Democratic propositions of free trade in Puerto Rico, because Puerto Rico is a part of the United States, teaches those men that as surely as the sun rises and sets if this free-trade measure shall pass, then the Congress of the United States and the people of the United States are committed irrevocably to the same doctrine in its application to the Philippine Islands. That is where you stand, gentlemen of the House of Representatives; that is where you stand, representative gentlemen, in any and all bodies of men in this country. You owe a duty to the labor of this country, and you must perform that duty. You owe the duty to the labor of

this country that not only shall there be adequate protective tariff laws upon the statute books, but that there shall be a protection policy that shall give Congress the right to exclude from the labor markets the millions upon millions of men in the islands of the Pacific.

Your votes for free trade, your votes for the phantom politics of the flag following the Constitution, and the Constitution tagging after the flag, is but a declaration that the Sulus, the Tagals, the Filipinos, and all the enormous horde of foreigners in Asia that have come to us as a possession under our treaty with Spain shall come to the United States and move in solid, indefensible, overwhelming columns of cheap—oh, how cheap!—low, degraded labor into the mines of West Virginia, into the labor districts of Minnesota, all along the great lumber region of that magnificent State, right into the very heart of the labor districts along the Great Lakes. That is what it means. How are you going to keep them out? If this dogma is true, they are citizens of the United States, endowed with all the rights I have.

Mr. Chairman, I may go to Duluth; no power can stop me but the Almighty. I can bid upon the labor that is being done in Minnesota; I can put my muscle in competition with the muscle of the men at work in the mines of West Virginia. I can even invade the marble quarries of Vermont and attack the prices that are being paid there. Is it any wonder that from New England comes a report to the highest authority in Washington that the labor organizations of that section of the country are alert in this matter?

Oh, Mr. Chairman, there will be a day of judgment. Men can harp about the Constitution and chipper about the flag and send out their manifestos from political conventions, but the men of this country who are doing the work, the men who are just now on the high road to permanent prosperity, are looking to see who are forging the chains that shall destroy their immunity from this competition. Never will I submit to it. Not only that—I will not only go among the miners of my district and tell them that this outrage has been perpetrated, but I will go among the coal miners of the adjoining districts and point out to them who it was that, in the hour when their interests were in peril, dared to hesitate and fool and bedevil the whole country in the interest of cheap labor.

We may as well talk plainly. We may as well come right to the point; we may as well call things by their right cognomen. Here is your first opportunity. The United States has entered upon a great future, a great scheme, a great purpose, wonderful in its grandeur, and it involves the welfare of its citizens at home more than it does the welfare of the citizens abroad, and here in this hour, when labor for the first time in this country for many years is profitable, it is menaced by a political dogma which is coming from the same source from which came the dogma of 1860.

Talk about humanity! No people on earth were ever treated with humanity in such overflowing rivers as we propose to treat the people of Puerto Rico. Nonsense, ridiculous absurdity, the whole of this. I read in a New York paper the other day a series of special telegrams, purporting to have come from Puerto Rico, stating that 30,000 women were naked and could not get cotton cloth to cover their nakedness, and right down under it was a statement from this same General Davis, who is a politician, a soldier, and a little of everything, and a good deal of nothing, declaring that if this money were appropriated, they would expend it to build roads. These people are suffering: I know they are suffering. I weep for them; I sympathize with them. They have not a dollar of anything to sell, and they have not a dollar with which to buy anything, and we not only propose to give them all this tariff, but we propose to take it off the men who in great haste, with their little sample cases, have rushed to Puerto Rico and Cuba and elsewhere and spotted the places where they could make money out of the commodities.

The statement published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last Saturday, being a telegram sent to the honorable Senator from Wisconsin, pointed out the whole situation, and "He who runs may read." Here it is:

The principal importers of sugar from Puerto Rico are A. S. Lascells & Co.—

These gentleman at this time are suing to recover what they have paid—

Lawrence, Turnure & Co., American Sugar Refining Co.—

to wit, the greatest trust in the world, the American sugar trust—

L. W. & P. Armstrong, Muller, Schall & Co., John Farr, and Melchor, Armstrong & Dessau.

These are the men who have bought the sugar of Puerto Rico. These are the men who stand here clamoring for free trade. These are the men who have bought the 60,000 tons of sugar which will be relieved of 85 per cent of the Dingley rate, and who will put that into their pockets, and who now protest against the payment of the meager, pitiable sum of 15 per cent of the Dingley rate. That is this whole transaction. No man can turn it in any other way. You may shout, you may pass resolutions, you may chipper through the newspapers, you may attack nominations of candidates for Congress, and you may threaten and bulldoze and make the charge of criminality and fraud and bribery through the press, as has been done in this city, and after it all you will find that the whole of this controversy is a contest of the owners of sugar and tobacco, bought in advance, to get rid of paying the pittance of 15 per cent of the Dingley tariff and to have that go to the people of Puerto Rico. That is all there is of it, and in order to bring that about the whole Democratic party of the United States and all their cogitators and cooperators have launched their boat in support of a principle that will bring to the labor sections of the United States millions upon millions of half-dressed vagabonds to cut down the prices of wages. If you will give the coal operators of West Virginia the right to bring by shipload those Filipinos as American citizens, clothed with their rights, they will drive the coal miners of West Virginia to 30 cents a ton or death and starvation.

Let us be plain about it. Let us look the country in the face. Let us tell our constituents what it is all about. Let us have no more of this nonsense. Daily and hourly come letters to members of Congress saying, "What is this about? What is this contest that is said to be splitting parties into pieces?" Why, my friend, it is this question, whether we shall put 15 per cent of the Dingley duty on the sugar and tobacco that come from Puerto Rico, and 15 per cent of the Dingley duty on goods that go into Puerto Rico, and take that money from the trusts and the dealers and operators and expend it for the benefit of the people of Puerto Rico. That is all there is of it. Not by a long way, my laboring friend. Not by a long way, you men of New England working in a factory. Not by a long way, you laboring men of Minnesota and Michigan and Illinois. Not by a long way, you burrowers in the mines of Indiana; you who are just beginning to see daylight; you who are just beginning to put clothes on the backs of your wives and children; you who are just beginning to look forward to the hope that you may at last have some reasonable and just compensation for your labor. Not by a long way is that the question. The question is, What is the status of the citizens of Puerto Rico and all the islands?—for no honest man will say that there is any difference.

That which settles the status of one settles the status of all, and if this tariff bill is defeated upon the ground that the flag and the Constitution march hand in hand and citizenship goes with the flag and the rights of citizenship go with the flag, your rates of wages, my friends of the Indiana coal mines, are gone and you have at last fallen into the hands of the men who never did anything for you but skin you when they had the opportunity. This is the issue of 1900, Mr. Chairman, and far the greatest issue that has been made in this country since 1860.

Now comes this question: Does any living honest man believe that any living sensible man believes that there is potency and merit and actual value in the question of this 15 per cent duty? Does not every Republican orator and statesman and newspaper writer who writes about it know that he is writing about a bogy man, and that behind it all is simply the stalking of the Democratic purpose, manifested at the very outset, to drive the Republicans of this country into a position where they could destroy them at the polls?

"Sauve qui peut" was the cry of the French at Waterloo when destruction was inevitable. "Every man for himself" must be the cry of 1900 if the Republican party in this Congress is to split upon the great principle which we settled in 1860, as we supposed forever.

Mr. Chairman, I will stand by the laboring men of my district. I will fight in the open ground, without qualification, all comers who seek to seize the labor markets of the United States and turn them over to this labor which has thus come upon us, and all this sickly sentimentalism about charity to our neighbors, all this absurdity about a great principle involved, will not answer the men at the polls in 1900.

Nobody would have hesitated to have given free trade to Puerto Rico had this question not come up. I think if the Democrats in Congress had been quiet and waited and let the Republicans gone on they would have executed the purpose that they had at this session, but they would have treated it as a matter of free trade by legislative enactment and not by the doctrine promulgated at Lincoln, Nebr., that the Constitution follows the flag.

We propose to give to the people of Puerto Rico money out of the pockets of the men who have been speculating in their products. The Democratic party proposes to give them the Constitution. There are 30,000 naked women in Puerto Rico. We propose to clothe them, if that be true, with money drawn from the men who have taken advantage of their troubles and of their products and stored them in warehouses waiting for this. The Democratic party proposes to clothe them with the Constitution. I once read a wonderful poem about Godiva, who, naked in the

ordinary sense, rode through the streets upon her palfrey clothed "all in chastity," but this is a new doctrine.

They propose to clothe them with the Constitution; and if it gets a little colder, they will add the Declaration of Independence; and if it gets still a little colder, they will add Washington's Farewell Address and the writ of habeas corpus and all sorts of things of that character. We propose, in liberality, in justice, in honest appreciation of humanity, to tax these importers 15 per cent of a hundred and use it for the purpose indicated, and in that way place a barrier upon the statute books of this country against the incursion of barbaric labor into the labor districts of Minnesota, and into the mines of Ohio, and Indiana, and West Virginia; and fight it as you will, disguise it as you will, analyze it as you will, that is the position that the laboring men of this country will take upon this question, and thank God the majority of Republicans of this House—almost all of the Republicans of this House—stand clear as the sun, bright as the moon, and, in the coming contest with the men who sought to destroy labor, terrible as an army of banners.

Contested-Election Case—Robbins vs. Aldrich.

SPEECH

OF

HON. MARTIN H. GLYNN,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, March 6, 1900.

The House having under consideration the following resolutions:

"*Resolved*, That Gaston A. Robbins was not elected a member of the Fifty-sixth Congress from the Fourth Congressional district of Alabama, and is not entitled to a seat therein.

"*Resolved*, That William F. Aldrich was elected a member of the Fifty-sixth Congress from the Fourth Congressional district of Alabama, and is entitled to a seat therein"—

Mr. GLYNN said:

Mr. SPEAKER: The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BURKETT] has talked about the election laws of nearly every place in this country. As I watched the minute hand of that clock move, I concluded that if he would only talk a little longer he would probably tell us something about the election laws of heaven whereby the archangels are chosen, and perhaps something of the election laws of the other place where murky imps are chosen.

Mr. MANN. There are no Democrats in heaven, and perhaps it would not be so interesting. [Laughter.]

Mr. GLYNN. No; but there are so many of your own party in the other place that the gentleman ought to know something of what is going on there, and he could tell us, perhaps, how they are elected. [Laughter and applause.] I believe the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BURKETT] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], who preceded him yesterday, showed the weakness of their own case by talking about everything else but the particulars of this case.

The gentleman from Nebraska has talked about the election laws of South Carolina, of Kentucky, and numerous other places, and I would like to ask him what application these laws have to this election case. He has told you again and again why the majority reported in favor of throwing out certain precincts in this election case, but I stand here to tell you that he did not give you the right reason why the majority threw out these precincts. I stand here to say that these precincts are thrown out by the majority because Mr. Robbins happened to get more votes there than Mr. Aldrich. The record shows such to be the fact. The election laws of this country have decided again and again, precedent upon precedent, that the entire poll of any district shall be thrown out where it is possible to show fraud in the vote of the different candidates by aliunde process. Now, Mr. Aldrich started out to do that in this county of Dallas, and you will find that in the precincts thrown out the aliunde vote of Robbins was proven to be larger than that of Aldrich, and that is why they were thrown out. If they allowed the aliunde vote to stand in seven of those precincts, why could it not stand in the other four? The only reason is that Mr. Robbins in the precincts thrown out got more votes than Mr. Aldrich did, and proved more.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BURKETT] by a mathematical process and a yard measure has tried to show that the Robbins vote in Dallas County as returned was larger than it ought to be. Why, sir, the friends of Mr. Aldrich on the stand admitted that there were 3,000 white voters in Dallas County. A large number of white voters were put on the stand, and of that number only 12 swore that they voted for Aldrich. Now, if more voted for him, why were they not produced? Do you suppose that if Aldrich could have proven that more than 12 white men voted for him he would not have done so? But he did not do it, and instead he adopts the contemptible course of coming in here and saying: "I did not get all the votes I ought to have got, and therefore I want to be seated."

The gentleman from Nebraska has talked also about the material progress of Dallas County; he has abused that county and its people. He has held them up as the most unprogressive people in Alabama, or perhaps in the United States. Yet from that county of Dallas, from that terribly abused, that loathsome county, come the two able men who to-day represent Alabama in the United States Senate, MORGAN and PETTUS.

The gentleman refers to a little "scrap," so to speak, that Mr. Robbins and Mr. Aldrich had in a hotel. It is true they had a fight; but that fight took place two months after the election—nearly three. What had that fight, then, to do with this contest? The facts of the fight are these: There appeared in a paper controlled by the Aldrich people a contemptible, a nasty, a dirty article; an article which, from whosever pen it emanated, reflected its own devilishness, its own murkiness. Robbins, like a man, denied the accusation and insinuations in that article, and asked Aldrich whether he was responsible for it. Both men grew angry and hot-headed. A fight ensued in which Mr. Robbins got the best of Mr. Aldrich. And for that reason the gentleman from Nebraska wants you to unseat Mr. Robbins. When the gentleman brought in that matter he was guilty of unprofessional conduct. The evidence about that fight was offered in rebuttal, but in fact it was evidence in chief. And in the report which the gentleman signed the majority said they would disregard the evidence which was offered in rebuttal, which should have been offered as evidence in chief. They disregarded it in their report, but now the gentleman comes in here to tell you that because these gentlemen had a fight and his man got the worst of it, Mr. Robbins ought to be thrown out.

The gentleman argues also that because Mason was shot one month after the election—or two months—Robbins ought to be unseated.

A MEMBER. The 14th of November.

Mr. GLYNN. Well, it was after the election. Three days are as good as three months. The man who shot Mason was the political opponent of Mr. Robbins in the Democratic party of his district; and to charge Mr. Robbins or his political associates with that would be the same as charging the Republican party with the murder of Garfield because the man who shot him happened to be a Republican, or the murder of Lincoln upon the Democratic party because the man who shot him happened to be a Democrat.

The gentleman talks a good deal about a man named A. Thompson down in Burnsville. This man Thompson was the only man of all the witnesses offered by Aldrich who swore that there was fraud in Dallas County. He was appointed as inspector and represented Aldrich at Burnsville. He says he is a Democrat, yet he has been the postmaster down there for years under a Republican régime. He swears that he voted for Robbins. Mr. Bamberg, the Republican clerk, and Mr. Aldrich's friend, swears that he knows Thompson voted for Aldrich. About Thompson I will have something to say in reply to the gentleman from Nebraska later on. But, sir, he talks about fraudulent counting of the votes. The ballots were intrusted to Thompson's keeping. Thompson represented Aldrich. He took the ballots home and kept them all night. Does that look as if the Democrats down there were trying to "monkey" with the vote, when they intrusted the ballot to a Republican inspector?

He said he got up during the night and counted the ballots, and that when they were counted the next day at the polling place, the count then made as part of the returns did not agree with the count he had made. Well, Thompson signed those returns; he swore that they were true. He afterwards went on the stand and swore that they were false. Now, I want to know, can this man, upon whose testimony the majority of the committee rely in this report, be believed? Is a man honest who swears one thing to-day and another thing to-morrow? Every other election officer in that place—the Republican marker, the Republican clerk—swore that the returns were true; and in their rebuttal Aldrich never tried to show that those men swore to a lie. He brought no man forward to uphold Thompson's veracity or besmirch the truthfulness of those who contradict Thompson.

Mr. MANN. I would like to suggest that whatever the fault may be on the part of the election commissioners, in signing the returns they no not swear to them.

Mr. GLYNN. These returns were practically sworn to.

Mr. MANN. They were not sworn to.

Mr. GLYNN. I would like to hear the evidence which shows they were not.

Mr. MANN. The evidence shows what I state; all the gentleman needs to do to satisfy himself on this point is to turn to the record.

Mr. GLYNN. Did not Thompson sign the returns? Was he not a sworn election officer, and were not all his actions performed under his obligations as such?

Mr. MANN. I do not know whether he was under oath or not.

Mr. GLYNN. He certainly ought to have been; and it is unfair to presume that he was not, under the circumstances.

Mr. MANN. He was not under oath, at all events.

Mr. GLYNN. Why, Mr. Speaker, he swore to the returns as an officer of the elections; and it is only dodging the issue for the gentleman to claim that he was not under oath in this particular statement. It is only boy's play.

Mr. MANN. Well, that is your contention.

Mr. GLYNN. That is the common-sense view of it, if any man will consider the question for a moment.

Mr. MANN. I repeat, that is your contention.

Mr. GLYNN. The gentleman from Illinois talked yesterday, and said that the Democrats did not want the negroes to have anything to do or to say about the Government. Well, in this particular case Mr. Aldrich and his campaign managers advised the negro Republican voters of Dallas County to stay at home and not vote at all. Who, then, wanted the negroes to have nothing to do with the affairs of Government in that case?

Mr. MANN. Only in certain precincts, and for very good and sufficient reasons, if the gentleman will pardon me. I repeat, only in certain precincts.

Mr. GLYNN. Well, at all events the Republican managers sought to keep away from the polls a certain number, whether it be large or small, of the Republican voters.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes; in 21 of the precincts of that county they advised them to stay away.

Mr. MANN. It was requested that they should not participate in the election in a few of these precincts, for, as I have stated, good reasons.

Mr. GLYNN. But they were requested to stay away. They were advised not to vote, and I ask the gentleman if that looks as if the Democrats in that county did not want the negro to have anything to do about the Government? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. Oh, the gentleman is simply begging the conclusion.

Mr. GLYNN (continuing). The gentleman from Illinois dreams that. In the course of his remarks yesterday he also read a campaign circular issued by the campaign committee down there. Now, that circular has as much to do with the legality or illegality of this case as the enunciation of the Ten Commandments or the whistling of the winds through the lofty buildings in his own white city of Chicago.

Mr. MANN. Well, I am very glad the gentleman calls it "white;" because if there is much white left in that busy center, it is certainly hard to find.

Mr. GLYNN. Well, perhaps a whitened sepulcher, I might call it. [Laughter.]

But, Mr. Speaker, I was referring to this particular campaign circular. I heard a Republican member of the majority of the committee, when this circular was read, say jocosely, "Why, I have issued worse circulars than that myself in campaign times." And yet the gentleman from Illinois uses it as a reason for unseating the contestee in this case.

Now, sir, I do not want to make this a political controversy. I do not think it is a question in which politics ought to enter. It is a question of fact, to be determined by the House. It is merely a matter of right and wrong. I deprecate the words and the implication of the man from Nebraska in the matter of making it political. There is no justification for such conduct in this case.

The gentleman from Illinois the other day talked glibly about how magnanimous the majority of the committee were in the Turner case. What was pending there? I, Mr. Speaker, was a member of the subcommittee which made the report in that case, and I knew the policy which was to be pursued. The game there was to hold it up as long as possible. Mr. Turner's opponent had no case at all, and the only thing that hurried up the seating of Turner was the sad news from Kentucky relating to the shooting of an executive officer of that State. But it has nothing whatever to do with the pending case, and I mention it now simply for the purpose of meeting the suggestions which have been raised in regard to it.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman from New York yield to me for a question?

Mr. GLYNN. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Is it not true that the Turner case was argued before the committee thoroughly by attorneys for the contestant, who insisted that Turner should be unseated?

Mr. GLYNN. Certainly; they all insist on that when they want anything done.

Mr. MANN. I simply wished the gentleman, in complete fairness to the committee, to make that statement.

Mr. BARTLETT. Every member of the committee contended that there was nothing in the contest.

Mr. MANN. Well, the report of the committee will not sustain that statement. I ask gentlemen to read the report of the committee and see whether there is anything to justify the suggestion of my friend from Georgia.

Mr. GLYNN. Well, the secrets of the committee room have no place here, but it was the chairman of your committee who hurried it up for political reasons and thus blocked the game of delay. That has nothing to do with this case, though.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] also said on yesterday that the returns were thrown out from three of the precincts in which Mr. Aldrich secured the representation he desired. Now, the election officers there, appointed at Aldrich's request, signed the election returns. Do you not suppose that they would have known if there was fraud there? And if you throw out those returns, you brand as traitors and thieves the men whom Mr. Aldrich himself selected as his representatives there. For my part, I do not believe that they were traitors and thieves. I do not agree with my friend from Nebraska [Mr. BURKETT] who thinks that every man who differs with him wants to stuff a ballot box or go down in his neighbor's pocket.

It was my intention to confine myself solely to the merits of this case, Mr. Speaker, but as the majority have seen fit to go into ancient history I have concluded to avail myself of the same privilege. Mr. Aldrich, in 1894, was nominated by the Populists of his district. He was indorsed by a branch of the Republican party. He crept into this House through the knot hole of a contest. About the contest of 1894 I do not want to say anything, for the reason that the present majority did not bring in the report, but you did bring in your report in the contest of 1896, and I protest most emphatically against your effort to try this case on any previous contest. I plead for extenuation of my conduct in citing this letter, your conduct in trying to oust Mr. Robbins in the contest of 1896.

In 1896 Mr. Aldrich was a candidate for Congress. When the Republican convention met, he and his followers found that they did not have enough delegates to nominate him. They bolted the convention and held a convention of their own, nominating Mr. Aldrich for Congress and sending Mr. Aldrich, with a negro Republican, as delegates to the national Republican convention at St. Louis. In the national Republican convention at St. Louis, the contested seats were tried. Aldrich and his opponent were denied their seats, and the men sent by the other convention were given their place there. The same convention which tried to give Aldrich a seat in the national convention nominated him for Congress. He went to that convention, this record shows, against McKinley, telling the silver people there that he was a silver man, and telling the gold men that he was a gold man, telling the Populists he was a Populist, and telling the Republicans that he was a Republican, a regular weather-cock in politics. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BARTLETT. Telling the Greenbackers that he was a Greenbacker.

Mr. GLYNN. Yes; telling the Greenbackers that he was a Greenbacker and the Free-soilers that he was a Free-soiler. Well, Mr. Wilson was nominated by the regular Republican convention. Mr. Wilson is a poor man; they tell me that Mr. Aldrich has plenty of this world's goods. Evidently the possession of these goods work strange results upon a man that went and caused poor Wilson to get out. Wilson, nominated by the regular Republican convention, withdrew from the contest, but when he withdrew he wrote this letter, of which I want to read part. Mr. Wilson says—remember he was the regular Republican nominee:

I yield to no man when demand is made upon me for service to my State or to my country. An enemy—

"An enemy," he says—Aldrich, that meant—

claiming to be within our ranks confronts us. The principles of the Republican party are sought to be subordinated to the debauchment and hoped-for greed of some of those heretofore trusted, and in whose sense of honor and decency we had relied, through the corrupting influences of an alien to our principles, aided by the misuse of money. I am unable longer to continue the unequal fight against this pseudo nominee.

Pseudo nominee! This is Aldrich. Perhaps the majority will not want so much ancient history after hearing this letter. [Laughter.]

Somewhere in his writings, Mr. Speaker, Lord Bacon says that "no pleasure is comparable to standing upon the vantage ground of truth," while in one of his prose efforts John G. Whittier holds that "it is always safe to do right, and the truest expediency is simple justice." Mr. Speaker, I agree with Lord Bacon. I agree with John G. Whittier. I believe that the greatest of pleasures is the pleasure of standing on the vantage ground of truth. I hold that it is always safe to do right. I know that the truest expediency is simple justice; and those thoughts are reflections of the

reasons why I purpose to vote for Gaston A. Robbins to maintain the seat in Congress which, in my mind, he now legally and honestly holds from the Fourth Congressional district of the State of Alabama. And I take this position not because I am a Democrat, not because Gaston A. Robbins is a Democrat—for as a member of the Committee on Contested Elections I am blind to all political complexions and deaf to all party cries—but because I want to follow the right as God has given me to see it, and because I believe that the sovereign will of the majority of the people of the Fourth Congressional district of Alabama should not be thwarted by any political thimble-rigging or any legal hairsplitting based on possible contingencies and improbable probabilities.

In a contest of this kind political inclinations should have no place, party prejudices no seat, personal feelings no habitation or home. On one side is arrayed Right, in her robes of immaculate majesty; on the other, Wrong, with her retinue of satanic courtiers and murky imps. With the arguments of one blend the sweet strains of the carols of Justice, while with the other mingle the groans of a disappointed Ambition and the stentorian commands of a suffering Hope that the members of this House will trample under heel the one royal prerogative of American citizenship—the power to name the men who shall make the laws for the land. We are sitting to-day as a judicial tribunal, and, like the Goddess of Justice, should be blind to every purpose and every determination but the sole aim—

> To think, to feel, to do
> Only the whole right,
> To yield no step in the awful race,
> No blow in the fearful fight.

For the opinion of the majority I have all the respect in the world. This respect, however, can not prevent me from thinking that the opinion of the minority is the true one. Of course, I do not expect that the majority of the committee will agree with me on this point, but I do hope that the majority of the members of this House will so agree when they vote on this proposition. We members of the minority gave the majority a pleasant opportunity to do this by offering to allow them to sign the minority report, but for some inexplicable reason they spurned our proffered generosity. Why they could possibly refuse to do this after hearing the evidence has been almost as much a matter of wonderment to me as why the seat of Gaston A. Robbins was ever contested at all. I think that both of these facts are destined to become the political curios of this session of Congress.

All through their report the majority lays great stress upon the multiplicity of contests that have come from the Fourth Congressional district of Alabama and seem to advocate the unseating of Mr. Robbins as a necessity for putting an end to these contests. It is true that Mr. Robbins has been before this House in a contest once before, but it is equally true that Mr. Aldrich is now trying to win his seat in this House through a contest for the third time. Every time before this that he has been a member of Congress he has come in through the back door of a contest, and if the majority of this committee are so anxious to put an end to the contests from the Fourth Congressional district of Alabama, let me suggest to them that they tell Mr. Aldrich to go back home and conduct his campaigns in the future on a square, manly basis, and not on a method predicated on a contest.

There is a contest in this election case because Aldrich was afraid to stand squarely and fairly before the people of his district and because his campaign manager, George B. Deans, gave orders to voters to stay away from certain precincts, had witnesses trained to swear to falsehoods, so that he might bring this election case into this House in a contest. Aldrich had succeeded in getting in twice that way before, but Aldrich and Deans wanted to get a seat on the principle of Disraeli when he said, "Get money honestly, if you can; but get money." I know that this is a bold statement to make, but in all its boldness I challenge each member of the majority individually to assert that it is not true or to cast the least shadow of suspicion upon the truthfulness of that assertion. But if they should so far forget the evidence in the case as to think that I am allowing partisan feeling to run away with my reason in this assertion, I most respectfully refer them to page 893 of the record in this case, on which Mr. George B. Deans, the campaign manager of Mr. Aldrich, swears that he conducted the campaign in the county of Dallas predicated on a contest having to be made. And so I say if the majority of this committee are so anxious to put an end to the contests from this Congressional district, they should send word to the campaign managers of Mr. Aldrich not to conduct their campaigns predicated on a contest, but fight them out in a good manly way.

I protest, and I protest most vehemently, against the course of the majority in trying to drag into this case any previous contest from the Fourth Congressional district of Alabama. I insist—and every fair-minded man must support me in the contention—that this case should be tried solely on its merits and absolutely divorced from all other contests. The majority of the members of this committee seem to think that they are trying over again the old Robbins-Aldrich case of four years ago, and their course fits well the famous story of Natt Head "about the same old hoss." A Western farmer had a college-bred son who went off preaching on the missions. He came back with an old rackabone, and the old man met him on the piazza. After exchanging salutations the father asked the son, "Where did you get that old horse?" "That is as good a horse as our Saviour rode into Jerusalem," replied the son. The old man came down from the piazza, examined the animal's mouth carefully, and then, standing back, remarked quietly, "Dan, I'll be blowed if it ain't the same old horse." [Laughter and applause.]

And so I am afraid that some members of the committee have hastily come to the conclusion that this election case is the "same old horse" from Alabama which stalked in here years ago. But it is not. It is a horse altogether of a different color this time. Without a scintilla of disrespect to my differing colleagues on the committee, I am afraid that they have allowed extraneous incidents to warp their judgment in this case. I am fearful that in this case at least they have dropped into the mood of that olden judge, Themistocles, whom Plutarch represents as saying, "May I never sit on a tribunal where my friends shall not find more favor from me than strangers." [Laughter.]

To my way of thinking, the position of the majority of the committee in this case is like the habitual mood of that famous old Greek, Agesilaus, who thought a rigid adherence to justice a mere pretense. A friend of his, Nicias by name, was once on trial for a serious offense, and to the judge Agesilaus wrote, "If Nicias is innocent, acquit him; if Nicias is not innocent, acquit him; anyway, be sure to acquit Nicias." So the majority of this committee say to the members of this House, "If Aldrich is elected, seat him; if Aldrich is not elected, seat him; anyway, be sure to seat Aldrich." [Laughter and applause.] But if a sense of justice yet abides in this House and if its contested-election cases are decided in accordance with law and evidence, Mr. Aldrich can not get the seat in this Congress to which Mr. Robbins has been elected; and facts and figures both prove Mr. Robbins to have been elected.

Why, my friends, if you grant every concession for which Mr. Aldrich asks, Mr. Robbins is yet elected by a majority of 389 votes; and surely the majority of the members of this House are not ready to stand before the tribunal of public opinion and acknowledge that they have been guilty of the crime of robbing a man of a seat in Congress for which he has a clear majority of 389 after there has been granted every concession for which his opponent asks. In addition to this, a fair examination of the evidence will show that many of the objections raised by Mr. Aldrich are puerile and ill founded. With these brushed aside Mr. Robbins would have a majority of over 1,100, but 389 is as good for all practicable purposes as is 1,100.

In view of these facts, it would be an act of injustice of the rankest kind to oust Mr. Robbins—an act of injustice deserving of the universal condemnation of the law-abiding people of this country. In his History of Rome Gibbon makes narration of an incident where the Ottoman, Bajazet I, had the stomach of one of his chamberlains torn from the body because the chamberlain had been guilty of drinking a bowlful of goat's milk belonging to a poor woman. The action caused a hurricane of comment on account of its excess of justice. And yet, those who advocate unseating Gaston A. Robbins are seeking to follow the course of Bajazet. They are apparently so anxious to walk straight in the path of an imaginary duty that they are traveling zigzag and bending backward. Because of some trivial irregularities—akin to the drinking of that bowl of goat's milk—they seek to tear the vitals out of the rightful cause of Gaston A. Robbins.

Why, my friends, if the reasons asked for by Mr. Aldrich for the unseating of Robbins, after all his contentions have been granted, were applied to the election of each man in this House, I make bold to say that there would not be a single Congressman in this House to-day and the Government could never secure a representative body to enact laws. There never was an election without some error and some taint, and everyone here knows this to be true. If you unseat Robbins, I warn you that there is not a man in this House who could not be unseated for somewhat similar reasons, provided each one had an Aldrich against him who was willing to spend his time and money in hunting up spooks and bugaboos to invalidate your election, spooks and bugaboos used by himself, but devoid of effectiveness because bunglingly handled.

If the lawyers of this House will read the brief of Mr. Aldrich, they will be amused by the jumping-jack tactics employed therein to established his case. They will find that the charges therein are not as particularly specific as is required by section 105 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, which says:

> The contestant shall specify particularly the grounds upon which he relies in the contest.

In section 1 of the brief the contestant falls to do this. In fact, he does everything but this. He is indefinite, purposely indefinite, possibly with the hope of hitting something by shooting at everything. He is like the sick man who was told he was about to die and in quick succession sent for a Catholic priest, a Presbyterian minister, a Methodist minister, and a Campbellite, and in explanation of his queer conduct said to the last minister: "Well, you see, Mr. Preacher, I am on my last legs and about to go, they tell me; and I have heard heaven is a very good place to go to, and I want to take all the chances of getting there." [Laughter.] Identically similar is the position taken, from a legal standpoint, by the contestant in this case. He has concluded that Congress is a very good place to go to, and wants to take all the chances of getting there. He wants to override justice and cast aside legal rules to reach the object of his ambition.

The Fourth Congressional district of Alabama is composed of the counties of Cleburne, Calhoun, Talladega, Shelby, Chilton, and Dallas. In this contest the whole question turns on the vote of Dallas County. There is no dispute as to the other counties. Under the laws of the State of Alabama under which this election was held, the statutes of the State provide that thirty days before the election a board, composed of the judges of probate, the clerk of the circuit court, and the sheriff of the county, shall appoint three inspectors or judges for each precinct in the county, two of them shall be of opposing political parties.

Some time before this board met Mr. Aldrich presented a list of 31 persons and asked the board to appoint those to represent him in the 31 precincts in Dallas County. Out of these 31 names the board named 20 of the inspectors asked for by Mr. Aldrich. Out of the 10 not appointed, the board gave good and sufficient reason for its conduct in refusing to name 6. This leaves only 4 for whose nonappointment no excuse is given. About this fact the members of the majority make much ado, and would create the impression that a crime had been committed. This is not true, for according to the Code of Alabama, section 1583, the board is not required by law to select inspectors from any list served upon them by any person or candidate, but are required "to appoint 3 inspectors for each place of voting, 2 of whom shall be of opposing political parties, if practicable."

So you see that the board really did Mr. Aldrich a favor when they named twenty out of the thirty-one names he presented. It was not obliged to name a single one of the names presented by Mr. Aldrich if it did not so wish. As long as it named three inspectors for each polling place, and two out of these three were of opposing political parties, the law was complied with. Thus drops the bottom out of the contestant's first cry of wrong and fraud in the election of Mr. Robbins. If Mr. Aldrich was elected at all, he was elected under the law passed by the legislature of the State of Alabama, and he has to stand or fall by that law. It is not within the power of this House to prescribe or to enact election laws for the State of Alabama. Congress has nothing whatever to do with the goodness or the fairness of this law.

In addition to this, "the act appointing inspectors is a judicial and not a ministerial act," as will be found declared in 100 Alabama Report, page 603, and this decision of the Alabama court is verified by the following decisions, viz: United States *vs.* Paxton (40 Federal Reporter, page 136); United States *vs.* Chairs (40 Federal Reporter, page 820); In re Supervisors of Election (43 Federal Reporter, page 859). Will this House say that it can take control of a board which acts judicially? Has it not been held from time immemorial that judges shall not be called upon to account for their judicial acts? If, however, this House should so override precedent as to be of the opinion that it has the right to call into question the acts of the appointing board and to criticise it, I propose to call the attention of the House to the sworn evidence in the case, which shows conclusively that the board gave the contestant every inspector it possibly could, except, perhaps, four, and of these, two were from Union precinct, which is the only one that was contested by Mr. Aldrich.

The evidence shows that the identical persons asked for by Mr. Aldrich to be appointed as inspectors were appointed in the following precincts: Plantersville, Summerfield, Woodlawn, Harrel's, Dublin, Martins, Pine Flat, Old Town, Pleasant Hill, Richmond, Burnsville, Pence's, Liberty Hill, Bell's, Vernon, Brown's, Elm Bluff, Smyly's, Boykin's, Carlowville, and City precincts (Record, page 291). The evidence also shows that the board failed to appoint the ones requested by Aldrich in the following precincts: Valley Creek, Orrville, Lexington, River, Portland, Cahaba, Union, Marion Junction, and Kings.

Thus it appears that the board did not give him inspectors in 9 precincts instead of 15, as alleged in Aldrich's notice of contest. The testimony of J. H. Lumpkin further shows that the following persons, requested by Aldrich to be appointed as inspectors, were unknown to the appointing board: Jurdon Hatcher, Orrville; J. H. Brown, River; and Westley Williams, Portland. Could any sane man ask the appointing board to appoint as inspectors persons who were unknown to them and whose politics was unknown to them?

The evidence of Sheriff Lumpkin shows that Charlie Smith, of Valley Creek precinct, was not qualified for the duties of inspector, and that the said Lumpkin requested Campaign Manager Mason to suggest the name of some other person to act in his place; and the evidence also shows that J. G. Johnson, suggested as inspector for Lexington precinct, was objectionable on the ground that there was a good deal of feeling against him in the precinct where he lived; and the testimony of W. N. Carson (Record, page 861) and of T. F. Kelley (Record, page 865) shows that W. S. Johnson, suggested as inspector for Mitchell's precinct, was disqualified, and that it is doubtful whether or not he was an elector of Mitchell's precinct—one of the qualifications required by the law for an inspector to possess—and for other reasons stated by said witnesses, in that they say it is not certain that he is a person of sound mind.

The testimony of A. C. Donaldson (Record, page 740) shows that S. B. Mitchell, the name of the person recommended for inspector in Cahaba precinct, was unknown, and it is also shown by the testimony of Sheriff Lumpkin that Saul B. Mitchell was unknown to the appointing board. There is no proof offered by Aldrich that John Logan, the person asked for in Union recinct, was a supporter of Aldrich, or that he was in any way qualified as inspector. The fact is that the record in this case does not show that the appointing board declined to appoint any person requested by Aldrich or his supporters who is shown by the record to possess the statutory qualifications. On the contrary, the record affirmatively shows that in every precinct where the board did not appoint the person requested by Aldrich there were good reasons for not appointing them, except, perhaps, in the single instance of John Logan, and in this instance there is no evidence to show that he was qualified or belonged to the opposing political party from the other inspectors.

It is true that some of these inspectors appointed by the board failed to appear on election day, but the appointing board is in no way responsible for their failure to appear and act as inspectors. In justice, the responsibility for their absence and failure to act should rest upon Aldrich, for the reason that he requested his supporters to remain away from the polls and take no part in the election. Under these circumstances there was but one course for the inspectors who did appear, and that was to appoint some other qualified elector of the precinct and proceed with the election.

Evidently Mr. Aldrich has proceeded under a misapprehension of the law. There is no provision of the election law of Alabama providing that a candidate or the constituted authority of a political party may offer or serve the appointing board with a list of persons to represent him or his party as inspectors at the several voting places. But the law does provide for the presentation to the inspectors by the candidates or by the constituted authorities of the political parties of a list of clerks and markers—not less than six nor more than ten in each precinct—to act as clerks and markers of the opposing political parties respectively (Code of Alabama, section 1595). The testimony shows that where the constituted authorities of the opposing political parties, or the candidates themselves, presented a list of clerks and markers, as provided for by law, asking the inspectors to appoint certain persons to represent them, that the inspectors complied with such request.

Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully call the attention of the members of the House to the fact that all through this contest Mr. Aldrich insinuates that the people of Dallas County would rather vote for the devil than vote for Mr. Robbins. Well, sir, His Satanic Majesty was not a candidate against Mr. Robbins, but Mr. Aldrich was, and the people of Dallas County showed that though they might prefer to vote for the Prince of Darkness rather than for Mr. Robbins, yet they preferred to vote for Mr. Robbins rather than for Mr. Aldrich.

The evidence of the case shows that Aldrich bases his whole contest upon the votes which he thought he ought to get, but which he did not get. He has completely lost sight of the fact that a vote in the ballot box is worth two dozen on the fence. "Aim high," says Emerson; "Aim low," says General Jackson; but the wise candidate is he who makes his gauge depend upon the fact of whether he is aiming at the moon or at a melon thief crawling off on his hands and knees. Aldrich aimed too low that he did not want the colored vote of Dallas County. He depended solely upon the white vote, and he overshot his mark. Robbins aimed at the golden medium and rung the bull's-eye so loud that it is still ringing in the ears of every justice-loving man in this House and urging him to uphold the law by keeping Robbins in his seat.

Examine the evidence in this case, members of the House of Representatives, and you will find Mr. Aldrich trying to create the impression that he did not get his full vote in Dallas County, and if the conditions existing after election had not existed he

would have received more votes. Examine this evidence a little further, gentlemen, examine it a little further, I ask you, and you will find the contention of Mr. Aldrich contradicted by his own campaign manager, Mr. G. B. Deans, who testified that he was in Dallas County constantly during the Congressional campaign and that he instructed the leading Republicans of certain precincts not to bring out their vote on election day.

How, I ask you, could Aldrich receive a full vote in Dallas County when, in obedience to his campaign manager, his supporters remained away from the polls? Aldrich was hoisted on his own petard. He had hugged himself into the delusion that he would receive the white vote of the district. He desired to go down in history as having been elected by the white people of the district for some purpose covered up in the secret resources of his soul, and wanted to anoint his bosom with the sweet unction of having carried the election held in the Fourth Congressional district of Alabama by the white votes. He thought he was going to get the white vote of the district, and he therefore instructed his campaign leaders not to bring out the colored votes in certain districts.

When, however, he found that he had not carried the so-called "white counties" by the majorities he expected, he falls back upon his old cry of "fraud" and says he was swindled in the count. What does the evidence say, gentlemen? Well, if it says anything it says that the contentions of Mr. Aldrich are without ground. All the election officers swear so. During the campaign and on the day of election there was peace and good order in Dallas County. All the citizens of this county were quiet and law-abiding on the day the last order was issued by contestant's campaign manager, G. B. Deans, who said:

> On one of my trips to Dallas County, the week before the election, I was informed that there were some cases of smallpox in River, Pine Flat, and some of the other adjoining beats. Thinking it possible that an election might not be held in Pine Flat and River beats, where I had instructed the full strength to be cast, I issued an order for the Republican vote to be cast in Cahaba beat, where I had previously ordered it suppressed. (Record, page 892.)

There is not in this record one scintilla of evidence upon which Mr. Aldrich can base his claim that the votes of this county should not be considered by Congress.

It appears from the testimony introduced by Mr. Aldrich that he had every opportunity of making a canvass, and that his campaign managers were constantly at work in Dallas County, and his general policy of instructing his supporters to remain away from the polls was fully carried into execution. Campaign Manager G. B. Deans testified that he instructed the contestant's supporters not to vote in the following precincts: Woodlawn, Harrels, Martins, Orrville, Lexington, Oldtown, Pleasant Hill, Richmond, Portland, Pence's, Liberty Hill, Vernon, Marion Junction, King's, Smyley's, Elm Bluff, Carlowville, Boykin's, Mitchell's, and Brown's, and the vote in Cahaba precinct was ordered suppressed until Saturday prior to the election on the following Tuesday. (Record, page 892.) This policy of instructing his supporters to remain away from the polls in other precincts is shown and proved by the testimony of Cæsar Foster (Record, page 315), and the testimony of A. J. Martin and exhibit thereto (Record, page 639), and the testimony of W. W. Sheppard and exhibit thereto (Record, page 792), and that of William F. Cook (Record, page 577).

Mr. Aldrich claims that the colored voters of Dallas County were his supporters in this race for Congress, although the testimony shows that he did not receive their votes generally. Hundreds of them appeared as witnesses, and their testimony is found in the record showing that they voted for Robbins. This claim of Mr. Aldrich is directly contradicted by his policy of instructing the colored electors not to vote. I call special attention to a letter written by George R. Mason and addressed to A. J. Martin which contains the expression that "If Mr. Aldrich is willing to risk his chances with the white voters, Mr. Robbins ought to be." (Testimony of A. J. Martin and exhibit thereto, Record, page 639.)

Before taking up the contested precincts I want to call the attention of the House to some of the general features of this case. Mr. Aldrich occupied forty days in taking his direct testimony, and he failed to produce a single witness, with the exception of one A. Thompson, of Burnsville, who swore to any fraud in the count. If there had been any fraud in Dallas County, do you not think that more than one man would have known about it? If there had been any fraud in Dallas County, do you think for a minute that the 19 other inspectors appointed on Mr. Aldrich's selection would not have come forward and said something about it? If there had been any fraud in Dallas County, do you not think that the men who were appointed markers and clerks upon the request of Mr. Aldrich at the voting precincts in the county would have proclaimed the facts from the house tops?

If the majority of the committee or the majority of this House takes any other stand, it brands these friends of Mr. Aldrich as traitors and thieves, and surely there must have been some honest men among them who would be willing to stand for Mr. Aldrich's cause. For my part, I think they were all honest men, and proved themselves such when they would not allow themselves to be persuaded from swearing to the truth to further the interests of their friend Aldrich. They placed honesty, justice, and truth above personal friendship, and swore, all of them, that Robbins had been honestly elected.

During the first thirty days of evidence taking Mr. Aldrich tried to prove his vote, and yet when he fails in that he cries out that the vote in certain districts of Dallas County ought to be set aside. And now a word more about Thompson, who swore that fraud was committed.

I want to call attention to the man's doings just to show his unreliability. He was appointed inspector at Burnsville precinct, 22, upon the request of Mr. Aldrich. When the returns were handed in from his precinct he swore to them as an inspector and certified to them as correct. Afterwards he took the stand and swore they were not correct. Evidently he swore to a lie at one time or the other; and when, I would like to know, can you tell that the truth is being told by a man who swears to one thing to-day and directly the opposite thing to-morrow? Which time is he telling the truth? Can you or I tell? Can he tell himself? And yet, in direct contradiction of Thompson, all the other officers of the Burnsville precinct—half of them Republican—F. S. Campbell, J. H. Burns, Jack Robinson, J. S. Dillon, and W. D. Barmberg, all swear that the returns from Burnsville are honest and true.

Shall the statement by a witness who swears one way at one time and then another way at another time be taken to set aside the sworn oath of four other officers? And if Thompson can be believed, why did not Mr. Aldrich offer evidence in his rebuttal testimony to uphold his tottering champion?

Another peculiar feature of the evidence in this case is that after Mr. Robbins had consumed his forty days of taking direct evidence, Mr. Aldrich broke all rules of legality, all canons of justice, all dictates of right, all mandates of manliness, by offering in rebuttal evidence which was not rebuttal at all, but evidence in chief to attack the integrity of the returns at Smiley's precinct 31, Lexington precinct 36, Valley Creek precinct 4, and the City precinct 36; also testimony in reference to the appointment of inspectors by the county board in Dallas County.

To this testimony no opportunity was ever given Mr. Robbins to reply, and every lawyer in this House knows that such a procedure is in direct violation of the statutes of the United States providing for the taking of testimony in contested-election cases. Mr. Robbins objected to the consideration of this testimony. So worthy did the majority of this committee on contested-election cases deem the objections of Mr. Robbins that in their discussion of the testimony at precinct No. 36 they concluded to disregard this testimony offered by Mr. Aldrich. If this evidence was disregarded by the committee and is disregarded by the House, there is no legal evidence which could have authorized the majority of the committee and none which can authorize the House to reject the returns of City precinct No. 36 and to report Mr. Aldrich elected.

If the case of Mr. Aldrich is deprived of the testimony taken in time of rebuttal testimony, but which is testimony in chief, the conclusion that Mr. Aldrich was elected, even under his own claim, can not be sustained. Mr. Aldrich relies upon that testimony in his brief, and without it he has no case, so far as City precinct No. 36 is concerned, and without the rejection of this precinct Mr. Aldrich can not be legally seated.

In their report the majority of the committee permit to stand as returned with the exception of the correction of two votes in precincts Nos. 1 and 2; the returns from Nos. 1, 2, 3, 6, 7; give no vote in either Nos. 10 or 11, because no election was held; permit to stand Nos. 12, 13, 14, 15, 27, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, and 35.

Thus it will be seen from the report of the majority that six precincts are rejected entirely and no vote permitted to be counted for either, although both Aldrich and Robbins did by aliunde proof prove a number of votes cast for each. The following are the precincts rejected by the majority entirely, and contains the official returns for each and votes proven for the contestant and contestee by witnesses:

	Official returns.		Aliunde proof.	
	Aldrich.	Robbins.	Aldrich.	Robbins.
Orrville, No. 8	1	90	3	75
Lexington, No. 9	3	54	2	36
Marion Junction, No. 28	.....	73	.....	40
Kings, No. 30	.....	52	.....	9

The majority report rejects the return of the election officers,

and counts the vote proven by aliunde proof at the following precincts, which were contested:

	Aldrich.	Robbins.
No. 4, Valley Creek	152	52
No. 16, Cahaba	163	8
No. 22, Burnsville	113	22
No. 23, Union	132	34
No. 24, Pence's	1	44
No. 36, city	126	564

They permitted to stand as returned—

	Aldrich.	Robbins.
No. 3, Woodlawn	3	38
No. 12, Old Town		56
No. 14, Richmond		21

which had been contested.

It will be observed from the report of the majority that they reject the returns from Valley Creek precinct, No. 4, upon the ground that the inspector asked for by the contestant and his party managers was refused by the appointing board of Dallas County, and that they appointed Llewellen Philips, who was claimed to be a Democrat, and that Judge Thomas, a colored man, was appointed in Philips's place on the day of the election when Philips did not arrive in time to conduct the election, and on account of this alleged fraud the said precinct is rejected, and they count for the contestant and contestee the votes which were proved by each. It will be noted that at this precinct the committee in the majority report find Aldrich to have proven 152 votes and Robbins 51 votes.

When the committee reach Orrville precinct No. 8 they discard the returns entirely for the same reason that they discarded the returns in Valley Creek, and yet decline to count the votes they found to have been proven by the contestant and contestee by aliunde proof. It will be noted that in this precinct the contestant proved only 3 votes, while the contestee proved 75 votes, according to the majority report.

Lexington No. 9 is treated in the same way for the same reason.

When the majority report deals with Cahaba No. 16 they reject the returns upon the same ground that they rejected the other two; but Aldrich having proven in this precinct, according to the report, 163 votes and Robbins 8, these votes are counted.

At Union precinct No. 23 the report finds that Aldrich proved 132 votes and Robbins 34, and they have declared that it should be rejected for the same reasons as the others were rejected, yet the votes proven by aliunde proof are counted.

At Marion Junction No. 28 the report of the majority entirely discards the returns for the same reasons as those applied to Orrville and Lexington, and refuses to permit any of the votes proven to be counted, and for the same reason reject entirely precinct No. 30.

It is a matter to be noted that the votes proven by aliunde evidence to have been cast at these precincts, rejected entirely, and those partially rejected are not counted by the majority except where Aldrich's alleged proven vote is large and Robbins's proven vote is small. Where the contestee proved a large vote and the contestant a small vote the returns are entirely rejected, and where the contestant proved by aliunde proof a considerable vote more than the contestee they are counted by the majority.

The rule of law which requires that when a precinct has been rejected for fraud in the conduct of the election the party shall be entitled to receive the votes proven by aliunde to have been cast for him is not applied when it benefits the contestee, but is applied when it benefits the contestant. The universal rule of law is that where the evidence shows the returns to be false and not a true statement of the votes cast such returns are impeached and destroyed, but that the true vote may be proven by calling the electors whose names are on the poll list as having voted at such election, and such votes as are proven by competent evidence should be counted for each candidate. Fraud does not invalidate the legal vote cast, but simply makes it necessary for those claiming the benefit of it to prove the vote. The rule of rejecting an entire poll is not to be adopted if it can be avoided. No investigation should be spared which would reach the truth without resorting to it. When a return is rejected for fraud, this will not disfranchise the legal voters of the precinct, but the true vote may be proven by competent evidence.

These principles of law have been uniformly held to be correct in many contested-election cases decided by the House, and are sustained in a large number of cases, a few of which are: Sixth volume American and English Encyclopedia of Law, pages 356 and 357; Washburn *vs.* Voorhees (3 Cong. El. Cases, 59); Reed *vs.* Julian (3 Cong. El. Cases, 832); Smith *vs.* Shelly (6 Cong. El. Cases, 18); Lowe *vs.* Wheeler (6 Cong. El. Cases, 61); Lynch *vs.* Chalmers (6 Cong. El. Cases, 338); Vallandigham *vs.* Campbell (2 Cong. El. Cases, 54); Covode *vs.* Foster (2 Bart., p. 600); Mann *vs.* Cassidy (1 Brewster, Penn.); Bisbee *vs.* Finley (2 Ells., p. 171); Paine on Elections, section 526, page 445; section 596, page 502.

In this contest Mr. Robbins has examined every election officer. He has examined 1,330 witnesses, all of whom testify that they voted for Robbins. What more could Robbins do? The sworn returns give it to Robbins. The sworn testimony of almost all the officers of election in the county of Dallas shows that the returns were fair. The testimony of almost 1,400 witnesses shows that the election was fair. And now shall we as judges, on the flimsiest of reasons, reverse the decree of the people that they rendered by their ballots on the 8th day of November, in the different precincts of Dallas County, Ala., and here in the Hall of the House of Representatives elect a man to represent that people? Can we afford to carry centralization to such an extent? I think not; and I hope that this House will reverse the findings of the committee and permit the contestee to retain his seat.

There is no law in Alabama which directs, compels, or authorizes the appointing board to appoint the men asked for by the contestant or contestee as officers of the election. The law does require that two of the inspectors shall be members of opposing political parties. It will be noted that this notice served upon the appointing board of Dallas County by the chairman of the Populist party and the chairman of the Republican party in Dallas County does not state to what political party the persons requested belong; and in one instance, where the man requested was appointed and served, it appears from the evidence that he was not of the opposing political party.

In some instances the persons requested were unknown to the appointing board as residents of the precincts for which they were asked to be appointed. No evidence has been offered to show that those who were not appointed for that reason, and who were unknown to the appointing board, lived either in Dallas County or in the precincts for which they were asked to be appointed, or that such persons existed at all. It appears from the evidence in the case of the sheriff, J. H. Lumpkin, and the probate judge that this duty of appointing inspectors was performed in pursuance of the law of Alabama, and in every instance where the parties requested were not appointed some good reasons existed why they should not be appointed; and the appointing board judicially determined after investigation who should be appointed as the various inspectors at the various precincts.

The statement made in the report of the majority that this board refused and neglected to give to Mr. Aldrich information prior to the election day as to what election officers had been selected for any of the precincts is not borne out by the testimony. From the testimony of Lumpkin it will appear that he had a full and free conversation with George R. Mason, the most active supporter of the contestant in Dallas County, about the persons asked to be appointed and those who were appointed and those who were not appointed, as requested. The testimony upon which the majority report that the chairman of the Aldrich campaign committee failed to receive a reply to his registered letter addressed to the probate judge of Dallas County, asking for a certified copy of the names of the inspectors and returning officers, is evidence given by G. B. Deanes in the time allowed for rebuttal testimony only, and should not be considered, because the contestee had no opportunity to reply to it or rebut it. Besides, from the testimony of the probate judge already referred to, the list of appointments for inspectors, after they had been completed, was delivered to the sheriff, who swears that each of the inspectors was notified in the usual way—registered letter—by the deputies of the sheriff.

There is a very, very curious feature of this case to which I again call the special attention of the members of this House. On page 893 of the record Mr. G. B. Deans—who was Mr. Aldrich's campaign manager—swears that he "conducted the campaign in Dallas County predicated on a contest having to be made." He also swears that in certain precincts he ordered the Republican vote to remain away from the polls—with the avowed purpose, it seems, of giving him some grounds for a contest. Mr. Aldrich has been a member of this House twice, and each time he has crept in through the knot hole of a contest instead of walking in like a man with a title undisputed and a right unchallenged.

Twice before he has been successful, and his campaign manager in the last election went on the theory that if he could not secure enough votes for Mr. Aldrich, he might land him by a contest, and so shaped his course. He admits this contemptible plan in his own sworn statement, and asks the members of this House to become sharers in his dastardly scheme. It is about time that Mr. Aldrich and his campaign managers were told that the charity of this House toward him had been exhausted, and that to obtain a seat any longer here it has become necessary for him to be elected.

Throughout its entire report, Mr. Speaker, the majority of this committee betrays a disposition to try this case on the previous contests brought here from Dallas County. I desire to protest

most emphatically against this method of procedure and to call attention to the fact that many precincts which were attacked in previous contests are admitted to have returned the votes as cast. I also desire to impress upon the House the verity that an examination of the testimony will show that in those precincts where Mr. Aldrich had election officers appointed as requested he received fewer votes than at those precincts where he did not get the men he requested.

By the process of elimination the contest now narrows to ten precincts. Of these the first is Valley Creek, No. 4. In this precinct the majority rejects the returns of the election officers and counts the vote proven by aliunde proof. To uphold his contentions in this precinct Mr. Aldrich introduced a number of colored men as witnesses. Of these 116 colored witnesses who swore that they voted for Mr. Aldrich 51 could not read and write; yet most of them promptly swore that they marked their votes for Aldrich without the assistance of either a marker or an inspector. Evidently these fellows were owls who could see in the daytime. It ought not to surprise anyone to learn that upon the poll list of this district there does not appear the names of many of the men who swore that they voted for Aldrich.

The election officers—even the Republicans—of this precinct contradict the testimony of these colored witnesses and swear the election was honest and fair. The reason for the colored witnesses contradicting the oaths of the election officers may be surmised from the fact that the evidence shows they were promised 10 cents per mile and 75 cents per day while at Stanton, and the testimony of Andrew King (page 664 of the Record), who swears that he was promised $7 per day for his time as a witness. The unreliability of the evidence of these people is shown by the evidence of Reuben Jones, who on the 8th day of April, 1899 (page 371 of the Record) swore to a statement that on the 11th day of April, 1899 (page 342 of the Record), flatly contradicted his previous oath. Moreover, the Rev. J. H. Shoaf swears (page 316 of the Record) that he was on the train that carried these colored witnesses from Selma to Stanton, and that he saw and heard them being coached to swear that they voted for Mr. Aldrich, and on page 317 of the record Mr. T. D. Kemp corroborates the affidavit of the Rev. Mr. Shoaf.

Were the rights of property in an ordinary suit depending upon the testimony of these "trained" colored witnesses, I make bold to assert that the court and jury would accept the evidence of Judge Thomas, the Republican inspector, who was introduced as a witness by Mr. Aldrich and who swore that the election was honestly conducted and the count fairly made, together with the evidence of the Republican marker, Keneely, and the other election officers to the same effect, in preference to the unreliable, untrustworthy evidence offered by Mr. Aldrich in this precinct to impeach the returns by witnesses who had evidently been tampered with and trained as to how to testify.

Orrville precinct is the next one under discussion, and in their treatment of it the majority performs some wonderful acts of political contortion. In this precinct the majority report counts no votes for either, although the report finds that Aldrich proved 5 votes and Robbins 75 by aliunde proof. They here follow the rule of rejecting a precinct for fraud, and refusing to count any of the votes proven, although in Valley Creek precinct, discussed just above, they counted for Aldrich and Robbins the votes they found were proven by the aliunde testimony for each. Upon what principle of law or justice this distinction is made we are unable to say. The counting of the votes in one precinct and refusing to count them in another precinct, to say the least of it, is remarkable.

This is one of the precincts in which the contestant's election manager, Deanes, ordered the Republican supporters of Aldrich not to come to the polls and vote, and although the election is proven to have been fairly and honestly conducted by the election officers, the entire vote is discarded. Verily, the majority here are playing a game of catch as catch can. Their actions recall the comical situations of the play called "A New Way to Pay Old Debts."

Next in order comes Lexington precinct. Here again the majority reject and discard entirely the official returns from this precinct and refuse to count the votes that were proven by aliunde proof for either party. It will again be observed that in this precinct the vote proven for Robbins by the aliunde proof far exceeds that of the contestant.

At this precinct there was appointed as the representative of the opposing political party Simon Armstrong, a colored Republican and supporter of Aldrich, who swears that he is a Republican; that he can read and write, and that he voted for Aldrich in this election: so the statement of the majority that Simon Armstrong, a colored Democrat, was selected to serve with W. W. Berry and J. M. Mosely, white Democrats, is not borne out by the testimony.

This is also a precinct at which Republican voters were instructed not to vote. It has been charged by the contestant that the name of one of the witnesses for contestee, B. F. Moseley, who testified that he voted for contestee, did not appear upon the poll list at this election. This is not true, because on the poll list for this district the name of B. F. Moseley does appear as No. 14.

The only other evidence offered by contestant relative to this precinct was by Van Perry and Mike West, who were offered in the time for rebuttal testimony.

To sustain the returns, contestee offered Simon Armstrong, the Republican inspector who voted for Aldrich, and who does sustain the returns in every particular. He swears that he voted for Aldrich, marked his own ticket for Aldrich, was present at the count, issued the tickets, wrote the initials of his name on the stubs, took the tickets out of the box, examined every ticket taken out of the box to see how it was marked; that he examined the tally sheets being kept, and that the number of ballots in the box corresponded with the poll list, and that the election was fairly and honestly held, the vote fairly counted, and the returns made accordingly.

Besides, contestee put up 36 witnesses, whose names appear on the poll list, who swore that they voted for him.

Now we must consider Cahaba precinct. Here again we have the majority of the committee shifting their rule as to precincts the integrity of which has been attacked and counting for the contestant the votes he is alleged to have proven and for the contestee the votes he is alleged to have proven. It is again to be remarked that when these votes proven by aliunde testimony are counted in this precinct, the contestant proves a large vote and the contestee a small number, according to the report.

The next precinct in dispute is Burnsville. Here it was that the Mr. Thompson of whom the majority "think so highly" was inspector. Thompson is the only witness of the hundreds put on the stand who swore there was any fraud in Dallas County. The majority calls him an "honest man," and yet this "honest man," on the day after election, swore that the returns of this precinct were honest, and after, on the stand, swore they were false. Does an honest man do that kind of thing? Is it fair for this House to unseat a man on the evidence of a man who thus contradicts himself in his oaths?

It is a fact to be remarked upon that this Inspector Thompson, whom the majority of the committee speak of as an honest man, signed the returns without protest or compulsion, freely and voluntarily, without suggesting or intimating to any one of the election officers that he had the night before counted the ballots and permitted what—if his testimony is true—was a wrong upon the man whom he had been appointed to represent to go unnoticed and unchallenged.

It is a familiar principle of law "that he who does not prevent a crime when he can is considered as participating in it."

To repeat the law Latin maxim: "Qui non obstat cum possit facere videtur."

This is called "a bold fraud" by the majority of the committee. The attention of the House is called to the fact that these Democratic election officers, contemplating and intending to commit a fraud, when the dispute arose as to the counting of the ballots, before the ballot box had been opened or the ballots examined, placed them in the keeping of the Aldrich inspector and left them with him in the ballot box, which had no fastenings, and was accessible to him or anyone else who might desire to go into it, at his house for the entire night. The ballot box and the ballots, from the time of the close of the election until the count began, were never in the possession of anyone except the Aldrich inspector. People who contemplate and conspire to perpetrate fraud do not thus act.

The aliunde vote of Union precinct shows Robbins to have received more votes than Aldrich, and of course it is rejected.

My time is growing short, and I want to turn to City precinct, 36, as it is the largest and most important precinct.

This precinct cast the largest vote of any in the county, being the precinct of the city of Selma, containing a population of 10,000 and more. The official returns gave—

Aldrich	79
Robbins	922

There are fully 1,300 registered voters, over four-fifths of whom are white Democrats. The returns of the precinct were attacked as fraudulent by contestant on the following grounds:

I charge and claim that I was denied full legal representation at said polling place, and that there were not more than 500 votes actually cast, and of that number I am entitled to not less than 250 and you less than 450 votes.

The witnesses offered by contestant to sustain these charges testified that the inspector he asked for, James Golson, was appointed and acted; at the request of the Republican chairman of Dallas County O. O. Moore was appointed marker, and at the time nothing was said as to appointing a clerk. The man appointed came with the Republican chairman, who made the request, and he was appointed marker. It is true that upon a typewritten list handed to the inspectors there appear the names of four persons from which it was asked that a marker and clerk be appointed, but none of them were present except Moore, and he was appointed marker, and nothing was said at the time as to a clerk by the Republican chairman, for R. D. Walker, one of the inspectors, swore that if any person had been presented to act as clerk he would have been appointed.

Besides, the managers were compelled to send up in the town to secure another clerk, only one being present. It should be remembered that contestant had an inspector at the precinct selected by him, who acted with the other two in this appointment, and who does not deny the evidence of the 10 Democratic inspectors, but who signed the returns and is not offered by contestant as a witness. We must conclude that contestant could not prove anything by him which would in any way impeach the returns.

There being no clerk presented for contestant, the two clerks, Milhous and Patterson, were appointed.

These requirements as to the appointment of clerks are not mandatory but are directory, and an unintentional failure to comply with them would not vitiate the returns. In order for the failure to do certain specified acts or the doing of certain prohibited specific acts to be fatal to the validity of the election, the statute must declare such acts or the omission to do such things as fatal to the election—that is, in order to destroy a return for the failure of the officers to perform certain requirements in the method of conducting the election the law must be mandatory—that is, it must declare that the failure to perform these duties avoids the election.

Ignorance, inadvertence, mistake, or even intentional wrong on the part of the officials should not be permitted to disfranchise the district, and unless the statute plainly shows that the legislature intended compliance with the provision in relation to the manner of procedure as essential to the validity of the election it is to be regarded as directory only. Nor are statutory provisions relating to elections rendered mandatory by the circumstance that the officers of the election are criminally liable for their violation. The rule prescribed by law for conducting elections is designed chiefly to afford opportunity for the people to exercise the elective franchise, and to prevent illegal voting, and to ascertain the true result. As such rules are directory, and not mandatory, a departure from the mode prescribed will not vitiate the returns of the election. (See Paine on Elections, 497, 498, and the notes thereto; see also Rinaker *vs.* Downing, decided by Committee on Elections No. 1 in the Fifty-fourth Congress.)

From these principles we conclude that the failure to appoint a clerk from this list for the contestant was a failure to perform a merely directory duty imposed by statute, and such a failure does not and can not vitiate the poll. Besides, the testimony clearly shows that the omission was not intentional, but a mere oversight, and that duty would have been performed and the provision complied with if the persons named on the list had been presented or had appeared. Besides, the list did not conform to the statute, in that it did not contain the number of names required; and, moreover, it is admitted by the proof and undisputed that O. O. Moore, the only person on this list that was present, was in fact appointed, as requested, and that the only reason another was not appointed was because none were present; and it would be unreasonable to demand that the election should have been delayed until these could be hunted up and produced by contestant's representatives.

See also 6 Am. and Eng. Ency. of Law, page 325; McCreary on Elections, 190, and cases cited; and the case of O'Neil *vs.* Joy, views of the minority, which declares:

> No case has been discovered sanctioning the conclusion that the voter should be deprived of his vote by the omission of the election officers to discharge a duty imposed upon them by law. It is only when the statute has declared the ballot to be void or forbids it to be counted that the court have felt obliged to sanction its exclusion.

See also Paine on Elections, sec. 360-373, note 3; Quinn *vs.* Latimore (120 N. C.); Clark *vs.* Robbins (88 Ill., 498); Barnes *vs.* Adams (2 Bart., 764); People *vs.* Wilson, (62 N. Y., 190).

Therefore the conclusion of the majority to reject the returns because of the failure of the election officers to appoint a clerk from the list furnished, who was not present and failed to appear, can not be sustained under the well-settled rules of law; but they are in the face of the law. They, the majority, not only reject the votes, but reject the poll.

The conclusion of the majority of the committee to reject the precinct because there are alleged to be found on the poll list 80 persons who were not registered is equally untenable, and can not be sustained either by the text writers, decisions of the courts, or the precedents in Congressional contested-election cases. On the subject I cite the following: Paine on Elections, sections Nos. 359, 360, and 374, and notes. The case of Dale *vs.* Irwin (78 Ill., 170). This case arose under the Illinois statute, which provided that—

> No vote should be received at any State, county, town, or city election if the name of the person offering to vote be not in the said register made on Tuesday or Wednesday preceding the election, etc.

The supreme court of Illinois held as follows:

> It is claimed that as the others voted without having been registered and without any proof of right, their votes are invalid. It does not appear that these votes were challenged or any objections made to their voting, and the presumption must be that they were legal voters, and so known to the judges.

The court not only decided that rejection of unregistered voters did not invalidate the poll, but that the fact that they were permitted to vote unchallenged, and that the ballots were deposited in box and honestly counted, prevented the rejection of the votes.

In a later case the same court reviewed this case (see Clark *vs.* Robinson, 88 Ill., page 498) and decided—

> That the prohibition of the statute in this regard was but directory against receiving such a vote, and that the failure of observance of this direction would not invalidate such a vote which had been received by the judge of elections and deposited in the ballot box.

How much less would such conduct of election officers invalidate the poll. This last case from Illinois is quoted with approval by the Committee on Elections No. 1, in the Fifty-fourth Congress, in its report of the case of Rinaker *vs.* Downing, which was finally adopted by the House. The House has dealt with the question and has never held that the precinct should be rejected because unregistered voters are permitted to vote; but it has decided that the votes should not be counted, but be deducted from the candidate for whom cast. To this effect are the following: Paine on Elections, sections 362, 363; Finley *vs.* Walls, Smith Election Cases, 367; Bell *vs.* Snyder, Smith Election Cases, 247; McCrary on Elections, page 445.

I might multiply authorities, but I content myself by asserting that no respectable authority can be cited to sustain the conclusion of the majority that the entire poll should be rejected because voters whose names did not appear on the poll list were permitted to vote.

I insist that the credible and trustworthy evidence does not show that a much larger vote was cast for Aldrich than was returned for him.

According to the report of the majority, Aldrich proved that he received 136 votes, which is 57 more than he was given in the returns. Twenty-one ballots were so badly marked that they were not counted, evidently cast by ignorant voters for Aldrich. That would make only a difference of 36. Ten of contestant's witnesses swore they voted for him, who are neither on the poll list or registration list. Nine whose names are not on the poll list also swear they voted for him, which would leave only 7 votes, the difference between the vote which was returned for him and the votes he proved.

It is true that 102 witnesses testified that they voted for contestant and marked their own tickets, but of this number that did testify 86 can neither read nor write; and the proof is abundant that they were coached and drilled and instructed how to swear and what to swear; and when I find that a number of them are neither on the poll nor registration list, and view with that suspicion and caution I should the testimony of such witnesses, and remember that the statements were made by the voter as to how he voted months after the election, and when witness fees and mileage were to be earned, as well as a free ride on the railroad, he must indeed be a very credulous man who accepts such evidence as proof sufficient to destroy the solemn returns of election officers, one of whom was a partisan of contestant; and also in preference to the testimony of the election officers, who testify as to the correctness and truthfulness of the returns and the fairness of the election.

While it is true that some of the voters on the poll list who testified that they voted for Robbins are not to be found on the registration list, there are not as many as 80. A comparison shows that many names on the poll list which are alleged by contestant not to be on the registration list are on the registration list; yet the only result of this must be to deduct from Robbins the votes of those whose names can not be found on the registration list. I believe the most of these are clerical errors on the part of the clerks of the election in putting down the name of the voters as they are called out when voting, either getting the initials wrong, writing it down according to the sound, and in many instances the errors have been made in copying the poll and registration list.

Besides, the evidence is that many voters brought their registration certificates, and when these were shown the list was not consulted.

I believe the proof shows that the election was fairly and honestly held, the votes honestly counted as cast, and honestly returned.

The statement that many persons obtained their ballots illegally is not fully justified by the evidence, since it is evident that the witnesses confused this election with the previous primary elections, where the tickets voted were not issued officially, three primary elections having been held shortly before this one. The testimony of all the election officers is clear that no tickets were furnished illegally or in violation of the statute of Alabama, and I do not think that the entire poll should be rejected for that reason, but only the unregistered votes deducted. The majority of the committee, while they say that the testimony taken in rebuttal when it should have been taken in chief should not be considered, yet they undertake to prejudice the case by stating what this testimony shows, with caustic comment. I think that the precinct can not be successfully rejected upon the legal testimony taken in chief by contestant and contestee, and to decide to reject it on the testimony taken in the time allowed by statute for testimony in rebuttal only is both illegal, contrary to

the statutes and precedents of the House, and at the same time manifestly unjust and unfair to the contestee, who has had no opportunity to meet it.

If the contestee were given time or opportunity to meet this evidence, he demonstrated to the committee that he could successfully meet this new testimony, without which, I repeat, this precinct can not legally or justly be rejected.

I conclude, therefore, with reference to this precinct, that the election was fairly and honestly held and the returns honestly and correctly made. There should be deducted from the contestee's vote the votes of those who voted for him who are shown not to have been registered. I have found great difficulty in verifying the exact number, but find 65 voters on the poll list whose names are not on the registered list who, it is claimed, voted for Robbins.

The evidence does not show for whom all these voted, but there were examined 28 voters who swore they voted for Robbins whose names do not appear on the registration list. If all these are deducted from Robbins's vote, then this precinct would stand:

Aldrich	79
Robbins	857

I therefore find that the precincts in Dallas County should stand as returned, except as follows:

	Aldrich.	Robbins.
No. 1	28	54
No. 2	32	80
No. 22	1	16
No. 36	79	857
The other precincts as returned gave the following vote	252	1,431
The votes in the other counties	5,296	4,477
Total	5,685	6,915
		5,685
This leaves as the result, majority for Robbins		1,230

To summarize the whole vote, then, Mr. Speaker, and to show the vote as the minority claims it should stand, I submit the following enumeration of the votes in each precinct of this Congressional district.

By the report of the majority the following precincts in Dallas County are counted as returned:

No	Precinct.	Aldrich.	Robbins.
1	Plantersville	28	54
2	Summerfield	32	80
3	Woodlawn	3	98
4			
5	Harrells	0	18
6	Dublin	0	24
7	Martins	1	90
8			
9			
10	River (no election)		
11	Pine Flat (no election)		
12	Old Town	0	56
13	Pleasant Hill	0	29
14	Richmond	0	21
15	Portland (no election)		
16			
22			
23			
24			
25	Liberty Hill	3	77
26	Bells	8	3
27	Vernon	1	19
28			
29	Browns	0	19
30			
31	Smyleys	3	41
32	Elm Bluff	0	10
33	Carlowville	6	35
34	Boykins	0	24
35	Mitchells	2	28
	Total	87	666

Votes proven by aliunde evidence in the ten contested precincts in Dallas County:

No.	Precinct.	Aldrich.	Robbins.
4	Valley Creek	151	41
8	Orville	3	75
9	Lexington	2	36
16	Cahaba	5	8
22	Burnsville	1	16
23	Union	5	34
24	Pences	0	44
28	Marion Junction	0	40
30	Kings	0	9
36	City	196	626
	Total	363	929

Vote in contested and uncontested precincts.

	Aldrich.	Robbins.
Vote in district, uncontested	5,293	4,477
Vote in Dallas County, uncontested	87	666
In contested precincts, vote in Dallas County proven by aliunde evidence	303	929
Total	5,683	6,072

Majority for Robbins, 389.

I have tried, Mr. Speaker, to give an impartial résumé of this case. I hold that, with every contention of Mr. Aldrich granted, Mr. Robbins yet has a majority of 389. I hold that Mr. Aldrich should not be allowed to creep into a seat in this House through the knot hole of a contest for the third time. I believe this House should tell him that it is necessary to be elected to obtain a seat here. I contend that by every tenet of law, by every dictate of justice, by every rule of right, Mr. Robbins is entitled to the seat he now holds. To deprive him of that seat would be worse than robbery. It would be legalized theft. To deprive him of that seat would be an act of injustice rank enough to cause the statues of justice in this grand edifice to weep salt tears of bitter sorrow. In the name of justice I appeal to you members of this House to think, to feel, to do only the holy right, to cast partisanship aside and vote for Gaston A. Robbins to retain the seat to which he has been honestly elected. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

The Puerto Rico Tariff.

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. DALY,

OF NEW JERSEY,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, February 23, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 8245) to regulate the trade of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes—

Mr. DALY of New Jersey said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It was not my intention to take part in this debate until I read the views of the minority of the Committee on Ways and Means, in which report the following language was used:

As late as the 19th of January the chairman of this committee [Mr. PAYNE] declared by the introduction of House bill 6883, to which the pending bill is offered as a substitute, against the policy of this bill and in favor of free trade between the United States and Puerto Rico.

Now, will the gentleman from New York answer my question? Is it true that you introduced such a bill?

Mr. PAYNE. The files of the house will show. I think it was about the 19th.

Mr. DALY of New Jersey. I am not asking about the date, but as to whether a bill of that character was introduced by the gentleman.

Mr. PAYNE. I introduced a bill for a tariff on goods imported from foreign ports into Puerto Rico, and by implication made it free between Puerto Rico and the United States, and also extending the internal-revenue laws to Puerto Rico.

Mr. DALY of New Jersey. In this minority report it is stated, "We do not know why these sudden changes have occurred." Will the gentleman state why the changes have occurred?

Mr. PAYNE. "The gentleman" explained that fully in his remarks, which the gentleman from New Jersey can read in the RECORD.

Mr. DALY of New Jersey. I have looked at the RECORD and have read your speech, and find no explicit statement of the causes that led to this change. I find nothing in the RECORD explaining that.

Mr. PAYNE. I am very sorry I did not get myself up and down to the comprehension of my friend. I had hoped, however, to do it.

Mr. DALY of New Jersey. I may be obtuse, but I do not think I am. The explanation is just about as satisfactory as those given by the members on your side of the House when a query is propounded. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. SULZER. Will the gentleman from New Jersey permit a question?

Mr. DALY of New Jersey. Yes, sir.

Mr. SULZER. In your opinion as a lawyer, do you believe this bill constitutional?

Mr. DALY of New Jersey. I do not think I have risen to the

height of a constitutional lawyer, but I certainly rank as high as some of the gentlemen who have discussed this question on the other side of the House. I believe the provisions of this bill are unconstitutional. [Applause.] Of course, it might require an extensive argument to convince either the minority or the majority of this House, but nevertheless I believe it is unconstitutional.

Mr. Chairman, by virtue of the Constitution of the United States the President is vested with that high and important prerogative to recommend to the consideration of Congress such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient. In line with that constitutional requirement, he, on the opening of the present Congress, made this pleading and touching suggestion for our guidance:

It must be borne in mind that since its cession Puerto Rico has been denied the principal markets she has long enjoyed, and our tariffs have been continued against her products as when she was under Spanish sovereignty. The markets of Spain are closed to her products except upon terms to which the commerce of all nations is subjected. The island of Cuba, which used to buy her cattle and tobacco without custom duties, now imposes the same duties upon her products as upon those from any other country entering her ports. She has, therefore, lost her free intercourse with Spain and Cuba without any compensating benefits in our market. Her coffee is little known and not in use by our people, and therefore there is no demand here for it. It is one of her chief products. The markets of the United States should be opened to Puerto Rican products. Our plain duty is to abolish all customs tariffs between the United States and Puerto Rico and give her products free access to our markets.

In pursuance of the recommendation of the Executive, the Committee on Ways and Means reported to this House, as admitted by the gentleman from New York, a bill providing for absolute free trade with the island of Puerto Rico, and again, on the 24th of the same month, this same committee reported another bill to "regulate the trade of Puerto Rico, etc.," and among its provisions is found:

That on and after the passage of this act the same tariff customs and duties shall be levied, collected, and paid upon all articles imported into Puerto Rico from ports other than those of the United States which are required by law to be collected upon articles imported into the United States from foreign countries.

SEC. 3. That on and after the passage of this act all merchandise coming into the United States from Puerto Rico and coming into Puerto Rico from the United States shall be entered at the several ports of entry upon payment of 25 per cent of the duties which are required to be levied, collected, and paid upon like articles of merchandise imported from foreign countries, and in addition thereto, upon articles of merchandise of Puerto Rican manufacture coming into the United States, customs duties equal in rate and amount to the internal-revenue tax which may be imposed in the United States upon the same articles of merchandise of domestic manufacture, and upon articles of the United States manufacture coming into Puerto Rico, customs duties equal in rate and amount to the internal-revenue tax which may be imposed in Puerto Rico upon the same articles of Puerto Rican manufacture.

In the language of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS]—

It does not provide for free trade between the islands and the United States, but fixes the rate of duty that shall be paid on all imports from Puerto Rico into the United States at 25 per cent of the duties charged on like articles from other foreign ports, and provides also that all articles imported into Puerto Rico from the United States shall only pay 25 per cent of the rate of duty imposed there upon like articles from other foreign countries, with this proviso: That on all articles imported from Puerto Rico into the United States, where internal-revenue duty is imposed in this country, that the custom duty shall be 25 per cent of the duty imposed on like articles from foreign countries plus the revenue tax levied and collected on the articles produced or manufactured in this country. It will thus be seen that under this bill the question is presented as to whether Puerto Rico and the Philippine Islands, under the treaty of peace entered into between this Government and Spain, become integral parts of the United States, or whether they can be treated as territory and separate and distinct custom laws and internal-revenue laws imposed there from what are levied, collected, and paid in the United States.

The attempt to impose this law upon the people of Puerto Rico is a departure by the Government from its recognized policy in dealing with newly acquired possessions since the date of the adoption of the Federal Constitution; in other words, since this country acquired its first territory outside of the original thirteen States. The policy proposed is foreign to the principles that have ever governed our country. Methinks that if a proposition had been made to levy a duty upon the products of the new acquisitions of Louisiana or Florida or Texas, it would have been impressed upon those who made the proposition that they were not free from guilt of treasonable utterance.

In the whole history of our country and its acquisitions it has never been suggested to the present time that this Constitution of ours was not intended for new acquired possessions as well as for the States. We insist that Puerto Rico is a part of and belongs to the United States, that no discriminating duty can be levied against her productions imported into the States, and that the Congress of the United States can not legislate against Puerto Rico any more than against the State of New Jersey in favor of New York.

Clearly Chief Justice Marshall was of the opinion that Territories have constitutional rights and are entitled to protection with other portions of the United States. In the case of Loughborough *vs.* Blake (5 Wheaton, page 319) this distinguished lawyer laid down the following proposition:

The eighth section of the first article gives to Congress the "power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises" for the purpose thereinafter mentioned. This grant is general, without limitation as to place. It consequently extends to all places over which the Government extends. If this could be doubted, the doubt is removed by the subsequent words, which modify the grant. These words are: "But all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States." It will not be contended that the modification of the power extends to places to which the power itself does not extend.

The power, then, to lay and collect duties, imposts, and excises may be exercised, and must be exercised, throughout the United States. Does this term designate the whole or any particular portion of the American empire? Certainly this question can admit of but one answer. It is the name given to our great Republic, which is composed of States and Territories. The District of Columbia or the territory west of the Missouri is not less within the United States than Maryland or Pennsylvania, and it is not less necessary, on the principles of our Constitution that uniformity in the imposition of imposts, duties, and excises shall be observed in the one than the other. Since, then, the power to lay and collect taxes, which includes direct taxes, is obviously coextensive with the power to lay and collect duties, imposts, and excises, and since the latter extends throughout the United States, it follows that the power to impose direct taxes also extends throughout the United States.

Upon the opinion of this great jurist we might rest our case with safety. Age commands for it veneration. Its reasoning is in harmony with the spirit of our institutions. But I go further and make my proposition impregnable by reference to a line of decisions which reaffirm the principles there enunciated.

Mr. Justice Brewer, in the case of Fong Yue Ting *vs.* United States (149 U. S., 738), in a dissenting opinion, said:

The Constitution has potency everywhere within the limits of our territory, and the powers which the National Government may exercise within such limits are those and only those given it by that instrument.

In the case of United States *vs.* More (3 Cranch, 160) Chief Justice Marshall laid down this proposition:

The Constitution was made for every citizen of the United States, and there is no citizen, whatever his condition, or wherever he may be, within the territory of the United States who has not a right to its protection.

In the decision in the Dred Scott case, reported in 19 Howard, 393, Chief Justice Taney declared:

The power of Congress over the person and property of a citizen can never be a mere discretionary power under our Constitution and form of government. The power of the Government and the rights and privileges of the citizen are regulated and plainly defined by the Constitution itself. And when territory becomes a part of the United States the Federal Government enters into possession in the character impressed upon it by those who created it. It enters upon it with its powers over the citizen strictly defined and limited by the Constitution, from which it derives its own existence, and by virtue of which alone it continues to exist and act as a government and sovereignty. It has no power of any kind beyond it, and it can not when it enters a Territory of the United States put off its character and assume discretionary or despotic powers which the Constitution has denied to it. It can not create for itself a new character separated from the citizens of the United States and the duties it owes them under the provisions of the Constitution. The territory being part of the United States, the Government and the citizen both enter it under the authority of the Constitution, with their respective rights defined and marked out, and the Federal Government can exercise no power beyond what that instrument confers, nor lawfully deny any right which it has reserved. * * *

In Thompson *vs.* Utah (170 U. S., 346) Justice Harlan said:

That the provisions of the Constitution of the United States relating to the right of trial by jury in suits at common law apply to the Territories of the United States is no longer an open question.

In Murphy *vs.* Ramsey (114 U. S., 15) the court says:

The people of the United States, as sovereign owners of the national Territories, have supreme power over them and their inhabitants. In the exercise of this sovereign dominion they are represented by the Government of the United States, to whom all the powers of the Government over that subject have been delegated, subject only to such restrictions as are expressed in the Constitution or are necessarily implied in its terms.

The force of these decisions exemplify the proposition that in legislating for the newly acquired territory Congress must be guided by the Constitution.

All the territory of the Union is the common property of all of the States. Every member—new and old—of the Union, admitted to partnership under the Constitution, has a perfect right to enjoy the territory which is the common property of all. Some of the property heretofore acquired, now States, was obtained by treaty with England, much of it by cession from other nations, and other by treaties with the Indians; still larger areas were acquired by purchase from Spain, France, and Russia, and paid for with money drawn through customs duties and taxes imposed upon the citizens of all of the States; large tracts were secured by the annexation of Texas, and the late war has added Puerto Rico and other properties, since which acquisitions these vast territories have been entered by the citizens of the United States and by those of Europe who choose to migrate thither, and no citizen of the United States was debarred from moving there with his property and enjoying the liberties guaranteed by the Constitution.

It is an astounding and monstrous proposition to suggest that one of our citizens, migrating to this new Puerto Rican territory acquired by our Government, shall enjoy there fewer privileges or have more burdens placed upon him than those enjoyed and borne by our fathers in the days of former territorial acquisition, and this in face of the constitutional provision that "duties, imposts, and excises should be uniform throughout the United States." The edict laid down by the Constitution that all men were equal and that no one part of our citizens, no matter in what part of the territory they should live, should stand in a position of vassalage to the Federal Government is as good to-day as when enunciated.

The distinguished gentlemen on the other side who have argued this proposition have declared that the provision of the Constitution that Congress shall have the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting territory, etc., invested them with plenary powers to legislate for such territory. It has never been denied on this side of the Chamber that the power was vested in Congress to legislate for the Territories, nor has it ever been questioned that Congress had the right to establish a permanent form of government; but we have always insisted that that power must be exercised according to the spirit of the Constitution. It can not be said with constitutional sanction that Congress can establish a little kingdom and give some one unlimited control over the people of that territory, and this for the plain reason that such an act would be repugnant to the intent and spirit of the Constitution.

The Constitution affords all necessary and needful authority for the proper legislation and rule of the Territories. The Constitution gives Congress power to legislate for the Territories in those matters which are of pressing importance, such as establishing courts of justice, providing means for local Territorial government, and the establishment of a system to pave the way to admit such territory into the United States. The Territories belonging to us are not dependencies, such as Australia and the Indies are to England, nor can any territory ever be acquired by us be such, for the superstructure upon which this Government rests is antagonistic to any theory looking toward dependencies or a colonial system. What we have are, and what we may acquire will be, integral parts of this country, entitled to take position alongside of the existing States as soon as they shall have sufficient population and other requisites of political existence. The Constitution intended to guarantee to each and every citizen of the Union the right to live and enjoy his property in any part of the Territory which he might select for his residence, and the imposition of discriminating burdens upon any class is clearly unconstitutional.

Mr. Chairman, I will not attempt to longer traverse the ground that has been so ably covered by the gentlemen who have preceded me, but aside from the constitutional question, I will, for a few moments, speak of the moral side.

The President in his message appealed for free trade, not from a constitutional standpoint, but from one equally as high, that justice be done these people; that they being a part of the autonomy of this country our gates should be open to them that they might enjoy the blessings of free trade between the people of one great country. He spoke of the markets of Spain being closed against her, and that she had lost her free intercourse with Spain and Cuba without any compensating benefits in our markets; that her coffee was little known and used by our people; and then with an ennobling sentiment declared, "It is our plain duty to abolish customs and tariffs and give her products free access to our markets."

This was a sentiment that should come from the Chief Magistrate of a great nation, and it indicated a spirit that was consonant with our institutions. Her fair fields had been swept by a hurricane, and his suggestions were in line with the feelings of a statesman and a patriot. The Secretary of War, too, viewed the conditions from a humanatarian standpoint, and rose to the height of the occasion and the dignity of the office he occupied when he pleaded that free trade be granted this beautiful isle of the sea. How touching when he says:

> They are left in hunger and absolute poverty; they will be discontented, intractable, and mutinous. The highest consideration of justice and good faith demand that we should not disappoint the confident expectation of sharing in our prosperity with which the people of Puerto Rico so gladly transferred their allegiance to the United States, and that we should treat the interests of this people as our own; and I wish most strongly to urge that the customs duties between the people of Puerto Rico and the United States be removed.

Again:

> Their products are, in the main, coffee, sugar, and tobacco. The prosperity of the island depends upon their success in selling these articles, and I most strongly urge that the customs duties between Puerto Rico and the United States be removed.

Aye, too, the great merchants' association of New York pleaded from the same standpoint that trade be opened up between them, and importuned the Congress of the United States to grant the request of the President. The people of the island ask not for charity; ask not for aid that they may rise from the ruins and devastation which are the result of the storm that swept over their land; but say, Give us free trade, give us local government, and we will become fit citizens of the great Republic to which through an accident of war we have allied our faith.

For these humane and moral reasons suggested by the President, the Secretary of War, the merchants, and the people of Puerto Rico, I ask that this bill become not a law.

Mr. Chairman, I am done. We can not afford to strike down the Constitution; we can not afford to violate the duty which by the ties of humanity and justice we owe these people. If this bill becomes a law, it will violate both, and the wrath of a liberty-loving people will certainly be visited upon your party.

Revenue for Puerto Rico.

It seeks not to hinder and oppress, but to help and bless.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES T. McCLEARY,

OF MINNESOTA.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, February 28, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 8245) to regulate the trade of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes—

Mr. McCLEARY said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: A problem well stated is half solved. What is the problem now demanding solution?

As the result of a war entered upon with the loftiest purposes and at the practically unanimous demand of the American people without regard to section, party, or creed, we find ourselves in possession of Puerto Rico, the Philippines, and other islands. These possessions bring to us new privileges and new responsibilities. These must be met in a spirit worthy of a great people.

THE PRESENT PROBLEM STATED.

With the transfer of Puerto Rico to the United States its former market in Spain was, of course, made less accessible. To add to its troubles a hurricane recently swept over the island, destroying many of the plantations. The people of Puerto Rico are in urgent need of relief. They need money and they need it at once!

Puerto Rico touches an especially tender place in the American heart. The island is small, being only about 80 miles long by about 40 wide. In the late war its people not only offered us no resistance but welcomed our soldiers with glad acclaim. They looked upon us and treated us as friends and deliverers. So their present need appeals strongly to the natural chivalry of the American people.

The present problem, then, is how to render the Puerto Ricans assistance most promptly and efficiently, with best results to them and with least embarrassment to the nation in the future.

My own first impression was that, of course, the kindest and best thing to do would be to proceed immediately to extend to Puerto Rico our fiscal system, giving her free access to our markets. But upon further investigation of the situation I have become satisfied that to give her immediate free trade would be to "keep the word of promise to the ear but break it to the hope."

THE ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED.

Extending to Puerto Rico our fiscal system would indeed free the people there from tariff duties between them and us, *but it would necessarily at the same time impose upon them our internal-revenue system.* This would give them a system of taxation to which they are largely unaccustomed, and which at the present time would bear very heavily upon them, especially upon the poor. We must remember that in Puerto Rico there are operated in many of the homes of the poor people little cigar factories and other small industries, *on which our internal-revenue system would be a burden almost intolerable.* The importance of this fact in relation to the question at issue, Mr. Chairman, can hardly be overestimated. In fact, it should of itself practically decide the question.

Moreover, in the transition state from Spain's control to ours, having only a temporary military government, Puerto Rico lacks the machinery for laying and collecting taxes. And further, and most important, much time would necessarily be consumed before the required money could be available.

In view of these facts, the present urgent need would have to be met either by an appropriation out of our National Treasury or by an insular loan.

If it were necessary, I have no doubt that the people of the United States would cheerfully contribute as a national gift whatever might be required to relieve the suffering of the island. But if the present need can be met in some other and better way, it seems wise not to establish what might prove to be a bad precedent.

A very large majority of the people of Puerto Rico are badly in debt. Their plantations have been devastated by a hurricane. Their property is mortgaged. But the island itself has come to us from under the rule of Spain without a public debt. To be sure, it has few public improvements, much as it needs them. But it would hardly comport with our ideas of desirable action to signalize the beginning of our control by having the island plunge into debt and issue bonds.

Immediate free trade, then, necessarily implies great present hardship to the people. It would also necessitate either a gift

from the National Treasury or a bonded debt for the island. The former would be humiliating to Puerto Rico, the latter to us.

The other alternative is that embodied in the pending bill. What is it? It is essentially this: To reduce the present tariff rates on goods carried between Puerto Rico and the United States by 85 per cent—that is, to charge only 15 per cent of the present rates—and *turn over to Puerto Rico the entire proceeds of the collections at both ends of the line for the use and benefit of her people.* Every other provision in the bill is inserted simply to protect the people of the United States from having their generosity abused by people for whose benefit it was not intended.

WHO WILL PAY THE MONEY?

Who will pay this money? Not the poor among the people of Puerto Rico. Not the small planters. Indeed, only part of it will be paid at all by inhabitants of Puerto Rico. Part of it will be paid by persons who sell goods to Puerto Rico and reap the profit of that trade.

The principal exports of Puerto Rico, in the order of importance, are coffee, sugar, and tobacco. In ordinary years coffee is by far the most important, being about three-fourths of the total export. Coffee is on the free list now and remains so under the pending bill.

As to the other two crops, it is important to remember that *they are not now owned by the planters. They have been sold and are now in warehouses waiting to be shipped.* It is important to remember also that *the Dingley tariff law is still in operation* between Puerto Rico and the United States as to goods coming into the United States.

When the shrewd brokers and exporters of Puerto Rico who now have these crops in their warehouses bought them from the farmers, they of course paid the farmers only such prices as would enable them to export the crops at a profit even under the full Dingley rates. *We hold it, therefore, neither a hardship nor an injustice to these men, under such circumstances, to require them when exporting those crops to the United States to pay to Uncle Sam, as trustee, a part of the Dingley rates, the proceeds to be sent back to Puerto Rico for the benefit of the farmers from whom the crops were originally bought.* This is practically a refund to those farmers of a part of that which they themselves in fact originally contributed.

Those who are urging immediate free trade are, unconsciously and with the best of intentions in most cases, urging a course which would enable these speculators to add to their profits the full Dingley tariff; urging a course under which none of these profits would be refunded to the people of Puerto Rico. This is what the Puerto Rican lobby now in Washington seem to want.

Already, under the pressure of widespread demand, the very reasonable amount of 25 per cent reserved in the original bill to be sent back to the people of Puerto Rico has been cut down to 15 per cent. I hope and trust that this House will have the courage to preserve at least this 15 per cent for the poor people in Puerto Rico, who have no lobby here and no money with which to send anyone to look after their interests.

Personally I would have preferred to leave the rate at 25 per cent of the present rates, as originally provided in the bill, or to fix even a higher rate for this year, because that would have given an income more nearly adequate to the needs of the island. I have some fear that the revenue produced by the rate prescribed in the bill as amended will not prove sufficient.

It is hoped and expected that if this bill becomes a law the reduction in the tariff rates will induce prompt selling of the crops now in the warehouses, and that thus will promptly be secured the means with which to relieve the suffering in Puerto Rico.

WHAT WILL BE DONE WITH THE MONEY?

Under section 4 of the bill, *every dollar collected, not only that collected in Puerto Rico itself but also that collected here on goods coming from that island, will be put into a separate fund for the sole benefit of Puerto Rico.* How will it be used? In the building of roads and schoolhouses and other public improvements, and in such other ways as in the discretion of the President may seem wise and kind. How will this afford the help now needed? Many of the people will find direct employment in the construction of these improvements. These people will thus have the means with which to buy food and other necessaries, the demand for which will give employment to other people; and so the beneficent work will go on, touching and helping all the people, renewing their courage and giving them strength.

Even this necessarily brief review of the case will, I think, show that the pending measure is the kindest of the courses open to us for helping the suffering Puerto Ricans. I believe that it is also the wisest, whether considered in its immediate consequences or in its ultimate effect.

BRIEF ANALYSIS OF THE BILL.

Turning now, for a moment, to the text of the bill itself, a copy of which I shall append to my remarks, we note that the preamble states the purpose of the bill. Section 1 defines the territory to which the bill applies. Section 2 provides that on goods carried to Puerto Rico from countries other than the United States the same duties shall be paid as would be paid if the goods were brought to the United States, the object being to prevent foreigners from evading our revenue laws by bringing goods here via Puerto Rico. Section 3 is intended to prevent the evasion of our internal-revenue laws by the transfer from the United States to Puerto Rico of industries upon which internal revenue is here required to be paid. Section 4 provides that all revenue collected in the operation of the bill shall inure to the benefit of Puerto Rico. And section 5 fixes the utmost limit of time in which the provisions of the bill shall be effective.

A TEMPORARY MEASURE.

As is shown by the preamble and by section 5 of the bill, it is merely a temporary expedient to meet a present emergency. It is not to remain in force after March 1, 1902, at the latest. Before that time shall have come it is expected that a plan of civil government for Puerto Rico will have been devised, generous in its aims and suitable in its provisions. I see no reason to doubt that among those provisions will be one for free trade with the United States. It is hoped and expected that by that time the condition of Puerto Rico will be so much improved as to make that the kind and safe policy to be pursued.

The question, then, is not in any sense whether Puerto Rico shall have free trade with the United States, but whether, under the circumstances, it is best for her to have it *immediately.* The committee especially charged with framing this legislation believes the proposed temporary arrangement to be both kinder and safer than immediate free trade, and in that opinion I concur.

As 15 per cent of the average Dingley rate is only about 6 per cent ad valorem, and as all the money collected under this bill is to be used for the benefit of Puerto Rico, it will be seen that the rate is not for protection but for revenue, and that in spirit the bill is in entire harmony with the humane recommendation made by the President in his last annual message.

THE "TRUST" CRY.

The cry has gone forth that this bill is favored by the sugar trust and the tobacco trust, and that therefore it should be defeated. Who sent forth that cry? How do those who utter it know that they are telling the truth? Does the fact that some one has started the rumor establish its truthfulness?

It gives me pleasure, sir, to say right here that I do not believe that there is a man on either side of the Chamber who is consciously or intentionally working in the interest of any trust.

The Democratic party has, of course, a very obvious motive in putting forth this "trust" cry. Its foresight and statesmanship are discredited in the eyes of the country. Nothing has happened which in 1896 it declared to be inevitable; everything has happened which it declared to be impossible. It finds the country prosperous beyond any former experience, and sees that its only hope of success lies in getting the people to act on impulse rather than on deliberate judgment. *Its principal work now is to rock the boat and try to get up a scare.* But, sir, it will again find that it has underestimated the intelligence of the American people!

And who can say that the cry is not being urged by agents of the trusts themselves? If men charged with the solemn responsibilities of legislation for this great country are to become stampeded by such a cry, is it not apparent that in any matter in which a trust might really be interested it could easily work its will by creating the impression that it wanted a certain course when in fact it wanted the opposite course? Is it not clear that in that case a timid man could easily be made to play into the hands of the trust? Is it not evident, sir, that one's only safe course is to keep his mind clear and his conscience void of offense, strong in the resolution to do the right as God gives him to see the right?

Now, let us look at this matter and see what reason tells us. What would be the natural position of the sugar trust and the tobacco trust as to immediate free trade with Puerto Rico?

They naturally wish to buy as cheaply as they can. They buy their material in large quantities and no doubt plan to save, so far as possible, all expense for middlemen. They would naturally, therefore, buy their raw material as directly as possible from the producers themselves. It is probable, therefore, that most of the raw sugar and tobacco now in Puerto Rican warehouses belong to the trusts or their brokers. But if they have already bought the sugar and tobacco now in the warehouses of Puerto Rico, it would be manifestly to their interest to have these products admitted to the United States free of duty. In no way that I can see could it be profitable to them to have a tariff on these products. Reason dictates, therefore, that if these trusts have any interest in the matter at all they would naturally favor immediate free trade.

Now, let us see what the record shows. Here on page 32 of the hearings recently had on S. 2264, a bill to provide a government for the island of Puerto Rico, appears the following statement made by General Davis, the military governor of the island:

The American Tobacco Company has lately bought the largest manufactory here, and the new management is understood to be arranging for a larger trade with the United States, the product of manufacture to be in the form of cigarettes.

The American Tobacco Company is, I understand, the organization commonly called the tobacco trust. Since it has bought the largest manufactory in Puerto Rico, it has probably bought also the tobacco crop. If this be true, it has a very evident interest in wiping out the present tariff and securing immediate free trade.

So far, then, Mr. Chairman, as I can discover, both the sugar trust and the tobacco trust, if they have any interest at all in this matter, would naturally favor immediate free trade with Puerto Rico. If so, what more natural thing could they do, knowing the great feeling against trusts in the United States, than to cause to be scattered broadcast the idea that they are against immediate free trade?

THE REAL QUESTION CONSTITUTIONAL.

But, Mr. Chairman, since this debate began the real question at issue has, by the course of the opposition, become a constitutional one. Our opponents are not satisfied to give Puerto Rico free trade on the ground stated by the President, namely, humanity. They contend that the people of Puerto Rico have a *constitutional right* to free trade with the United States, because, as they contend, the Constitution *ex proprio vigore*—that is, of its own force, without legislative enactment—extends to all territory belonging to the United States. They seek to make that doctrine popular by shouting that "the Constitution follows the flag." They hope that by using this sugar coating they can get the people of the United States to swallow the pill which a generation and more ago was urged upon them and rejected.

Why, Mr. Chairman, that is the doctrine invented by John C. Calhoun when in 1847–49 he was endeavoring to extend slavery into the territory acquired from Mexico, the doctrine which Daniel Webster so strongly antagonized, the doctrine which was the basis of the Dred Scott decision, the doctrine to oppose which the Republican party was born, the doctrine which Lincoln combated and which the soldiers of the Union shot to pieces on a hundred battlefields, the doctrine which was one of the things surrendered at Appomattox! [Applause.]

Our political opponents, under cover of pretended solicitude for Puerto Rico, would like to galvanize that old doctrine into life again. And why? Because, sir, if they could do that they might hope to thwart our purposes in the Orient, if not absolutely to destroy our whole protective system; because, sir, behind a victory in this House to-day their fancy pictures a victory in the nation next November!

THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE DOCTRINE.

If it be true that by its own force without Congressional enactment the Constitution spreads over all the territory belonging to the United States, it is already in the Philippines. If the Constitution carries with it to Puerto Rico the *right* to free trade, it carries that right with it to the Philippines also. But by one of the provisions of the treaty of peace recently negotiated with Spain that country is to enjoy in the Philippines for ten years the same trade privileges as the United States enjoys. It follows, therefore, under the doctrine advocated by our opponents, that Spain also is entitled to free trade in the Philippines.

But we have treaties with all the leading nations which guarantee to them in all United States territory trade privileges equal to those enjoyed by the most favored nation. So, under the doctrine of our opponents, all of these nations are entitled to free trade with the Philippines. But if all these nations are entitled to free trade with the Philippines and at the same time the Philippines are entitled to free trade with the United States, it follows logically and inevitably that all the leading nations of the earth are to-day entitled to free trade with the United States via the Philippines. In other words, sir, if the doctrine of our opponents be correct our whole protective tariff system is already undermined. This is the Barmecide feast to which Republicans are invited! Who among us will accept that invitation?

THE DUTY OF THE HOUR.

It is our contention, sir, that the Constitution is an instrument of government for the Union, which is composed of States, and that the power of Congress over the territories is and ought to be plenary. Congress has never abused that power. It never will. As was said by Mr. Justice Bradley, in the case of Mormon Church *vs.* United States:

> Doubtless Congress, in legislating for the Territories, would be subject to those fundamental limitations in favor of personal rights which are formulated in the Constitution and its amendments; but these limitations would exist rather by inference and the general spirit of the Constitution, from which Congress derives all its powers, than by any express or direct application of its provisions.

That spirit will direct our deliberations and guide our actions. Congress will protect the rights of all the inhabitants of our territory to religious and personal liberty, and will justify always the proud boast that "Freedom follows the flag!" [Applause.]

Across the main aisle, sir, I see our political opponents standing in solid phalanx behind the proposition that the Constitution of its own force extends over all the possessions of the United States. They are hoping anxiously, desperately, that to-day they may in some way secure enough Republican votes to defeat the pending measure. If on this last day of winter they could secure from a Republican House of Representatives apparent legislative sanction for their contention, the morrow's sun which ushers in the spring would indeed rise on a season of hope for them. If the vote which will be taken now in a few minutes should sustain their view, they will in large measure have justified their past and brightened the outlook for their future.

What sophistry can mislead, what threat can intimidate, what flattery can beguile any Republican Representative to give aid and comfort to our opponents at such a time and on such an issue? Let us stand with Daniel Webster against John C. Calhoun, with Abraham Lincoln against Jefferson Davis! When the roll shall be called, let us show our faith that now, as always, the Republican party is thoroughly competent to meet its great responsibilities, abundantly able to guide the nation along the pathway of high and honorable achievement! [Applause.]

CONCLUSION.

Mr. Chairman, this bill does not propose a permanent policy for Puerto Rico; it is simply a temporary expedient to meet a present emergency. It does not impose tariff duties on Puerto Rico; on the contrary, it greatly lowers those already in operation. It does not seek to take money from Puerto Rico; on the other hand it aims to assist her to raise, in the way easiest for her, money for her present need. It seeks not to hinder and oppress, but to help and bless. Like the wonder-working and beneficent sun, which from the lakes and the seas takes up moisture which is afterwards deposited in refreshing and life-giving showers upon the parched and thirsty earth, this bill collects from those who are well able to bear the burden, and who at the same time may justly be called upon to do so, the means with which to give employment and hope to the poor and the needy.

There is one kind of statesmanship whose watchword is "popularity." There is another whose watchword is "duty." Mr. Chairman, I have an abiding faith in the might which comes from right, and a similar faith in the sober second sense of the American people.

Imperative demands upon my time in other lines of official duty have deprived me of the opportunity of investigating this subject as fully as I would like. But from the information that I have been able to gather in an earnest effort to learn the truth I sincerely believe that, all things considered, the pending measure is the wisest and kindest of the courses open to us. I shall therefore vote for the bill, with the hope that it may speedily be enacted into law, to the end that the Puerto Ricans may at the earliest possible moment have the relief which they so much need. [Applause on the Republican side.]

(TEXT OF THE BILL AS IT PASSED THE HOUSE.)

A bill temporarily to provide revenues for the relief of the island of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes.

Whereas the people of Puerto Rico have been deprived of markets for a large portion of their products and have lost property and crops by severe and unusual storms, whereby they are impoverished and are unable to pay internal-revenue and direct taxes; and

Whereas temporary revenue is necessary for their schools, their roads, and their internal improvements, and the administration of their government: Now, therefore,

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the provisions of this act shall apply to the island of Puerto Rico and to the adjacent islands and waters of the islands lying east of the seventy-fourth meridian of longitude west of Greenwich, which was ceded to the United States by the Government of Spain by treaty concluded April 11, 1899; and the name Puerto Rico, as used in this act, shall be held to include not only the island of that name, but all the adjacent islands as aforesaid.

SEC. 2. That on and after the passage of this act the same tariffs, customs, and duties shall be levied, collected, and paid upon all articles imported into Puerto Rico from ports other than those of the United States which are required by law to be collected upon articles imported into the United States from foreign countries.

SEC. 3. That on and after the passage of this act all merchandise coming into the United States from Puerto Rico and coming into Puerto Rico from the United States shall be entered at the several ports of entry upon payment of 15 per cent of the duties which are required to be levied, collected, and paid upon like articles of merchandise imported from foreign countries; and in addition thereto upon articles of merchandise of Puerto Rican manufacture coming into the United States and withdrawn for consumption or sale upon payment of a tax equal to the internal-revenue tax imposed in the United States upon the like articles of merchandise of domestic manufacture; such tax to be paid by internal-revenue stamp or stamps to be purchased and provided by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and to be procured from the collector of internal revenue at or most convenient to the port of entry of said merchandise in the United States, and to be affixed under such regulations as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall prescribe; and on all articles of merchandise of United States manufacture coming into Puerto Rico, in addition to the duty above provided, upon payment of a tax equal in rate and amount to the internal-revenue tax imposed in Puerto Rico upon the like articles of Puerto Rican manufacture.

SEC. 4. *That the duties and taxes collected in Puerto Rico in pursuance of this act, less the cost of collecting the same, and the gross amount of all collections of duties and taxes in the United States upon articles of merchandise coming from Puerto Rico, shall not be covered into the general fund of the Treasury, but shall be held as a separate fund, and shall be placed at the disposal of the President to be used for the government and benefit of Puerto Rico until otherwise provided by law.*

SEC. 5. This act shall be taken and held to be provisional in its purposes and intended to meet a pressing present need for revenue for the island of Puerto Rico, and shall not continue in force after the 1st day of March, 1902.

The Puerto Rico Tariff.

REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD WAYNE PARKER,
OF NEW JERSEY.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, February 28, 1900,

On the bill (H. R. 8245) to regulate the trade of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey submitted the following in extension of his remarks:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is a subject of amazement to find that we are thought by some to be working against the interests of Puerto Rico when we give her the benefit of a tariff even as against ourselves to provide Territorial revenue and some measure of protection to her own industries. This measure is one that is dictated by world-wide experience. England has given to almost all her colonies the right to impose such a tariff. Australia and Canada have insisted upon making such tariff protective. The schedule which I annex as part of my remarks shows the large proportion of revenue which was raised by customs in 1896 in a number of English colonies. Of course, in many of these colonies the tariff was laid for revenue only, and so as to favor English productions. But in Australia and Canada these tariffs are distinctly for the benefit of their own industries; and they are the most successful of all, most loyal to the country of which they are the territory, most happy and contented.

On the other hand, where duties are laid merely for revenue, or the taxes are raised mostly by excise or land tax, they have been reduced to a purely agricultural condition, and there is the utmost discontent. Examples of this are found in the Cape of Good Hope and in India. We may almost appeal to Ireland as a like example. It is acknowledged to be generous for England to allow her colonies to raise their revenue by duties. But by this bill we do more than England ever did, and give much more than Canada ever had; for we give to Puerto Rico a preference in our own markets over every other country to the extent of 85 per cent of the Dingley tariff, while we allow her to raise a revenue by placing a small duty even on our own productions.

The small duty which is put upon what she sends to us is nothing but an export tax on her behalf, for it goes back to her; and this export tax on agricultural products is really such a land tax as is raised in every Territory for local purposes, but will be paid much more easily, without the expense or difficulties which attend the assessment and collection of a land tax. The law is exactly the same in its effect as if Puerto Rico had a Territorial government and had exercised a privilege to levy import and export duties on goods sent to us, and obtained from us, to the same per cent of the Dingley tariff. If she had a Territorial government now, and we should give the privilege, she would certainly find it to her advantage to exercise it.

The fact that these duties are for her local and Territorial benefit is the key likewise to the constitutional questions. A local territorial tax for the benefit of the Territory is subject to no rules of uniformity, such as govern taxes laid for United States purposes.

When the Constitution was adopted, it was agreed by all that it was only fair that the States should contribute to the general expenses of the General Government by some uniform law, and hence it was provided by the Constitution that Congress should have power "to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises" for general purposes—that is to say, "to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States." But in order to see that no State was unfairly treated, the section proceeded:

> But all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

And further:

> No capitation or other direct tax shall be laid, unless in proportion to the census or enumeration hereinbefore directed to be taken.

These taxes so provided for, and which must be uniform, are United States taxes for United States purposes.

Local taxes for Territorial purposes can not be uniform any more than those of a State, but are measured and adjusted according to the needs of the Territory. Such local taxes are not levied under the section above mentioned, but under the further power given by the Constitution to govern each Territory for its own benefit. If local Territorial taxes for local purposes were to be uniform throughout the United States, the Territory could not put taxes upon its lands unless the same taxes were laid throughout the United States. If Territorial excises must be uniform throughout the United States, neither the District of Columbia nor the Territories of Arizona, Oklahoma, or New Mexico could lay any excise upon a saloon license unless the same excise were imposed throughout the United States.

The District and the Territories have always laid these excises without objection, because they were local and for local purposes and not a general excise for general purposes. In like manner local duties, whether export or import, for the local purposes of the Territory, can be imposed so as to give local revenue and to save, in this case, the prosperity of the island of Puerto Rico. The requirement of general uniformity as to duties, imposts, and excises is just as strong as to imposts and excises as it is with reference to duties. All three of them must be uniform for money that goes into the United States Treasury; neither of them need be uniform as to money which goes into the local treasury. Loughborough *vs.* Blake, and all the cases cited, were, as to general taxes, etc., imposed for the general purposes of the General Government. There is not a case that holds that Territorial duties, imposts, and excises can not be imposed for Territorial purposes, as is the case here.

It is amazing to hear so much argument as to other questions not involved in this bill, the great questions as to whether the guaranties of human liberty are not carried by the Constitution wherever the United States has sway. Many of them are expressly so carried. All think that the great principles of liberty go with any dominion of the United States. But these are different and greater questions than those of local taxation. If need be, I believe that the United States can protect itself from the immigration of Chinese from the Philippines just as it does from China itself, and just as it now segregates an Indian tribe. But this bill raises no such question. It is a measure to provide local revenue for Puerto Rico, while it opens to that island a preference in our own markets and gives a preference in their market to ourselves, and at the same time protects their own local trades from a competition which would certainly be hurtful if too suddenly introduced.

Some measure to relieve this island must be adopted, and now. Better free trade than to leave things as they are. But better yet to give to the island some local independence and the power to raise necessary revenue without oppressing these people.

APPENDIX.

Country.		1896.	
		Revenue.	Customs.
Gibraltar	pesetas	1,581,785	
Malta	pounds	313,080	176,457
Ceylon	rupees	21,974,573	5,261,309
Cyprus	pounds	183,658	22,660
Hongkong	do	2,250,170	(*)
India	rupees, 10	98,370,167	†14,550,200
Straits	dollars	4,296,064	None.
Cape	pounds	6,809,502	None.
Mauritius	rupees	8,849,181	3,029,745
Natal	pounds	1,457,238	265,360
Bermuda	do	34,256	25,717
Canada	dollars	37,829,778	19,478,247
Falkland Islands	pounds	12,358	2,804
Guiana	do	555,774	294,671
Honduras	dollars	302,686	156,215
Newfoundland	pounds	330,089	291,380
Bahamas	do	65,126	55,576
Barbados	do	177,032	94,944
Jamaica	do	775,208	327,841
Turks	do	9,707	
St. Lucia	do	55,321	20,779
Vincent	do	26,487	12,706
Grenada	do	50,275	24,583
St. Christopher, etc	do	49,560	20,778
Antigua	do	54,950	29,460
Trinidad	do	576,809	277,384

*Opium monopoly. †Opium and salt.

The Puerto Rico Tariff.

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM ASTOR CHANLER,
OF NEW YORK.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, February 28, 1900.

On the bill (H. R. 8245) to regulate the trade of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes.

Mr. CHANLER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This bill is manifestly an unfair one. From the Puerto Rican point of view the island enjoyed a full measure of autonomy, enjoyed nearly unrestricted suffrage, had her markets in Spain and Cuba, when in the war for humanity we invaded the country, cut off the Spanish and Cuban markets, which now charge duties on Puerto Rican products. In return we have not opened our own markets as we did in the case of California, New Mexico, and all other territory formerly acquired by cession consequent to a war or by purchase.

In the cases of California and New Mexico the Administration declared that from the moment of interchange of ratifications of the treaty of peace with Mexico the territory became part of the United States, and our revenue laws were extended to it. This view of the Polk Administration was sustained by the Supreme Court in the case of Cross *vs.* Harrison. It is now sought to distinguish the case of Puerto Rico from that of California because of the phraseology of the treaty of Paris, but the real motive is that certain interests desire to place a protective tariff, like a Chinese wall, around our country, as it existed before intervention.

In order to hide the real motive the assertion is made that the people are not yet capable of being given a Territorial government. The real objection is that if we declare a full-fledged Territory, free interchange of commodities with the rest of the Union would follow without further legislation.

As for the question of self-government, Spain had accorded it to Puerto Rico; and is this great liberating and liberal Republic going to deprive a people of rights and privileges accorded them by monarchical Spain? Are we now going to uphold the principle of nonrepresentation? In our hearts we may be afraid that in giving the Puerto Ricans full American citizenship we may have to do the same with the Filipinos, and so the Puerto Ricans must suffer—the loyal Puerto Ricans can hope for no more consideration than the rebellious Filipinos. Such is the reward of virtue.

Coming back to the tariff question, Puerto Rico is a purely agricultural country, and when we deprive them of their markets we are starving the Puerto Ricans to death. Nothing can make the island flourish but free trade with the United States. To-day a workman earns 50 cents in Puerto Rican money, equivalent to 30 cents in United States money. Nearly everything but the products of his own soil is taxed in the custom-house. The planters can not and will not raise the daily wage unless with the advantages of free trade they are enabled to sell their products in the United States.

There is in the island, especially since the hurricane, a general feeling of utter hopelessness. We never hesitate in our tariff revisions to protect one section of our country, even though another would object, provided it was for the general good. Why should we ruin a loyal, friendly people because they, too, produce tobacco and sugar, and because some producers in another section of the Union object for selfish motives? The general welfare will not suffer by free trade with the island, and the island will become the richest section of the United States. Besides, we will be saved the spectacle of crushing a million people to the dust so that a handful of sugar and tobacco planters may be content.

What great hopes we hold out to the Filipinos! What a reward for their acceptance of American rule!

On the whole, it is not so much a question of fact as a question of principle. Putting ourselves in the place of the inhabitants of Puerto Rico we would do everything but fight to become vested with the rights of citizenship, and perhaps we might even be driven further by necessity.

At all events we must be prepared for strifes and all sorts of trouble in the island, disloyalty and professional pauperism, unless we take down the "Chinese wall."

The Loud Bill.

SPEECH
OF
HON AMOS J. CUMMINGS,
OF NEW YORK,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, March 22, 1900.

The House having under consideration the bill (H. R. 6071) to amend the postal laws relative to second-class mail matter—

Mr. CUMMINGS said:

Mr. SPEAKER: This is the fourth time this bill has appeared in the House of Representatives. I have opposed it every time in the interest of every man, woman, and child enjoying the blessings of cheap literature. It is a blow at every typesetter, every bookbinder, every stitcher, every papermaker, every stereotyper, and every feeder and pressman employed in New York and other cities of this Union. It ought to be the policy of the Government to increase rather than decrease labor. The passage of this bill will throw thousands out of employment and prove of no advantage to the Government.

I was surprised at the attack made upon my friend, F. M. Lupton, on the floor of this House. He has been called a lobbyist, and is hauled over the coals here for daring to send to members of the House circulars explaining the situation so far as it affects his own business and that of other publishers. I look upon Mr. Lupton as a public benefactor. He has printed an edition of the works of Charles Dickens in twelve volumes, which were sold for 48 cents in this country and in Canada. This was done under the rates prescribed for second-class mail matter. He himself says that if you pass this bill the price of these books will go up over 200 per cent. This 200 per cent is to be taken from the pockets of farmers and others whose children throughout the country buy this cheap literature.

Mr. Lupton sold David Copperfield at 3 cents a copy delivered at any town in the Union, and the works of Thackeray, Bulwer, and others at 4 cents apiece. These are prices that will be wiped out by the passage of this bill. Those who have denounced Mr. Lupton for his earnest protest ought to have answered his arguments against the passage of the bill. Manufacturers of all kinds are daily appealing in circular letters to Congressmen for relief.

Some want the beer tax removed; others are aggrieved because alcohol is not free; druggists complain of the war tax; shipbuilders are opposed to the proposed eight-hour law; yet no one has had the hardihood to denounce them as lobbyists because they are defending their own interests. Let us see what Mr. Lupton says concerning the Loud bill:

SOME REASONS WHY THE LOUD BILL SHOULD NOT PASS.

I submit the following reasons why the bill relating to second-class mail matter (H. R. 6071), introduced by Mr. LOUD, should not become a law:

1. As to "books and reprints of books:" Up to the year 1876 cheap books, as they exist to-day, were unknown. In catalogues of that time I find standard works in paper covers, noncopyright, by such authors as Dickens, Bulwer, and Thackeray, listed at $1 each. The same works can be bought to-day for 10 cents per volume. The first move in the direction of cheap books for the masses was made by Donnelly, Lloyd & Co., of Chicago, who issued in 1876 a publication known as The Lakeside Library, a reprint of standard novels and other works in pamphlet form, at from 10 to 20 cents per volume. This was followed in 1877 by The Seaside Library, issued by Mr. George Munro, in New York, and later by The Franklin Square Library, issued by Messrs. Harper & Brothers. This was the beginning of popular low-priced literature of the better class.

From its inception the necessity of the periodical rate of postage was recognized, and the Post-Office Department, appreciating the educational value of these serials, almost immediately admitted them to the mails as second-class matter. This action on the part of the Department gave to the work the stimulus and encouragement it required, and as a result almost every important work of fiction and of science has been issued in low-priced editions and made available to persons of the most humble circumstances, residing in the most remote and sparsely settled localities.

By reason of the fact that I have been permitted to mail these publications as second-class matter, I have been enabled to sell a set of Dickens's works in 12 volumes for 48 cents (4 cents per volume), delivering the same, at this low cost, at any post-office in the United States or Canada. I have likewise sold certain of the works of Bulwer, Scott, Thackeray, Hawthorne, and George Eliot at 3 cents each. For this I claim no credit, although my work is often commended by customers and others.

I am not engaged in philanthropic work. I publish these books at these low prices because it pays me to do so, and I merely quote these instances to show what has been and is being done in the dissemination of literature of the better class among the masses of the people solely by reason of the low rate of postage that has prevailed. That such literature can not be sold to the public at the present or even double the present prices should the Loud bill become a law will be readily understood when the fact is appreciated that the increase in the rate of postage of from 1 cent to 8 cents per pound, contemplated by the bill, is more than the present total cost of this literature, delivery charges included.

If the object of the Government in carrying second-class matter at the low rate that has been accorded to it is the education of the masses—and there can be no other object—what class of literature has a greater educational value than the works of the standard authors—works of permanent value as distinguished from those merely ephemeral in character?

The principal ground upon which this feature of the bill is urged is that so-called pernicious literature obtains admission to the mails under the operation of the present law; therefore, it is proposed to crush both good and bad in order to get rid of the bad.

A more absurd proposition could scarcely be conceived. If it is desirable to legislate against pernicious literature it is quite simple and easy to do so, and there is no need of sweeping along with it all that is good and manifestly beneficial. As well pass a law to exclude all weekly newspapers from the second-class rate of postage because we now admit Police Gazettes and others that are considered, and probably are, demoralizing.

But I will go further and attempt to show that the language of the bill, while excluding the better class of literature, still permits the objectionable class to enjoy the second-class privilege. That which is termed the objectionable class by the advocates of the bill, and which they appear to be so anxious to exclude, consists of the detective and Indian stories published in what are called "Boys' Libraries." These publications are neither "books nor reprints of books." It is true they contain a complete story, but these stories are either original or a reprint from one of the so-called "boys' papers." They are in no sense "reprints of books." They are not books, for they have neither the form, shape, or character of books.

Hence, while Pilgrim's Progress, David Copperfield, and The Virginians, being both "books and reprints of books," are excluded, Deadwood Dick and The Boy Detective, being neither the one nor the other, may be allowed to pass. They may be excluded by arbitrary ruling of the Department, but the language of the bill does not exclude them.

2. As to sample copies: The exclusion of sample copies is urged by the promoters of the measure upon two grounds only: First, that the service is being abused under existing law, and, second, that such exclusion would be in the line of economy, tending to reduce the deficit in the postal revenue.

Anyone who will study the present law and the rulings of the Department will readily see that ample remedy is provided for any abuse of the sample-copy privilege. "After a publication has been admitted to the second-class rate," says one of the rulings, "the continuous mailing of sample copies in numbers exceeding the issue to regular subscribers will be deemed evidence that the publication is primarily designed for advertising."

Here is ample remedy already upon the statute books and only requiring enforcement for every abuse that is complained of. Why, then, is it necessary to exclude sample copies altogether, making it almost impossible for a new publication to start and gain a foothold, and depriving legitimate publications of the most valuable means they have of adding to and maintaining their circulations?

But the promoters of the measure say they expect to save the Government several millions of dollars annually by its enactment. They reason that if they can succeed in throwing out so much second-class matter, which, as alleged, is carried at a loss, the Government will be just that much in pocket. They are in the position of a merchant who should reason that he could save so much by discharging half his salesmen, expecting his business to go on just as well without them. Why? Because the class of periodicals that most extensively use the sample-copy privilege are those whose business is transacted almost exclusively by mail.

The publishers of these periodicals receive enormous numbers of letters, and send out vast quantities of circulars, letters, and merchandise, as premiums to their subscribers. Not only that, but these publications are filled with that particular class of advertisements that invite correspondence, and every order received means the mailing of some article of merchandise. This is not true of the class of advertisements that appear in the leading monthly magazines or in the daily and Sunday newspapers, as a comparison will readily show; and yet the magazines and Sunday papers produce the great volume of weight as second-class matter, and their circulation returns to the Government no compensation for the loss thereon, while publications of the other class referred to are comparatively light in weight, and whatever loss there may be upon the carriage of the same is fully offset by the profit upon letters and merchandise that directly or indirectly result from their circulation. Second-class matter of the class referred to is simply a vehicle for the circulation of first and fourth class matter, and it is from these two classes that the Government derives all of its profit.

The loss upon the one is offset by the gain upon the others, and if one is curtailed the other is reduced. So, therefore, by excluding sample copies the only class of periodicals whose business is profitable to the Government is destroyed, while the class that is manifestly unprofitable is retained. At the same time all other expensive and unprofitable branches of the service are continued. It is plain that such legislation could not possibly effect what its promoters claim for it. Instead of producing an increase of revenue, it must inevitably result in a greater deficiency.

3. As to "returns" from news agents. That provision of the bill which increases the rate of postage upon the return of unsold copies of all periodicals from 1 cent to 4 cents per pound is a direct blow at the small news dealer. These men are poor, and their business is small. If deprived of what is known as the "return privilege," their already scanty incomes must be alarmingly curtailed or they must go out of business altogether.

4. As to the separation of second-class matter. The bill gives the Postmaster-General power to compel a publisher to separate second-class matter "into United States mail sacks or bundles, by States, cities, towns, and counties." All large publishers have been and are willing to expedite the work of the postal service by separating second-class matter by States, but the further requirement that the same shall be separated by cities, towns, and counties is calculated to work no small hardship, inflicting upon every publisher the expense of maintaining a miniature post-office.

Such are the principal objections to H. R. 6071 as I view them. I know that the enactment of the measure will result in making good literature less plentiful and much more costly to the public. I do not believe that it will result in any saving to the Government. I fully believe that if second-class matter could be given full credit for the revenue derived from matter of the first and third classes which it indirectly produces, no loss would be shown.

F. M. LUPTON.

Nos. 23, 25, and 27, City Hall place, New York, March 15, 1900.

These are facts, Mr. Speaker, that can not be gainsaid. They speak louder than words. The blow is not only leveled at the news publishers and those who enjoy cheap literature, but it strikes the country newspaper and the news agents. There are at least 75 news agents here in Washington, the most of whom will be driven out of business by the passage of this bill. Many of them are poor women driven out of the thread and needle business by the department stores.

Ten years ago you would find a little thread and needle store on most every block; to-day you may roam the city and not find one. The poor women who have conducted these little stores have become news agents. They sell candy, tobacco, and newspapers. The passage of this bill would prevent the return of the unsold newspaper. It would not be prudent for them to order a specified number of each newspaper and magazine because the unsold copies would remain upon their hands and become a dead loss to them. Under the system as it is to-day they are relieved from this risk.

Now, listen to the protest of T. S. Hoyt, manager of the Northern News Company, in Troy, N. Y. He groups his objections to the bill as follows:

Because it diverts the attention of Congress and the public from the actual causes of the constant deficits in the Department, which have amounted, as made up by Treasury grants since the enactment of the present law, 1873-1899, to $158,895,552.05. The most operative of these causes is the extravagant overpayment for railroad transportation of mails. On every route on which the daily weight is 5,000 pounds and over the Department pays yearly $171 (or $68.40 per ton) per mile for that 5,000 pounds.

Beyond 5,000 pounds the yearly payment is $21.37 per ton for the excess over 5,000 pounds for each mile. This means a difference of $117.57½ on every such mile, such difference amounting, on the more than 64,900 such miles of the last year, less the 20 per cent off for land-grant roads, to more than $7,310,000. Why should there be two prices for the same daily avoirdupois? The elimination of this element alone would extinguish the deficit of last year and leave a surplus of $700,000.

For each daily ton beyond the first 5,000 pounds the railroads are paid a yearly $21.37 per mile. A ton of matter New York-Buffalo costs on the railroad $21.37 multiplied by 440 miles divided by 365—$25.74. The express carries second-class matter over the same route for $10 per ton, which includes collecting and receipting, transportation, and delivery and getting receipt. The express gets for its service less than two-fifths of what the railroad gets for transportation alone of the mails. The express may be slower, and that must be taken into account.

If the railroads received for the mails one-half the price they now get for the excess over 5,000 pounds, it would pay them on as high a scale as their other business. Deducting from the thirty-two millions the railroads are now paid for transportation the seven millions already indicated, and halving the remaining twenty-five millions, we have a reduction of twenty millions.

Because the bill attempts to discourage a most prolific stimulus to first-class matter. Second-class matter, and especially those parts affected by the Loud bill, originate a vast amount of letter writing. If they did not, men would no longer publish them. The deficit of 1899 was $9,610,779.75; that of 1897 was $11,411,779.65. The receipts were, in 1899, $95,021,384.17; those of 1897, $82,065,462.73. This improvement in finances has come from the greatly increased receipts. Second-class matter, paid and free, went up from 365,480,182 pounds in 1897 to 414,044,972 in 1899.

The advance in pounds of second-class matter in the two years was 14 per cent, and that in total receipts 15 per cent. The fall in the price of printing paper has done this by stimulating the numbers and weight of second-class matter, and the Post-Office has raked in the proceeds from increased first-class matter thus created. On whatever this bill would drive out of the mail the Government would lose trade that, under good business management, would be profitable. The first-class matter arising from this source the Post-Office would still get. A certain amount would be discouraged out of existence and with it its quota of first-class matter.

Because it implies what the Postmaster-General boldly asserts. He talks of the "enormous wrongs which have grown up in the perversion and abuse of the privileges accorded by law to second-class matter." The price set for such matter is no more a "privilege" than the price set on first. Whoever sends second or any other class matter through the mails does so by paying the price set by law, as interpreted, as long as that interpretation rules. The price for second-class matter is not a low one. It is double what it need be under common-sense management. Why should Congress discriminate against its own business and discourage what ought to be a source of revenue at half the present price?

Because not only are the descriptions of second-class matter it affects entitled to be carried on paying the price, but they are equally worthy in the intent of that law. The Postmaster-General makes the policy of that law to be to encourage "the dissemination of public intelligence" and "the promotion of enlightening influences." The matter menaced in the Loud bill falls as certainly in this category as that which is called "legitimate."

Because the bill opens the way for espionage and caprice. The Post-Office should have no business with any quality of second-class matter except its weight or the space it occupies. The rulings which the Postmaster-General denounces are the rulings, and are much more in harmony with the law and common sense than those he or this bill would substitute. Endless vexations have arisen in which Post-Office officials have postulated differences where no real difference is.

There is a bill before Congress now to reimburse a publisher more than $30,000 extorted from him under rulings which excluded his publications from pound rates while allowing others of the same kind to travel in the mails unmolested. From such decisions, no matter how unreasonable or capricious, there is practically no appeal. No more star chamber for us, if you please.

The railroad incubus. How is it that Congress allows and enacts this overpayment for railroad transportation of mails to go on year after year? A little spasmodic outcry is occasionally heard in Congress, but each year the new and larger appropriation goes through, and nothing is done. What is the pull? With the national conventions coming in the early summer, will the postal commission be ready to report in time for Congress to act before adjournment? If not, the old extravagance will probably be reenacted, but on a larger scale.

There should be no tinkering with comparatively minor matters till the question of fair rates for railroad transportation and the gathering in of all second-class matter is settled. Other questions should wait for these. The Postal Commission is now in its second year, and its conclusions are in order. Whether the standard be weight or space, the pay of railroads for transportation should agree with what they receive for similar service in their immensely larger outside business.

He shows that by the passage of this bill you are killing the hen that lays the golden egg. It is actually going to prove a loss to the United States instead of a revenue. His figures show that under the rates for this second-class mail matter the deficit is being lessened each year, and as the years go on, taking the average of the last five years, the Postal Department will be established upon a paying basis in 1903.

This morning I received a circular by mail. If the arguments of some of those who advocate the passage of the bill are correct, this man ought to be horsewhipped for daring to send a circular to a member of Congress. I know that, under the orders of the Postal Department to-day, no letter carrier, no clerk in a post-office, no railway postal clerk is allowed to come to Washington even during his vacation and talk to his member of Congress concerning bills in which he is interested; but the Postal Department itself can always be heard.

At one time, as I am assured, the letter carriers were forbidden to even write to a Representative concerning such matters. The order from the Postal Department forbade it. This circular shows that hogs are carried from Chicago to Philadelphia at $5 per ton. The Loud bill increases the rate of second-class mail matter to $80 per ton. This would make the cost of freight for literature fifteen times as much as that for hogs. Here is the circular:

LITERATURE AND HOGS—AN APPEAL FOR LITERATURE.

The rate for hauling hogs and sample hogs from Chicago to Philadelphia is $5.00 per ton in large or small quantities, one hog deep, and the hogs have to be fed and watered on the way, the sick ones doctored, and the dead ones thrown out. The hogs are weighed in bulk. The distance is a little over 800 miles.

The rate publishers pay for second-class matter—sample copies of newspapers and serial books—is $20 per ton (average postal haul being a little over 800 miles), and the mail bags do not have to be fed or watered, none get sick or die on the way, and may be piled two or three deep.

It is proposed by the Loud bill to increase the rate of the latter class to $80 per ton, over fourteen times as much as hogs and sample hogs pay; each individual piece and fraction of a piece to be stamped; and nothing at all is said in the bill about increasing the rate on hogs or sample hogs, nor of requiring each hog or fraction of a hog or sample hog to be stamped, and there is no difference in the rate between hogs and sample hogs.

Why this partiality for hogs? Why this discrimination against literature? Is it fair, is it right? Upon what glorious principle of honor and patriotism can it be justified? None whatever—it is all wrong. The next step will be to give hogs free passes to go and come anywhere and everywhere, while books and newspapers will not be allowed to travel at all. This is class legislation pure and simple, and therefore inimicable to the Declaration of Independence and antagonistic to the Constitution of the United States. It certainly is.

Seriously, gentlemen, let it not be said of us that we enter the twentieth century as a people who show favors to swine, whatever the breed, but that we love literature better than hogs.

Very truly,

WILMER ATKINSON.

PHILADELPHIA, *March 31, 1900.*

Here is a letter from the editor of Cheerful Moments, published at 154 East Twenty-third street, New York City:

MARCH 13, 1900.

Hon. AMOS J. CUMMINGS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We do most respectfully protest against the enactment of the Loud bill (H. R. 6071) for the following reasons, to wit:

1. It excludes from the mails as second-class mail matter all "sample copies" of newspapers, thus depriving them of one of the most valuable means not only of extending their circulations, but of securing new subscribers to take the place of those who die or drop out for various causes. It therefore will cause the general depletion of newspaper circulation by subscription.

2. It permits the mailing of periodicals at the pound rate to subscribers only, and defines subscribers as those who "voluntarily order and pay, or agree to pay, for the same." Under this definition a person whose subscription has lapsed and has not been renewed is not a subscriber, and copies of a periodical sent to other than advance-paying subscribers could be excluded. This is a direct blow at the local country newspaper.

3. It will throw out of employment hundreds of thousands of workingmen and women engaged in the printing, paper making, electrotyping, and allied trades, entailing distress and calamity the extent of which can hardly be estimated.

4. Mr. LOUD maintains that the purpose of the bill is to reduce the deficiency in the postal revenues. He claims that there is a heavy loss to the Government in the carriage of second-class matter. This claim is untenable, because whatever loss there may be upon the carriage of second-class matter is fully offset by the gain upon the carriage of the two profitable classes, the first and fourth, which are a direct outgrowth of the mailing of the second-class matter.

Every publisher receives large numbers of letters and mails large quantities of "premiums" (fourth-class matter) to his subscribers and club raisers, and almost every advertisement is a bid for correspondence by mail and the consequent mailing of merchandise in filling orders. There are other causes than the carriage of second-class mail matter to account for the annual deficiency in the postal revenues, which would still be operative should the bill become a law. How, then, could the enactment of this measure reduce the deficiency?

5. Lastly, it creates a virtual censorship of the press by giving to post-office officials the absolute right to determine what newspapers and periodicals shall have the advantage of the rates of second-class mail matter. It confers on the post-office the power to determine what is and what is not a periodical: and since there is not a single newspaper or magazine published in the United States which, in some issue, is not amenable to this authoritative discrimination against advertising, supplements, premiums, extra editions, and extra free matter, and which, therefore, may be relegated to mail matter of the third class, it literally places them at the mercy of any postmaster's mandate.

Trusting you will give the above objections to this bill the consideration to which you may deem them entitled, and that you will vote against its enactment, we remain,

Very respectfully, yours,

GEO. W. WILLIS PUBLISHING COMPANY,
GEO. W. WILLIS, *President.*

All these statements, Mr. Speaker, should have been answered before an attempt was made to crowd this bill through the House. Personal abuse is no answer.

It is a blow at trade newspapers. Here is an extract from a letter written to me by M. T. Richardson, editor of the Boots and Shoes Weekly, printed at 27 Park Place, New York:

The last time I met Mr. LOUD in connection with that bill was at a meeting of some association here in this city more than a year ago, and he especially mentioned a paper published in Maine, called Comfort, that was a great offender against the Government in the matter of sending out sample copies. This paper was supposed to have a million circulation. I have seen it, and it is pretty well filled with small advertisements requesting people to send for circulars or catalogues of something or other, or to remit small sums of money, from 10 cents up, for certain articles. There may be, perhaps, two hundred or more such advertisements in each issue.

Let us assume that each sample copy of Comfort sent out causes somebody to write one letter. That would produce a million letters to be transported through the mails at 2 cents each and bring in to the Government an income of $20,000, but it is much fairer to assume that each copy of Comfort not only causes one person to write a letter, but it may cause several people to write several letters each. I think it would be a fair and very conservative estimate to suppose that each copy of this paper produces five letters on the part of people receiving the paper. That would mean 5,000,000 letters, or $100,000 income to the Government from the letters produced by a single edition of Comfort.

As a matter of course, the people to whom the letters are addressed must pay the Government a big revenue of postage on circulars and catalogues sent, to say nothing of letters which these people themselves write back to those making inquiries of them.

When you come to consider that this is only one paper out of large numbers that appeal to people in a way to cause them to write letters, it can be easily inferred that the Government's income from letters as the result of sample copies sent out must run up into millions of dollars a year.

As to the effect of the passage of the bill upon wage-workers, I read the following letter from Street & Smith, publishers, who give work to over a thousand employees in their great establishment in William, Rose, and Duane streets, New York. They say that "thousands of your constituents are dependent upon these industries for their daily bread, and your opposition to the measure would win the heartfelt gratitude of all the wage-workers in this line of industry." Here is their letter:

ESTEEMED SIR: It has possibly not occurred to you what enormous interests will be affected by the enactment of this measure as a law and what great injury will result to the wage-workers of all large cities. The passage of this bill will render it impossible to mail the bulk of publications which now enjoy the privileges of second-class matter at 1 cent a pound unless the prices of the same are increased to the public to cover the extra postal charges which will be involved under the proposed law, and of course increased prices to the public will necessarily mean a large curtailment in the output.

This affects not only the publishing interests of large cities, which are great, as you are aware, but it will also affect the workers in the allied trades—bookbinding, typesetting, stereotyping, lithographing, paper making, and kindred trades—throughout the country. These trades give employment to many thousands of people, including, no doubt, a great number of your constituents. The curtailment of product that will necessarily result from the passage of this bill will throw a vast number of these deserving people out of work, causing great distress and hardship.

The only plea that is urged in favor of this measure is that it will do away with the annual deficiency in the Postal Department. Examination of statistics will show you that this deficiency has been gradually becoming less each succeeding year without any change whatever in the law, till it now amounts to less than $4,000,000 per annum, and at the present rate of decrease there will be no deficiency whatever in 1902 and succeeding years. The facts fully considered, is it advisable to adopt such drastic measures, bringing hardship and poverty to the working class?

There are other good reasons why this bill should not become a law, which we give herewith.

If enacted, this bill will not prove a saving to the Government, but will cause loss and embarrassment to all publishers. It gives the Postmaster-General absolute power to exclude from the mails, as second-class matter, any publication that he may choose to call a book, no matter how often it is published, or whether it complies with the present statutes.

The Loud bill further prohibits any publisher from sending more than 500 copies of any issue of his periodical as samples for the purpose of increasing circulation. At the same time the bill gives to trade unions, benevolent or fraternal societies or orders organized under the lodge system, the privilege of sending an unlimited number of samples of all their periodical publications, published at stated intervals, as frequently as four times a year, enabling them to be used for advertising purposes to an unlimited extent, while restricting samples of all legitimate periodicals to 500 copies of any one issue.

This bill compels news dealers to pay four times as much postage as they now pay on all copies of periodicals that they may have to send back and return to news companies from which they are purchased, thereby limiting the news dealer in his trade with the public to actual advance orders for all publications. At the present time the news dealers of the country are enabled, by the liberality of the postal laws, to maintain agencies in every community, where the popular journals and magazines can be procured, a convenience which can scarcely be estimated highly enough to the residents of the small towns, full of intelligent and reading people, scattered over the Eastern, Western, and Southern States. Any blow at these news agencies is a blow at the cheap magazines, the daily press, and the illustrated journals, which, outside of great cities, make their way to the homes of the people through the local agents and the mails.

The loss to the Government in the diminished circulation of these journals would come chiefly through the diminished receipts from first-class mail matter. It is therefore through the advertising of the publishers of second-class mail matter that the enormous volume of letter postage is due. It is an unassailable fact that the receipts of the post-office increase in proportion to the circulation of this matter. No one can appreciate better than yourself the large amount expended by publishers themselves in letter postage in the direct work of maintaining the circulation and other necessary correspondence in connection therewith. It is to the interest of all publishers that these changes in the present law, initiated and contrived to limit the circulation of periodicals, should be defeated.

For the reasons above stated we urge you to cast your vote against the passage of this measure, assuring you that you will thereby earn the gratitude of thousands of citizens of your district, as well as the consciousness that you have not stood in the way of the literary progress and enlightenment of the great American people, who have become a nation of readers and thinkers very largely through the influence of the present postal laws relating to second-class matter, which were framed to create the very enterprises which the proposed measure seeks to destroy, and which enable the residents of the most obscure hamlets to secure their reading matter at low prices, the same as those in the great centers.

We assure you that this appeal does not represent the single publishing house of Street & Smith, as in this movement the press and publishers of the entire country are almost a unit with us in opposing the measure. The limited time that will elapse before the consideration of the bill renders it difficult to secure as strong an expression of public opinion as could otherwise be shown, but we need only point to the determined protest which arose from the whole American people when a measure almost identical to this one was proposed in Congress two years ago and defeated by a large vote.

Yours, respectfully,

STREET & SMITH.

Hon. AMOS J. CUMMINGS,
Washington, D. C.

I add to this a letter from Samuel S. Blood, manager of the International News Company, of 83 and 85 Duane street, New York:

MARCH 8, 1900.

DEAR SIR: This bill is, in its spirit and purport, distinctly opposed to the interests of the people and to the purpose for which the Post-Office Department was instituted. It imposes unnecessary and harsh restrictions upon the circulation of popular literature for the masses, and thereby tends to obstruct the progress of the people toward a higher plane of intelligence. They will be quick to mark and condemn these obnoxious features of the Loud bill if it becomes a law.

The main purpose of the postal service is to facilitate the intercourse of the people of all sections of the United States through the mailing of printed matter, as well as written correspondence. This should be the primary consideration rather than that of a revenue for the Government. The people have made no complaint about a too low rate of postage, nor are they likely to do so in the future. They want increased facilities, not higher rates.

In view of these facts this bill ought, in my judgment, to be rejected, and I urgently invite your influence, efforts, and vote to that end.

Yours, truly,

SAMUEL S. BLOOD, *Manager.*

Hon. A. J. CUMMINGS;
Washington, D. C.

As a supplement to this statement, I append a letter from Ormond G. Smith, a well-known publisher in New York:

DEAR SIR: This bill compels news dealers to pay four times as much postage as they now pay on all copies of periodicals that they may have to sell back and return to news companies from which they are purchased, thereby limiting the news dealer in his trade with the public to actual advance orders for all publications.

At the present time the news dealers of the country are enabled, by the liberality of the postal laws, to maintain agencies in every community where

the popular journals and magazines can always be obtained, a convenience which can scarcely be estimated highly enough to the residents of the small towns, full of intelligent and reading people, scattered over the Eastern, Western, and Southern States. Any blow at these news agencies is a blow at the cheap magazines, the daily press, and the illustrated journals, which, outside of great cities, make their way to the homes of the people through the local agents and the mails.

The loss to the Government from these proposed changes would come mainly through the diminished receipts from first-class mail matter. It is through the advertising contained in second-class mail matter that the enormous volume of letter postage is due. It is an unassailable fact that the receipts of the post-office increase in proportion to the circulation of this matter. Only those directly interested know the enormous amount now expended in letter postage by the public in the necessary correspondence in connection with business growing directly out of the circulation of newspapers and periodicals. It is to the interest of all business men, as well as publishers, that these changes in the present law, initiated and contrived to limit the circulation of periodicals, should be defeated. Hence we urge you, as a representative of a commercial community, to use your influence to prevent the passage of this bill.

In view of the rapidly augmenting revenues of the Post-Office Department, and the probable early disappearance of the deficit, the proposed legislation is without extenuation or excuse. As this steady increase of receipts is largely due to the circulation of periodicals that carry advertising, any restriction of the rights and privileges of periodicals is adverse to the monetary interests of the Post-Office Department, as well as destructive of the business of thousands of merchants.

To one feature of existing conditions in our great business and monetary world especial notice should be given by every observant member of Congress. Trusts and monopolies having now so multiplied as to run small competitors to the wall, any scheme to protect the man of limited means and assure him of a market is eminently commendable. In the advertising pages of our great magazines and newspapers and trade journals the men of small capital, the inventor, manufacturer, or industrial investor, in every section of our country, finds the widest field of trade open to him, that no trust, no combine, no monopoly can rob him of.

Not a trust, combine, or monopoly in the country but what would rejoice to eliminate this advertising competitor. Therefore to in any manner restrict or restrain the province of these mediums is to cater directly to the interests of monopoly, and just as directly against the livelihood of small capitalists and mechanics and producers and tradesmen in all sections of the United States.

Outside of the Post-Office Department there is no demand for the passage of this bill. It would restrict the distribution of a large amount of valuable educational matter and of standard novels, constituting the best literature which passes through the United States mails. Mr. LOUD's contention that the mail service costs $30,000,000 more than it would if conducted at the same rates by private parties argues that the source of the postal-revenue deficiency is not in the quantity of any kind of matter carried.

James S. Metcalfe, the editor of that brilliant weekly, Life, printed at 19 and 21 West Thirty-first street, New York, sends me the following:

NEW YORK, *March 9, 1900.*

MY DEAR MR. CUMMINGS: We are against the Loud bill simply because it gives local postmasters greater power to inflict, by arbitrary action, annoyance and damage to publishers. It is bad enough as it is, as is shown by an experience of our own, in which one of our Christmas numbers was held up on a technicality under the present law, and was afterwards released upon appeal to the Department.

Hon. AMOS J. CUMMINGS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Mr. Frederic L. Colver, president of the Frank Leslie Publishing House, 141 Fifth avenue, New York, sends me the following letter:

NEW YORK, *February 20, 1900.*

Hon. AMOS CUMMINGS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: May we ask that you will oppose the Loud post-office bill, which, we understand, is soon to be presented for your consideration?

This bill very unjustly discriminates against the rights of Frank Leslie's Popular Monthly and all other legitimate periodicals, especially those published in the Eastern States.

While we recognize the necessity for some revision, and more strict laws regulating second-class matter, we believe the proposed Loud bill is not the proper remedy. In our opinion, more care should be exercised by postmasters in admitting publications to the benefits of the second-class rate. The mails are often burdened with tons of literature, published in the form of so-called "libraries," which publications are nothing more than lengthy stories which should be published in book form.

We think you will agree with us that a periodical—weekly, monthly, or quarterly—which disseminates literature on a variety of topics interesting and useful to the people should have the benefit of the second-class rate of 1 cent per pound within the limits of the United States, Mexico, and Canada, as heretofore; but this Loud bill proposes to make the honest publishers suffer, while the object should be the curtailing of privileges granted to some dishonest ones.

We are particularly opposed to that clause of the Loud bill creating 1,000 miles as a zone limit for the present second-class rate of 1 cent per pound. The periodical publishers of a city like Chicago or St. Louis would have an immense advantage over the publishers in the East. We presume you are aware that the great majority of widely circulated periodicals are issued in the Eastern States.

But, Mr. Speaker, here is a letter from the chancellor of the New York University. Listen to him:

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY, UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS,
New York, March 19, 1900.

MY DEAR SIR: Please favor the cause of colleges, schools, and general education by opposing the Loud bill (H. R. 6071) or causing it to be amended so that college and school publications may still be sent through the post-office as second class matter. As a worker for education for a generation, I know that such periodicals are very useful and are seldom or never self-supporting, but are maintained by students as a rule at considerable cost. It is very unwise for the Government to discourage such papers when it is so liberal in its postage rules in various other directions.

Very truly, yours,

HENRY M. MACCRACKEN, *Chancellor.*

Hon. A. J. CUMMINGS,
House of Representatives.

I have also the following letter from R. W. Massey, president of the Massey Business Colleges, of Columbus, Ga.:

COLUMBUS, GA., *March 9, 1900.*

DEAR SIR: I would respectfully call your attention to the inclosed circular letter, which refers to the Loud bill. Should this bill pass in its present form, it would strike a severe blow at the cause of education. We believe that our worthy educational institutions are certainly entitled to the same privileges granted to trades unions and lodges.

Please consider the excellent reasons stated in the circular letter.

Very truly, yours,

R. W. MASSEY,
President Massey Colleges.

Hon. A. J. CUMMINGS,
Washington, D. C.

An appeal to friends of education—The Loud bill (H. R. 6071) strikes a blow at the cause of education.

To Members of Congress.

GENTLEMEN: Permit me to call your attention to a matter of great concern to the educational interests of the United States. On the 20th instant the Loud Bill (H. R. 6071) comes before your honorable body. Section 7 of this bill repeals the Manderson-Hainer Act absolutely, while section 4 protects benevolent and fraternal societies, trade unions, and lodges, to the exclusion of the school and other beneficiaries of the act of July, 1894.

This is a great injustice to educational institutions, and one I am sure should be prevented. The bill should be amended so as to give educational institutions the same privileges that are granted benevolent or fraternal societies, trade unions, and lodges.

I call your earnest attention to the following facts:

1. Pound-rate postage exists to facilitate the spread of intelligence among the people. It gives the public cheaper newspapers, and if it is accorded to the schools it will tend to popularize and cheapen education.

2. Every good school, public or private, is distinctly beneficial to the general public. The school paper furthers the interests of the school, and, therefore, of the general public. It is a potent influence in persuading our young people to become educated. It is not a self supporting private enterprise, as is the ordinary newspaper; it is an adjunct of the school and a part of the school's work. It, therefore, does not appeal to support through personal subscriptions, and could not, as a rule, be thus supported. It asks for the cheap mailing privilege in behalf of its educational mission, and the fact that it is issued to the public gratis all the more entitles it to this privilege.

3. Mr. LOUD urges that all periodicals, school papers along with the rest, should be required to have regular paid subscribers; but he departs from this rule in the case of trades unions and lodges. Upon what theory of policy or justice does he grant the cheap mailing privilege to these organizations and not to the schools? Is not a school with its hundreds of students quite as much a public enterprise as is a lodge or an association of carpenters or tailors? Under Mr. LOUD's proposed measure, an organization of bartenders, or distillers, or cigar makers can distribute their literature through the mails at pound rates, while a college or academy would have to pay the Government twenty times as much for the privilege of sending the school literature to its students and patrons. Is not such discrimination a direct blow at the educational cause?

4. Nearly all school periodicals have local circulation only, being distributed in the immediate vicinity of the school. The cost of distribution is therefore a mere bagatelle as compared with the cost of mailing papers which go to all parts of the country. In nearly all cases the charge of 1 cent per pound actually pays the Government the full cost of transmission. In the case of the country weekly newspaper, the Government effects this local transmission through the mail free. Under these circumstances, to charge the schools 1 cent per copy, or more than 20 cents per pound, is to burden the school with a tax as unjust as it is impolitic. If the Government transmits the country newspaper free, should it not at least carry the school paper at actual cost? It transmits the Police Gazette and all other classes of immoral and sensational publications at pound rates under circumstances that cause a direct loss to the postal revenues of millions of dollars annually, yet Mr. LOUD's proposed bill refuses to carry educational literature at cost, and proposes to tax our worthy institutions of education, while it pays a bonus to thousands of sensational and advertising sheets that, so far from benefiting the public, are positively harmful in their influence.

5. The schools that issue periodicals in the interests of their educational work are, for the most part, the schools of the common people, situated in small cities and villages, and devoted to supplementing the work of the public schools with more advanced courses of general or special education. They are attended by students who can not afford to attend distant colleges or universities. They consist mainly of academies, normal schools, industrial and business schools, etc. Their rates of tuition are low, and they are not backed by large endowments or public funds. They afford to the farmer or mechanic an opportunity of giving his children technical or preparatory training near at home and at a moderate cost. Surely it is not unreasonable to ask that the Government foster these worthy popular schools to the extent of transmitting their periodicals through the mails at cost.

6. But it is urged that if the pound-rate privilege be allowed to the schools, this privilege will be abused by certain schools that will take advantage of it to circulate advertising matter in no way related to education. In reply to this it may be said that the objection is equally pertinent in the case of periodicals issued by lodges, etc., and of the general newspaper itself. It would be an easy matter to insert a clause in the law restricting the advertising functions of the school paper and other periodicals; but this objection has never been raised in the case of the country newspaper, which often consists almost wholly of advertisements, but which, as before stated, is transmitted through the mails entirely free of charge. Why, then, should this advertising bugaboo be raised up in the case of the school paper?

7. In all the reports of Postmasters-General, and in all the literature sent out by the advocates of the Loud bill, it has not once been charged that the schools have anywhere been guilty of abusing the pound-rate privilege accorded to them through the wise and beneficent act of 1894. We therefore urge that the present attempt to debar them from this privilege is unwarranted, unwise, and entirely unsupported by public sentiment, which is everywhere favorable to the largest and most liberal encouragement of educational interests.

Yours, truly,

RICHARD W. MASSEY.

I have also a letter from E. L. Kellogg & Co., educational publishers, 61 East Ninth street, New York. Here it is:

MARCH 21, 1900.

DEAR SIR: We wish to make a strong protest against many features of the Loud bill, and it is herewith inclosed.

Our periodicals for teachers are widely known in educational circles, and

have reached a circulation of over 100,000 copies. We have paid for postage during the last four years $50,000, only one-third of which is postage on second-class matter. Besides this, our correspondents spent at least $25,000 on postage and fees on money orders to be sent us. And all this is a business you may never have heard of, but which is doing, we believe, a great work for the advancement of education and raising the standard of teaching and teachers.

You run the risk of crippling this work and many other reputable, responsible publishers in all parts of the country by passing the present Loud bill.

We respectfully protest against the enactment of the above-entitled measure for the following reasons:

1. It excludes from the mails as second-class mail matter all "sample copies" of newspapers and periodicals, thus depriving all publications of one of the most valuable means not only of extending their circulations but of securing new subscribers to take the place of those who die or drop out for various causes. It therefore will cause the general depletion of newspaper circulation by subscription.

2. It permits the mailing of periodicals at the pound rate to subscribers only, and defines subscribers as those who "voluntarily order and pay or agree to pay the same." Under this definition, a person whose subscription has lapsed and has not been renewed may be construed as not being a subscriber, and copies of periodicals sent to other than advance-paying subscribers might be excluded. This is a direct blow at the local country newspaper, the religious and educational papers.

3. It requires publishers who are permitted to mail matter of the second class to separate the same, before mailing, into United States mail sacks or bundles, by States, cities, towns, and counties, as the Postmaster-General may direct, thus forcing every publisher to establish in his office a minature post-office, and entailing great extra expense.

4. It will throw out of employment thousands of working men and women engaged in the printing, paper-making, electrotyping, and allied trades, entailing distress and calamity, the extent of which can hardly be estimated.

5. The advocates of the bill maintain that its purpose is to reduce the deficiency in the postal revenues. They claim that there is a heavy loss to the Government in the carriage of second-class matter. This claim is untenable, because whatever loss there may be upon the carriage of second-class matter is fully offset by the gain upon the carriage of the two profitable classes, the first and fourth, which are a direct outgrowth of the mailing of the second-class matter.

Every publisher receives large numbers of letters and mails large quantities of fourth-class matter to his subscribers and club raisers, and almost every advertisement is a bid for correspondence by mail and the consequent mailing of merchandise in filling orders. There are other causes than the carriage of second-class mail matter to account for the annual deficiency in the postal revenues, which would still be operative should the bill become a law. How, then, could the enactment of this measure reduce the deficiency?

6. Lastly, it creates a virtual censorship of the press by giving to the post-office officials the absolute right to determine what newspapers and periodicals shall have the advantage of the rates of second-class mail matter. It confers on the post-office the power to determine what is and what is not a periodical; and since there is not a single newspaper or magazine published in the United States which in some issue is not amenable to this authoritative discrimination against advertising, supplements, premiums, extra editions, and extra free matter, and which therefore may be regarded as mail matter of the third class, it literally places them at the mercy of any postmaster's mandate.

Hoping you will give the above objections to this bill the consideration to which you may deem them entitled, we are,

Very respectfully, yours, E. KELLOGG CO.

Hon. A. J. CUMMINGS, *Washington, D. C.*

Mr. Speaker, these are selections from over a hundred circulars, letters, and dispatches that I have received making protests against the passage of this bill.

Now, in reply to what some gentleman has said about the fact that a ton of an edition of Sapho had recently been sent through the mails from the city of New York, I want to say that you of Congress have fastened upon New York City Anthony Comstock, a well-known and respected official, whose duty it is, if this book is pernicious and meretricious in its tendency, to see that its sale is stopped. It is not necessary to pass the Loud bill to do this. You can do it now under the law. I see the performance of Sapho by Olga Nethersole is stopped: and if this is right, the same power invoked might stop the sale of the book. If you favor the Loud bill, why do you not pass a bill preventing all theatrical exhibitions whatever, because a police justice says Olga Nethersole has overstepped the bounds? [Laughter.] I protest against punishing honest men, who are giving us cheap literature under the law as it now stands, because some publisher of pernicious literature violates the law and takes advantage of this second-class rate. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, the city of New York pays net every year to the Postal Department over $5,000,000. This money is distributed throughout the country for the benefit of post-offices unable to meet their running expenses. Two years from now the city will be adding two millions additional to the revenues of the Government under this second-class mail system. I submit that it is a gross injustice to thousands of her workingmen and working women to repeal this law. You should foster their interests instead of attempting to destroy them. If you want to reduce your postal expenses, strike yourselves rather than the poor mechanics. Renounce your franking privilege and save the Government untold millions.

"Mutton, sir! Mutton! Mutton in the market! Seven and a half cents per pound! Price pinned on the back!" is what Col. Tom Benton used to say whenever a measure with a venal taint came before Congress.

Mr. Speaker, are the railroad and express companies in the mutton trade? Are they purchasers? If so, who furnishes the mutton?

Late Representative Sydney P. Epes.

REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. JONES,
OF VIRGINIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, March 24, 1900.

The House having under consideration the following resolutions:

"*Resolved*, That the business of the House be now suspended that opportunity may be given for tributes to the memory of Hon. SYDNEY P. EPES, late a member of the House of Representatives from the State of Virginia.

"*Resolved*, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, and in recognition of his eminent abilities as a distinguished public servant, the House, at the conclusion of these memorial proceedings, shall stand adjourned.

"*Resolved*, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

"*Resolved*, That the Clerk be instructed to send a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased"—

Mr. JONES of Virginia said:

Mr. SPEAKER: Whilst there is little to be added to what has been so justly and beautifully said of my departed friend and colleague, I am unwilling that this occasion, specially set apart for the commemoration of his life and virtues, shall pass without some brief expression of my estimation of his character and worth and of the deep personal loss which I have sustained in his untimely death.

My acquaintance with SYDNEY P. EPES was neither so long nor perhaps quite so intimate as was that of some others who have participated in these commemorative exercises. I met him for the first time some four years ago, although by reputation he had, of course, been known to me before our personal acquaintance began. For this reason I shall leave to others, more capable of performing so pleasing a task, the recital of the story of his brief yet well-rounded life.

With the opening of the Fifty-fifth Congress commenced that daily intercourse which soon ripened into the fruition of an unfailing and enduring friendship. Although our homes were widely separated, a fact which precluded that social intercourse so largely a part of life in Virginia, it so happened that the early youth of his father and mine had been spent in the same section of the State, and that between their ancestors had existed ties of blood and of friendship in which we both felt a common interest and a pardonable pride. This naturally drew us into a close companionship, and I recall with feelings of no little pleasure the conversations upon what to both of us was a topic of unfailing interest. How often do I remember that he spoke to me with love and veneration of his parents; and were I asked to name the crowning virtue in the life of SYDNEY P. EPES, I should declare it to have been the filial affection which he ever manifested toward the aged father and mother to whom he owed his being and whom he so greatly honored.

He was a man of sterling integrity and unflinching devotion to his friends, and it is no exaggeration for me to say that of all those whom I have known since my service in this House began no one of them possessed in a greater measure or in a higher degree than did he those personal attributes of mind and of heart which drew other men to him and which bound them to him as with hooks of steel in the bonds of an everlasting friendship. He was one of the youngest members of this body, and his service here was of comparatively brief duration, and yet I venture to affirm that not one of the many who, since I have been a member of this House, preceded him upon that journey which leads to the great hereafter left behind him those who mourned his death with a more sincere or profound sorrow.

The mysteries of life and of death are, indeed, unfathomable. It is not for us who are permitted to linger yet upon life's stage to question the wisdom of Him who ordaineth all things and doeth all things, when He removes from these earthly scenes one so full of health, of strength, of vigor, and of young and promising life. But of all my acquaintances in this body it has seemed to me he would be almost the last upon whom the icy hand of Death would be laid: for he was, indeed, the perfection of manly form, and his health always appeared the most robust. In my memory he will ever dwell as one radiant with health and glowing with life and brightness. It is difficult to realize that one so full of hope and strength and life, which gave promise of a repleteness of long years of usefulness, has been so suddenly stricken down.

His character was most engaging, and his disposition as gentle as that of a woman. His manners were courtly, but unaffected, and his bearing was ever chivalrous and manly. He had few, if any, enemies, and his friends were legion. His popularity in the district which he so faithfully represented upon this floor was deservedly very great, but the sincere esteem and deep affection in

which he was held by those among whom he lived, those who had known him longest and best, is the highest tribute to an honorable and upright life.

Those of us who accompanied his remains to their last resting place may never forget the sadness and sorrow pictured upon the countenances of the companions of his youth and the associates and friends of his maturer manhood. The solemn and impressive services held at his home were attended by the entire community, and the tearful faces of all betokened the sincerity of their admiration and the depth of their affection.

They laid him to rest in a quiet, peaceful spot, not far distant from the home where dwell those whom of all the earth he held most precious, whose grief is unspeakable and whose loss irreparable. May Heaven protect that disconsolate home, and may the loving hand of the living God sustain his grief-laden widow and guide the inexperienced footsteps of his five fatherless children.

Overthrow of the Carpetbag Government in South Carolina in 1876.

SPEECH

OF

HON. B. R. TILLMAN,

OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

In the Senate of the United States, Friday, March 23, 1900, at the close of the debate on the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9080) appropriating, for the benefit and government of Puerto Rico, revenues collected on importations therefrom since its evacuation by Spain and revenues hereafter collected on such importations under existing law, Mr. TILLMAN asked and obtained leave to have the following speech printed in the RECORD.

SPEECH OF HON. B. R. TILLMAN, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, BEFORE THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION OF THAT STATE, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1895, PRINTED AS PART OF HIS REMARKS IN THE SENATE, MARCH 23, IN JUSTIFICATION OF THE DISFRANCHISEMENT OF THE ILLITERATE NEGROES IN SOUTH CAROLINA.

Mr. TILLMAN said:

Mr. PRESIDENT AND GENTLEMEN OF THE CONVENTION: I regret that my physical condition is and has been such since Tuesday morning, coupled with enforced attendance upon this convention, as to render me unable to arrange the data and prepare such a speech as I think the occasion requires. I also feel my inability in a physical way to accomplish what I shall undertake, but I will simply do the best I can.

It has been well said that this is a momentous issue; that this convention of the people of the State to deal with the question of suffrage will mark an epoch in our history. I may further say that the question of suffrage and its wise regulation is the sole cause of our being here. The prosperity, happiness, and progress of this people depend upon its wise solution. The very life of the State is involved in the wisdom or the unwisdom of our action. Why do I say this? When the Southern Cross went down in battle and the hopes of the Southern Confederacy were laid in the grave of the "lost cause," when we had struggled for four years with a bravery and patriotism and self-sacrifice unparalleled in history for the right of self-government, and for our rights under the Constitution as we conceived and understood them, what came to pass? President Johnson appointed a provisional governor, and ordered a constitutional convention to be convened to prepare the way for the State of South Carolina to reenter the Union.

That convention assembled and adopted a constitution. Under it legislation was enacted; the "Black code," of which we have heard so much, was part of that legislation. Whatever may be said as to the "Black code," it gave the Black Republicans, Thad Stevens and his negrophilist allies, excuse for their reconstruction deviltry. It was the only pretense they wanted, because these hellhounds, actuated by hate for the Southern people, were determined upon degrading us to the lowest level possible, and they had right at hand an instrument which the most fertile imagination, if it had been given a thousand years to concoct a scheme of revenge, could not have surpassed it. It was the presence among us of our exslaves set free by the results of the war.

Actuated solely by the purpose to perpetuate the rule of the Republican party, and with the hellish purpose of venting their rage and hatred upon a conquered people, they passed the reconstruction acts and came very near impeaching Johnson because he had been moving forward contrary to their will. And then they put in motion the forces of the Army, which were already here, to depose the civil government which we had established, to overthrow the fabric which we were trying to reerect, and to put in its place the rule of the negro over the Anglo-Saxon. Canby, the major-general in charge of this department, issued his orders calling for the election of delegates to a constitutional convention. And in effect he said to the Southern white men: "Attend to your material interests, the Army will take care of your government; your help is not wanted, nor will your interference be tolerated." And the radical, ringed, streaked, and striped carpetbagger convention of 1868 assembled.

The constitution which they gave us was submitted to the vote of the people—to the negroes, in fact. All our then leaders, without exception, took the position that this action on the part of Congress and the United States Army was outside of the Constitution and must fall. They advised our Southern white men to remain at home and pay no attention to it; that it would drop of its own illegality; and the consequence was no white man participated in the election to ratify the constitution. It was pushed through at the polls, guarded all over the State by bayonets, and we were placed under the rule of our ex-slaves. A legislature was elected under that constitution, and an ex-Army officer, Robert K. Scott, was elected governor. The statehouse was filled with the minions of Black Republicanism, officered and led by white thieves, who came here for the express purpose of getting rich at the expense of our impoverished and fallen people.

The first legislature under the radical and carpetbag régime met in November, 1868. It was composed in both branches exclusively, except the members from two or three white counties, of carpetbaggers and negroes. I have attempted to get the figures as to the number of negroes in the four legislatures which met during those eight years of misrule. I have not been able to do so, but my recollection of the statements made in the public press at the time is that there was a small majority of white men in the first, and in the second and third a large majority of negroes. I have the figures as to the fourth—1874–75—when there were 15 senators who were colored and 61 colored representatives, about half.

Now, sir, to give a clear idea of the results of the rule of those people during those eight years of misgovernment and robbery, I must beg your pardon while I read some figures gathered by the investigating committee appointed by the general assembly, which, in 1877, took up this question and gathered such testimony as would place on record for the benefit of future historians the facts as to the hellish work accomplished through Canby and his carpetbaggers, who had been foisted upon this people by the bayonet. The witnesses were almost wholly officeholders under the carpetbag government.

THE PUBLIC CREDIT.

The amount of the public debt July, 1868, when the Radicals went into power, was $7,162,231, including bills of the bank of the State. This was the honest debt of the State contracted prior to the war; and I do not hesitate to say here that before 1868, and up to that time, there was no State in this Union whose credit was superior to that which this State enjoyed in the money markets of London and New York.

Now, sir, prior to 1868, under the system of government which had obtained and been in effect here from 1790, during the latter years, in the forties and fifties, the average expenditure of our State government for all purposes per annum was $400,000. Let us make some allowance, if you please, for the inflation of currency just after the war and the increased value of articles which had to be purchased, and, if you wish, let us add 50 per cent to that as an average and reasonable estimate as to what it ought to have taken to carry on the government honestly; that would make during the eight years, if you estimate $600,000 as necessary to carry on the State government, $4,800,000.

What did these carpetbag thieves and negroes collect in cash? I will only give the aggregate items here. I hope the reporters will get them and print them for the benefit of the people of this State, as well as people of the other States. The total amount for the eight years collected in cash by these men was $10,165,114. If you subtract $600,000 annually, it will make $4,800,000. If you please, put it five millions, and you will see they collected an excess of $5,000,000 over and above the necessary expenses of the government. Did they stop there? Let me read you a brief letter which our State treasurer, who is more familiar with this matter than I am, wrote me in answer to the inquiry I made yesterday:

Hon. B. R. TILLMAN.

DEAR SIR: Under the conversion act of 1869 the Republicans issued $5,965,000 of conversion bonds in excess of old bonds surrendered, and there were no vouchers whatever for this excess. These fraudulent bonds are listed on the New York Stock Exchange to the shame, injury, and disgrace of the State to this day.

They are quoted in every price list you see now as nonfundable South Carolina bonds at 1 cent on the dollar. When the State

treasurer and myself went to New York three years ago and endeavored to refund our debt, we were met by Henry Clews and his agents—Clews had been Kimpton's partner in his scheme of robbery—and they dogged us all over New York City with the cry, "Here, pay this debt which bears the seal of South Carolina, or you can not get any recognition in this money market."

They also fraudulently issued $1,000,000 bonds in 1868, ostensibly to pay interest on the public debt. The act authorized the issue of one million, but they issued two million, one of which was fraudulent. Another fraudulent issue was one million for the relief of the treasury in 1869. The assets of the Bank of the State and the railroad shares held by the State in 1867, amounting to $7,069,674, disappeared after the first negro legislature met in 1868, and the State had to issue $1,259,100 bonds to redeem bills of the Bank of the State in addition to the large amount of these bills received for taxes. For a statement of these frauds see pages 316, 317, United States Census, 1880.

The plunder and destruction of the public funds and property by the negro legislature and reconstructionists that came into power under the auspices of the Federal Government is perhaps without parallel in the history of civilized countries. Money was raised by any and every means found available, with reckless disregard to cost and in violation of every principle of honesty and justice, not to be expended for legitimate public uses, but squandered and embezzled in a manner that defies description and is almost incredible.

This iniquity was accomplished by increased taxation upon onerous assessments of property, the issue of bonds, stocks, and certificates in the name of the State by the legislature, governors, treasurer, and speakers of the house of representatives, and financial agents, and by their sale and hypothecation at frightful reductions in value; by the payment of account for unnecessary public printing for the enrichment of publishing companies; for bills for legislative service; for wines, groceries, and dry goods (these last alone amounting to $543,232); by the reproduction and repayment of warrants and coupons that had already been paid, but had never been canceled, and even by the "raising" of checks on public account by interpolation and alteration of figures, etc.

Respectfully, W. T. C. BATES, *State Treasurer.*

Now, this is a long story, Mr. President, and I shall not attempt to rehearse it in all of its details. I shall only attempt to jump from one mammoth and gigantic steal to another. I will not attempt to take them up chronologically. I have not had the time to arrange the data. I will read here, for the benefit of this convention, an extract from the report of the investigating committee, of which my distinguished colleague, Governor Sheppard, was a member, so you may see and learn some of the infamies practiced by these legislators and those in control of our affairs.

The committee says:

The legislative pay certificate was the fountain head and nursery of many of the frauds, forgeries, and perjuries exposed in this report. Through this source the most flagrant violations of law were committed, whereby the State was annually robbed of amounts ranging from $200,000 to $1,000,000, including fraudulent printing certificates, which were collected and divided between the officials, senators, members of the house, and political hangers-on of the administration. To perpetuate the power and influence of the Republican party it was necessary to have a ready and unfailing reservoir of funds.

No simpler or easier way suggested itself than the issuing of pay certificates by the speaker of the house and the president of the senate. Thus it became not only possible, but practicable, to perpetuate the numerous frauds in the public printing and supplies to which we have already referred. Indeed, this, like the famous hydra, threw out its hundred heads, encircling and poisoning every department of the government, and giving comfort and support to local leaders, in its trail following the low, despicable forgeries and perjuries necessary to effect the end proposed. It is not surprising that the poor and ignorant members of the general assembly fell into these practices, when they were conceived and brought forth by such adroit swindlers as those who led. This immense fund produced and nurtured a bond ring, a printing ring, and this legislative ring—the most popular and at the same time most unscrupulous. It is evident from the testimony, that such a source of revenue as this was indispensable to silence any complaint, and to pacify the fears of the timid and the greed of the avaricious whilst the other great rings were in successful progress.

Among the many remarkable and famous leaders in this enterprise, without at all intending to disparage the claims of others, your committee must mention the names of F. J. Moses, who issued and sold, and John J. Patterson, who became the purchaser. Those two stand out in bold relief, as twin stars, shedding a baleful light upon all who approach them. The evidence which we append will fully justify the conclusion which your committee has reached. The table submitted with this report shows, among other things, that in one session there was issued $1,168,255 in pay certificates (not including printing certificates), every dollar of which was a robbery, except about $300,000 due the members of the senate and house and regularly elected and appointed attachés of the general assembly.

The evidence of more than one witness shows that it was a race between the bond ring, composed of a limited number, and the general assembly as to who should receive the most of the money raised by taxation and the sale of bonds. It was decided that the greatest good could be accomplished by distributing the money to the greatest number, and members of the general assembly, therefore, became the beneficiaries. An unlimited number of certificates were issued on the written or verbal orders of the presiding officers and the chairmen of standing or special committees.

LEGISLATIVE SUPPLIES.

Now, sir, I will take up the question of supplies furnished the legislature. I beg again to read:

The committee respectfully invite attention to the evidence and vouchers submitted with this report, under the head of "supplies." The abuses have been so great and of such a palpable nature that the most credulous person would hardly believe that such frauds should be perpetrated under the forms of legislation. History fails to cite an instance which can be compared with such a carnival of fraud and extravagance as has been held in South Carolina by and through the purchase of supplies for the members of the general assembly.

Under the head of "supplies," says Josephus Woodruff, clerk of the senate, was embraced anything that a senator chose to order. These orders were generally given through the clerk, and the accounts were rendered against the clerk of the senate. At first the orders were moderate and included only stationery and postage stamps, but they gradually increased until they assumed gigantic proportions. In the commencement of this business of furnishing members they gave orders on the clerks to deduct the amount from their pay, but very soon the orders largely exceeded their pay, and the accounts were then included in the report of the committee on contingent accounts and pay certificates thus issued for almost every description of merchandise.

In addition to this, pay certificates were drawn and turned over to the chairman of the committee on contingent accounts for collection and distribution. As the matters became common, the senators claimed that all their expenses should be paid by the State, or, in the language of Senator C. P. Leslie, "The State had no right to be a State unless she could pay and take care of her statesmen."

C. P. Leslie, I believe, was a negro.

A DELEGATE. No; he was a white man.

Senator TILLMAN. He was so much the bigger rascal, then.

Mr. WIGG (a colored delegate). All those you are reading about are white men.

Senator TILLMAN. I will find you plenty of "nigs" after a while, Wigg. [Laughter.]

The committee further say in their report:

A room in the State house was fitted up wherein to serve "wines, liquors, eatables, and cigars" to State officials, senators, members of the house, and their friends, at all hours of the day and night. Woodruff's evidence is that the largest bills were rendered for refreshments, including the best cigars and liquors, which were served up in a room adjoining that of the clerk of the senate, and kept open at all hours, and was visited daily by State officials, judges, senators, members of the house, lawyers, editors, newspaper reporters, and citizens generally, irrespective of party, and that they discussed matters, State and national, in the most agreeable manner over their sparkling glasses.

Not satisfied with the establishment of a barroom in the capitol, they employed a porter, who had charge of the "refreshment" room. The porter states that for six years the statehouse barroom was generally opened at 8 o'clock in the morning and kept open until 2 to 4 the next morning; that during that time some one was constantly there eating, smoking, or drinking, and that Sunday formed no exception to the rule.

Now, sir, to show you the rapid development of taste and the extravagance of our statesmen of both colors, here is a table of contrasts as to what they thought they ought to have in 1869–70, and what they considered necessary to their comfort in 1871–72:

1869–70.	1871–72.
In 1869–70, $5 clocks satisfied them	But in 1872 clocks went up to $600.
40-cent spittoons in 1869	As against $8 cuspidors in 1872.
$4 benches	As against $200 crimson plush sofas.
Straw beds	As against sponge mattresses and oriental pillows.
[Laughter.]	
$1 chairs	As against $60 crimson plush Gothic chairs.
$4 pine tables	As against $80 library tables.
25-cent hat pegs	As against $30 hatracks.
$8 desks	As against $50 desks.
$10 office desks	As against $80 to $175 office desks.
50-cent coat hooks	As against $100 wardrobes.
Cheap matting	As against body brussels carpeting.
Clay pipes	As against the finest Habana cigars.
Cheap whisky	As against champagne.
$4 looking glasses	As against $600 mirrors.
$2 window curtains	As against $600 brocatel curtains, lambrequins.
$5 cornices	As against $80 walnut and gilt cornices.

Then follow itemized bills of legislative "supplies," showing everything and anything that merchants anywhere ever bought and sold. Well, I reckon that is enough of that; I must move on. I am in so much filth that it is nearly up to my neck, and I do not want to get buried in it or tire your patience.

The next subject I take up is the public printing. I will give you some statistics collected by this committee from the official records, showing the amount of printing, the money expended for printing during those eight years of negro domination: Sessions 1868–69, $21,124; 1869–70, $45,000; 1870–71; $152,465; 1871–72, $173,000; 1872–73, $450,000. That is the highest point reached.

We come down to the next session, which cost $385,000, and then having got broke, having destroyed the credit of the State, having exhausted all means of bamboozling and fooling anybody to trust them, they got back to $50,000 a year for the last two years they were in power, during which period, as the gentleman from Beaufort said, Mr. Cardozo brought in his reform financial measures. The aggregate in the eight years is $1,326,589. This committee tabulated from the archives of the State the amount expended by the State of South Carolina from 1790 to 1868 for public printing, and it aggregated only $609,000 for the seventy-eight years, showing an excess of cost of printing during the eight years of Republican administration over the seventy-eight previous years of $717,589.

I told you a moment ago that in 1872–73 the amount expended for public printing was $450,000. The committee also prepared another table of statistics, gathered from official sources by correspondence, showing the cost of printing for one year in the States of Louisiana, North Carolina, Mississippi, Florida, Alabama, Tennessee, Georgia, Texas, Missouri, Maryland, Virginia, Arkansas,

Kentucky. They aggregated $278,241 for their public printing, as follows:

Public printing—year 1877.

Louisiana	$40,528.71
North Carolina	18,281.31
Mississippi	18,439.85
Florida	19,669.35
Alabama	17,000.00
Tennessee	11,402.00
Georgia	12,906.00
Texas	31,163.47
Missouri	27,000.00
Maryland	25,000.00
Virginia	29,812.00
Arkansas	13,040.00
Kentucky	13,999.71

Leaving a balance against our negro and carpetbag rulers of $171,759 necessary to defray the expenses of public printing.

Now, sirs, how was this brought about? Here is the testimony of Josephus Woodruff, clerk of the senate, who, with A. O. Jones, clerk of the house, and with Neagle, comptroller-general, were copartners in the firm of the Republican Printing Company. Woodruff says:

When it became necessary to get appropriations through we became aware of the absolute necessity of paying for the passage, and we added the estimate for these expenses to the amounts of our accounts in order to save ourselves from loss. One-half or more of the total amount of appropriations for the Republican Printing Company was paid to State officials and members of the general assembly.

There were no specific appropriations then, and printing claims were paid out of any moneys in the treasury not otherwise appropriated. Even then it was almost impossible to obtain payment of our claims direct from the treasury. On presentation of the claim Mr. Parker would refer us to Mr. Neagle, who was the only party he knew had money. In this way we discounted our claims, frequently selling them at 25 and 30 cents on the dollar in order to carry on our work, which was very heavy. As an alternative we had to take Neagle into partnership.

I submit here copy of partnership agreement, dated July 1, 1872, between Woodruff, Jones, and Neagle, witnessed by Le Grande Benedict. When Cardozo took possession of the office of treasurer, I endeavored to perfect the same arrangement as to percentage that I had with Parker. He said that he had decided not to pay out any money for an object unless there was a specific appropriation. That necessitated the introduction of a bill for the payment of our claims before the legislature. An itemized bill was accordingly made, presented, passed upon by the committee in both houses, and an appropriation of $250,000 made for the payment of the claims of the Republican Printing Company. Governor Moses was paid $20,000 to sign the bill.

In this connection it pains me to have to read, Mr. President, a document to be found in the senate journal, 1873, which is as follows:

SENATE COMMITTEE ROOMS, *Columbia, S. C., October 30, 1873.*

The committee on printing of the senate, to whom was referred a bill to make appropriations for the payment of the expenses of printing, have had the same under careful consideration, and beg leave to report:

That the work ordered by concurrent resolution of the general assembly at its last session is of the highest importance to the State, not only because of the information that it affords the immigrant, but as furnishing a valuable record in history. The committee examined specimens of the portion of the work now in progress, and, after a patient hearing of the clerks of the two houses as to the time, labor, and expense involved, believe the appropriation asked for this purpose to be just and reasonable.

In regard to the appropriation for the payment of the printing of the supreme court decisions, the committee, on reference to chapter 104, page 495, revised statutes, find that while the comptroller-general is authorized to draw his warrants for the publication of these decisions, no appropriations have been made for the payment of the warrants, thereby rendering further legislative action necessary to authorize the treasurer to pay for the work.

With reference to the last item of appropriation asked for by the bill, the committee find that in the reassessment of property for the fiscal year 1873–74 the comptroller-general ordered the reprinting of the blank tax assessments, tax returns, and other necessary papers for carrying out the act passed at the last session of the general assembly providing for a reassessment of the taxable property of the State, and the committee are perfectly satisfied of the justness of this claim.

The committee, in justice to the State printers, also beg leave to state that they have carried on their work, as shown your committee, at heavy sacrifices on account of the State treasurer's inability to meet the former appropriations made by the general assembly. Their contract has been faithfully observed and their work well and promptly executed. The committee therefore recommend that the bill do pass.

(Signed) *ROBERT SMALLS, *Chairman.*
THAD. C. ANDREWS.
H. J. MAXWELL.
C. D. HAYNE.
B. F. WHITTEMORE.

The same Woodruff testified, and he brought his bank checks, and the committee, in searching, went to the bank and found certificates of deposit to prove that he had issued checks to bearer for the following amounts paid to senators, beginning with Moses, the governor, who was a native South Carolinian, $20,000; then to Neagle, who was their partner, $40,000; Melton & Chamberlain, $10,000; F. L. Cardozo, $12,500, and, coming on down through a lot of senators, $5,000 each, we find the name of Robert Smalls, and so on, aggregating $112,550 that they paid to that wing or branch of the general assembly. A. O. Jones testified that he paid the house $55,000; so it seems that the house sold itself disreputably cheap as compared with those that presided at the other end of the capitol.

But listen again. They found that the $250,000, after paying out one hundred and eighty-odd thousand of it, would not work, would not go around, so they made up a bill of deficiencies, amounting to $231,000. And Woodruff goes on and says:

For the payment of this amount certificates of indebtedness, which I have already alluded to, were ordered to be issued to the company. In order to effect this, as against the bitter opposition of the other ring, I again interested the senators and paid them the following sums.

And here follows another list of $5,000, $2,000, and $1,000 down to $500 to this same blessed set of statesmen, aggregating $57,200, in addition to the $112,000 they had already received. No wonder that the printing account was $450,000 that year! I can produce the proof, for it is here, the testimony of the cashier of the bank as to the deposit of a certain check on a certain day by Robert Smalls. I have here on my desk his pardon by the governor in 1879, but it is unnecessary to exhibit it. He disputes and denies his guilt. It is natural that he should. These people have forced me, by endeavoring to claim that it was white men and not negroes who did these wrongs, to unearth these records from our archives and bring them here and let the world know that these men who stand here and clamor for justice for their race perpetrated these damnable robberies as well as infamies when they were in power.

PRINTING STEALS AND SMALLS'S CONNECTION WITH THEM.

There are transactions between Josephus Woodruff and Robert Smalls in the matter of public printing.

One in the fall or the winter of 1870. In connection with this we quote from Woodruff's testimony, page 215, Report on Frauds:

He swears: "In the fall or winter of 1870 the Carolina Printing Company was organized by Messrs. J. W. Denny, R. K. Scott, N. G. Parker, D. H. Chamberlain, J. W. Morris, and L. Cass Carpenter. 'This company owned the Daily Union, of Columbia, and the Charleston Republican. Senator Leslie told Woodruff that 'the friends' in the senate thought that, as this was a matter of senate patronage, they should have a percentage of the profits from the printing. In order to carry out the wishes of 'the friends,' Mr. Leslie proposed that pay certificates for various amounts, ranging from three to five thousand dollars, for current printing be drawn, and one-third or one-fourth of the amount realized be given to the chairman of the committee on printing for division among 'the friends,' including some 15 or 16 senators. This system was carried out as long as moneys could be paid out of any sums in the treasury not otherwise appropriated, and was only checked and stopped when the law for specific appropriations and payments was enacted.'

"The certificates were usually counted at the South Carolina Bank and Trust Company, of which bank Governor R. K. Scott, Treasurer Niles G. Parker, and Attorney-General Chamberlain were stockholders. The checks in the hands of the committee are but a portion of the amounts paid during the time of the above arrangements. The money was deposited to the credit of the printing company, and sometimes, according to the witness, division or gratification checks were drawn against deposits in the Carolina National Bank and Central National Bank, which checks, he supposes, are still held by these banks. The testimony of Woodruff, corroborated by the checks in the hands of your committee, shows that the following-named persons received the amounts severally annexed to their names under said arrangements.

Here are mentioned the names of twenty-eight senators and representatives who received amounts ranging from $50 to $5,000. Among them Senator Smalls received two checks, amounting to $250.

L. N. Zealy, who was connected with the South Carolina Bank and Trust Company (page 354, A Report on Public Frauds), swears:

I have also examined the following checks, payable to Robert Smalls or order and R. Smalls or order, signed by J. Woodruff for Republican Printing Company, and find that they have been paid by the South Carolina Bank and Trust Company, and charged to the account of J. Woodruff for the Republican Printing Company, indorsed by Robert Smalls, one bearing this additional indorsement: "Pay to the order of J. C. Roath, esq., cashier." Nathan Ritter, cashier, which indorsement indicates that it has passed through the bank in Charleston for collection:

"No. 19.] COLUMBIA, S. C., *April 3, 1871.*

"South Carolina Bank and Trust Company, of Columbia: Pay to Robert Smalls or order $300.

"J. WOODRUFF,
"For REPUBLICAN PRINTING Co.

"(Endorsed: Pay to the order of J. C. Roath, esq., cashier. Nathan Ritter, cashier. Robert Smalls. Also the figures 138.)

"No. 41.] COLUMBIA, S. C., *July 5, 1871.*

"South Carolina Bank and Trust Co. of Columbia: Pay to R. Smalls or order fifty dollars ($50).

"J. WOODRUFF,
"For REPUBLICAN PRINTING Co.

"(Endorsed: Robt. Smalls)."

THE FIVE THOUSAND DOLLAR FRAUD.

The second transaction between Josephus Woodruff and Robert Smalls was pertaining to the appropriation of $250,000 to the Republican Printing Company.

The senate committee on printing, of which Robert Smalls was chairman, and Thad. C. Andrews, H. J. Maxwell, C. D. Hayne, and B. F. Whittemore were members, recommended that "the bill do pass." (Page 263, report on frauds, as quoted above.)

Josephus Woodruff testified (page 265, report on frauds):

"I can enumerate but a portion of the amounts paid on the passage of the appropriation of $250,000." He here mentioned a list of 30 senators and others receiving sums ranging from $50 to $40,000, among whom is Senator R. Smalls, $5,000.

Josephus Woodruff continued: "The above, which foots up a total of $112,550, does not include payments made by Mr. Jones to members and officers of the house, a reference which I feel sure would make at least $30,000 more. Add to this amount the then existing liabilities of the company, $80,000, and it will be seen the whole amount paid out of that appropriation was $217,550, leaving a balance of $32,450 for the support of the printing establishment and work of the session of 1872–73. The work of this session was enormous. It is true that additional appropriations of $50,000 for the current printing and $50,000 for the permanent printing of that session were made; but the amounts were not paid, nor provision made for payment, until the session of 1873–74, when certificates of indebtedness receivable for taxes were ordered to be issued to the printing company in payment of their claim."

*Robert Smalls was a member of the constitutional convention then sitting.

Now, here is the evidence which fastens the bribery on Smalls:

ZEALY'S TESTIMONY.

Lawrence N. Zealy, being recalled says (pages 360-361, report on frauds): "I have examined the following check, No. 17, payable to cash, signed by J. Woodruff, amounting to $5,000.

"No. 17.] "COLUMBIA, S. C., *January 19, 1873.*

"South Carolina Bank and Trust Co. of Columbia: Pay to cash or bearer five thousand dollars.

"$5,000. "J. WOODRUFF.

"(Indorsed 'A,' and the figures 584.)"

And find on reference to the Journal "A," page 437 of books South Carolina Bank and Trust Company, on Saturday, January —, 1873, a check for $5,000 charged to J. Woodruff. The check bears date 19th January, 1873, and, the necessary amount of funds being to the credit of J. Woodruff, was charged to his account on Saturday, the 18th of January, 1873, Sunday being the 19th January, 1873. I also find in individual ledger, page 584, as designated on margin of Journal "A," page 437, the same amount charged to J. Woodruff, and that said check appears by following deposit slip, viz:

SOUTH CAROLINA BANK AND TRUST COMPANY.
Columbia, S. C., January 18, 1873.

Deposited by Hon. Robert Smalls.

Gold		
Currency		
Checks W	$5,000	
Total		

The above having been placed to the credit of Hon. Robert Smalls, for, upon examination of Journal "B," page 437, Saturday, January 18, 1873, I find the following entry: "Hon. Robert Smalls, credit $5,000." And by reference to the following number (875) on said page 437 of Journal "B," which number (875) refers to the number of the page on which the account headed "Hon. Robert Smalls" appears, the following entry is found:

"1873. Jan. 18. By deposit (No. 437), $5,000. (Individual ledger.) Said deposit check, referred to above, bears the letter 'W' after the word 'check' on same line which indicates that the deposit made was a check; and it was the habit of the officers of the bank when a check was deposited by any person to place the first letter of the maker of the check's name upon the deposit slip. From the appearance of the letter 'W' and the entry in the books I have no hesitation in saying that it refers to the check of J. Woodruff, charged on the same day to J. Woodruff's account and placed to the credit of the Honorable Robert Smalls."

It has been claimed that as January 19, 1873, was Sunday, there is a mistake. It is evident, however, that this was simply a clerical error likely to be made in any transaction, for the books of the bank show that the money was deposited on January 18. However, it is conclusive from the testimony of Zealy that Smalls did receive the check and that the check was fraudulent.

LEGISLATIVE EXPENSES.

The next thing, after passing from this matter of printing, to which I will direct your attention is the table prepared by the same committee from the record covering legislative expenses. I will not attempt to tire the patience of this body by going over the figures; I will pick out items here and there and print the whole for the information of those who shall read this exposé. The number of clerks employed in 1870-71 was 349 (we have been wrangling here to-day about keeping seven poor little fellows who came here to do clerical work); 1872, 176; 1873-74, 126, and so on through the list. They had 124 pages one session [laughter]. One for every member of the house [laughter]. They had 144 messengers one year and 212 another. The total amount expended under the head of legislative expenses during the first two years was $822,000; during the next year, $1,533,574; the next year, $908,855, and the next year, $922,536. The table referred to is as follows:

EXHIBIT J. O. H.—*Showing the expenditures on account of legislative expenses for the several sessions of 1870-71, 1871-72, 1872-73, 1873-74, and the number of officers and attachés employed under Republican administrations, as contrasted with like expenditures, sessions 1876-77, under Democratic rule.*

[Columns with an asterisk represent amounts settled by comptroller-general warrants through "Big bonanza warrants."]

Administration.	Sessions of—	No. of clerks.	Amount of pay.	No. of laborers.	Amount of pay.	No. of doorkeepers.	Amount of pay.	No. of firemen.	Amount of pay.	No. of chaplains.	Amount of pay.	No. of janitors.	Amount of pay.
Republican administration	1870-71	349	$78,901.00	14	$1,075.00	21	$2,997.98	3	$397.00	3	$1,182.00	2	$386.00
Do.*	1870-71		1,764.00						135.00				
Do	1871-72	475	18,480.00	16	520.00	16	2,835.50	14	1,656.00	3	870.00	5	703.00
Do.*	1871-72		20,836.00		413.00		998.00		530.00				
Do	1872-73	176	50,851.00	17	13,240.00	15	2,870.00	10	1,054.00	3	445.00	2	104.00
Do.*	1872-73		5,651.00		2,440.00								
Do	1873-74	126	53,160.00	150	25,133.00	13	4,243.00	8	895.00	3	660.00	3	823.00
Do.*	1873-74		7,168.00		6,897.00		200.00		199.00		1,422.00		
Democratic administration	1877	22	6,415.00	6	282.00	4	470.00						

Administration.	Sessions of—	No. of messengers.	Amount of pay.	No. of mail carriers.	Amount of pay.	No. of porters.	Amount of pay.	No. of pages.	Amount of pay.	No. of sergeants-at-arms.	Amount of pay.	No. of solicitors.	Amount of pay.
Republican administration	1870-71	144	$21,165.50	2	$456.00	170	$13,995.00	124	$6,004.00	17	$2,830.00	22	$9,515.00
Do.*	1870-71		1,175.00										
Do	1871-72	212	147,249.50	2	372.00	23	94,670.75	74	4,200.00	7	1,726.00	27	8,179.00
Do.*	1871-72		11,488.00		333.50		3,969.00		3,967.00		306.00		2,250.00
Do	1872-73	82	2,903.00	3	486.00	4	539.00	50	1,497.00	6	3,935.00	13	3,816.00
Do.*	1872-73		1,172.00										
Do	1873-74	28	4,253.00	4	407.00	9	1,054.00	41	3,053.00	12	2,325.00	16	6,279.00
Do.*	1873-74												1,259.00
Democratic administration	1877	2	188.00	1	47.00	2	94.00	8	376.00	3	685.00	2	420.00

Administration.	Sessions of—	No. of stenographers.	Amount of pay.	Legislative accounts and claims passed.	Sundries, wines, cigars, liquors, groceries, dry goods, etc.	Stationery.	Fuel.	Newspapers.	Postage stamps.	Telegrams.
Republican administration	1870-71	17	$4,636.00	$13,202.00	$157,747.20	$20,199.00	$22.00	$3,253.00	$950.87	$332.45
Do.*	1870-71			96.00	52.83			642.00		
Do	1871-72	5	1,627.00	68,616.00	262,388.50	68,445.39	10,623.00	4,423.00	1,598.54	465.10
Do.*	1871-72		340.00	4,511.00	19,126.00	4,370.00	1,085.00	815.00		
Do	1872-73	2	835.00	68,306.00	22,450.00	22,504.00	1,842.00	1,842.00	1,132.00	267.00
Do.*	1872-73			4,497.00	27,902.00	8,372.00		1,807.00		
Do	1873-74			24,613.00	34,367.00	2,103.00		5,767.00		
Do.*	1873-74			22,648.00	19,141.00	2,872.00		1,200.00		378.00
Democratic administration	1877					1,380.00				

Administration.	Sessions of—	Furniture.	Rent of committee rooms.	Impeachment trials.	High joint committee, including amount paid by H. H. Kimpton.	Amount paid members.	Printing.	Total No. of employees.	Total amount paid employees.	Total legislative expenses.
Republican administration	1870-71	$37,000	$1,448.00	$1,146.00	$41,000.00	$103,000.00	$152,565.00	888	$143,537.00	
Do.*	1870-71			41.00						822,608.83
Do	1871-72	116,578.00	3,678.00			102,900.00	173,000.00	879	359,397.00	
Do.*	1871-72		100.00	3,006.00						1,533,574.78
Do	1872-73	17,285.00	2,490.00	20.00		103,000.00	450,000.00	315	91,838.00	
Do.*	1872-73		822.00							908,855.00
Do	1873-74	5,780.00					395,000.00	423	109,435.00	
Do.*	1873-74									922,536.00
Democratic administration	1877					58,140.00	6,622.00	50	8,977.00	84,096.00

GIGANTIC SWINDLES.

Now, not satisfied that the taxes were five millions more than were necessary, you will recall that the State treasurer spoke of the disappearance of seven millions of assets belonging to the State, being the assets of the bank of the State and the stock of the State in different railroads which she had lent her credit to. Here is what the committee says about it:

Since the day of the coming of this man to South Carolina there has been perpetrated upon the people of the State a series of frauds, great and small, many of which have been already made the subject of comment and all of which mark out together an era challenging comparison for its infamy with any history within the period of modern times. In each case the familiar footprints of this man are to be seen and measured, and most to be found in the forefront of the mottled army of plunderers, as "the years of good stealing in South Carolina" have come and gone.

That was one of his bonmots which he got off, I suppose, in the statehouse barroom when he remarked that there were "five more years of good stealing in South Carolina." This is the only record he has left here in the memory of these people. In a general way, if you ever hear his name mentioned, some one speaks and says: "Oh, yes; John J. Patterson is the one who said that there were five more years of good stealing in South Carolina."

The committee says further:

At that time the State owned large amounts of stock in various railroad companies in the State which had been acquired in consideration of public bounties conferred upon these corporations, and also other property of various descriptions which for the moment was not productive of income. The most direct method of securing the controlling interest was to procure legislation to authorize the sale of the stock held by the State in the Greenville and Columbia Railroad Company, and to this end the act was passed creating the sinking fund commission, composed of Governor Scott, Attorney-General Chamberlain, Comptroller Neagle, the chairman of the committee on ways and means of the house, and the chairman of the committee on finance of the senate, and authorizing them to sell all unprotective property belonging to the State. Ostensibly the purpose of this act was to dispose of the damaged granite and marble and other material lying around the statehouse grounds.

The real purpose was consummated by the sale of 21,698 shares of stock in the Greenville and Columbia Railroad Company—which cost the State $20 per share, aggregating $433,960—at $2.75 per share, aggregating $59,909.50 This was followed, of course, by a sacrifice of the interest of the State in all other corporations and the accumulation of a fund, all of which (in gross violation of the letter of the act) was transferred to the financial agent and lost. The evidence hereto appended is conclusive that this act was passed by bribery, the means for which were furnished by H. H. Kimpton. The stock was sold without advertisement on the day after the bill was passed and approved, and without any action of the commissioners either authorizing its sale or limiting the price at which it should be sold, and was paid for by Kimpton's receipt as financial agent in New York for the amount of the bid. No money passed, and the fund transferred to Kimpton's books was "sunk" beyond recovery in the devious processes of hypothecation and general bond swindling.

After a majority of the stock in the company was obtained by this arrangement and by purchases from private parties, and the ring thus placed in control of its affairs, the scheme which was the objective point of the operation was brought into play in the shape of a "bill relating to the Greenville and Columbia Railroad Company," prepared by Attorney-General Chamberlain, and on the 17th day of February, 1871, introduced by Timothy Hurley, one of the ring, for the purpose of a further issue of bonds and giving them a value in the market. In the fifth section of this act will be found the gist of the matter. The State then held a lien for indemnity against her indorsement upon one million and a half of guaranteed bonds of this company, so that subsequent bonds would be of little or no value and could not be sold by the ring. By this section the lien was postponed to bonds to be issued under a second mortgage, thus enabling the ring to divide and put their bonds on the market, while the only security held by the State was swept away and a contingent debt of $1,500,000 fixed upon the State without indemnity.

Who were the partners in this swindle? "The financial board was composed of Governor Scott, Treasurer Parker, and Attorney-General Chamberlain. Kimpton paid out of the proceeds of the sale of State bonds the money for a share and a half for Neagle, comptroller-general, who had the general supervision of the bonded debt; one share for Crews, who was chairman of the committee on railroads in the house; one quarter share for Cardozo, secretary of state, who had the sealing of all the bonds; two and a half shares for Waterman, for Governor Scott; one-half share for Attorney-General Chamberlain, and two shares for Kimpton himself, and one share for Leslie, land commissioner." These are the men who stole all the State's interest in the Greenville and Columbia Railroad. Then had the legislature, after they had gotten control of the railroad, to steal the balance from the widows and orphans and other stockholders of the State. They got their power to do these infamies through the members from Beaufort and other negroes, who misrepresented our people in those days under bayonet rule and carpetbag government.

THE IMPEACHMENT SWINDLE.

The next steal to which I will direct your attention briefly is what is called the "impeachment swindle," and again John J. Patterson shines out with an immoral preeminence as the prince of scoundrels.

Again let the investigating committee speak:

The second noteworthy achievement of John J. Patterson, following that connected with the Columbia and Greenville Railroad Company, was in quite a different field of action. The investigations made into the management of the issuing, sale, and hypothecation of State bonds made it plain that the financial board, composed of Governor Scott, Treasurer Parker, and Attorney-General Chamberlain, had fraudulently and illegally issued several millions of State bonds, and it was determined to bring these parties to trial by impeachment. C. C. Bowen, then a member from Charleston, on the 18th of December, 1871, introduced a resolution to impeach R. K. Scott of high crimes and misdemeanors.

This was Patterson's opportunity. With the assistance of Worthington he gave encouragement by day to the friends of the measure and by night worked upon the credulity of Scott, "running with the hare and holding with the hounds." When the scheme was ripe, and Scott became thoroughly alarmed, he engaged the services of those worthies to buy up a majority of the members of the house, and issued to them for this purpose three "armed-force" warrants, in blank as to amounts and names of persons to whom payable, leaving these important matters to be attended to by Patterson. In 1869 the joint resolution was passed authorizing the governor to employ an armed force for the preservation of the peace, "the expenses of which were to be paid out of any funds in the treasury not otherwise appropriated."

It was from this convenient fund, then ready to hand, that the warrants were drawn—one filled up with the name of John Mooney for $25,545, another in the name of John Leggert for $10,000, and the third in the name of David H. Wilson for $13,500. All of these names are fictitious, but were nevertheless indorsed on the warrants. The two first were collected by F. S. Jacobs, who was cashier of Hardy Solomon's bank and Patterson's confidential friend. The third order was collected by Hardy Solomon, president of the bank. The financial arrangement thus concluded, Patterson and Worthington did their work faithfully, and with the money of the State bought for Scott and Parker immunity for their crimes.

In the progress of this double-dyed villiany it became evident that if an adjournment over to the holidays could be effected and the members then permitted to return to their homes, where the sentiment of the people was unanimous against the thieves, it would require more money to purchase the recusant members than the State treasury could afford.

Another source of annoyance to the financial ring was the report of the joint investigating committee, which was already printed and ready for delivery, and which fully established their guilt. Whipper had the floor, and intended to speak until the hour of adjournment had arrived, and unless he could be seated the vote could not be had before adjournment. In this emergency the services of the speaker, F. J. Moses, jr., were secured by the payment of a large sum of money out of the militia fund, whereupon Samuel J. Lee, a ready tool of the ring, rose to a question of privilege, upon which Moses ruled promptly, and thus removed Whipper from the floor.

Meantime Governor Scott had issued a proclamation convening the general assembly on the day following the day fixed for adjournment, on the dignified ground that it was "neither decent nor proper, and is injurious to the State, for the general assembly to adjourn from the 22d of December, 1871, to the 5th of January, 1872, whilst the governor and treasurer are charged with high crimes and misdemeanors." The high and chivalric tone of these two worthies, who could steal the money of the people by the millions and yet could not brook the indignity of remaining under a threat of impeachment for a week, even for the sake of the joyous festivity of Christmas, ought to have redeemed a multitude of sins. Under such threats and persuasions and preliminary trickery further debate was cut off, and the resolution of impeachment was defeated by an overwhelming vote—63 to 27. In this controversy R. B. Elliott bore a prominent part in behalf of the persecuted officials, and received warrants on the "armed-force fund" to the amount of $10,500, which were fully paid to him out of the treasury in January and February, 1872.

And then they go on and show how the warrants were paid. I notice here the name of W. J. Whipper, another delegate on this floor, whose pathetic appeal and eloquent portrayal of the consequences of our act should we pass the suffrage plan has been sent broadcast. Whipper's name appears in a good light in the impeachment swindle. He was among those who were endeavoring to impeach Scott. He was on the floor, and the hour for adjournment was fixed by resolution. Speaker Moses took him off the floor after he had received $10,000 for doing it. And the negroes, who had been bribed in the meantime—Patterson got enough of them, buying them up cheap, paying the big ones $500 and $300, etc., and the small ones a less amount—voted down the impeachment resolution.

I am sorry now I have to pay my respects to the gentleman from Beaufort in another aspect. I believe, judging from his speech, which he made extemporaneously, he is the ablest man of color I have ever met. But the proof lies here, overwhelming and undeniable, that he, too, on divers occasions, was a bribe taker, and that, in addition to that, while secretary of the sinking-fund commission, he perpetrated a scheme to get some of the State's money. He sold State property for $7,000, then he brought a bill for services as attorney for $8,000, pocketed all he had sold the property for, and brought the State out in debt to him. [Laughter.]

I am sorry to have to bring this fact out on a member of this body, but that member stood here as a representative of the negro race and threatened us with direful consequences if we pressed forward to secure to our posterity immunity from such danger in future. I am forced, in self-defense and as a vindication of our action, to bring out the fact that while he was a representative of the people he participated in this wrong and robbery and stealage, and he must appear in the eyes of the world as simply wanting a possible return of John J. Patterson's "five years more of good stealing."

TESTIMONY AS TO W. J. WHIPPER'S VARIOUS DEFALCATIONS.

[Page 128 of Report on Public Frauds.]

Examination of John B. Dennis, continued:

Regarding the contract for furnishing the statehouse, he says he never had any contract at all to do the furnishing. Says that in the summer of 1870, when Moses was speaker of the house, Moses asked him if he would like to make the purchase of the furniture for the hall of representatives and the committee rooms in the new statehouse, which was fast being completed. He replied he would like to do so. Speaker Moses gave him an order to furnish the necessary articles for fitting up the representative hall and committee rooms.

On the strength of this order witness contracted with M. H. Berry, of this city, to furnish the desks, chairs, and everything that came in his line. Mr. Berry then proceeded to New York with him and took him to the manufacturers, where selections were made. Mr. Berry's bill amounted to, as near as can be remembered, about $12,000. He purchased of Messrs. Stewart, Stephen & Co., of Brooklyn, N. Y., the carpets, lambrequins, cornices, etc., that came within their line, and of Messrs. Nicol, Davidson & Co., chandeliers,

cuspidors, etc., that came within their line. Does not remember the exact amount of their bills, but thinks the three accounts of Berry, Nicol & Davidson, and Stewart, Sutphen & Co. aggregated about $40,000.

Byars, from Orangeburg, moved for a committee of nine to be appointed for the purpose of investigating the furniture account, which motion was carried, and he (Byars) became chairman of it. (Page 190).

When the call for reports from special committees was made Byars rose and reported that the committee had carefully considered the accounts for furnishing the house of representatives and committee rooms, and recommended that they be paid ninety-two thousand some hundreds of dollars (does not recollect the exact amount), and that the account of W. E. Rose for $190 for board of some of the workmen engaged in putting down carpets and putting up chandeliers, etc., be not paid. After this came a question as to how the certificates for payment of the $92,000 should be drawn. Byars being afraid if they were drawn to the merchants who furnished the goods that they would not indorse and hand over the certificates in excess of the amount due them.

It was finally decided to draw them all in favor of witness and let him take the amounts and hand over to the parties who furnished the goods, and indorse all of the others and they could be distributed among the friends of the $92,000 report. To this witness consented, thinking in that way he could prevent the payment of all of the certificates except those justly due to parties who had in good faith furnished the goods. This was done; and witness went to Governor Scott and told him what he had done, and if he (the governor) would now assist in having paid the amount actually and honestly due to the parties who furnished the goods, the amount being only about $40,000, that he (witness) would then go before any court and swear that the excess in the hands of the members of the legislature was a fraud and ought not to be paid. Governor Scott said he could do nothing about it.

The witness testified that among the 40 members amongst whom the certificates were divided "W. J. Whipper received a certificate for himself for $3,000." (Pages 190, 191, and 192.)

Later on (page 843) John B. Dennis further testified:

I think I have mentioned in my previous testimony that the amount of pay certificates given to Whipper was $3,000. I remember distinctly that some time afterwards he complained that the warrant was less than he was to have received.

F. E. Wilder, being duly sworn, deposed and said (page 844):

I reside in Beaufort County, in this State. I was treasurer of that county from the early part of 1871 to the latter part of 1872, and from some time in 1876 to the early part of 1877. In the spring of 1872 (I think some time in the month of March) I cashed several legislative pay certificates for W. J. Whipper, who was member of the general assembly from that county. I do not remember how many of them I cashed, but I think the amount was over $3,000.

House certificate, dated March 1, 1872, in favor of Paul Brown, for $1.80), for amount of account for legislative expenses; house certificate, dated February 29, 1872, in favor of Patrick Dunner, for $1,000, for amount of account for legislative expenses; and house certificate, dated March 13, 1872, in favor of W. J. Whipper, for $36, for per diem for attending as a member of the house of representatives—all fastened together, and the latter, indorsed "1748 S. E. Wilder, $2,836, March 29, 1872," being shown to witness, he says:

"I think these are the certificates or part of the certificates I have mentioned I cashed for W. J. Whipper. I turned in these certificates to the State treasurer as cash on account of taxes on the 20th of March, 1872. I know that is the date I turned them in, because that is the date of my receipt to the State treasurer for the amount of them. I have this day examined my receipt at the State treasury. My receipt in the State treasurer's book is numbered 1748, corresponding with the number on the back of the certificate in favor of W. J. Whipper. I am entirely satisfied I got all these certificates from W. J. Whipper, for this reason, amongst others: That the only persons whose claims I cashed that spring were Smalls, Myers, Bascomb, Nehemiah, and Whipper, and none of these certificates were amongst the claims I cashed for the first four persons. Smalls's claim was a treasurer's duebill; Myers's claims were pay certificates, all drawn in the name of Myers; Bascomb's claims were two pay certificates, one drawn in his own name, and both amounting to only $300 to $400, and Nehemiah's claim was a pay certificate drawn in his own name—according to my impression it was drawn in his own name—and was about for $900. I received no such certificates, such as those now shown to me, from anybody but Whipper, and therefore I say I am entirely satisfied that I got all of them from him.

"(Signed) F. E. WILDER."

THE FURNITURE STEAL.

John Williams, being duly sworn, deposes on oath as follows: "I acted as sergeant-at-arms of the house of representatives while F. J. Moses, jr., and S. J. Lee, esqs., were, respectively, speakers of the house. It was part of my duty, under a resolution of the house, to purchase supplies for the house of representatives by order of the speaker.

"While Moses was speaker I purchased some bedroom sets and delivered them at the building of Mr. Greenfield, at the corner over Muller's store, and furnished eight rooms. Two of them were occupied by Gen. W. J. Whipper." (Page 171.)

"I know that large quantities of furniture were furnished by Mr. Berry each session; that as soon as the general assembly adjourned the furniture disappeared, and that I was compelled, under the order of the speaker or some committee chairman, to refurnish all the rooms as soon as the legislature met. I was told that it was my business to furnish the rooms; that after that I had nothing more to do with them or the furniture in them; consequently it was, in my opinion, stolen by parties who had charge of it."

SINKING FUND FRAUDS.

The joint investigating committee makes this report pertaining to the sinking fund commission and frauds therein (page 850, Report on Public Frauds):

But for brazen effrontry we call attention to the transactions and testimony of W. J. Whipper, at one time a member and secretary of this remarkable commission. He admitted in his testimony, with shameless audacity, that he had received certain State bonds and money which he appropriated to his own use. It seems that he was employed by the commission at one time to negotiate the sales of some public property. He not only negotiated certain sales, but he converted the proceeds unlawfully, and perhaps feloniously, to his own use, and when pressed for settlement appears with an account current, which, we venture, cannot be equaled in any business transaction. He sold property amounting to $6,517.99, and credits himself with $7,033.33 for professional services, although the evidence shows conclusively that he was never employed as attorney for the commission.

Gen. W. J. Whipper being sworn, says (page 851): "During the legislative terms embracing the sessions of 1870-71 and 1871-72 I was chairman of the house committee of ways and means and ex officio a member of the sinking fund commission. I was secretary of the commission for a portion of that time, succeeding J. L. Neagle as such. I have some bonds of the sinking fund commission in my possession and one paper, the latter being a receipt of D. H. Chamberlain, then attorney-general, for a note of J. B. Dennis (receipt produced and turned over to the committee). The bonds are only constructively in my possession. They are in possession of Gen. William Gurney as collateral for a loan made to me. I got the bonds in payment for a tract of land situate in Charleston, sold to Henry Bischoff by me as secretary of the commission.

"I do not remember what class of bonds they were, except that they were State bonds of one of the issues since reconstruction. The amount of them was $4,500, or about that amount. General Gurney has had them since the summer of 1872. They were put up with a number of other collaterals to obtain a running loan. I was then doing business with General Gurney, who was my factor at that time. I deem it proper to state that I was at that time secretary and also attorney for the commission, both when I received the bonds and when I pledged them as collateral. The loans were for me individually. I have not seen General Gurney about the bonds nor endeavored to procure them. * * * I claim a balance in my favor of $1,638.63, for which I hold the bonds above named. I have not with me the itemized particulars of my claims against the commission. I claim nothing as secretary or member. My claim is for actual expenses and as attorney's fees, and amounts to $8,156.62."

W. J. Whipper, in account with sinking fund, State of South Carolina.

[Furnished the committee by him.]

DR.

1872.		
Jan.	To amount received from city of Charleston, per sale of powder magazine, one-third of $7,100	$2,368.00
	To amount received from H. Bischoff for lot of land on Line and Meeting streets, Charleston, one-third of $6,875	2,291.66
	To amount received from J. S. Riggs for lot of land on Line street, one third of $550	183.33
Mar.	To amount received from A. McBee for State works and grounds, Greenville, one-third of $2,850	950.00
	To amount received from Pleasant Barton, first installment of lease of State road, Greenville	725.00
		6,517.99

CR.

1872.		
Jan.	By auctioneer's commission on $7,100, at 2½ per cent	$177.50
	By auctioneer's commission on $6,875, at 2½ per cent	171.87
	By auctioneer's commission on $550, at 2½ per cent	13.75
Mar.	By auctioneer's commission on sale of State works and State road, and papers, stamps, and expenses	206.37
	By cash paid for advertising in Charleston Courier	242.75
	By cash paid for advertising in Daily News	247.05
	By cash paid for advertising in Beaufort Times	32.00
	By cash paid for advertising in Beaufort Republican	32.00
	By amount due W. J. Whipper as attorney	7,033.33
		8,106.62

RECAPITULATION.

Debtor by receipts	6,517.99
Creditor by payments	8,156.62
	1,638.63

Whipper, it will be seen, claims $7,033.33 as attorney's fees in a transaction involving only $6,517.99.

J. L. Neagle, the predecessor of Whipper as secretary of the sinking fund commission, swears (page 855): "W. J. Whipper was authorized, as secretary of the sinking-fund commission, to sell some real estate in Charleston. He was never employed as attorney for the commission to my knowledge."

I leave it to all disinterested men to judge of Whipper's guilt or innocence.

THE BLUE RIDGE STEAL.

There is next the Blue Ridge steal. The State had a mortgage on the Blue Ridge road, having advanced large sums of money in the effort to reach the Northwest by a railroad through the Blue Ridge Mountains, and held practically the title to the road—that is, the State and Charleston jointly. We have $4,000,000—$4,200,000, I think—of Blue Ridge scrip issued fraudulently, and there is a lawsuit now pending in the United States court to force this State to pay the Blue Ridge scrip issued by that legislature in defiance of the law and now held as an obligation by a gentleman in New York, who claims that it was hypothecated with him as security for money, and it seems to me that we are never to be rid of the consequences of this misrule. The penitentiary down here cost $900,000; that is the sum added together here as the amount appropriated during those years of Radical government.

I will pass on, Mr. President, merely mentioning that a large sum—about $500,000—was spent for the militia; and you all remember that during those dark days of 1872, 1873, and 1874 there was hardly a Saturday night of the year that a drumbeat of some negro militia company was not in the earshot of each one of you, while threats were made by these negro soldiery that they intended to rise up and exterminate the white men from the face of the earth and take this country.

A PREEMINENT SCOUNDREL.

I have shown you by the records and the report of this committee that of all the thieves and scoundrels and villains who fastened their fangs upon the throat of this State and sucked its lifeblood John J. Patterson must be given preeminence.

What did they do for Patterson—these negroes? He bought enough of them to send him to the United States Senate as a representative in that august assemblage of this grand old State, to

occupy the chair that has been graced by Calhoun and Hayne. Here is what the committee says about it:

In conclusion, the undersigned respectfully report that the election of the Hon. J. J. Patterson to the Senate of the United States on December 10, 1872, was procured by corruption and bribery.

They would further remark that the legislature of 1872-73 was largely composed of new members, and that they were most solemnly pledged to a correction of past abuses and to the inauguration of real reforms. Some of the members may have been unfit for the discharge of the important duties of legislation by reason of ignorance, yet came to Columbia with a desire, in an humble way, to do what was right. John J. Patterson enjoys the unenviable position of having been the first to place before them the poisoned chalice of temptation and to corrupt them with its enticing drafts. Need we wonder that they were intoxicated and fell? Then followed a wild saturnalia of public plunder, the record of which furnishes nothing which is at all pleasant to investigate or to perpetuate in history.

This report is signed by John R. Cochran, chairman, a Republican; Henry A. Meetze, of the senate; Gerhard Muller, J. C. Sheppard, and S. Dibble, of the house.

Now, I have alluded to the fact of this villainy, anarchy, misrule, and robbery, and I can not, in any words I possess, paint it. There is no man on this floor living in the country who dared during that dark period to leave his fireside without dread that when he returned he would find some harm to his family; and he dared not go forth without being armed, fearful of robbery. The sky was lit almost every night by the glare of burning dwellings and ginhouses. Our courts of justice were filled with bribe takers, and the judges themselves were not free from bribery. How did it come about, and who must bear the blame? We are told the negroes did not do it. "Oh, we didn't do it," they say. [Addressing the negro delegates.] You blindly followed and obeyed the orders of the Freedman's Bureau and the Union League and ignored the appeals of your former masters, who treated you with kindness and furnished you with your daily bread.

I myself can testify that appeal after appeal was made by me, and by almost every white man in this State, with the negroes with whom he came in contact on his plantation: "Stop! come back! help us free ourselves from this burden!" But every one of you, almost up to 1876, blindly followed wherever these white thieves ordered. Was it negro government? The negroes furnished the ballots, and that is what we are dealing with. The negroes put the little pieces of paper in the box that gave the commission to these white scoundrels who were their leaders and the men who debauched them; and this must be our justification, our vindication, and our excuse to the world that we are met in convention openly, boldly, without any pretense of secrecy, to announce that it is our purpose, as far as we may without coming in conflict with the United States Constitution, to put such safeguards around this ballot in future, to so restrict the suffrage and circumscribe it, that this infamy can never come about again.

The negroes were the tools of designing white men, I acknowledge—participators and willing tools. The poor, ignorant cotton-field hand, who never reaped any advantage, nor saw anything except a pistol, blindly followed like sheep wherever their black and white leaders told them to go, voted unanimously every time for the Republican ticket during that dark period, and these results were achieved solely and wholly by reason of the ballot being in the hands of such cattle. Is the danger gone? No. How did we recover our liberty? By fraud and violence. We tried to overcome the 30,000 majority by honest methods, which was a mathematical impossibility. After we had borne these indignities for eight years life became worthless under such conditions.

Under the leadership and inspiration of Mart Gary, because he planned and brought about the straight-out movement of 1876, in spite of the low-country fighting on this floor against those who opposed putting Chamberlain forward as a compromise candidate—under his leadership and through his magnificent courage (for Edgefield alone gave us the excuse to claim the governorship) we won the fight. We had a legal right by her majority, but then Grant's bayonets were here to prop Chamberlain in the governor's chair. We were held in suspense from the meeting of the general assembly in November until Hayes's title had been settled by the electoral commission in March. The whole State was like a powder magazine. The people had sworn to have their liberties or to die.

How did we bring it about? Every white man sunk his personal feelings and ambitions. The white people of the State, illustrating our glorious motto, "Ready with their lives and fortunes," came together as one. By fraud and violence, if you please, we threw it off. In 1878 we had to resort to more fraud and violence, and so again in 1880. Then the registration law and eight-box system was evolved from the superior intelligence of the white man to check and control this surging, muddy stream of ignorance and to tell it to back, and since then we have carried our elections without resort to any illegal methods, simply because the whites were united. If we were to remain united it would still be desirable that we should guard against the possibility of this flood, which is now dammed up, breaking loose, or like the viper that is asleep, only to be warmed into life again, and sting us whenever some more white rascals, native or foreign, come here and mobilize the ignorant blacks. Therefore the only thing we can do as patriots and as statesmen is to take from them every ballot that we can under the laws of our National Government.

I read a moment ago from the report of the committee that good government can only rest on intelligence and good morals. I will go further and say that good government and the very life of republics rest on virtue, patriotism, and intelligence. The chief amongst the three is intelligence. It has been said, and it must be apparent to any one who thinks, that even if we restrict the suffrage as we propose, with 40,000 conservatives and 40,000 reformers, divided and striving for mastery, and 15,000 illiterate white men disfranchised, the negroes are still here in sufficient numbers to control us.

Are we so besotted, so forgetful and oblivious of the record which I have just read to you? Have our memories grown so callous that we as a white race—kinsmen, brothers, common inheritors of the glorious past and of the freedom transmitted to us by our forefathers—have we got to the point where we can not unite as brothers, throwing aside the petty bickerings and animosities that have been engendered in the last five years, and without regard to personal ambition or partisan advantage to anybody, can we not provide so that we will not have to appeal to these people as arbiters of our fate? Can we not rise to the necessities of the occasion and put into this constitution such an article in reference to suffrage as will guarantee, as far as the law can guarantee, to future generations that they shall have the blessings of Anglo-Saxon civilization and liberty in this State? How pitiable, how puerile, ineffably, unutterably contemptible appear the personal ambitions and petty spites of men alongside of this grand and glorious purpose!

I am sorry that I feel constrained briefly to touch upon this matter now from a different standpoint. I shall be as brief as the subject will permit. I feel almost willing to stop now and leave unuttered any word in answer to what has been said this morning, and to leave it to the patriotism and wisdom of this body to move forward and not hesitate. We were told something about perfect equality of white men; that the poor tenant who has nothing but his wife and children, who labors for his daily bread from year's end to year's end, gathering no property, is equal to the highest man in this State. I grant it. It has been my cardinal doctrine as a public man that all white men, as far as the enjoyment of the privileges of government and the emoluments of office are concerned, should be equal in this State, and that the majority alone should govern. But that doctrine can not be brought in here as a reason why we must stop and pause and falter in our purpose to secure to our posterity good government, unless you carry it further; and if you are going to bring in the universal brotherhood of man as an argument here, then are not the blacks as much entitled to that consideration as anybody? The logical conclusion is inevitable.

On this question of suffrage it is said that some men's right to vote will be jeopardized. If there was any way under high heaven by which we could do more than we have done, in God's name I would glory and honor the man, and bow down and submit to his leadership, if he would show us. What do they offer us? A continuation of the existing conditions and perpetuation of fraud or fraudulent methods; and the sword of Damocles suspended over our heads by a single hair swings, and swings, and swings; and all that is necessary to bring about chaos is for a sufficient number of white men, actuated by hate, or ambition, or from any unpatriotic motive, to climb up and cut it loose, mobilize and register the negroes, lead them and give them a free vote and a fair count under manhood suffrage.

Some men have seduced themselves into believing that the best white men, the so-called better class, of which we have heard so much within the last few years, could form an alliance with this black substratum, and that our liberties would not be endangered. What folly! The point can not be controverted that whenever enough white men go with that class and bring them forward, the so-called best white men may get in office once, twice, or thrice by means of the negro majority led by the white minority, but the struggle for the control of that vote will just as invariably debauch, demoralize, and lower and finally corrupt and make rotten the public morals as that the sun shines in the heavens.

The men who sink nearest to their level in social equality, as Moses, Chamberlain, and those scoundrels did, can always command their support. And you will always be confronted with the possibility, the probability, and even the certainty of it coming to pass at some time, until you shall have reduced their voting strength so that there will never be enough of them to do more than to put either one white faction or the other in control of the government. And even that, which we can not help, stands here as fixed as the law of the Medes and Persians by the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments—and yet you hesitate to make the evil as small as possible and minimize the danger!

Allusion has been made to the fact that several prominent gentlemen met in this city to see if there could be any terms of amity,

any treaty of peace between the warring factions in this State, and the words "ingrate" and "traitor" have been used in connection with my name as a participant.

What was the condition? The minority faction had opposed almost to a man the calling of this constitutional convention. Demagogues of a certain stripe had used the newspapers of the State to threaten and terrify the poor whites with the possible and probable loss of their ballots if the constitutional convention was called. Spartanburg, which had never suffered from negro domination and which can never suffer in its local affairs from negro domination, voted overwhelmingly against the constitutional convention. When the fight seemed almost lost and those of us who had struggled for ten years or more, in season and out of season, whenever an opportunity offered, to urge upon the people the wisdom and necessity for calling a convention and taking care of our posterity by limiting the suffrage, when we felt that the fight was desperate, in October a meeting was called at Ridgeway. The governor and myself and the chairman of the Democratic executive committee, who has let his tongue run so loosely, were invited and promised to go there and discuss the question.

The people sent us here, and they elected numbers of you without regard to your factional differences in the past; they sent you here as patriots; they have sent you here although you have opposed them in politics, and I thank God for it, because it has been demonstrated on this floor that we are all actuated by high and noble purposes except where our personal ambitions are concerned, and we vote here as free men and equals, at no man's dictation. They say I have been shorn of my strength and my influence; that I have been measured here by my logic and my capacity to argue; that I have been turned down time and time again. I thank God that if I have it has proved to others here that I am no more than anyone else. I am simply trying to do my duty, and will always try to do it as I see it. I am not infallible, and do not claim to be. While I have never claimed that wisdom will die with me, I do say that it is my honest purpose and patriotic desire to advance the welfare and interest of this Commonwealth without regard to anyone who has opposed me in the past.

It has been charged, directly or indirectly, that the agreement entered into is still to be carried out, and the evidence is brought forward in the matter of the appointments of the committees and their chairmen.

As a matter of fact, which seems to be forgotten, the members of the Charleston delegation are representatives of the recalcitrant, irreconcilable faction there. Did they not turn Hemphill and Barnwell down in their convention and send straight-outs square from the shoulder like men? Where, then, is the connection, the bond of union between those of us on the reform side who participated in that conference and the representatives from Charleston? Barnwell could no more control his people for peace, unity, and harmony than I [Tillman]. Mitchell, Barker, Farrow, Bryan, and the rest of them came here as the representatives of public opinion in Charleston, and they do represent it. They have excited no bitterness here. If they have any feeling of resentment they have hid it like patriots.

The gentleman from that city who has been associated with me on the committee on suffrage has shown a high patriotic purpose, a complete willingness to cooperate in saving the right of suffrage for the poor and illiterate white men as far as he could. His consummate legal ability has been of incalculable benefit to the committee. He came into the committee possibly with prejudice against me. I acknowledge I went in it with prejudice against him, because he has been fighting the dispensary. [Laughter.] We have come to know each other better, and I feel warranted in saying that we will part with the highest mutual respect, if not friendship. And so I trust it will be with all of us. We will return to our homes with a higher purpose and a broader view, and if we must differ we will differ like decent white men, and go into the forum of reason and try to convince our constituents as to which man is right, and when the voters have spoken at the Democratic primary, as white men, we will present a united front to the remnant of the black cohorts whom we have come here to reduce and paralyze.

We have been told had we dared hint to the people that it was our purpose to incorporate an educational qualification in this constitution we would not have been sent here; that we would have been run off the stump. I spoke at Edgefield, Barnwell, and elsewhere. I concealed nothing. How do you propose to get around the Chinese wall, the impassable bulwark which the fifteenth amendment throws around the negroes, except by an educational or property qualification.

The desire has been on the part of the gentleman from Laurens to perpetuate the understanding clause, keep up the present system, the eight-box law, the registration law, and all. You can not do it, gentlemen. The people do not want it any longer; they are tired and sick of it unto death. With existing conditions there is nothing left; no man's ingenuity can contrive or conceive of anything to do except to put an educational or property qualification, or both. The property qualification straight would disfranchise 30,000 people, white men, who own nothing in their own names, and it is contrary to all my ideas of principle, fairness, and right, because some of these very men are the most intelligent of our citizens. I said last night that the chalice was poisoned. Some have said there is a fraud in this understanding clause. Some poisons in small doses are very salutary and valuable medicines. If you put it in here that a man must understand, and you vest the right to judge whether he understands in an officer, it is a constitutional act. That officer is responsible to his conscience and his God—he is responsible to nobody else. There is no particle of fraud or illegality in it. It is just simply showing partiality, perhaps [laughter], or discriminating.

Now, to return to the gentleman from Laurens. If you look down the vista or the pathway which he asks you to take, you see no signs of light or rays of hope. You see nothing there but the dire alternative that some time in the near future we shall have white men struggling to get possession of the negro vote and a continuation of the present iniquitous system. I desire to say this for the benefit of his constituents more than his. Let this convention reject our scheme or modify it or not, it is written as we want it passed. We are responsible for it, all except Mr. Henry, who has disclaimed any paternity of the educational and property qualification, and I am ready to rise or fall by it and to meet the gentleman in Laurens or Spartanburg or any other county in this State and show to the people that I have not betrayed them, that I have not broken any pledges, that I am not an ingrate, that I am not a traitor, that I have acted as their best friend, and have stood squarely by all the pledges I ever made and have endeavored to rise to the height of a statesman. I will go to Spartanburg, where the 2,000 majority on the other side is. I am not afraid to meet him anywhere, because right is right and truth is truth, and with these two bucklers I am ready to face any man that God ever made where my public acts or my private life are brought in question.

The bugaboo of possible injunction against the understanding clause is brought in here to throw discord among us and to terrify timid men. Well, now, any lawyer, the merest tyro in the profession, who knows anything about it, knows that no one can go into court and get an injunction unless he alleges personal damage or wrong, and the man would go there under this law simply to get his own rights, and not to keep other people from being registered, and the court, if the question was brought up, might ask what harm had come to him by refusal to register under the understanding clause, and the court might say it was unconstitutional, but it would go from one court to another, and by the time it was decided, as Mr. Bryan has said, we would be on firm ground with the educational qualification pure and simple, and our suffrage plan would be based on a rock.

A few more words, Mr. President, and I will conclude. I believe this is about the longest speech I ever made in my life. I shall briefly discuss the resolution of the gentleman from Marlboro as to striking out the money clause—the $300 clause. Now, he said that to allow one illiterate who had $300 to register and vote and to prohibit another illiterate who did not have $300 was an unjust discrimination. Mr. President, the millennium has not yet come, and I am afraid it will not come in this day and generation, if ever. Perfect equality before the law in taxation or anything else is an impossibility. That theory is in our law and in our Constitution, but it has never been put in practice in any court in any county in this State. I would like to ask him, as he pleads so strenuously against the injustice of having one illiterate with property to register and another not, why did he forget to mention the injustice of allowing a man who is educated to register and the man who is not to register? You did not say anything about it; you took mighty good pains to leave it untouched.

Mr. ROGERS. I will answer the question. I recognize as fair and right the principle that an intelligent ballot is the safeguard of any community, but I can see no reason, and you can show no reason, why two illiterate men, both standing on equality in every other respect, one should be given this privilege over the other simply because of the fact that he has a few dollars.

Senator TILLMAN. The very fact that he has a few dollars is a sufficient reason of itself to show that he is probably a better citizen, is more industrious, thrifty, has accumulated something on which to pay taxes; and taxes without representation is repugnant to American liberty. By means of the $300 clause you simply reach out and take in some more white men and a few more colored men.

I can not see for the life of me why we should not go forward and not pander and cringe before people who do not understand that this does not restrict one single ballot—only gives it to a few more. That is the whole subject in a nut shell. If there is inequality in giving a man of property the ballot and prohibiting another who has none from voting, there is inequality in giving it to a man who can read and write fairly but has not got as much intelligence as his neighbor who can not. There are men in my

neighborhood who came out of the war penniless who can not read and write because they never had the opportunity of going to school, yet they are good citizens and have accumulated property, are well to do, sending their children to school, but if they should not be able to read and write, under your restrictive purpose, if this convention should yield to you, they and similar men will be barred in the future from voting.

So far as I am concerned, and so far as the committee is concerned, we knew this thing would create a howl among a certain class. But what is the use to pander to the notions of these people? We are told it would be said: "Here is John Smith" (for instance), "a negro with $300, who can vote, and you can not because you have not got $300, and BEN TILLMAN, who was on the committee on suffrage, did it for you." I am ready to take the consequences. The convention can vote it down if they please, but I will never deny anywhere my connection with it, and I am ready to go to the people on it.

[NOTE.—The disclosures of the corruption and malfeasance in office on the part of the Republican officeholders, of which only a very small part is given in this speech, necessitated indictments in the State courts against almost every State and county officer in the State. On the other hand, the action of the white men who had participated in the Hamburg and Ellenton riots had resulted in the indictments in the United States court for intimidation, murder, etc., of probably 500 citizens. After one or two postponements in both courts, an agreement was reached in Washington by which indictments against all parties in both courts were nolle prossed, thus settling the matter of punishment by turning everybody loose.]

Late Representative Sydney P. Epes.

REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID A. DE ARMOND,

OF MISSOURI,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, March 24, 1900.

The House having under consideration the following resolutions:

"*Resolved*, That the business of the House be now suspended that opportunity may be given for tributes to the memory of Hon. SYDNEY P. EPES, late a member of the House of Representatives from the State of Virginia.

"*Resolved*, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, and in recognition of his eminent abilities as a distinguished public servant, the House, at the conclusion of these memorial proceedings, shall stand adjourned.

"*Resolved*, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

"*Resolved*, That the Clerk be instructed to send a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased"—

Mr. DE ARMOND said:

Mr. SPEAKER: Early in his Congressional career I became acquainted with SYDNEY P. EPES; and I was a member of the committee which attended his remains on the sad journey back to his Virginia home, where we laid away all that was mortal of him, for its long rest, in a modest graveyard in the shadow of the pines. I was not as close to him as some other friends were, but I knew him well enough to esteem him living and to remember him most kindly now that he has gone to that—

Undiscovered country from whose bourne no traveler returns.

The sudden taking off of this young man in his prime must remind us forcibly of the uncertainty of life and the certainty of death. With him death did not lay siege to the citadel of life and approach slowly through the years, undermining one defense after another, and finally, in the winter of age, take the ruin which none remained to defend and which had sunk into such a state of decay that nothing was left to be defended. In this case the assault was sudden, unexpected, irresistible. In the flush and bloom of health, in the sunny hour of the approaching noontide, when the sky was cloudless and the air resonant with hope, and the landscape bright with promise, the end came almost before the note of alarm could be sounded. In the shock of the sudden affliction, however, we are not without the comfort of beholding our friend, on the canvas of memory, in the cheerful garb of the young instead of the somber vestments of decrepitude.

Our departed friend may appropriately be spoken of as a Virginia gentleman. A Virginia gentleman! What a proud title of nobility. How much does it imply? Gentleness, courtesy, and hospitality blended with courage as daring and fortitude as abiding as flesh and blood, dominated by soul, ever knew. Kings have conferred titles of nobility, and vanity has paraded itself under their insignia; but such nobility as is the birthright of the Virginian gentleman emanates from a higher source than any earthly throne.

The politeness that is for the lowly as well and as full as for the most favored; the hospitality that is as natural as the balm of May and as genial as the sunshine to the opening flower; the courage that laughs in the blaze of the cannon and flinches not from the bayonet; the fortitude which adversity can not daunt or defeat dim—these great things are embedded by the Creator in the Virginia gentleman beyond the power, I verily believe, of even death to destroy. And our friend that has left us was a Virginia gentleman.

A pathetic incident came to our notice when we were on the sad mission of the funeral party—the very day that we buried the dead man was the day that he had expected to pass with his family in their quiet home. Instead of the fond husband hastening home to the loving wife, we bore a corpse to the desolate hearthstone of the stricken widow. The little children who waited in the happy hopefulness of young hearts for the kisses of the returning father dropped their orphans' tears into the new-made grave of the father whose lips had the death seal upon them.

Lovable and loved while living, we leave thee, dead friend, returning to our duties—the duties that rest upon the living. Thy work is done. And in the soil of old Virginia, so rich in the mold of statesmen and patriots and heroes, in the long, dreamless sleep into which all some time must sink, reposes the body of another Virginia gentleman, whose memory we fondly cherish.

Puerto Rico Tariff.

SPEECH

OF

HON. OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD,

OF ALABAMA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, March 28, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 8245) to regulate the trade of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes—

Mr. UNDERWOOD said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Before the commencement of the Spanish-American war, under principles recognized by all nations as to the ownership of the territory over which they exercised national sovereignty, the Spanish Crown exercised exclusive sovereignty over the island of Puerto Rico.

Being thus possessed of the legal title to the island, Spain had the right to cede it to us, and the United States possessed an equal right to acquire the title to the island, especially when it was done with the consent of the inhabitants of the island.

The treaty of Paris was the contract by which the two nations respectively passed and acquired the title to the island, and there can be no question that from the moment the treaty was formally ratified by the two signatory powers the complete sovereignty of all the land in the island of Puerto Rico was vested in the Government of the United States, as much so as we have possessed the sovereign title to Alaska for a third of a century; and the inhabitants (except those who desired to retain their allegiance to the Spanish Crown under one clause of the treaty) became citizens of the United States. The ninth article of the treaty declares that the Spanish-born residents of the ceded islands who shall not elect to retain their old allegiance within a given time shall be deemed to have adopted "the nationality of the territory in which they may reside."

Puerto Rico possesses no government except that which we prescribe for it, and has no position in the house of nations except through the sovereignty of the United States. Then, of necessity, "the nationality of the territory" of Puerto Rico must be of the United States, and the inhabitants must be subject to the sovereign powers of our Government as against all other governments and therefore citizens of this country.

As to whether their rights and privileges as citizens are in any way different from that of the people of the several States I propose hereafter to discuss.

It must be remembered that the sovereign proprietorship of Alaska, the Indian Territory, New Mexico, Arizona, Oklahoma, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico are absolutely identical. This being true, the ultimate destiny of government, whether they will ultimately become States in the Union or not, is merely conditional upon the accidental results of Congressional legislation, and can not affect the sovereign proprietorship or the present status of their inhabitants.

The President of the United States has evinced a great anxiety to rule the people of Puerto Rico without constitutional restrictions, and the leaders of the Republican party have advanced ingenious arguments to prove that the Constitution is as foreign to this island as it was before the sovereign title to it was ceded to the United States by Spain. Their arguments show an anxiety

to meet certain political conditions, rather than a determined purpose to now solve these constitutional questions from the standpoint from which they must ultimately be decided by the Supreme Court of the United States.

The most fallacious of these arguments is that which contends that rights granted to the citizens by the Constitution are not effective until Congress has by express legislation carried the Constitution into the new territory. This is probably due to the fact that heretofore Congress, as a matter of precaution in acts organizing new territory, has prescribed that they should be governed under constitutional restrictions.

It can not be denied that what Congress has the power to enact it has the power to repeal. Yet who will contend that Congress has the power to withdraw the protection of the Constitution from Arizona, New Mexico, Oklahoma, or Alaska?

Indeed, in the case of Thompson *vs.* Utah (170 U. S., 343) the Supreme Court has declared that the right of trial by jury in that Territory was established by the Constitution, and not carried there by act of Congress.

Again, it is contended that a treaty provision is a law unto itself, and fixes the status of the new territory acquired and of its inhabitants; but the Supreme Court of the United States has disposed of this contention, in the case of Fing Yue Ting *vs.* United States (149 U. S., 698) and United States *vs.* Old Settlers (148 U. S., 427), in which it was held that if Congress passes a law inconsistent with a treaty pledge the law will be enforced and not the treaty.

In the case of the Cherokee Tobacco (11 Wallace, 616–620) the Supreme Court said, "It need hardly be said that a treaty can not change the Constitution or be held valid if in violation of that instrument. This results from the nature and fundamental principles of our Government;" and in Thomas *vs.* Gray (169 U. S., 264) the same court held that treaties are subordinate to the Constitution of the United States.

By some it is contended that the law of the Constitution does not extend beyond the States in the Union, but in the case of Callars *vs.* Wilson (127 U. S., 540) the Supreme Court held the contrary doctrine.

In the cases of Loughborough *vs.* Blake (5 Wheaton, 317), Scott *vs.* Sandford (19 Howard, 393), Banks *vs.* County of Yankton (101 U. S., 129), Mormon Church *vs.* United States (136 U. S., 1–67), Slaughterhouse Cases (16 Wallace, 36–72), McAllister *vs.* United States (141 U. S., 174–188), Murphy *vs.* Ramsey (114 U. S., 15–44), and Capital Traction Company *vs.* Hof (174 U. S., 1) the Supreme Court have recognized the doctrines that the Constitution extends beyond the several States in the Union.

It can not be disputed that the Constitution contains some clauses which expressly or by implication relate solely to the States, but unquestionably the rights guaranteed to the individual citizen by the Constitution are operative wherever the sovereign power of the United States exists, be it in Virginia, Arizona, Alaska, Ohio, or Puerto Rico.

We now come directly to the constitutional questions raised in the bill before the House. Under its provisions a tariff duty of 15 per cent of the existing law is imposed on goods and merchandise brought from Puerto Rico into the Territorial limits of the United States as they existed before the Spanish war, and a like duty on goods and merchandise carried from this country into Puerto Rico.

Heretofore Congress has never attempted to impose new or extraordinary duties in new territory, but has contented itself by extending the existing tariff laws to the new territory. But the present Administration contends that the constitutional provision that "all duties, imports, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States" does not apply to Puerto Rico, and has, in violation of the Constitution, and without warrant of law, by an arbitrary act, maintained a war tariff in the islands, and now Congress is expected to follow the unwarranted precedent set by the President. The Secretary of War, in his last report to Congress, goes so far as to say:

> The provision of the Constitution, prescribing uniformity of duties throughout the United States was not meant for them—
>
> The Puerto Ricans—
>
> but was a provision of expediency solely, adapted to conditions existing in the United States upon the continent of North America.

The able lawyer who made this statement overlooks the fact that the provision of the Constitution I have last quoted is a guaranty to the individual citizen, a limitation of the power for his benefit; and as the power of taxation is an express grant to the Federal Government, I can not conceive how it is possible to extend the power, expressly derived under the Constitution, to Puerto Rico unless the limitations on the power goes with it.

Unless it is contended that the island of Puerto Rico, though subject to the sovereignty of this Government, is not a part of the United States as defined by the Constitution, to reach such a conclusion the decision of the Supreme Court in Loughborough *vs.* Blake (5 Wheaton, 317–319) must be ignored, when the court says:

> Our great Republic, which is composed of States and Territories. The District of Columbia or the territory west of the Missouri is not less within the United States than Maryland or Pennsylvania; and it is not less necessary, on the principles of our Constitution, that uniformity in the imposition of imposts, duties, and excises should be observed in the one than in the other.

This decision was rendered by Chief Justice Marshall, the expounder of the Constitution, and will probably be considered by the great tribunal that must ultimately try this case as of more weight than the opinion of the Secretary of War; and in the case of Cross *vs.* Harrison (16 Howard, 164–199) the Supreme Court held in the case of California, but then ceded to this Government by Mexico, and at that time occupying the identical position that Puerto Rico does now, that no import duties could be levied in California on articles the growth, produce, or manufacture of the United States, as no such duties can be imposed in any other part of the United States on the production of California.

But it is useless to further argue the law of the case; "none are so blind as those who will not see," and those who believe with me, that the guaranteed rights of the individual citizens in the Constitution are the greatest protection the common citizen has as against the overthrow of his rights and liberties by the concentration of power and wealth, will stand with the interpretation of the Constitution as given by the great judges who have adorned the Supreme Court bench, and will not become followers of the new school that can assert in December that "our plain duty is to abolish all custom tariffs between the United States and Puerto Rico, and give her products free access to our markets," as did the President, and in February declare that the Puerto Ricans had no rights that we were required to respect.

I have always recognized the Republican party as an opportunist party, ready at all times to abandon any position if it conceived that party advantage could be derived from the change; but never, in the wildest flights of my imagination, did I ever imagine that the Republican party would dare to openly declare that for the purpose of victory and spoils they were willing to abandon the rights guaranteed to the people under the Constitution.

On yesterday the able and eloquent gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] appealed to the Republican members of the House to support this bill, not for constitutional reasons, not for a protective tariff, not for principle, but to save the Republican party. To save it from what? Not from the anger of an outraged constituency, for the masses of the people are against this bill. To save you from whom, then? I know of none others for you to fear unless it be the anger of the subsidized interests who furnish the money for Republican campaigns.

But I for one believe the cause of suffering, starving Puerto Rico is just and right. I believe that you are attempting to place upon these poor conquered people an unjust burden of taxation; and when the case goes to trial before the bar of the public opinion in the next election, they will repudiate your party and drive you from power. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Conferring Jurisdiction on the Court of Claims in Certain Cases.

SPEECH

OF

HON. T. M. MAHON,

OF PENNSYLVANIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, March 30, 1900,

On the bill (H. R. 909) conferring on the Court of Claims jurisdiction with respect to certain claims.

Mr. MAHON said:

HISTORY OF THE CASE.

By this bill it is intended to provide for the payment of losses resulting mainly from three hostile expeditions that were made into Pennsylvania during the late civil war. The losses occurred in the counties of Adams, Bedford, Franklin, Fulton, Somerset, York, Cumberland, and Perry, all lying immediately along the southern border of Pennsylvania, excepting Cumberland and Perry, which adjoin Franklin and Adams to the north.

By the chance of their location these border counties were the territory in the North over which our State authorities believed contending armies would march and pillage. Thus realizing that the southern border of the State would be very much exposed during the war of secession, and that the Southern armies would invade the State if no troops were put upon the border to prevent invasion, early steps were taken by the governor and legislature to protect it.

I now invite your attention to the special sacrifices made by Pennsylvania, in view of her exposed condition and anticipated invasion of her territory, and the appropriation by the Federal Government of the means of defense she had collected.

Shortly after the war of secession broke out, Governor Curtin, under the authority of the State of Pennsylvania, organized this body, spoken of as the Pennsylvania Reserves. This was done

under an act of assembly entitled "An act to create a loan to provide for arming the State," approved 1861, which provided for the loan of $3,000,000 "to defray the expenses of organizing, arming, equipping, transferring, and supporting the military forces of this State now or hereafter to be called into the service in aid of the government of this State or of the United States."

It was provided by this act that the commander in chief, who was the governor, in connection with the officers composing the grand staff of the militia, were authorized to organize a military corps, to be called the Reserve Volunteer Corps of the Commonwealth, to be composed of thirteen regiments of infantry, one regiment of cavalry, and one regiment of light artillery; these regiments to be organized, armed, equipped, clothed, disciplined, governed, and officered as similar troops in the service of the United States, and to be enlisted in the service of the State for a period not exceeding three years, or for the war, unless discharged, and were liable to be called into the service of the State at such times as the commander in chief might deem their services necessary for the purpose of suppressing insurrections or to repel invasions, with the further provisions that they were liable to be mustered into the service of the United States, as of course they were upon a requisition by the General Government, whether so expressed in the act or not.

Further provisions were contained in the said act for the establishment of camps of instruction, and for the pay and rations of the said corps under the State authority.

Under that act the Pennsylvania Reserves were organized; they were put into camps of instruction, and they constituted a standing army reasonably sufficient for the defense of the State against such raids and invasions of the enemy as then seemed likely to occur.

This corps, as provided in the act, was composed of 13 regiments of infantry, 1 regiment of cavalry, and 1 regiment of light artillery. They were fully armed, equipped, and organized, as provided by the act. They were among the best soldiers raised by the State, and at the time they were suddenly called into the service of the Government were in a high state of discipline and efficiency. Their splendid history justified the expectations had as to their ability to defend the State against anticipated invasion.

"While the State was congratulating itself upon the possession of this splendid corps as an adequate defense, they were suddenly called into the service of the United States Government, as they were liable to be from our constitutional relations to the United States Government, and the State was stripped of the special defense which she had as wisely provided and upon which she had so hopefully begun to rely. Disasters, however, had crowded thick upon the national arms and the necessities of the General Government were imperative."

Again, in 1862, when General Lee first invaded Pennsylvania, during what was known as the Antietam campaign, we organized twenty-seven or twenty-eight regiments of militia, with the express understanding that they were not to be marched beyond the State line, and that they were organized for the defense of the State. The National Government called upon us for these, and they were turned over and marched under the direction of United States officers. They were taken beyond the borders of the State.

At this time the southern counties were entirely at the mercy of General Stuart's troops. And when he found that the General Government had removed all the troops raised for the defense of the border counties out of the State to defend the capital of the nation, General Stuart, with about 2,000 cavalry and 500 wagons, crossed the Potomac, entered the counties of Adams and Franklin, which lie close to the southern border of the State of Pennsylvania, and took away from the people property amounting to $177,011.68.

The messages of Governor Curtin to the legislature of Pennsylvania during the war will give, more clearly than any recital of my own, the principal facts attending the several invasions of our State, and as they are in the shape of official communications at times when the occurrences were fresh and vivid in all minds, they may be relied on as historically accurate. Stuart's raid is thus mentioned and detailed in Governor Curtin's message of January 7, 1863 (Ex. Doc. of 1862, page 8):

In October last a body of rebel cavalry with a battery of artillery suddenly crossed the Potomac, and made their way as far as Chambersburg, plundering what they found of supplies useful to them and committing other depredations. They went out of the State by crossing the South Mountain, and thus reaching the Potomac below Harpers Ferry.

The troops in the field were not prepared at the moment to punish this attempt on her soil, and it is to be much regretted that efficient measures could not have been taken by the Army to capture the rebels on their return to the Potomac. Immediately after I received notice that this force had crossed the line of the State I called into service the Anderson Cavalry, then encamped at Carlisle, and two companies of regulars at the barracks at that place. These troops were pushed forward in the direction of Chambersburg and South Mountain.

The cavalry at Camp Curtin, consisting of one full and two imperfect regiments, were armed as infantry, and, together with two companies of infantry and a battery of volunteer light artillery, of Harrisburg, were held in readiness to go forward, when Major-General Wool arrived and assumed the command of all the forces. He had previously ordered part of his command from Baltimore and marched the troops to Gettysburg.

The rebels marched with so much celerity that they did not encounter any of the forces of General Wool and escaped from the State. I recommend that application be made to Congress for an appropriation to compensate our citizens for the damages which they suffered by the raid.

In May, 1863, the State authorities believed, from information received, that General Lee intended to invade the State. In June, 1863, General Lee and his army invaded the State. We had again organized 25 regiments, or about 31,000 men, for the defense of the border, and again they were, by direction of the War Department, turned over to the United States. General Jenkins's cavalry raided the border counties just before the battle of Gettysburg in July, 1863, and small bodies of troops, leaving the main army, took everything in the shape of property they could find and carried it away to the main army, causing a loss to my people of $1,648,118.22.

Again, in 1864, the State raised seven regiments for service in the State in defending the border. You will remember that about this time one of the divisions of General Early came within the suburbs of Washington and a skirmish took place within the limits of the national capital. The seven regiments were taken to Washington City to save it from the hands of the invaders. They were taken from the State in the latter part of July, 1864, the last regiment leaving on the 29th day of July. At this same time the border counties were threatened with another raid. On July 21, 1864, Governor Curtin, of Pennsylvania, and Governor Bradford, of Maryland, addressed this joint message to the President:

To His Excellency ABRAHAM LINCOLN,
President of the United States:

The repeated raids across the Potomac River made by portions of the rebel army, and the extent of the damage they have succeeded so frequently in inflicting, have most injuriously affected the people of Maryland and Pennsylvania in the neighborhood of that river, and many of them, it is believed, as the only security against such losses in the future are seriously considering the propriety of abandoning their present homes and seeking safety at the North.

It seems to us that not merely in this sectional aspect of the case, but in its national relations, the security of this border line between the loyal and rebellious States is an object justifying and requiring a disposition of a portion of the national force, with an especial view to it defense. The Potomac River can only be crossed, in its ordinary state of water, at some five or six fords, and we propose to enlist from our respective States a volunteer force that shall be sufficient, with the aid of the fortifications which the force itself can speedily construct, to effectually guard them all. We ask of the Government that the recruits so raised shall be credited to the quotas of our several States on the call last made, and be armed, equipped, and supplied as other volunteers in the service.

We are aware that, as a general rule, well-founded objections exist to the enlistment of a force to be exclusively used for home or local defense; but we regard such a service as we now suggest as an exceptional case, and the complete protection of this part of our frontier as of admitted national importance.

Soon after the outbreak of this rebellion the importance of a special defense of the region bordering on the upper Potomac was recognized by the Government, and the Hon. Francis Thomas, of Maryland, was authorized by it to raise three regiments, with a view to the protection of the counties on either side of that river. These regiments were raised, but the subsequent exigencies of the service required their employment elsewhere, and they therefore afford at present no particular security to that region beyond other troops in the service.

The necessity, as we think, of some peculiar provision has now become so obvious that we would with great respect, but most earnestly, urge upon your excellency the expediency of acceding to the suggestions we have made, and we will immediately set about raising the forces required, and we have no doubt they will be promptly procured.

A. W. BRADFORD.
A. G. CURTIN.

Mark you, this letter was sent on July 21, 1864. The last of the seven regiments were taken away on the 29th of July, 1864, eight days after the President had received the letter. On the 30th of July, 1864, no reply had been received. McCausland's raid was imminent; his troopers were swinging toward the Cumberland Valley; the President and the Secretary of War were appealed to to protect our people, who had already, from 1862 to 1864, been plundered of their property, their business destroyed and paralyzed.

What little they had left they hoped to retain by the strong arm of the Government protecting it. But the Secretary of War said no; that it was the policy of the Government to draw the enemy from the capital of the nation, as well as their base of supplies, into our region, and that our portion of the State was to be left unprotected for strategic reasons and in order to draw the enemy there.

The State of Pennsylvania responded to every call of the Government for the common defense. Her quota of troops was never unfilled.

Let me here say that the great State we represent, thus exposed to the repeated incursions of an active and adventurous enemy, through the valleys which open passageway into our borders, and thus stripped of her resources and her defense, contributed to the armies of the Union in 1861 130,994 men; in 1862, 71,100; in 1863, 43,040; in 1864, 91,704, and in 1865, 25,840, making a total, exclusive of militia and recruits for the Navy, of 362,284—more than a third of a million of men.

There was no duty she did not perform in common with her sister nonseceding States for the maintenance of the authority of the Federal Government. But she was situated on the border, and in addition to responding as above stated, and notwithstanding that she had the right to expect that the Government would

prevent the enemy from entering upon her territory, she organized in addition militia of her own to repel any attempted invasion. She took every precaution against such a calamity. These forces were organized, drilled, armed, and equipped at the expense of the State, and stationed to protect against the very invasion and injuries for which she now presents this claim.

But there was imminent danger to the entire country of incalculably greater loss. The capital of the nation was threatened. Its vast property interests at the seat of Government, its Treasury, its archives, its very existence as a Government—all were in the greatest peril, and in this crisis, under the Constitution, the President called this force, organized to protect the State, to the higher duty of protecting the nation. The call was responded to by the withdrawal of said reserved militia raised by the State, and that withdrawal left the State defenseless and injury followed.

On July 30, 1864, the day after the last State troops were sent to Washington, the city of Chambersburg was invested about 6 o'clock in the morning by the whole command of McCausland and Johnson. I quote the following from Governor Curtin's message, August 9, 1864:

At 7 o'clock a. m., six companies of dismounted men, commanded by Sully, entered the town, followed by mounted men under Gilmore. The main force was in line of battle. A demand was made for $100,000 in gold or $500,000 in government funds, as a ransom, and a number of citizens were arrested and held as hostages for its payment.

At this point the loyalty of the people of my native city, the queen city of the beautiful Cumberland Valley, was put to a test. Would they pay a half million of dollars to aid the Confederacy; a half million dollars to be used against the boys in blue, the flag, the Government, or refuse to pay it and have their homes destroyed by fire? Their answer came prompt, "No; not one dollar." The rebels commenced immediately to burn and pillage the town, diregarding the appeals of women and children, the aged and infirm, and even the bodies of the dead were not protected from their brutality.

In a few hours the loyal but patriotic people of Chambersburg were gathered on the hills around the doomed city looking on the ashes that covered all they had in the world, the loss amounting to $1,625,435.55. And the entire loss of the people of the city of Chambersburg by raids and the burning of the town amounts to $2,471,468.85.

Two days after the city was destroyed a reply was received to letter of Governors Curtin and Bradford, of July 21, 1864, heretofore mentioned, refusing to grant the authority to keep troops on border.

Also, on August 1, 1864, the following letter was sent to Gen. D. N. Couch on same subject:

WAR DEPARTMENT, ADJUTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE.
Washington, D. C., August 1, 1864.

Maj. Gen. D. N. COUCH,
Commanding, etc., Harrisburg, Pa.

GENERAL: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 22d July relative to the United States providing uniforms for a special corps of militia from certain border counties of Pennsylvania.

In reply I am directed to inform you that the subject has been carefully considered by the Secretary of War, who can not sanction the issue of the clothing in question.

I am, General, very respectfully, your obedient servant.

THOMAS VINCENT,
Assistant Adjutant-General.

These regiments would have been adequate to have met the emergency and to have protected Chambersburg had they been where they were accessible and easily handled and where they would naturally have been when this raid, which threatened the security of that place, occurred.

Let me here quote from a speech by Governor Curtin in the constitutional convention of Pennsylvania in 1874, who, as a prominent actor in the events just detailed, is best able to testify to the facts, and whose vivid language is better than any words of mine:

In the beginning of that terrible conflict we raised in Pennsylvania an army intended for the domestic protection, but the defeat of the armies of the Federal Government required their presence out of the State, and they were immediately surrendered. At various times during the war troops were raised in Pennsylvania to protect the border, but were demanded by the national necessity and went forward. In 1864, by an arrangement with the Federal authorities, seven regiments were raised in Pennsylvania for border protection.

Care was not taken as to the selection of the men; many were older than generally required for military service. Many were not in health; some had been in the service and had contracted the diseases which many of our gallant and true men suffered in the South, and not a few had been wounded and discharged as unfit for military service. These seven regiments were all that were necessary for the protection of the State. The rebel armies advanced north in the summer, as we well know, and the seven regiments were called for, for the protection of the Capitol at Washington.

At first it was declined. The battle of Monocacy resulted in a defeat of the army under General Wallace, and the armies of Breckenridge and Ewell approached the national capital, and then it was declared that the presence of these troops from Pennsylvania might be a positive necessity to the safety of the Federal capital, and the whole force was sent forward, and three days after they were sent from Pennsylvania many of them died in defense of Washington.

The rebel army burned Chambersburg; and will any American citizen tell me that it is not proper to relieve these people? Why, in the brilliant record made in that State during that terrible struggle, her fidelity was never more illustrious than in uncovering her own border in order to protect the capital of the nation. In doing that the beautiful town of Chambersburg was exposed and burned, and the country around it was ravaged by the enemy. (Deb. Const. Conv., volume 2, page 650.)

These are some of the facts connected with the case we now present. It is unnecessary to demonstrate to you that Pennsylvania responded to the utmost extent of all her resources in men and money, and came up to the full measure of her duty to the country. She maintained, in full and perfect accord, her relations to the General Government through the entire struggle, and answered every requisition made upon her. She stripped herself of her own disciplined forces which she had raised primarily for her own protection in view of her exposure to the swift and sudden raids of the enemy through her open and unguarded valleys.

The great Cumberland Valley, attractive, teeming with wealth and agricultural luxuriance, was an ever inviting avenue, through Virginia and Maryland, into Pennsylvania, for the Confederate armies, who had long exhausted the resources of the State where their operations were principally conducted. It was therefore natural and consistent with the obvious dangers of the situation for the governor of this State to be so anxious and concerned as he was, and to continually importune the general authorities at Washington for special protection for our border.

Our contiguity to the scene of active warlike operations and the peculiar temptation which our rich and fertile fields afforded to the enemy were conditions ever present to the mind and ever exciting anxiety and alarm. Finding that any force that Pennsylvania might organize for her own protection would be called upon by the Government, and recognizing that it was entirely legitimate that the Government should call upon us for this force, we turned our attention to reenforcing the Army of the United States and allowing the General Government to take care of our border.

There is a general principle, however, which underlies all government, which underlies our National Government, and which is clearly expressed in our Constitution, and which is just as clearly understood whether it was expressed or not, and that is, that the States of this Union surrendered certain rights to the General Government, in consideration of which they were to receive certain privileges. That, indeed, underlies all organized society and all human government.

Blackstone's definition of government and his essay upon the rise of government, in which the broad ground is taken that the very first principle which underlies government is that men must combine for protection, and in order to receive protection they must surrender certain personal rights, in consideration of which they were to receive the protection which they sought.

We surrendered all rights the Constitution required us to surrender. We now demand the consideration guaranteed to us by the Constitution. However, I will more fully discuss the legal questions hereafter.

HOW CLAIMS WERE ADJUDICATED.

The acts of assembly that were from time to time passed to investigate and perpetuate the evidence of these claims and providing against fraud or speculation therein are of a character that must commend themselves to the judgment of the members of this committee and the National Legislature.

The last act, and the one under which these claims were finally adjudicated and reduced to their present dimensions, was passed May 22, 1871. These claims have been adjusted and readjusted under conditions and methods of procedure which would seem to exclude all possibility of misrepresentation or imposition. They were, so far as the claims of the residents of Chambersburg and vicinity are concerned, also adjudicated under the acts to which I have referred.

They were adjudicated for all the counties in which losses were incurred by the operations of the war, under the act of April 9, 1868 (P. L. 74), entitled "An act for the relief of the citizens of the counties of Adams, Franklin, Fulton, Bedford, York, Perry, and Cumberland, whose property was destroyed, damaged, or appropriated for the public service and in the common defense in the war to suppress the rebellion," which act provided for the appointment of commissioners to investigate and adjudicate the claims of the citizens of the said counties, and upon their adjudication to report and file the same with the auditor-general, and imposing the duty upon the proper officers of the Commonwealth, to be designated by the governor, to proceed to recover compensation for said losses from the General Government, and when so collected the amount recovered to be paid pro rata to the sufferers, in accordance with the report of the commissioners thus appointed. Provision was therein made for the ascertainment and appraisement by the commissioners of the losses sustained, and an elaborate mode of procedure and method of verification and proof prescribed.

There was contained in the act the further reservation that the act should not be construed to make the Commonwealth in any way liable for the ultimate payment of damages ascertained and reported under the act, thus expressly excluding any concession of the liability of the State, or any change in the attitude of the State toward the General Government that might otherwise have been inferred from this and similar legislation.

The matter was again brought before the legislature, and the act of May 22, 1871 (P. L. 272), was passed. This was entitled

"An act to authorize a liquidation of damages sustained by citizens of Pennsylvania during the late rebellion," and provided that the claims of the citizens of the counties of York, Cumberland, Adams, Franklin, Bedford, and Perry, for extraordinary losses sustained during the rebellion, as adjudicated under the prior acts, naming them, be subjected to a careful revision by two commissioners in each of the counties named, to be appointed by the president judges of the courts of common pleas of said several counties. There was this further provision:

And the governor shall appoint competent counsel to represent the government in the revision of said claims before the several commissions; and said commissioners shall reexamine and readjudicate all of said claims, and may reject or diminish any now on file as equity may require, but not increase the amount of any, excepting the claim of the German Reformed Church (which was one claim which it was provided shall be equitably adjusted); and any claims which may have been assigned or transferred by the original claimant, the assignee or present owner of the same shall be required to make satisfactory proof of the amount actually paid for the claim, and the amount so paid shall be awarded and no more; and if any owner of an assigned claim shall fail to make such proof satisfactory, the claim shall be rejected, and as said commissioners readjudicate said claim, they shall indorse their approval thereon for the amount allowed and return the claims to the auditor-general.

This latter officer corresponds to the officer known as the comptroller or comptroller-general in some of the States.

These claims, as finally adjudicated under the last act, were filed in the auditor-general's office—afterwards filed in Quartermaster-General's Office at Washington—in order that they might not lose any right to have them allowed under the act of July 4, 1864.

Section 2 of the act provides:

The State shall issue to each claimant, or to his, her, or their representative, a certificate or certificates to the amount allowed on each claim, in the following form.

These commissioners have reported and filed their reports and their findings, with proofs, in the auditor-general's office. The certificates have been nearly or quite all delivered to the holders.

This is the form of the certificate:

This is to certify that —— —— has on file in the office of the auditor-general a duly approved and registered claim for the sum of —— dollars, as adjudicated under the act entitled "An act to authorize the liquidation of damages sustained by citizens of Pennsylvania during the late rebellion," and payable only when said claims shall be paid by the United States Government.

I would call your attention to the reservation contained in this certificate. These certificates, signed by the governor and State treasurer and countersigned by the auditor-general, are the evidence in the hands of the holders, and contain the implied pledge of the State to secure the payment from the General Government of the claims so ascertained, whereby they may and do invoke the agency of the State to secure the final payment of the claims so ascertained and evidenced, and by way of redemption of this engagement on the part of our Commonwealth, it now appears, at the behest of its legislature, in the resolution passed at its last session, to redeem its undertaking. This last adjudication includes the losses that were sustained by reason of the burning of Chambersburg.

The following section of the act of 1871 sets forth the undertaking of the Commonwealth to secure, so far as it may, the enforcement of what has always been believed to be the obligation of the Federal Government:

SEC. 3. It shall be the duty of the governor of the State to demand the payment of said claims by the General Government, and also the payment of the amount heretofore paid by the State on said claims, and to appoint such agents for the purpose as may be deemed necessary, and any appropriation made by Congress to said claims shall be wholly applied to the certificates authorized by the second section of this act, as Congress may direct, until the same shall be paid in full: *Provided*, That this act shall not be construed to make the State in any wise responsible for or on account of said certificates.

Thus you will see these claims have been solemnly adjudicated, and there has been excluded any possible mistake, imposition, or fraud that might otherwise have been practiced upon either the State or the National Government. They were passed upon in a sedate and deliberate manner and in an orderly proceeding, in which the adverse interest was represented, there being no desire to secure anything against the General Government except what was justly due.

In a great majority of cases these claims were presented by the claimants themselves without the intervention of counsel. The commissions were composed of men of high character in each of the counties named in the act, and, as already stated, the public interests were represented in a way that was in all respects analogous to that in which the General Government appears before the Court of Claims. The claims were thoroughly examined, the proofs and findings filed, and the whole is a matter of record in the auditor-general's office.

Pennsylvania has always insisted that the General Government should pay these claims.

The legislation of Pennsylvania upon this subject, from war times to the present, has always contemplated the liability of the General Government. Such was the tenor of the language of its chief executive in 1864, in his message to the legislature, assembled under a special call immediately after the burning of Chambersburg. The dominant, the constant idea in all the legislation upon this subject—and there has been a succession of enactments relating to these claims—has been the assertion of a claim upon the General Government, through the State and by the State, for the payment of these losses.

There has been no laches on the part of the State we represent. There has been no abandonment of any right she may have. The claim of the State for reimbursement to its citizens for these extraordinary losses was promptly put forward almost in the very week, within ten days, you may say, of the destruction of Chambersburg, and has been maintained and insisted upon in all her public official acts and deliverances upon this subject from that time until the present. As proof of it, the legislation of Pennsylvania upon our statute books need only be referred to.

This claim is now presented by the State of Pennsylvania in her corporate and political capacity, and as a party to the Federal compact. As a party to a convention which, in express terms, gives her a right to protection and impliedly to indemnity upon failure to afford such protection she now asks to be made whole.

Prior to the adoption of the Constitution there existed thirteen independent sovereign States, of which Pennsylvania was one.

The Articles of Confederation were found to be defective and inadequate. In many ways it had all the qualities of a treaty of alliance and for mutual defense between independent States, and although a central power was erected, all requisitions for supplies and support were made upon the States as States, and the response thereto depended upon their will.

It was evident that the political relation resting so lightly upon the parties was unsatisfactory and unsafe. A more perfect union was desired, to provide for the common defense, and by reason and argument for the giving up by the States of their control over their militia, over their armies, over their fleets, their rights to deal with each other or with foreign states by conventions and treaties, to lay and collect customs duties, to keep under their control their men and ships of war for their own defense, will be found in that wonderful preamble to the Constitution of the United States. Its brief but pregnant phrases are an epitome of the whole argument for the more perfect union sought to be secured under the Constitution, and the leading thought was to provide for the common defense.

Let me read it:

We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

A Federal Government was created, dealing directly with the people, and which enforces its authority and the provisions of the Constitution by acting upon individuals and the citizens instead of upon the States. We had taken on all the conditions of a powerful empire. We took our place among the nations of the world, armed with national power, and having control of the purse and sword of the people living under the folds of the flag—the emblem of our nationality—as I before stated, before the Constitution was adopted.

Each State before the Constitution had the power to create and control its own army for the defense of its territory, its property, its citizens, and their property; but this military power was surrendered to the Federal Government upon the guaranty of the latter that it would do what might have been done by the State but for the entering into this new relation; and it would, therefore, seem to conclusively follow that if there was loss of property by reason of failure to keep this guaranty compensation should be made for that loss.

Such is the relation the States bear to the General Government. The right to repeal the contract, the right to recede from the relations created by the Federal Constitution can not exist, and therefore it contains the essential element of a contract, continuing obligation. Our citizens are bound by it, and the Government is also bound by the contract.

Whether a State or its people could escape the obligation thus made was eloquently and ably debated for many years. The war of the rebellion settled the question that a State could not break away from the compact, and all agree that on this question the debate is closed forever.

Under the Articles of Confederation "there was a combination of power and resources and a distribution of responsibility for the protection of all. The obligation before had rather the qualities of an obligation imposed by treaty or convention between independent sovereignties. Under the present Constitution the obligation is cast upon the Government formed by the people of all the States and constituted the consideration for the surrender by the States of their independent character and their entry into the indissoluble bond."

What was the consideration given by the Government to the States in return for the surrender of the right or power they had to control their military forces and resources?

"One of the obligations of the contract thus formed—indeed, I

may say the principal, the most important of all—was the duty expressly laid upon the political corporation, which then first took origin, to employ the resources and power of all for the defense of each against invasion, domestic sedition, and the preservation of their republican institutions."

Section 4 of Article IV of the Constitution contains this express convenant:

The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion, and on application of the legislature, or of the executive when the legislature can not be convened, against domestic violence.

The guaranty to protect each State against invasion was one of supreme importance to the States, and especially in view of the fact that the State had conceded to this new nation into which it entered the power to control its militia in all respects except the officering and training. And when the Federal Government fails to protect a State against invasion, and by reason thereof injuries have been sustained, a very different question is presented in claims made by private citizens for injuries by the Federal forces in actual conflict or injuries inflicted by the enemy on such individual citizens.

The present claim now under consideration is presented by the State of Pennsylvania, one of the States that entered into and became a part of this new nation, and party to this covenant for protection against invasion upon the terms already mentioned. It is, therefore, a claim that does not, as we submit, fall within the rule so often quoted.

Paschall, in his Annotated Constitution, in commenting upon the phrase "the United States," in section 4, Article IV, of the Constitution, already quoted, says:

This is the only instance in the Constitution where the Government, by its corporate name, has covenanted for any duty. The "powers" of the Government are vested in the respective departments thereof; and as to the "necessary and proper" legislation, that is specially conferred upon Congress. Here the obligation is from the "United States" to the "States," but whether to be exercised by Congress or the President is one of the questions which have grown out of the reconstruction measures.—*Paschall's Annotated Constitution*, second edition, section 233, page 242.

Referring to the use of the word "invasions" in this clause of the Constitution just referred to, Paschall says:

"Invasions" is here doubtless coupled with the guaranty of the United States to protect every State against invasion (Article IV, section 4); but the invasion would be none the less so if invited by State authorities, or if no call should be made by the legislature or governor of the invaded State.—*Paschall's Annotated Constitution*, page 135, section 133.

In dealing with invasion by a foreign foe, or from another State, the primary duty is upon the General Government at all times to protect against such invasion. The same facility of action on the part of the State does not exist. The National Government has the duty resting upon it at all times to guard against such incursions and to be ready for such emergencies. The State is purposely shorn of all powers and conditions which would otherwise put it efficiently in its power to provide for and defend against foreign or extra-State aggression. It will be noticed that the constitutional language is, "that the United States shall protect each of them (States) against invasion."

Recurring to the constitutional language, it can not be regarded as anything less than an express covenant made to the States. The States are the parties capable of enforcing the obligation or demanding such equivalent in the way of reimbursement or indemnity as amounts to such enforcement.

Everything in the present case has been done by the State of Pennsylvania to put itself in proper relations to the General Government for making its claim and for calling for an enforcement of the constitutional guaranty, or, more properly in this case, the repayment of such indemnity for losses resulting to the State from failure to perform such guaranty, in the sense of the definition of that term as used and understood in the language of the section upon which we rely.

The great purpose of the Constitution then was to secure the general welfare and protection of all the members of the Federal Union. In consideration of the sacrifice of their autonomy, as it might otherwise have existed, they agreed that the resources of all should be combined to this end. Each was to share in the benefits to be derived without a preponderance of advantage to one over another. All were to share proportionately in the burdens, and throughout the Federal charter every provision and all its language look to an equalization of burden and contribution, and such has been the uniform practice in calling upon the States for their quotas and in reimbursing them for any undue measure of contribution.

Such was the express letter of the Articles of Confederation, and it can not be supposed that in "the more perfect union," designed for the common benefit and welfare of all, burdens should be made to press unduly upon any locality or section or community.

Where a State contributes money and troops beyond her just and fair proportion she has always received back from the General Government that extra cost and expense. The claim in such cases has always been presented by the State, and her rights to an equalization of her burden with the rest have been asserted and maintained by the State as such.

Whether there has been an overcontribution and devotion of property and resources to the common cause, or such property has been sacrificed in order to subserve and advance the general interests of all, makes no real difference. The principle is substantially the same, and both cases come within the analogies of the doctrine of compensation for property appropriated for the public advantage.

Where property has been destroyed or loss incurred for the benefit of the nation and the protection of the whole, it is practically a taking of such property for such purposes. Where loss and destruction of property has been permitted through the voluntary action or default of the Government in order to subserve a general purpose, to advance the common good, to save the whole, substantially the same conditions present themselves as if such property had been taken and such loss incurred directly for the general interest and welfare.

Where the Government has relieved itself of a direct duty, such as the obligation to anticipate and defend against an invasion of a State, whether the invader be from another State or from beyond our national boundaries, in order to carry out a plan of campaign, to keep its armies massed in the field, to protect the national capital, or to overpower and destroy organized military movements in some other field of operations, and thereby abandons the immediate and perhaps lesser matter of defending a particular locality from incursion and devastation, such loss and destruction of property which follows is a sacrifice resulting from the necessity of the performance of the greater duty or the development of the more important plan.

The loss thus contributed or incurred is no less a devotion of the thing sacrificed to the public interests. It is no less a taking, because thus indirectly suffered to subserve the general good, than if such property were directly taken or destroyed to secure an immediate public advantage.

Mr. Whiting, in his essay on "War claims," annexed to his work on The War Power under the Constitution, conservative as he seems to be, and inclined by his official attitude as Solicitor of the War Department to a strict and cautious view of the liability of the General Government, says:

When individuals are called upon to give up what is their own for the advantage of the community, justice requires that they should be fairly compensated for it; otherwise the public burdens would be shared unequally. * * * In guarding against the abuse of the right to take private property for public use it is provided that the owner shall be entitled to be fairly paid for it, and thus he is not to be taxed more than his due share for public purposes.

In Grant *vs.* United States (1 N. and H. Reports), the court says:

It may safely be assumed, as the settled and fundamental law of Christian and civilized states, that governments are bound to make just indemnity to a citizen or subject whenever private property is taken for the public good, convenience, or safety. In the case just cited the Government was held to pay for the property destroyed in Arizona merely to prevent it from falling into the hands of the enemy.

Immediately after the war of the Revolution, which was prosecuted prior to the adoption of any constitutional prohibition against taking private property for public use without compensation, and for which war the troops were furnished by the several States, Congress impliedly recognized the principle of compensation for undue burdens incurred by any particular State. A resolution with reference to compensation for injuries done by the military authorities was adopted in 1784, containing the following passage:

That it be referred to the several States, at their own expense, to grant such relief to their citizens who may have been injured as aforesaid as they may think requisite, and if it shall hereafter appear reasonable that the United States should make any allowance to any particular State which may be burdened much beyond others, that the allowance ought to be determined by Congress.

In this connection I quote from Vattel:

But it is perfectly consonant to the duties of the state and the sovereign, and of course perfectly equitable, and even strictly just, to relieve as far as possible those unhappy sufferers who have been ruined by the ravages of war, as likewise to take care of the family whose head and support has lost his life in the service of the State. There are many debts which are considered sacred by the man who knows his duty, although they do not afford any ground of action against him.—*Vattel's Law of Nations*, page 403.

Applying to the present case the principles thus cautiously conceded in the foregoing citations, it will be seen that our State and they whose claims for indemnity she now presents have incurred losses and made sacrifices largely in excess of that proper measure of contribution and liability which she filled in obedience to all the requisitions made upon her through that eventful season of trial and national danger.

What Pennsylvania suffered in these repeated invasions, the history of which I have already given you, was a sacrifice incurred directly for the benefit of all. The property of the people of the border counties was exposed to destruction through deliberate action to subserve the common interest of all, to defend the national capital, to preserve the strength and integrity of our armies in the field for greater and more decisive operations elsewhere.

Our troops, raised for State defense, and which the facts show would have been sufficient for that purpose, were taken into the national service and removed beyond the boundaries of the State. Our militia were officered by national commanders and marched over the State line to contribute to other purposes and plans in the military operations of the Government.

Particularly was our militia in 1864, in which the great bulk of the damages now presented was inflicted, as already mentioned, hurried away to the National Capital and from the front of the raiding force, whose inroad might thus have been prevented. Although entitled to the presence of an adequate force to protect her valleys and her towns from these invasions, and although she repeatedly called upon the General Government for such interposition and defense, she was obliged to surrender her claim for protection, submit herself a sacrifice for the public benefit and safety.

The case comes within the principle, more or less, clearly expressed in the quotations I have already given you. In the language of the authorities, it presents a case of property destroyed, "not only in extreme necessity but for the public benefit;" a "positive evil suffered by individuals for the supposed gain of the whole community at the will of that community."

Clearly, then, we have the right to compensation for loss incurred for the general good at the instance of the whole community, and our case is not covered or affected by that narrower doctrine of public law, which, after all, is but a prudential one, justified rather by the harsh plea of necessity than by any considerations of justice or merit that there is no compensation for casualties of war or losses inflicted by an enemy in the course of ordinary military operations.

There is annexed to the conditions of our case the well-authenticated fact that the losses were incurred through the direct interposition of the Government, by its deliberate action in appropriating our resources and means of defense, in relieving itself from its express obligation to perform the duty of interposing for our defense, and in purposely subjecting our property to destruction and loss for what was conceived to be a higher and more important purpose of advancing the general welfare and safety.

The fact that the National Government had expressly bound itself to protect each State from invasion, in consideration of the surrender of control over its own means and the military power of its people, and that this obligation was voluntarily abandoned in order that the Government might not be embarrassed or its armies disintegrated, or its capital destroyed, or the more rapid suppression of the war against its existence might not be interfered with, may well be regarded as a sufficient consideration upon which the obligation of the Government to indemnify is founded.

The States may be considered as having said at the time that the Union was formed, "We will surrender all that which will otherwise enable us to sufficiently protect ourselves; we will disarm ourselves; we will put our forces and our means at the disposal of the General Government, because in exchange therefor we can call upon the common treasure and manhood of the whole, and in the obligation to so respond lies the equivalent for that which we give up." I hold that this takes our case out of the operation of the ordinary rule laid down by the writers on public law, and puts us within the range of the principle of compensation and contract obligation.

When it is true, as in this case, the losses have been incurred through the deliberate action of the Government for the public benefit, and in disregard of express covenanted duty, the only excuse for which was the higher claims for the time being of national safety and the security of all.

To pay these claims, and all others like them, would be an act of justice, and, with the ready command of means at our hands, would after all be only measurably to reinstate those who have lost their all, who have been beggared to secure the safety, the prosperity, and the happiness of us all.

I am only asking that the purposes of the founders of the Government shall be carried out; that all the States having entered into this Union, and having tied their own hands, shall have the strong right arm of the Government itself to interpose for their protection and safety. If, from inexorable conditions, if from commanding necessity, it becomes impossible to anticipate and defend against threatened incursions into the territory of a State, or by reason of some military policy or political or national emergency it becomes necessary, as it was in the case of the State of Pennsylvania, for such a State to submit her bosom bared to the sword of the enemy, then I say that that which is recognized as hardly more than an approximate measure of restoration or reimbursement should be conceded; that that inequality of burden thus still unlifted be no longer allowed to remain; that Pennsylvania be compelled no longer to do or suffer more than any other State of the Union, according to its just share and proportion; that our fair State should not have one of her most beautiful towns laid in ashes beyond the hope of indemnity, as an inexorable fatality, an exceptional, an irremediable, sacrifice laid upon the altar of the great civil strife out of which we have so gloriously and successfully come.

This is our whole case, and it is for the National Legislature to say, on the demand of the State, the party to the contract, that we shall be put on an equality with the rest of the States, so that the cost of that war shall have been no more to us than to the rest. It is simply asking that which the framers of the Constitution intended and what all the parties to that contract must be supposed to have understood that contract to mean.

It can mean nothing else. The language of the constitutional guaranty we invoke would otherwise be but an empty rhetorical flourish; and we can not believe that men, dealing with the great and momentous questions which then pressed upon all minds, and just as they were entering upon the untried experiment of a new political existence, would not have weighed well every word employed in the great instrument.

It is impossible to make a stronger case than this for asking compensation under this guaranteed protection.

If this does not make a case, then this guaranty might better have never been written. It is only a delusion, and it was a snare if no obligation follows a failure, because no one can read the Articles of Confederation and the history of the times without being impressed that this Constitution never would have been agreed to, whereby the control of the militia was surrendered and the power to protect against invasion yielded to the Federal Government, if it had been supposed that the guaranty to protect imposed no obligation.

It is inconceivable that so important an element of sovereignty would be yielded up for a meaningless promise.

If such a guaranty were found in a treaty between two nations it would not be doubted that a failure to keep it by the guarantor would call for pecuniary compensation. No argument is needed to support that proposition.

While the Constitution is not a treaty, its acceptance by the States under the circumstances makes the obligation in principle the same.

If, therefore, there is the obligation we are contending for, if the facts connected with this case entitle our Commonwealth to claim indemnity for its people at the hands of the Government, under the guaranty of the Constitution, the duty to compensate for the losses suffered, to reimburse our State and her people, is just as obligatory as if it were enacted in the form of an act of Congress and were found upon our statute books. Indeed, it has a higher character. It is a more solemn and impressive obligation, because it is found in express terms in a higher and more commanding place—the fundamental law of the land, which confines, limits, and dominates the Government itself and all its coordinate agencies.

The only question to be answered is whether there exists the guaranty, the promise, the understanding, the contract obligation, the mandate of the Constitution. Has the guaranty been properly invoked? Have the conditions contemplated in the fundamental law occurred? Was our State threatened with these invasions? Was the Government called upon to interpose its power and guard our gateways? Were we disarmed, and were our people exposed to plunder and devastation? Did they suffer their losses for the common good and at the instance and in deference to the requirements of the national authority? As we answer these questions we determine the duty of the United States and its Legislature in the present case.

The next question is, Was there an "invasion" in the sense of the Constitution?

This is answered by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Pacific Railroad *vs.* The United States (120 U. S. R., 227) in these words:

> It has been held by this court in repeated instances that, though the late war was not between independent nations, yet, as it was between the people of different sections of the country, and the insurgents were so thoroughly organized and formidable as to necessitate their recognition as belligerents, the usual incidents of a war between independent nations ensued.
>
> The rules of war as recognized by the public law of civilized nations became applicable to the contending forces. Their adoption was seen in the exchange of prisoners, the release of officers on parole, the recognition of flags of truce, and other arrangements designed to mitigate the rigors of warfare. The inhabitants of the Confederate States on the one hand, and of the States which adhered to the Union on the other, became enemies and subject to be treated as such, without regard to their individual opinions or dispositions, while during its continuance commercial intercourse between them was forbidden, contracts between them were suspended, and the courts of each were closed to the citizens of the other. (Brown *vs.* Hiatts, 15 Wall., 177, 184.)

In the Prize Cases (2 Black, 636) the court held that war commenced with the President's proclamation of blockade, April 27, 1861. The dissenting judges held that it commenced with the act of Congress of July 13, 1861, and by the authority of this act the proclamation of the insurrection was extended so as to declare eleven States in rebellion. War continued in the States then named until August 20, 1866, when the proclamation of the President proclaimed the insurrection at an end.

During certain periods of the rebellion flagrant war existed in addition to the States proclaimed as in rebellion, in Missouri, Kentucky, Maryland, West Virginia, and for brief times in parts of Indiana, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. The war in Missouri, Kentucky, Maryland, and West Virginia partook of the character of civil war, as well as of an invasion through the States in organized rebellion, while in the States of Indiana, Ohio, and Pennsylvania it was entirely of the character of an invasion.

The war in Missouri, Kentucky, Maryland, and West Virginia was none the less a civil war because those States were not proclaimed as in rebellion. There was more or less organized insurrection within their limits, although the lawful State governments were not subverted in those States as they were in the 11 States proclaimed in rebellion. But the existence of flagrant war without any proclamation or declaration by Congress is a matter of well-remembered history and has been judicially recognized.

In the Prize Cases the court says:

> Insurrection against a government may or may not culminate in an organized rebellion, but a civil war always begins by insurrection against the lawful authority of the government. A civil war is never solemnly declared; it becomes such by its accidents—the number, power, and organization of the persons who originate and carry it on.
>
> When the party in rebellion occupy and hold, in a hostile manner, a certain portion of territory, have declared their independence, have cast off their allegiance, have organized armies, have commenced hostilities against their former sovereign, the world acknowledges them as belligerents and the contest a war. They claim to be in arms to establish their liberty and independence, in order to become a sovereign state, while the sovereign party treats them as insurgents and rebels, who owe allegiance and who should be punished with death for their treason.

In the prize cases, from which I have just quoted, the court further says, referring to the attitude of the States proclaimed in rebellion:

> Hence, in organizing this rebellion, they have acted as States claiming to be sovereign over all persons and property within their respective limits, and asserting a right to absolve their citizens from their allegiance to the Federal Government. Several of these States have combined to form a new confederacy, claiming to be acknowledged by the world as a sovereign state.
>
> Their right to do so is now being decided by wager of battle. The ports and territory of each of these States are held in hostility to the General Government. It is no loose, unorganized insurrection, having no defined boundary or possession. It has a boundary marked by lines of bayonets, and which can be crossed only by force—south of this line is enemy's territory, because it is claimed and held in possession by an organized hostile and belligerent power.

Therefore, under the law of the land, as declared by the highest judicial authority, and under the principles of international law, which so far are incorporated with and recognized as part of our system of jurisprudence, the States in rebellion were at war with the United States, and as States recognized as belligerents.

In the light of this it can not be doubted that the entering upon the soil of the State of Pennsylvania by the Confederate forces for hostile purposes was an "invasion" against which the United States had guaranteed that State protection.

I have stated the controlling facts which decide the merits of the present claim, and I ask you to attach high importance to the consideration that these facts are, in their entire body and substance, facts incapable of bona fide dispute, because they are facts established by the public records of the State and of the Union, and are facts which have entered into, and make a part of, the accepted history of the country.

The writings of Grotius, Vattel, and others are continually cited as authority for the doctrine that nations are not liable to pay citizens for losses of property incident to the ravages of war; but the rule laid down by them, as will presently appear, has the important qualification that it rests not upon any principle which forbids but only upon an inability to pay.

We have already shown that this case does not fall within the rule.

The rule referred to was stated by Grotius three hundred years ago, and was repeated by Puffendorf and Vattel two hundred years ago.

Centuries before our own Constitution was adopted, and in said Constitution, a guaranty was given to do that which alone writers declared that the nations and governments in their day were not bound to do. But conceding the rule, nobody has ever questioned that it is a harsh rule, and no writer has ever attempted to justify it except upon the ground of necessity. Inability of nations to pay is the chief reason given for it, as will presently appear. It is not and can not be defended because it is a just rule.

It is only said that it is the misfortune of the citizen to have property where the shock of battle came, or in the path of an invading enemy, and that his Government has not money enough to compensate him. He does his full duty in common with all other citizens, and added to this is the loss of his property, a loss they do not suffer. It is a loss incurred in a conflict involving interests common to all, and justice would demand that the loss should be the loss of all. There is no logic that can reach any other conclusion.

Courts still adhere to it, but no nation in its sovereign capacity is controlled by it or can be justified in resorting to it to escape its moral obligations to its citizens, because it can not be defended upon any principle of justice.

Let me contrast for a moment the methods and the results of war as waged in the seventeenth century, when Grotius compiled his treatise, with the more enlightened and humane principles upon which war has been conducted in the nineteenth century.

These were some of the results of the Thirty Years' War:

> In the single Duchy of Wurttemberg history asserts that 8 towns, 45 villages, and 36,000 houses had been laid in ashes, and 70,000 hearth fires completely extinguished; 7 churches and 444 houses had been burned at Eichsted. Many towns that had escaped destruction were almost depopulated; 300 houses stood empty at Nordheim. More than 200 had been pulled down at Gottingen merely to serve as fuel. The wealthy city of Augsburg, which contained 80,000 inhabitants before the war, had only 18,000 left when it closed. In 1635 there were not hands enough left at Schweidnitz to bury the dead, and the town of Ohlau had lost its last citizen. Forests sprang up during the contest and covered entire districts which had been in full cultivation before the war, and wolves and other beasts of prey took possession of the deserted haunts of men.

Let us turn to a page of modern history. According to Allison's history of Europe, when the Duke of Wellington entered France with his victorious troops after conquering the French on the fields of Spain, he gave peremptory orders that nothing should be taken without compensation. This will be verified by reference to his order contained in his collection of dispatches, edited by Colonel Gerwood. He gave receipts for supplies and money was paid in the camp. The British historian exultantly comments on the conduct of the great soldier, and records the astonishment with which his conduct was regarded by the people both of Spain and of France. In one of his dispatches Wellington says:

> If we were five times stronger than we are, we could not venture to enter France if we can not prevent our soldiers from plundering.

Whether this was upon grounds of policy or in obedience to a milder spirit which gradually then came in vogue in regulating the conduct of war by civilized nations is a matter of little consequence.

Again, I might mention the conduct of our own General Scott, in his invasion of Mexico, in which private property was respected, forced contributions very sparingly resorted to, and payment generally made for supplies drawn from the country of the enemy. Yet even in the midst of the savage methods and reckless devastation of the wars of the seventeenth century, Grotius used the language I have already quoted with regard to the obligation of the State to repair damages suffered by its subjects through the destruction of property for its use, and he emphasizes this principle of justice in these terms:

> Neither can the state be absolved from this obligation, though at present not able to satisfy it; but when the state is in a capacity the suspended obligation shall resume its force.

The argument of necessity and impracticability, so strongly enforced by the writers of those times, would seem no longer to have the same force or application. Surely the aggregate of damages resulting from the incursions into the States of Pennsylvania and Maryland and Ohio and Indiana would be but as a drop in the ocean compared with the aggregate wealth and power of the nation to whom the appeal is made for their payment, and even that body of claims which may be supposed to exist in States of whichK entucky and Missouri are examples, so far as the evidence upon which they are based, may have survived the lapse of twenty-five years, would fall far below our ability to pay the same.

But this claim stands on a higher plane and on a firmer foundation than any of these. Its payment requires no departure from any rule, wise or unwise, just or unjust; it rests not only upon a principle inherently just, but also upon a solemn guaranty in the Constitution of the United States. To that the State of Pennsylvania appeals.

Looking at the claims of the people of our border counties, without reference to their presentation by the State, and regarding them merely as direct claims of individual citizens against the Government, they may be regarded as fortified by numerous precedents. I am inclined to think that the harsher and stricter doctrines of the writers who formulated the principles of public law in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries have been more or less modified by the more enlightened and liberal notions of more recent times, and by the milder methods of carrying on wars between nations.

The dreadful barbarities and reckless waste of life and property which characterized wars in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries have given place to a more humane view of the duties and obligations of nations to each other in a state of hostility. The burning of a town, the wanton destruction of private property, the plunder of noncombatants are rare exceptions in the conduct of modern wars, and whenever they occur they meet the unsparing condemnation of the public opinion of the civilized world.

Therefore, inasmuch as they more rarely occur, the damages are within smaller and more manageable proportions, and the feeling of sympathy for the exceptional misfortunes of those who suffer

are strong arguments which move nations to compensate for the undue proportion of suffering and loss that thus happen to be entailed.

Moreover, the disproportion between the damages in such cases and the resources to meet them is by no means so great, and certainly the general aggregate wealth of the nations is vastly greater than in the ruder and the poorer centuries which have preceded ours.

As an example of the more liberal tendency of later times in dealing with exceptional calamities of war, I would refer you to the action of the British Government in its treatment of the Loyalists in their revolted colonies after the close of the Revolution. In the treaty of peace negotiated between the representatives of the New Republic of America and Great Britain, the Federal Government refusing to enter into any stipulation on behalf of the Loyalists who had been stripped of their estates by the colonial authorities further than that they would recommend to the States some sort of consideration for them, it was finally settled upon that basis. This decision of the case of the Loyalists was bitterly attacked in the House of Commons as an abandonment of a national duty.

Lord North said, in commenting upon the provisions of this treaty, that—

> Never were the honor, the principles, the policy of a nation so grossly abused as in the desertion of those men who are now exposed to every punishment that desertion and poverty can inflict because they were not rebels.—*Sabine's American Loyalists*, volume 1, page 99.

Lord Mulgrave declared that the article respecting the Loyalists he could never regard but as a lasting monument of national disgrace. Mr. Burke said that a vast number of the Loyalists had been deluded by England and had risked everything, and that to such men the nation owed protection, and its honor was pledged to their security at all hazards. The lord chancellor declared that the stipulations of the treaty are specific, and, said he:

> My own conscious honor will not allow me to doubt the good faith of others, and my good wishes to the Loyalists will not let me indiscreetly doubt the dispositions of Congress, since the understanding is that all these unhappy men shall be provided for. Yet if it were not so Parliament could take cognizance of their case and impart to each suffering individual that relief which reason, perhaps policy, certainly virtue and religion, required. (Ibid., page —.)

The debate on the proposed compensation of the American Loyalists in Parliament in 1778 was participated in by Mr. Pitt, Mr. Burke, and Mr. Fox, among others. It is true that Mr. Pitt, in presenting the plan which was adopted, denied their right on the ground of strict justice, but he went so far as to say:

> The American Loyalists could not call upon the House to make compensation for their loss as a matter of strict justice, but they most undoubtedly have strong claims on their generosity and compassion.

But Mr. Fox, perhaps the most liberal of the public men of that day, said that in his opinion the giving the Loyalists relief—

> Is not a matter of liberty, nor a matter of compassion, but what they had a strict right to; not a right to full payment of their unqualified claims, but a strict right to compensation for what they had suffered.

The debate was upon the bill for appointing commissioners further to inquire into the losses and services of all such persons who have suffered in their rights, properties, and professions during the late unhappy dissensions in America in consequence of their loyalty to His Majesty and attachment to the British Government.

Edmund Burke said, among other things:

> The loyalists had certainly been assured from the first authority in the State that if they left their property and joined the King's army, or came to America, they should receive protection and support. That pledge was sacred, and ought to be faithfully fulfilled.

The substance of this discussion will be found in Cobbett's Parliamentary History, published by Hansard, volume 27, pages 610 to 619, inclusive.

The claims were allowed and paid to the extent of more than $16,000,000, an amount then of much greater consequence than a similar amount would be now. These claims were substantially the same as the claims of our own people would be for damages suffered through the action of the late enemies of the Government.

In 1871, September 6, a law was passed authorizing the distribution of a sum of a hundred millions, and on April 7, 1873, authorized payment of one hundred and twenty millions, although in her constitution France had given no such guaranty as is given by section 4 of Article IV of our Constitution.

See letter of James G. Blaine to Hon. Ormsby B. Thomas, chairman War Claims Committee.

See letter of Henry Vigund, secretary legation of the United States, Paris, March 28, 1890, to Hon. James G. Blaine, Secretary of State.

See letter of Mr. Rilet, dated Paris, March 24, 1890.

The acts of our own Government all through its legislative history is full of repeated instances of the exercise of this more liberal spirit. There is a long catalogue of special appropriations that were made for the burning and destruction of property along the Chesapeake by the British in their invasion of 1814. These were not cases of property used for military purposes and destroyed for that reason by the enemy, but property that was destroyed directly by the incursions of the enemy.

There are many cases also of compensation for the destruction of property in the incursions upon our Niagara frontier during the late war with Great Britain.

I might refer to the act of Congress of 1816 providing for the payment of claims for property lost, captured, or destroyed by the enemy while in the military service of the United States during the war of 1812 (United States Statutes at Large, volume 3, page 263), and the liberal spirit in which it was interpreted was an advance somewhat upon the ancient doctrines; the act of July 4, 1864, relative to the payment for quartermaster stores, subsistence, and supplies furnished to the Army (United States Statutes at Large, volume 16, page 331), and subsequent legislation on the same subject; the captured and abandoned property act of March 12, 1863 (United States Statutes at Large, volume 12, page 820), and legislation supplementary thereto.

These are instances of a certain degree of modification in the ancient principles supposed to regulate the liability of the sovereign to make appropriation for losses of property in the course of military operations.

The following are some of the cases of payment made to compensate for property destroyed by the incursions of the enemy during war, to wit:

Act April 24, 1816, to pay William Flood for property destroyed by the British at New Orleans in 1815 (volume 6, Statutes at Large, page 163).

Act of April 27, 1816, to pay Samuel Manac for his property destroyed by hostile Creeks in late war (page 171).

See cases in Report No. 332 on H. R. 4241, Fifty-second Congress, first session. All these cases were for property destroyed, not in occupancy of United States military authorities.

The main reason or argument now assigned for not paying our citizens for such losses sustained by invasions is the mistaken impression that they will be so great it would bankrupt our Government. This is a mere declaration not sustained by any facts. The wildest estimate made to pay the losses by invasion in the border States does not exceed $20,000,000. The income the Government receives in twenty days will pay the whole bill. The aggregate would be small comparatively with the aggregate of those paid under the act of April 9, 1816, and subsequent acts for losses during the war of 1812.

We then had a population of about 8,000,000, and most of our people were poor; we now have 65,000,000 and are the richest nation on the globe; we are far more able to pay now than we were in 1816, or France was in 1872, or Great Britain after the war with the colonies, when she paid £20,000,000 to her people who remained loyal; we are more than able to be just, so let us be just.

In the Franco-Prussian war Germany made France pay her an indemnity of three thousand million francs. Out of this enormous sum Germany paid all her subjects who suffered by reason of the war. The United States asked no indemnity from the Southern people she conquered out of which to indemnify and pay the loyal people of the North who had been invaded, its people harried, their fields laid waste, their goods of all kinds confiscated, homes burned by the Confederate troopers and armies. Instead, the United States has been paying the people in the disloyal States, not under a guaranty in the Constitution, but by acts of Congress, millions of dollars, Tennessee alone up to March, 1884, having received $2,150,791.80. (See Report No. 720, Forty-eighth Congress, first session, H. R. 5377.)

These examples might be multiplied, but need not be. The manifest and conclusive teaching of them all is to admonish legislatures and governments that the spirit of the age and the morality of the public law unite in demanding that where war has brought upon individuals peculiar and special losses which have been incurred for and resulted in the general good of the entire people, there the Treasury of the entire people ought to make compensation therefor.

I do not base our claims upon any appeal that I might make to your generosity and liberality. I do not stand before you asking charity or a gift. I am willing, for the purposes of the argument, to concede the authority of the principles laid down by writers on public law upon the subject of the liability of States for the unavoidable misfortunes of their subjects. I place our case upon the higher and firmer ground that the claim is now made by the State under the express letter and the undoubted spirit of the contract to which she is a party, and by which the General Government has obligated itself to execute certain duties toward our State as to all the others.

Having failed to expend its treasure and its resources for our special protection, whether the justification therefor be sufficient or not, we are entitled to be relieved, as far as possible, from the consequences of that failure, by an appropriation of a much less amount than would have been regarded as properly expended if it had been directly appropriated in the first instance to guard against the misfortunes that have followed from the failure to

act. Let the loss thus incurred be distributed among all. Upon that principle will our Government best be administered, the principal end of its existence secured.

Pennsylvania now comes under the guaranty of the Constitution and presents her claim for her people. Say to her, "You are under no more obligation to continue to bear the losses resulting from the nation's default than you were liable to have contributed directly more than your quota of men or share of stores and money for the common defense. So, having been involved in loss and expenditure of property, in order to secure that common good let that expenditure be borne by all proportionately and justly, and no longer be left to remain a burden upon one alone."

Fair valleys devastated, a beautiful and prosperous town wantonly destroyed by fire, hundreds of families reduced to hopeless poverty, are the sacrifice made by our State to the common cause. She had a right to have her borders guarded, her people defended; but her territory was left open to the advance of the enemy; her soldiery, who had assembled for her defense, were hurried away to other points at the almost frantic command of the national authorities. The sacrifice was willingly made at the mandate of national necessity.

Let the contribution so made be reimbursed, so that our State, which had no weightier interests at stake in the great struggle than New York, or Connecticut, or Maine, or the remoter States of the Northwest, whose waving fields never felt the fierce breath of war and whose peaceful homes were never disturbed by the rude intrusion of the hostile trooper, shall no longer be compelled to bear the sad consequences of her devotion and sacrifice to the cause of the common country.

I have now presented the case of my people. I can do no more. We stand here with clean hands. A case fully made out under the facts and law. You must as the final arbitors render the verdict.

Empire or Republic—Retention of the Philippines.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN S. WILLIAMS,

OF MISSISSIPPI,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, April 3, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (S. 222) to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I believe that very nearly all of the arguments which have been made by the imperialists of this country in favor of the retention of remote islands populated by alien and inferior races have been disposed of except, perhaps, two. One is the "mission" plea, and the other is the "manifest-destiny" plea. People tell us, Mr. Chairman, that we have a "mission" to perform in the Philippine Islands. As for myself, I am somewhat distrustful of men with "missions."

In my limited experience I have found that the man who has a "mission," or who pretends to have a "mission," has some greed, some avarice, some selfish purpose, or else some fanatical notion in his head, and in order to recommend it to other people strives to get the idea into their minds that he is in partnership with the Lord God Almighty. [Applause.] Now, my friends, although this is in general a description of the class of persons claiming to have a "mission," yet it is also true that every man, every woman, and, more than that, every nation has a mission in this world, for the most part unrealized in any definite way by themselves; and when you inquire seriously what that mission is, or must be, your answer will always be that it is for the particular entity to live its life in character with its nature.

You must know, therefore, what a thing is before you can say what its mission is. You must know what sort of a ship you are on, what direction you are taking, and how fast you are going before you can know where you are going to land or where you ought to be expected to land. Therefore it becomes important to inquire what we are among the nations of the world. Then we may determine possibly—approximately, at any rate—what our mission is.

Then what are we? What sort of a ship of state?

We are, Mr. Chairman, a Constitutional Democratic Republic. We are "constitutional," as contradistinguished from those nations of the world who are governed by the discretion either of a king, a czar, an emperor, an aristocracy, or even a parliament. We are "democratic" as contradistinguished from those republics which are aristocratic or plutocratic. The chief corner stone of the faith of a democratic republic consists in the fact that its end and aim and object is the liberty and the happiness of the individual citizen, as contradistinguished from the happiness, the welfare, or the supremacy of a class, or the splendor of a state.

Then, Mr. Chairman, we are a "Republic" as contradistinguished from all monarchical power—from a mo-narch, to go back to the etymological pronunciation—a one-man power.

Now, having gotten along that far, can it be the mission of a *constitutional* government to carry the flag and government where the *Constitution* can not follow—to establish government where the government locally must be, if it preserves civilization at all, a government in contradiction of its own Constitution? Can it be the mission of a *democratic* republic to carry the flag and domination where democratic institutions and democratic relations and conditions among the citizens can not follow?

And what are democratic institutions? Upon what basis does the democratic temple rest? Why, sir, it rests upon three pillars—fraternity, equality, and liberty; these three support it. Is there anybody here that can contend for a moment that we can carry with safety to ourselves, our institutions, and our civilization, to the Filipinos the creed of their equality with ourselves and our children throughout the ages in molding the destiny of this Republic?

Is there anybody not a hypocrite who pretends for one moment that we can carry a genuine spirit of "fraternity" to a different race from ourselves, in our opinion inferior to ourselves? The whole history of the world shows it impossible. Do you contend that you will carry to them even the mere muniments of inherited English liberty? If so, your conduct toward Porto Rico proves your contention false, and Porto Ricans, Mr. Chairman, are two-thirds Caucasian.

Then can it be the mission of a democratic republic to carry the rule of the republic where democratic institutions can not rest upon democratic pillars? But last of all, can it be the mission of a "republic"—of any sort of republic—to carry the flag and domination where the character of the government, which must be inaugurated and which must continue to exist, shall be essentially and in all main things a monarchical government—a government by a monarch, whether that monarch be under the name of a monarch, a president, a military satrap, or a proconsular governor.

So much for that, Mr. Chairman. Then let us see about our "manifest destiny." I know what destiny is, and I know that every man has a destiny and that every nation has one. I know that there is a God in history who works upon us and by means of us to accomplish His own purposes, and that those purposes, so far as this world is concerned, are for the upraising of humanity and the amelioration of the conditions of the great masses of mankind, but I do not know what "manifest" destiny is.

We all have a destiny, but it has not been manifested to many of us. But if there be any manifest destiny at all for any man or for any nation, that manifest destiny lies in this, that "whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he surely reap." If he sows chains abroad, he will reap slavery at home. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If he sows contempt of constitutional limitations and guaranties abroad, he will some day find the very men whom he has taught to laugh at them as "cradle fixings" and "swaddling clothes that we have outgrown" laughing at them again at his very door when he appeals to them for protection. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

An imperial army has a "destiny," too, Mr. Chairman. Its destiny is to destroy free institutions.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard the "mission" argument carried still further. I have heard ministers of the gospel pretendedly preaching, not the gospel of Mohammed, who carried faith to the unfaithful by fire and the sword, but the doctrine of Jesus Christ, say that we had "a mission to civilize and Christianize the people in the far Orient." How? By means of Krag-Jörgensen rifles and the sword of the cavalry? It is not the mission of Christianity to make wounds, but to bind them up. It is its mission not to start the tears of women and children, but to assuage them—not to destroy home and home life, but to teach people to make and beautify homes.

It would surprise nobody who ever lived more than it would astound the Fisherman of Galilee Himself and His disciples to hear that the doctrine of peace, the doctrine of freedom—and of democratic freedom at that, for it is the democracy of the teachings of Jesus Christ that prove His divinity—were "destined" or had a "mission" to be carried to the peoples of the world by Krag-Jörgensen rifles, men-of-war, and proconsular viceroys. Why, the cardinal doctrine of His teaching was that you became whatever you were by what was nurtured in you and came out of you as an emanating influence to the world, and not by something superimposed upon you by an authority higher than yourself.

However, Mr. Chairman, I did not rise this evening so much for the purpose of speaking myself as for the purpose of obtaining the permission of the House to insert in the RECORD in this connection parts of two speeches made by the Hon. Carl Schurz at the city of Chicago. Mr. Chairman, if I have not that permission

already, I want permission to insert in the RECORD, in extension of my remarks, the speeches I have referred to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent of the committee to extend his remarks by the insertion of the article referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[The speeches of Mr. Schurz referred to will appear at the conclusion of the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I wish to ask, furthermore, Mr. Chairman, permission to insert in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a letter written by the Hon. GEORGE F. HOAR, a Senator from the State of Massachusetts, to the editors of the Journal, Advertiser, Herald, and Globe at Boston, Mass., in connection with some criticisms made upon him because of the position which he had taken upon this question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by adding to them a letter written by the Hon. GEORGE F. HOAR. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[The letter of Senator HOAR referred to will be found in the RECORD at the conclusion of the two speeches of Mr. Schurz.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I desire furthermore to ask permission to insert in the RECORD a part—a good part of it I have stricken out—of a little pamphlet which I hold in my hand called The Liberty Catechism, and written by Frederick W. Gookin.

Mr. KNOX. I do not know anything about the author of the pamphlet. Who is the author of the pamphlet?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Frederick W. Gookin.

Mr. KNOX. Who may he be, please?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I really do not know; and, Mr. Chairman, I am not one of those men who care much about "who a man may be" if what he says is sound and reasonable, and in my opinion appeals to the heart and head from the right standpoint.

Mr. HILL. I will ask the gentleman if he has read the pamphlet?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Yes, indeed, I have, and very carefully edited it, too, and stricken out a good deal that I did not agree with; but there is a good deal that I do agree with, and that I wish to adopt as my own.

Mr. KNOX. I am not sufficiently informed about Mr. Gookin——

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that this is the first time that I have heard of this pamphlet, but that Frederick W. Gookin is one of my distinguished constituents.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Now I know he is all right. [Laughter.]

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. He is the cashier of the Commercial National Bank of Chicago, a very able man, and a very thoughtful man, and a man very much interested in all public questions.

Mr. KNOX. Ought not the whole of this pamphlet to be inserted?

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. I should think anything that Mr. Gookin would write would be worthy of insertion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Some of it is a little bit too Republican for me, and I shall leave that out. [Laughter.] The balance of it I shall insert and adopt as my own.

Mr. KNOX. Would not the gentleman be willing to insert the whole pamphlet?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. No, sir. What I insert I make my own and I must agree with it or else I could not adopt it. There are some things in almost everybody's utterances that I do not agree with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by adding to them such parts of the Catechism of Liberty as he agrees to, and has indicated.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman means fragmentary liberty, not the full catechism.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Well, I will head it to suit myself; but I will say that there will be no liberty taken with the manuscript that would hurt a Democratic heart in any way.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

[Mr. Gookin's Catechism of Liberty will be found in the RECORD, at the conclusion of Senator HOAR'S letter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to insert as a part of my remarks a part of a speech made by the Hon. George S. Boutwell, a gentleman who, by the way, I suppose, *is* known to the gentleman from Massachusetts and to other gentlemen in the House—a distinguished Republican, a distinguished statesman, an ex-Senator and ex-Cabinet officer, and, I believe, one of the fathers of the Republican party.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that he extend his remarks by the addition of a portion of the speech of the Hon. George S. Boutwell. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Hon. George S. Boutwell's speech will be found in the RECORD at the conclusion of Mr. Gookin's pamphlet.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Now, Mr. Chairman, how much time have I left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has fifteen minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I shall devote that time to reading some things to this House that I think will be very pleasant reading "to men of good will." This is quoted from The Public of December 23:

In his message President McKinley said he had "every reason to believe" that the cession of the Philippines to the United States was in accordance with the wishes and aspirations of the great mass of the Filipino people. But what reasons had Mr. McKinley for believing this? He specifies none. And certainly the burden of proof is upon him, for the only expression of the Filipino people so far made came through the envoys of the Filipino republic, and those expressions were hostile to the cession. The envoys did all in their power to bring them to Mr. McKinley's attention, but without success. How can he say that he had "every" reason to believe that the Filipino people approved the cession when he refused to listen to the only expression of sentiment that any of the Filipino people in an organized capacity ever attempted to make?

Here is another one. I leave out part of it because it is personally denunciatory of the President. I am not going to be bound by that sort of thing. I am never in the habit of personally denouncing my political opponents, believing that such a habit is not good in reason nor sound in policy. This part of it is sound:

Mr. McKinley attempted in his vote-hunting speech at Fargo to scandalize Aguinaldo by insinuating that this young Filipino leader had been bribed by the Spanish. That libel has been utterly discredited, as Mr. McKinley must know; so completely discredited that it has no standing any more outside of yellow journals and willful libelers. But note Mr. McKinley's comment upon the slander. Said he, referring to Aguinaldo and his demand for independence as the condition of peace: "He had another price than that once, but the United States pays no gold for peace."

Does not that sound, Mr. Chairman, like the fathers of the old Republic when they said, "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute?" Yet, what a plain tale shall put its pretensions down, and a tale of the President's own making at that? Listen:

Evidently Mr. McKinley had forgotten that the only excuse yet offered for his paying gold to the Sultan of Sulu to continue a polygamous, pro-slavery, and Mohammedan government there was to secure peace. It would seem that the United States does pay gold for peace. But no. Mr. McKinley is right, as usual. It was not gold with which peace was bought of the Sultan. It was silver.

We can at last thank the President a little on this side of the Chamber, it seems, for "finding a use" for silver.

Then, Mr. Chairman, here is something that I recommend to the House. It is good reading:

Self-government rather than good government! That was the keynote of the anti-imperial conference. The sentiment is profoundly true. It touches the depths of political morality. Not that good government is to be despised or regarded with indifference or even with secondary concern. Good government is among the highest of human aspirations. Politically speaking, it is the very highest. But no government other than self-government can by any possibility be or ever become good.

It may be stable—as stable as the government of the Czar. It may be peaceful—as peaceful as the government of a prison. It may be good government in the estimation of the privileged classes. But it can not be good in the only sense in which unselfish and truly religious and patriotic men have a right to call government good. New York in the worst days of Tweed was better governed than Warsaw in the best days of the order that reigned there. By its keynote sentiment the anti-imperial conference justified itself.

We have frequently shown from the acts of the Administration that its purpose is to establish crown colonies after the English model. Senator LODGE only says so in terms. Thus the United States, a Federation of democratic Commonwealths, is to become, as to its "new possessions," a monarchy with their inhabitants as subjects. How long after we get crown colonies will it be before we have a crowned head?—*From the Public*, December 30, 1899.

"American crown colonies." How does the phrase strike you? Please hear the following elucidation of the interpretation of the Secretary of War of the power of the Federal Government:

Should Secretary Root's interpretation of the power of the Federal Government be adopted, the Federation of American States will soon be superseded by a veritable empire, with the States as subordinate departments, and crown colonies scattered over the earth. In order to bolster up the colonial system which the Administration evidently desires to establish, if possible, Mr. Root exactly reverses the constitutional principle that has heretofore controlled.

It has always been held that the United States have no powers except such as the Constitution confers, all other powers having been reserved to the States; but Mr. Root argues that the United States acquire undelegated powers simply because they constitute a nation. His object in this is to establish the constitutional right of the United States to hold the Philippines and Puerto Rico as crown colonies, after the British method, giving to the inhabitants no constitutional rights of American citizenship nor any of the constitutional securities as to trade.—*From The Public of December 8, 1899.*

But there are those who say that we have already expanded. I myself care but little about words. Certain, however, it is that there is no expansion, whether done or yet to be done, involved in the retention of the Philippine Islands. The phrase would

have been more accurate had it been "we have already imperialized." Whether this be true or not—and that it is not true I have the word of the President himself, who has upon many occassions said that "the question is one for Congress to determine," and whose followers on the floor are now contending that our occupation of the Philippines is merely provisional and military, and that therefore the islands can not be considered at this stage of our history as "parts of the United States"—I have only to say that if we have already imperialized, let us then disimperialize, and go swiftly about the work.

Republicans tell us upon this floor that Congress has under the Constitution the power "to dispose of the Territories." If so, and if the Philippine Islands have become a territory or territories of the United States, let us, in Heaven's name, "dispose of" them in some way, either by granting them autonomy and independence, which is the remedy suggested by us, or by dividing them up and selling to those nations of the world who are said to be so anxious to possess them. If we had a right to buy them, then we have the right to sell them. Upon this question I insert an extract from an editorial in the Land of Sunshine, edited by Charles F. Lummis, headed—

WHILE THERE IS YET TIME.

President McKinley tells us that "we have expanded," and that it is no longer a question. * * * But probably it is not yet too late in this country for a plain American to rise and ask, "How? When? Who's 'we?' What was the date and what were the ceremonials?" Certainly to annul the Constitution of the United States must have taken a specific act by specific persons at a specific point of time. These things do not come by evaporation nor as a dream in the night, without agent or chronology or responsibility. If there are no Americans left who might be curious, the historian at least will wish to know. * * * If for more than a century we have been wasting our own time and that of Congress, and the thing can be so easily done without any help from us, let us know how, that we may save trouble next time.

I can not sit down without recurring to the flag argument, and the idea that it is the patriotic duty of every citizen to support the Administration of his country, if, perchance, only that Administration be involved in war, regardless of the character of the war or the causes of its inauguration, or the intent of the Administration in carrying it on. Edmund Burke long ago exposed, in words familiar to every American schoolboy, the falsity, even the ludicrousness, of this contention. Mr. Charles F. Lummis adds something worth thinking about upon that question:

NOT YET TREASON TO THINK.

They are either not very thoughtful or not very honest who are crying, "Sh! you mustn't think in time of war!"

Every sober man knows that in the intended sense this is no "time of war." The argument rests on such war as menaces the country, and then, indeed, a patriot may have to fight first and think afterwards. But to pretend that this nation is in such danger from the Filipinos that we must put our reason under martial law is a little too absurd. * * * The only danger this country is in, or ever will be in, is from the citizens who think self-government is a sort of blind man's buff, and that all they have to do is to shut their eyes and minds and grope in the wake of the gentleman who is "it."—*Charles F. Lummis, editorial in the Land of Sunshine.*

To that I add the following:

TO BE KEPT RIGHT.

We must combat the notion that our country can do no wrong. She can, and she will if we let her. Human nature would always be doing wrong if we did not try not to. Precisely because we are in a war, it is the time when every American needs most to remember his obligation and to watch that the honor of his country be not left to a venal few or an intoxicated many.

And this:

WHAT IT STANDS FOR.

The American flag is what it stands for. There is no sovereign virtue in the bunting itself nor in the stitches that confirm it. There should even be Americans of moral courage enough to lower that flag when it is where it does not belong. It once floated in Mexico. Were they not patriots who hauled it down?

But there are too many Americans now who dare to haul down the spirit of our flag at home. For more than a century the Stars and Stripes have stood for human rights and the consent of the governed. They do not stand for that in the Philippines to-day. They will not always stand for that in the United States if we misuse them elsewhere.

The men who corrupt our politics; the men who surrender conscience; the men who do not care—these are the ones who are really hauling down our flag. It is time for us to stop chatter about six yards of cloth and concern ourselves with the soul of which that cloth is only a token. And to begin with, we had better lay quiet, firm hands upon the only dangerous enemies this nation has in the whole world. We shall need no cruisers to get them, nor weapons to lay them by the heels, more than

"That weapon which comes down as still
As snowflakes fall upon the sod,
But executes a freeman's will
As lightning does the will of God."

Here is another from The Public regarding the real purpose of the Administration concerning the Philippine question:

Regarding the Philippine question, the Presidential mouthpiece for that purpose in the Senate has indicated the Presidential policy with unmistakable distinctness. We allude to Senator BEVERIDGE, of Indiana. It is not a policy of expansion Mr. BEVERIDGE advocates. It is a policy of undisguised imperialism, and the chief motive is commercial exploitation. "The times call for candor," he says, and candid he unquestionably is. Looking without a blush upon his countrymen as belonging to a race of remorseless brigands, he admonishes the Senate that "that man little knows the common people of the Republic, little understands the instincts of our race who thinks we will not hold" our conquest "fast, and hold it forever."

And the race thus characterized by himself as a race guided by instincts of insatiable greed he has the impious effrontery to entitle "trustee, under God, of the civilization of the world." It is well to know the depths to which this Administration has sunk in its mad departure from the eminently American precept that "forcible annexation" is "criminal aggression;" and Senator BEVERIDGE in his Philippine speech renders us that service. The day has now gone by when Administration organs can fool dull devotees of party by pretending that no variation from American traditions is contemplated. They must either repudiate the Administration or accept imperialism in all its nakedness.

The purpose of the Administration is proclaimed by this Administration Senator as authoritatively as possible outside of a Presidential message. And it proves to be what critics of the Administration have predicted in the face of ridicule that it would be—a policy of world-wide empire, maintained by overwhelming military force in ceaseless action against all resistance. Without concealment we are now invited upon an imperial and military career like that wherein Rome—the old "trustee, under God, of the civilization of the world"—lost her own liberties in struggling to destroy the liberties of other peoples, and finally disappeared in the gloom of the dark ages in which her own betrayal of her ideals of liberty had enshrouded the world.—*From The Public of January 13, 1900.*

And right there, Mr. Chairman, I am moved to call the attention of the House to the difference between "expansion" and "imperialism." I am in favor of institutional and constitutional expansion, and the Democratic party has been the great party of expansion, and will be in the future as it has been in the past, whenever and wherever there is a field for "expansion" and not for "imperialism." What is expansion? It is stretching yourself out, carrying yourself as a nation, with all that clothes you and makes you, your Constitution and free institutions, to people somewhere else; not superimposing yourself upon somebody, but carrying your Government, its spirit, its Constitution, its laws, its aspirations, its traditions—in short, its soul as well as its body—to new parts of the world.

To expand in the historical American and Democratic sense is to incorporate in the body politic as a part of an equal population other peoples who can cooperate with us in carrying the Republic on to its destiny as a constitutional democratic republic, whose essential aim is home happiness, and liberty—"the greatest good for the greatest number." But what is imperialism? It is merely stretching your sway, your power, your dominion, superimposing yourself bodily only upon somebody somewhere as a paramount power, superimposing yourself as a nation upon another people or other peoples held by military or political power as your inferiors or your subjects.

That is the difference between "expansion" and "imperialism." Every good Democrat is an expansionist; every good Democrat believes that we can go into unfilled areas fit for homes for the sons and daughters of the American people, fit for free men to live and labor and grow and increase in, fit for development by men who love liberty, and by women who are pure, and make pure and healthy homes for themselves and their children. There is a field for "expansion" for the American people. Wherever, moreover, you can find a kindred population capable of assimilation with ours, capable of understanding, appreciating, and loving our institutions, there is also a field for the Republic's expansion.

But wherever you can find only alien and inferior races that do not intend to welcome and can not understand your institutions, wherever you may not extend your constitutional guaranties, wherever you must live either as arbitrary master or not live at all, wherever you must have either the military to rise supreme and be a military power or else anarchy to prevail, that is not a place for the Republic to go. In such places there can not be "expansion"—institutional, constitutional, democratic, republican expansion. Only one thing can grow in such places—the noxious weed imperialism.

Truly, alas! as the author of the article just read, says: "It is the policy of undisguised imperialism," which the Administration would recommend as a "poisoned chalice" to our lips.

Why, even the leader of the Republican party, in his lucid intervals, is an American citizen and remembers that he is the chief of a democratic republic. He had one lucid interval when he said, "Forcible annexation is criminal aggression."

Surely that phrase is, as the writer of the article just read says it is, "an eminently American precept." "Ah!" as Rip Van Winkle says, "how soon it vas forgot."

Mr. HILL. What is the article you just read an extract from?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. From The Public of January 13, 1900.

Mr. Chairman, I was astonished the other day to read in the RECORD that a Senator from a great State had drawn a roseate picture for the fond and aspiring eyes of the American people, exhibiting to them in that guise a career of imperialism and world dominion. I was still more astonished when he cited as illustrations of the grandeur and glory and greatness of such a career the instances of the Grecian empire in Asia and the Roman empire of the world.

I remember, Mr. Chairman, reading the History of the Nineteenth Century, by Gervinus, the great German historian, who, when he came to tell the cause of the fall of the empire of Napoleon the Great, expressed it in one German word, "Ueberspannung"—overspanning, overstretching, overextension, going too far. Had the great Corsican been satisfied with the natural boundaries of France—the Alps, the Pyrenees, and the Rhine—his stupendous work would exist to-day true to itself and beneficent to mankind.

The Roman Empire might be existing in all essentials, Christianized and purified, but Roman still, but for the insane and self-destructive greed and love of blood implanted in the hearts of the senators and the populace of Rome by a career of world dominion. Rome could "expand" in Europe, it could only "imperialize" in Asia. Its natural boundaries, geographically, politically, and institutionally were essentially European.

The glory, greatness, the power and taste and art, the "ineffable grace" of Greece might be existing to-day in somewhat different and Christianized form but for following the Macedonian madman with her best blood to the plains of Asia, imperializing, not expanding—putting all her energies and the lives of her best and bravest and highest at the behest of "empire"—making vast, and in the end exhausting, sacrifices in an effort in which Alexander and his successors, and Greece with them, failed. Failed how? By losing all that was essentially Greek and becoming all that was essentially Asiatic.

Thus, Mr. Chairman, I for one feel that when the Senator called upon us in eloquent, though somewhat sophomoric, phrases to look back upon the failures of history which he would have us consider worthy of our imitation, drawing pictures of them in bright but false colors to lure me and you into running the race which they had run, he underestimated the intelligence, as well as the historic knowledge, of the American people. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

A.

ANTI-IMPERIALIST MEETING—CARL SCHURZ'S ADDRESS AT THE CONFERENCE IN PHILADELPHIA—WASHINGTON'S IDEAL—OUR TREATMENT OF THE FILIPINOS—PROMISES MADE—THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE SITUATION.

MR. SCHURZ'S ADDRESS.

The address of Mr. Schurz—"For the Republic of Washington and Lincoln"—which was the principal feature of the conference, follows in full:

THREE PROVIDENTIAL FAVORS.

Look back upon the time when our country first rose into view. Europe was in the throes of the bloody and destructive struggles following the Reformation. The efforts for religious freedom seemed rather to hamper than to promote the efforts for the political enfranchisement of peoples. On the European Continent modern absolutism issued from the confusion.

Even in England, where a certain measure of political freedom had been won by long contests, and where at last the Crown was overthrown by the great rebellion, the Commonwealth quickly degenerated into a military absolutism, which in its turn had to yield to the restoration of the royal power. And when a new revolution resulted in firmly establishing constitutional government, still that Government remained preponderantly aristocratic, and the church continued to be united with the state.

While these troubles were afflicting the peoples of Europe, who were painfully staggering under the inherited burdens and shackles of feudal institutions and privileges and customs and traditions heaped upon them by past centuries, the soil now occupied by this great Republic was opened to the best aspirations of a new era.

The Englishmen, Germans, Dutch, Frenchmen, Swedes, Celts, who sought their fortunes here found a free field for their activities. No matter whether they came in search of an asylum for their religious beliefs or in quest of wealth or adventure; no matter whether kings still claimed this New World as theirs, and whether aristocrats or great proprietaries tried to preserve something like feudal authority, all pretensions adverse to political freedom speedily vanished in this atmosphere. Here that freedom had not to struggle through any established institutions or customs inherited from the past. Here the seed of democracy planted itself in virgin soil, to grow and bear fruit without hindrance. Here was, therefore, the natural birthplace of that great charter of human rights and human liberty, the Declaration of Independence, pointing out the goal to be reached and destined to serve as a guiding star to all mankind. If here the momentous problem of government of, for, and by the people is not to be solved, where in the world can it be?

This greatest of all opportunities was the providential favor Washington recognized; and he did not fail to point out the awful responsibility arising from it when he said: "The preservation of the sacred fire of liberty and the destiny of the republican model of government are justly considered as deeply, perhaps as finally staked on the experiment intrusted to the hands of the American people." And the manner in which he thought that this our great opportunity should be turned to the benefit of mankind, he forcibly indicated by expressing in his Farewell Address his ardent wish "that the happiness of these States, under the auspices of liberty, may be made so complete, by so careful a preservation and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection, and the adoption of every nation which is as yet a stranger to it." And further: "Observe good faith and justice toward all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all; religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant day, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence."

Thus did Washington view the first providential favor bestowed upon this people, and also our duty to spread this blessing among the nations, not by the force of arms, but by the moral power of example.

The second was no less extraordinary, although Washington himself would have been too modest to avow it. It consisted in the fact that the first President of this Republic furnished in himself, by his character, the principles he followed, the motives that inspired him, and the wisdom of his policies, the most perfect model of a republican chief magistrate in the history of the world—a President to whose teachings and example all his successors—indeed, all those wielding public power in this Republic—could with the utmost confidence look for safest guidance. Surely no other nation has ever been so signally blessed.

The third unique providential favor enjoyed by the American people consists, owing to their geographical situation, in their happy exemption from those embarrassments and dangers by which other nations, being in constant touch with powerful, jealous, and possibly hostile neighbors, feel themselves obliged to keep up vast, burdensome, and constantly increasing armaments on land and sea. For more than three-quarters of a century—a war of our own making and the period of our civil conflict excepted—the American people have enjoyed the inestimable boon of a substantially unarmed peace in perfect security. Until recently we valued this priceless privilege so heartily and proudly that we looked down with pitying superiority upon the nations of the Old World, seeing them grievously burdened with their monstrous military and naval establishments; and we watched with an almost disdainful smile their incessant efforts to increase those burdens in their nervous anxiety lest some rival might get an advantage; until at last one of their mightiest rulers truthfully confessed that the ruinous competition could not much longer go on without fatal consequences. And we were the only great nation on earth securely free from these drag weights and worries.

This is no mere fancy picture. The history of a century bears it out. Excepting the period of our civil war, we had, compared with other great powers, neither army nor navy, and yet our rights and our honor were safe all over the globe. The greatest sea power on earth yielded to us far more deference than to any other nation. Why all this? While a hostile power wishing to attack us would have had the advantage of greater readiness, it could not strike at a vital point in our continental stronghold. It would have had to count upon a discouragingly long struggle against immense resources and an incalculable staying power on our side, and during that struggle it would have offered dangerous opportunities to its jealous rivals in the Old World. Moreover, it was thought that our Monroe doctrine, looking to the primacy of this Republic in this hemisphere, would keep us from unnecessary meddling with Old World affairs.

Therefore we could not have a war unless we kicked some foreign nation into it. Even all our wishes concerning Cuba would probably have been conceded by Spain without firing a gun if we had only waited. In one word, it was the first precept of European statesmanship to remain on good terms with this Republic at almost any cost. And therefore it was that we were secure in the enjoyment of the inestimable blessing of unarmed peace, with the fullest liberty to devote all our social energies to the development of our immense material resources and of our mental and moral capabilities; to the solution of the great problem of popular government given in our charge, and to our glorious mission to promote the cause of liberty and civilization among mankind by the peaceable moral force of our example.

These were the extraordinary providential favors bestowed upon the American people, part of which Washington witnessed, part of which he foresaw, and the duties and responsibilities flowing from which he felt so deeply.

THE NEW COURSE.

What have we done with these blessings? While the conduct of the American democracy has indeed not reached the ideal which was in Washington's mind, and while for this reason it has had its failures, and those failures have had to be dearly paid for, yet remaining until recently substantially true to the most essential principles upon which it was founded, and especially to Washington's precepts concerning its intercourse with the outside world, the Republic has achieved a measure of development in wealth, greatness, and power that has in a like space of time never been equaled by any nation in history.

But now we are told that we have come to a turning point; that the very power we have won in walking that providential path obliges us to strike out in a different direction; that we must no longer content ourselves with making this vast continent the home of a free, peaceable, and happy people, with an honest endeavor to solve on this virgin soil the momentous problem of popular self-government, and with advancing the cause of liberty and civilization among mankind by the moral force of our example, but that we must give up the priceless privilege of unarmed peace; that we must have big fleets and armies in order to play a new part in the affairs of the world; that we must become conquerors to spread our commerce and have far-away possessions and rule foreign peoples as our subjects—no matter what the original design of our Republic and the fundamental principles of our democracy may have been. And when the advocates of this new course are hard pressed in argument they always resort as their last refuge to the plea that Providence has precipitated us into this new course and that it is vain to resist.

WHAT IS PROVIDENTIAL?

Nobody can be less disposed than I am to pose as a mouthpiece of Providence. But I do maintain that when we speak of something having been so ordained by Providence, that no human being could be held responsible for it, we can only mean that the will of man one way or the other could not play a determining part in it. In this sense it may be said that geographic, climatic, and other such conditions, which made the building up of a great democracy on this American soil so natural, were providential; that the rising up of an ideal leader at the beginning of our Government was providential; that the peculiar situation of this Republic among the powers of the earth, enabling it to build up that great democracy in the New World untroubled by the jealousies and quarrels of other nations, was providential. But can it be maintained that in the same sense the conquest of the Philippines was providential, and that President McKinley was right when he said in Boston, February 16, 1899, "The Philippines were intrusted to our hands by the providence of God; it is a trust we have not sought?" Look at the facts.

Some time before our war with Spain broke out its possible contingencies were attentively considered by the Administration. Commodore Dewey, commanding our Asiatic Squadron, informed himself about the state of the Spanish power in those regions, and weeks before the declaration of war, on March 31, 1898, he reported to our Government that he could destroy the Spanish fleet and reduce the defenses of Manila in a single day, and added: "There is every reason to believe that with Manila taken or even blockaded the rest of the islands would fall either to the insurgents or ourselves."

Dewey was instructed to make his squadron ready for battle, and then, when war was declared, to seek the Spanish fleet and destroy it. All this was done, not by any mysterious dispensation, but by order of the Navy Department. When Spain, after a series of defeats, got ready for peace, the Secretary of the Navy telegraphed to Dewey as follows:

"WASHINGTON, *August 13, 1898.*

"The President desires to receive from you any important information you may have of the Philippines; the desirability of the several islands; the character of their population; coal and other mineral deposits; their harbor and commercial advantages, and, in a naval and commercial sense, which would be the most advantageous," etc.

Thus it appears that the President was then not yet quite certain how far it would be profitable to us that Providence should impose that "unsought" trust upon us. When he had received information which made him think it would be profitable to have the whole archipelago intrusted to us, he instructed our peace commissioners at Paris to insist that Spain should cede us the whole. And after a long and arduous wrestle with the representatives of Spain, as described in Senate Document No. 62, our commissioners at last succeeded in extorting from them the cession of what sovereignty Spain had over all those islands, and they agreed that the United States should pay $20,000,000 therefor.

PROVIDENCE AND THE PHILIPPINES.

Thus the record shows most conclusively that the conquest of the Philippines was not thrust upon the Administration by a mysterious and overruling power, but that it was deliberately planned with a cool calculation of

profit, and that if the business so far has not been as successful as expected, it proves only that the calculation was not quite correct. And when now President McKinley tries to make the American people accept his interpretation that the Philippines were simply "intrusted to our hands by the providence of God" and that "it is a trust we have not sought," he has, to say the least, taken liberties with Providence which he may answer for. With the same right Napoleon invading Spain and making one of his brothers King of that country, and Maximilian, made Emperor of Mexico by the bayonets of French invaders, might have piously turned up their eyes, saying that the providence of God had intrusted those countries to their hands and that it was a trust they had not sought. Coming from their mouths, Mr. McKinley himself would have called such words hypocritical cant, if not blasphemy.

Let us now see in what manner the policy for which the President makes divine Providence responsible was carried out. We made war upon Spain, as our Congress solemnly declared to the American people and to all mankind, for the purpose of liberating the Cuban people from Spanish oppression, declaring that they were, and of right ought to be, free and independent. It was a grand spectacle—a great nation voluntarily undergoing the burdens and horrors of war merely to secure to a foreign population that freedom and independence they were painfully struggling for. It was a purpose so noble in its unselfishness that many persons abroad would not believe in its sincerity, but charged us with some secret selfish design of conquest. At this we were extremely angry.

Then came Dewey's victory in Manila Bay, and with it the temptation testing our sincerity. Dewey invited the chief of the Filipino insurgents, Aguinaldo, to join him and encouraged and aided him with arms and ammunition to organize the revolutionary movement against Spain on a great scale. Aguinaldo did so; he formed an army of about 30,000 men, set up a civil government which, according to the testimony of the imperialist agitator Barrett, who had seen it, compared in its Congress favorably with the Parliament of Japan, and had well-constructed and active executive departments and an internal administration working admirably, as described by gentlemen belonging to the Navy and vouched for by Admiral Dewey; an army, a civil government, and an internal administration infinitely superior to anything of the kind the insurgent Cubans ever had.

The Filipino army went to work fighting the Spaniards most successfully, taking many thousands of them prisoners. In fact, it virtually did the only fighting against the Spaniards on the Philippine Islands between the time of Dewey's victory, on May 1, 1898, and the time of the surrender of Manila, on August 12, and that fighting redounded to the benefit of our forces; for the Filipino army cleared the interior of the country of Spanish troops and cooped up the Spanish garrison of Manila, effectually blockading that city on the land side, while our ships and the American troops that had meanwhile assembled blockaded it on the sea side, so that the Spaniards in Manila could neither get reinforcements nor withdraw into the interior.

OUR FILIPINO ALLIES.

While these services were being rendered by the Filipinos, and their effective cooperation sought and accepted by us, the Filipinos acted as our allies against a common foe. And then when we had taken Manila and assembled a large land force there, did we remember that we had gone to war against Spain with the solemn proclamation that this should be a war of liberation, and not of conquest, and that our Filipino allies were fairly entitled to the full benefit of that pledge? No; not that. President McKinley entered into peace negotiations with the common enemy, Spain; negotiations from which our allies, the Filipinos, who urgently asked to be heard, were carefully shut out, and through his peace commissioners President McKinley concluded, behind the backs of our allies, a treaty with Spain, the common enemy, by which he recognized, not that the Philippine Islanders were, and of right ought to be, free and independent, like the Cubans, but that Spain, even after having been actually ousted from that country, was still the rightful sovereign of the Philippine Islanders, so that she could sell them; and he bought them and their country for the sum of $20,000,000. It was in this singular way that, as President McKinley wishes to have us believe, "the providence of God intrusted to our hands the Philippines—a trust we have not sought."

Thus, in the first place, he contrived to turn the much-vaunted unselfish war of liberation into a vulgar land-grabbing game, and to strip the American people of the unique glory of a most generous act, grand in its unselfishness. Does he think such a breach of faith can be pleasing to the sight of an all-righteous Providence? Or does he imagine he can deceive an omniscient God by the wily plea that the pledge of an unselfish generosity applied only to the Western Hemisphere, and that the liberating of one people gave us a right to subjugate another?

AN ACT OF PERFIDY.

But more than this. Recognizing the fact that Dewey invited Aguinaldo to the Philippines to help him in his operations by organizing the insurrection against the Spaniards; that the Filipinos did do effectual service as our allies, being permitted to believe that they were fighting for their own independence; that we left them undisturbed in that belief until we had sufficient troops on the spot to need their aid no longer, and until Manila was taken, and that then, behind their backs, we bought them from defeated Spain to subjugate them as our own subjects, every fair-minded man will agree that this was an act of downright perfidy. Does President McKinley think that so treacherous a use of power by the strong to despoil the feeble of their rights can be looked upon with favor by an all-just God?

The excuses given by the President and by his spokesmen for this faithless deed are worthy of the deed itself. They show how far the moral sense of men may be debased by the defense of a bad cause. I have read with care the famous "preliminary report" made by the Philippine Commission "at the request of the President" just before the last November elections, and I must confess that some passages of it have filled me with painful astonishment. That report, for instance, in order to justify what has been done, asserts "that no alliance of any kind was entered into with Aguinaldo, nor was any promise of independence made to him then or at any other time." I was sorry to see such a statement signed by gentlemen of high standing. Was it worthy of such men to forget that while there was no alliance in form, signed, sealed, and delivered, there was cooperation amounting to an alliance in fact, and that this carried with it moral obligations of a class which no man of honor will disregard.

Let us hear the "preliminary report" itself. After having recited how Aguinaldo was brought to the scene of operations on a United States ship at the desire of Dewey, "for the purpose of strengthening the United States forces and weakening those of the enemy," the report goes on: "Shortly afterwards the Filipinos began to attack the Spanish. Their numbers were rapidly augmented by the militia who had been given arms by Spain, all of whom revolted and joined the insurgents. Great Filipino successes followed, many Spaniards were taken prisoners, and while the Spanish troops now quietly remained at Manila, the Filipino forces made themselves masters of the entire island, except that city." Well, according to this very statement of the commission, did not the Filipinos do for us the business of allies, and very effectively, too? I venture to say that at the time they were regarded as our allies by everybody except those who had already then in their minds the scheme of turning the war of liberation into a land-grabbing game.

But they were also virtually recognized as our allies by our very commanders in a manner which the commissioners in their preliminary report did not see fit to mention. I do not refer here merely to the often-quoted correspondence between General Anderson and Aguinaldo, in which our general greeted the Filipinos with assurances of friendship and requests for cooperation and assistance in terms usually addressed by one ally to another. Nor do I refer only to the fact that armed vessels of the Filipinos, flying the flag of the Filipino republic, were plying to and fro and going out on expeditions against various Spanish posts, under the very eyes of our Admiral.

But here is still something more. On July 13, 1898, Admiral Dewey sent the following dispatch to the Secretary of the Navy: "Aguinaldo informed me his troops had taken all of Subig Bay except Isla Grande, which they were prevented from taking by the German man-of-war *Irene*. On July 7 sent the *Raleigh* and the *Concord* there; they took the island and about 1,300 men with arms and ammunition; no resistance." Now, what became of those 1,300 Spanish prisoners? They were turned over to the Filipinos. Only recently those prisoners taken in Subig Bay have been liberated from their captivity in Filipino hands, and it was reported that some of them intended to make a claim against the United States for damages on the plea that before capitulating they had been promised by our Navy officers that they would be permitted to surrender to the American and not to the Filipino forces, and that they had been turned over to the Filipinos in violation of that promise. No denial has been made of this story except as to the giving of that pledge.

Now, what did it mean, this turning over by American forces to the Filipinos of Spanish prisoners of war captured in a joint enterprise? What else could it mean than that, whether there was any formal compact of alliance duly signed or not, Aguinaldo with his army was practically recognized as a belligerent ally of good standing? But for this would not the prisoners taken from the common enemy have necessarily been kept under the control of the American forces? Had the Filipinos been considered a mere half-barbarian band accidentally helping us and of no substantial right in the premises, how could such a turning over of prisoners to them have been justified?

But let us hear Admiral Dewey himself. In a recent letter answering an inquiry from Senator LODGE as to what pledges were given to Aguinaldo, the Admiral says: "I never treated him as an ally, except to make use of him and the natives to assist me in my operations against the Spaniards." Precisely so. We "used" them practically as allies against the common enemy, profiting from their cooperation as allies. And then, having so used them, we refused them the recognition morally due to an ally. Does not the Admiral "give away" the whole case?

Again, when our peace commissioners sat at Paris the testimony of Rear-Admiral Bradford was taken, and Senator FRYE asked him: "Suppose the United States, in the progress of that war, found the leader of the present Philippine rebellion an exile from his country in Hongkong, and sent for him and brought him to the islands in an American ship, and then furnished him 4,000 or 5,000 stands of arms and allowed him to purchase as many more stands of arms in Hongkong, and accepted his aid in conquering Luzon, what kind of a nation in the eyes of the world would we appear to be to surrender Aguinaldo and his insurgents to Spain, to be dealt with as they please?" To which Admiral Bradford answered: "We become responsible for all he has done; he is our ally, and we are bound to protect him." Senator FRYE forgot to ask the further question, what kind of a nation we would be in the eyes of the world if we bought our allies like a drove of sheep from Spain, the defeated common enemy, to treat them not as they, but as we, please.

After all this, what fair-minded man will deny to all intents and purposes the Filipinos were our allies; that they were fairly entitled at our hands to every consideration due from one ally to another, and that when our Administration refused them audience at the peace negotiations which were to decide their fate, and then behind their backs bought them like a herd of cattle from the defeated common enemy, it did a thing so mean in its disloyalty that it is no wonder its sponsors shrink from looking it in the face, but nervously strive to hide its hideousness from their own eyes by covering it up with all sorts of pretexts and sophistries?

But, truly, what a pitiable sight is that presented by the respectable signers of the "preliminary report," who argue that because no formal compact of alliance was made—that is, because the Filipinos with their generous confidence in our good faith trusted American honor so imprudently that they neglected to put every stipulation in black and white before going with us into a common fight against the common enemy—they have lost all moral right to be respected and treated by us as allies! Shame, where is thy blush?

PROMISE OF INDEPENDENCE.

The contention of the commissioners that "no promise of independence was ever made" to the Filipinos is of the same moral grade. Again, there is, I admit, no instrument in writing signed by an American in authority. Neither do I care whether our consuls or Admiral Dewey made a formal promise of independence to the Filipinos. That is not the question. The question is whether we gave the Filipinos any reason for believing that after defeating the common enemy this Republic would recognize their independence, and whether they were permitted so to believe while they were fighting against the common enemy.

On July 22, 1898, General Anderson reported to the Secretary of War: "Aguinaldo declares dictatorship and martial law all over the islands. The people expect independence." What reason had they to expect that this Republic would recognize their independence? The best in the world—a reason, too, most honorable to them as well as to the American people. They knew that, when beginning the war against Spain, we had loudly disclaimed all idea of conquest and had declared the Cubans of right entitled to their independence. They knew that in all things which in our eyes gave the Cubans their right and title to independence, the people of the Philippines held the same if not a superior title. They would have considered it an insult to the great and magnanimous American Republic to entertain on their part even the slightest suspicion that our professions of unselfish purpose were a mere humbug, and that while liberating one people we were capable of scheming the subjugation of another because we coveted their land. In one word, as over so many of their proclamations showed, they expected their independence because they believed the American people to be an honest people and the American Government to be an honest government. And in this belief they acted as our allies against the common enemy.

We permitted them to entertain that belief while so acting. It is true, in Washington the scheme was meanwhile hatched to rob them of their fairly-earned independence. Was the Administration at least honest enough then to inform them that their expectation of independence might be disappointed? It was not. Indeed, the Administration did secretly instruct our consuls and commanders not to make any promises to the Filipinos that might embarrass the execution of the treacherous scheme. But the Filipinos themselves were left in their happy confidence so long as their service as our allies was of any value to us. I say, therefore, although there was no written engagement promising them their independence, our solemn proclamation at the beginning of the war that this would be a war of liberation and not of conquest, and our permitting them to expect their independence accordingly, while we accepted their aid as our allies, constituted a promise so complete and morally so binding that it is difficult to understand how any honest man can so forget himself as to question it.

THE SHAM SOVEREIGNTY.

And thus when the Spaniards were thoroughly defeated everywhere, and Manila was taken, and our Filipino allies were of no further practical use to us, the Administration instructed our peace commissioners in Paris to obtain from Spain the cession of her sovereignty over the Philippines, not to the people of those islands, but to the United States. Now I shall show, I trust, to the satisfaction of every candid mind, that this proceeding involved on our part the grossest betrayal of our own professed principles, and one of the most glaring self-stultifications ever committed by any government. When we made war upon Spain for the liberation of Cuba, we could not, and did not, deny that Spain, historically, possessed the sovereignty of Cuba.

But we maintained that Spain by her tyrannical and oppressive misgovernment had morally forfeited that sovereignty; that she had ceased to possess it as a matter of right; and that, although the Spanish forces were still in actual occupation of the principal cities and harbors, and of a very large portion of the interior of the island, the people of Cuba, having risen up against Spanish misrule, had won the right of sovereignty for themselves. We therefore solemnly declared in that famous resolution of Congress not merely that Spain must be driven out of Cuba but that the people of Cuba *"of right ought to be and are free and independent;"* that is, that the sovereignty of Spain over Cuba was no longer valid, but of right ought to be possessed, and actually was possessed, by the Cuban people themselves.

How does this bear upon the case of the Philippines? It is a fact, not questioned by anybody, that Spanish sovereignty was historically no better founded in the Philippines than in Cuba; that Spanish misrule was fully as grievous in the Philippines as in Cuba; that the people of the Philippines had risen against the misrule as the Cubans had; that the case of the Philippines was therefore identical with that of Cuba, with this difference, that the Filipinos had achieved much greater military successes and organized a far better and stronger native government than the Cubans ever had; so that in the Philippines the Spaniards had not only, as they had in Cuba, forfeited the moral title to sovereignty, but had actually lost also the exercise and possession of it. The right of the Filipinos to sovereignty over their country was therefore, according to our professed principles, even stronger than that of the Cubans.

The Spanish title to sovereignty over the Philippines was thus utterly discredited by ourselves. By word and act we had, in the parallel case of Cuba, maintained that the Spanish title had rightfully passed to the people of the country. And yet that Spanish title so utterly discredited by ourselves we then recognized again as valid in order to enable Spain to sell our Filipino allies to us. And we bought that title, although we knew full well that Spain had actually lost it all, and could not deliver anything of it, but we bought the sham, in order to steal the substance from the Philippine islanders, to whom, by our own doctrine, it rightfully belonged. This is the farcical and contemptible predicament in which the action of the Administration has placed the great American Republic.

JUGGLING SUBTERFUGES.

I am well aware that astute lawyers may find some quirk or quibble to persuade people who wish to be so persuaded that under the law of nations Spain had still a technical title to a sovereignty which she had morally forfeited and practically lost and could not deliver, and that this she could sell and we could buy. But will such a technicality satisfy our consciences and protect our honor? Most of us have learned by experience to distinguish between the class of men who, in their dealings with their neighbors, are governed by an innate moral sense of right and who will never condescend to take an unfair advantage even when the law permits them to do so with impunity, and another class consisting of persons claiming to be respectable, but to whom the question of moral right is of no concern, and who do not scruple at any moral wrong for their own benefit, taking care only not to run foul of the penal code.

The first class we call "gentlemen," and we respect and trust them. The second class we do not, at least we ought not to, call gentlemen, for we feel like carefully guarding our pockets when we meet them. Let there be no illusion about this. He who uses the technicalities of the law to take a wrongful advantage of his neighbor may keep clear of the penitentiary, but he is not an honest man.

And now I soberly ask you, Does not the purchase of that Spanish sovereignty put the American people plainly into that category? How pitiably the Administration itself has been at sea as to the origin of our title to sovereignty! On December 21, 1898, in his famous "benevolent assimilation" order, which in fact was his declaration of war against the Filipinos, President McKinley said: "The destruction of the Spanish fleet in the harbor of Manila by the United States naval squadron, followed by the reduction of the city and the surrender of the Spanish forces, practically effected the conquest of the Philippine Islands and the suspension of Spanish sovereignty therein. With the signature of the treaty of peace between the United States and Spain on the 10th instant, and as the result of the victories of American arms, the future control, disposition, and government of the Philippine Islands are ceded to the United States. In fulfillment of the right of sovereignty thus acquired," he ordered immediate military occupation.

That this was not a truthful statement of the case—that is, that we had then acquired no rights by the treaty, which at that time, not yet having been ratified, was of no force, and that we had not acquired the Philippines by conquest, for which we are still fighting—everybody will admit. Why, even the President himself admitted it, for several months later he said in a speech at Pittsburg: "Until the treaty of peace was ratified (which it was only seven weeks after the issue of the order before quoted), we had no authority beyond Manila city, bay, and harbor. Spain was in full possession of the remainder of the archipelago." This was correct as to the extent of our authority, but it was again strikingly erroneous as to the status of Spain; for, as everybody knows, Spain was not only not "in full possession of the remainder of the archipelago," but she was not in possession of any part of it. The so-called remainder of the archipelago was possessed, if by anybody, by the people thereof—a notorious fact of which the President of this Republic was strangely unmindful.

At last Mr. Day, late Secretary of State, and chairman of the commission that made the peace treaty, comes to the rescue, and declares in a public letter that we have acquired the Philippines not by conquest—for, says he, "the United States has never undertaken, so far as I know, to wrest from a foreign country lands or possessions simply by right of conquest"—but by purchase, paying $20,000,000 for them. But he does not say in his letter what everybody knows, that we bought something from Spain which Spain no longer owned and did not and could not deliver, as we are painfully aware, inasmuch as we have ever since been engaged in killing our late Filipino allies, who defend the rightful title belonging to the people. And finally comes the President, who coolly observes in his message that the Philippine Islands "belong to us by every title of law and equity."

"Law and equity," forsooth! Consider it from the ethical standpoint, which to honest men is the only true one. What is our position in truth? That of a powerful and rich man who, artfully abusing the confidence of poor and feeble people, robs them of their dues by legal jugglery and force, and then blandly tells his victims that Providence has so ordered it for their good, putting upon him a trust which he has not sought.

THE SLAUGHTER AND DEVASTATION.

And to enforce such a title of sovereignty resting not upon anything akin to moral right, but at best upon a shrewd legal technicality which in private life every gentleman would despise, we have proceeded to kill thousands upon thousands of men and devastated the homes of thousands upon thousands of innocent people who had never done us any harm and whose only offense consisted in having confidently expected that the generous and liberty-loving Americans would be true to their professed principles, and who, being grievously disappointed in this, still wished to be free and independent. What defense in the world can there be of such an outrage? Aside from shifting the responsibility on Providence, the excuse is brought forth that our soldiers were attacked and had to "defend" the American flag.

Defend the American flag? Let us see. There are certain facts admitted by all. The first shot was not fired by a Filipino, but by an American soldier, killing a Filipino who had not attacked him, but had simply crossed the American line. Some shots were fired in return, and then the firing spread and developed into an extended engagement which evidently was not planned by the Filipinos. Aguinaldo promptly disavowed the collision, and made a fair proposition to stop it. It would thus have been stopped had our commander agreed; but he insisted upon continuing the fight. General Otis says in his report:

"The engagement was one strictly defensive on the part of the insurgents and of vigorous attack by our forces." The only excuse given for his action is that the Filipinos would have wanted to fight if they had been ready, and that they had become "abusive," and "insulting," and "defiant"—terms often freely applied by some Anglo-Saxons to people of other, especially darker, races who presume to think that they have some rights. Thus the plain fact is that our men actually began the slaughter and that our commander refused to stop it when he might have done so with honor.

But more important is the other fact, also set forth in General Otis's report, that the President had directly provoked a collision with the Filipinos by his notorious order of December 21, 1898—a document so inflammatory in its character that General Otis found it necessary to suppress it and to substitute a proclamation of his own—a scheme which failed, as the President's order became public through a subordinate commander. General Otis knew that the President's order would be taken by the Filipinos as a declaration of war, which in fact it was. No criticism of the President's action can place the responsibility for the Filipino war more conclusively upon the President than this part of General Otis's report. And when, after all this, we hear the President say, as last summer he did say in his speech at Pittsburg, "The first blow was struck by the insurgents;" and at Fargo, "Then it was that the insurgent leader made an attack upon our men, and then our boys let loose;" and in his message, "An attack, evidently prepared in advance, was made all along the American lines"—when we hear him say to the people such things, in the face of such facts, we fairly hold our breath and bow our heads.

FALSE EXCUSES.

After all this we must not be surprised that the imperialists are so anxious to make the American people believe that there would have been no fight in the Philippines had there been no speeches made in the United States against the policy of conquest and subjugation, and that the authors of such speeches are therefore traitors giving aid and comfort to the enemy. Has it been forgotten that the Filipinos have more than once risen against Spanish tyranny long before we took any interest in those islands and their people? Does not this show them capable of rising without any such outside encouragement?

But we are told that to rise against the Americans is quite a different thing; that a majority of the Filipinos really are fond of us and hail American sovereignty as the satisfaction of a long-felt want; and that there are only a few mischievous leaders whose "sinister ambition," as the President calls their desire for freedom and independence, has stirred up disorder, and who would soon have desisted had not the speeches of American anti-imperialists encouraged them.

I hardly could trust my eyes when I read in the President's annual message this amazing statement: "I had every reason to believe, and I still believe, that this transfer of sovereignty was in accordance with the wishes and aspirations of the great mass of the Filipino people." And this in the face of the fact that we need there for the enforcement of that sovereignty the largest army this Republic has ever had in active field service except during our civil war—an army twice or three times as large as any we had in the Revolutionary war, or in the war of 1812, or in the Mexican war, or in Cuba in the late war—an army ten times as large as that which is thought necessary to keep order in Cuba now.

Why do we need so tremendous a force? To beat the Filipino army, which, as our Secretary of War told us in a speech at Chicago, represented almost too infinitesimally small a portion of the Filipino people to be mathematically expressed by way of percentage? Or did we need it, as others tell us, to protect the "good Americans" among the Filipino people against the so-called "rebels?" But if, as the President says, "this transfer of sovereignty was in accordance with the wishes and aspirations of the great mass of the Filipino people," why do we not put arms into the hands of the great mass to enable it to tackle that small rebellious minority and hand it over to the police? Why not? The reason is simple: Because, as everybody knows, there is too much reason to fear that this great mass of "good Americans" would, upon occasion, turn out to be good Filipinos and eventually use those arms against us.

A few months ago I said in a public address: "We have not a true friend left among the islanders, unless it be some speculators and the Sultan of Sulu; we have managed to turn virtually the whole population into deadly enemies." This statement was hotly impugned by Professor Worcester in a published paper in which he actually named three prominent Filipinos who, he says, are not speculators, but our fast friends, and he adds that "we have many another honest and able American friend among the leading men of the archipelago." With the same assurance, the same Professor Worcester had told us of the splendid success of the local government established under American auspices on the island of Negros, and about the enthusiasm with which the native people had received it. But shortly afterwards came the news of the "treason" of some of the principal native officers, whose "benevolent assimilation" and devotion to the American liberators have been praised so highly. And we have had similar experiences in other places. I doubt whether even Professor Worcester's three elect are quite safe.

Certainly we may here and there find a Filipino who for some reason attaches his fortune to ours. Napoleon found some such men in Spain in 1809. The Emperor Maximilian found even a larger number in Mexico. But did that make the great mass of the Spanish people Napoleon's friends or the Mexican people the friends of the French and the Austrian invaders? By the steady pressure of force we can compel obedience, but not friendship and fidelity. Nor will mere "good government" prove a remedy, for the best government will always be unpopular if it is foreign government, especially when the imposition of foreign sovereignty has been accomplished by treacherous breaches of faith and bloody terrorism. Sincere acceptance of rule by a foreign race—a race so utterly foreign as ours is to theirs, so foreign in origin, customs, habits, traditions, ways of thinking, and a race withal so imperious, so grasping, and so disdainful of all other races it considers inferior—

sincere acceptance of such a rule by the great mass of a people is impossible. It is against human nature.

British rule in India has in part been recognized as beneficial. But in spite of some theatrical demonstrations of loyalty we hear of, Great Britain would not to-day with any confidence leave the maintenance of the Indian Empire to the fidelity of the native population. The British heart secretly trembles at the thought of what would come if a torch were thrown into that mass of Indian combustibles. As to the Philippine Islands, our Government, whatever otherwise its quality, will always be essentially government by garrison. Those who carried on their struggle for freedom will always remain the heroes of the people; and whatever banquet we as foreign rulers may spread to them, the shade of their betrayed and murdered independence will, like Banquo's ghost, always claim the first seat at the board. If President McKinley really believes that "the transfer of sovereignty was in accordance with the wishes and aspirations of the great mass of the Filipino people," it shows only how hopelessly blind he is to the true nature of the problem.

WHERE THE RESPONSIBILITY RESTS.

No, the Filipino people needed no impulse from the outside to encourage their resistance to subjugation by foreign arms. If they had needed such encouragement, they would have first had it from President McKinley himself when he told the world—it was before the snake of imperialistic ambition had bitten his heart—that "annexation by force could not be thought of, because, according to the American code of morals, it would be criminal aggression." Nothing truer and nothing severer has been said by anybody in condemnation of his present policy. That while the fight was going on the Filipinos were pleased to hear of men in this country opposing their subjugation was natural enough—just as natural as was the comfort the revolutionary American colonists took in the utterances of Chatham and Burke. But would the American colonists have ceased to struggle if Burke and Chatham had been silent?

And besides, what does it mean that no American citizen should permit himself to denounce a public wrong or to advocate the principles upon which this Republic is founded, lest people who feel themselves betrayed and oppressed find comfort in his words? If the Administration has led us into policies which can not bear discussion in the light of the Declaration of Independence, of the Constitution of the United States, and of the teachings of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln, must we bury the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution and Washington's and Lincoln's teachings out of sight, so that they may not interfere with the ambitions and schemes of our rulers? Is it not, rather, high time to bury such policies, so that the great American Republic may dare to be itself again?

No; the shrewd trick of representing those who labored to prevent and to stop the Filipino war as responsible for that war will not succeed with an intelligent people. Is there a sane man in the world who believes that there would have been any Filipino war had the President remained true to the solemn pledge that the war against Spain would be a war of liberation and not of conquest and mindful of his own affirmation that annexation by force could not be thought of because it would be criminal aggression? Would there have been a Filipino war if the President had inspired the Filipino people with the hope that their rights would be respected as we had promised to respect those of the Cubans instead of treating our allies as if they were mere interlopers in their own country, who could be bought and sold like dumb animals, and then flinging in their faces that outrageous "benevolent assimilation" order, so insulting and inflammatory a provocation that General Otis, foreseeing with alarm the certain consequences of its issue, anxiously but ineffectually sought to conceal it?

No, there can be no question as to the responsibility for this disgraceful conflict and all the blood spilled in it. Those who had the power to prevent or stop it by being simply faithful to the principles the American people have hitherto so proudly professed—they will be held forever answerable for this wanton and wicked war by impartial history, and no sanctimonious cant, no cunning sophistry, can disguise their guilt or save them from that awful judgment.

THE CONFIDENCE GAME.

I am aware that an arraignment like this puts our imperialists very much out of temper, and they impatiently exclaim, "Why say such things while you know that the case is finally settled and your criminations serve only to smirch the good name of the country?" I have this to answer:

First. What I have spoken is the truth. I challenge any defender of the Administration policy to disprove the correctness of a single one of my statements of fact, or of the conclusions drawn.

Secondly. Those have smirched the good name of the country who have done and are doing these nefarious things, not those who denounce them. Nay, the repute of the country would be still more smirched if we permitted the world to believe that such things could be done in the Republic of Washington and Lincoln with the general approval of the people, even without calling forth a voice of protest.

Thirdly. The case is not finally settled, and it will not be finally settled until it be settled aright. A most unscrupulous and crafty "confidence game" has been worked upon the American people. When after Dewey's victory more troops were sent to the Philippines than the war against the Spaniards seemed to require, we were told that criticism was unpatriotic, because the President was best informed and must be trusted.

When the peace negotiations came and it was rumored that the Administration would demand the cession of the Philippines to the United States, we were admonished to hush all unfavorable discussion because it would encourage the Spaniard to obstreperousness in the peace negotiations.

When the peace treaty with that cession in it was before the Senate, we were warned that no patriot would oppose the ratification of a treaty of peace, and as to the final disposition of the Philippines, that would rest with Congress. And all the while the President repeated over and over that Congress would have to speak the decisive word. But now, when Congress is to take up the great question, we are told that the whole case is settled and that any attempt to shake or even to criticise that settlement will be useless and unpatriotic.

Oh, no, gentlemen; this will not do. This artful dodge has been played long enough, and too long. The President's attempt, while constantly speaking of Congress as the ultimate arbiter, to anticipate the action of Congress, and thus to force its hand by accomplished facts, has advanced to a dangerous stage, but it has, after all, not quite succeeded; and if that spirit of liberty which gave birth to this Republic still lives, it will never succeed. Unless I am much mistaken, the people are still sovereign in this country, and they will not permit any President to purloin that sovereignty from them by a sleight of hand.

The people will still have to pronounce the final verdict, and I trust they will do so after a conscientious consideration, not of the mere question of profit, but, what is infinitely more important, of the moral merits of the case. It is, therefore, not only the right but the duty of every good citizen to form an honest opinion on this momentous subject and to speak out without fear or favor.

THE GREAT WRONG.

The people will find, if they have not found it already, that a great wrong has been done in their name, which, unless it be undone, so far as it can be, will cover them with eternal disgrace.

I challenge any one of the President's defenders to point out in the whole history of the world a single act of perfidy committed by a republican government more infamous than that which has been committed by this Administration against our confiding Filipino allies. Show me a single one! You will search for it in vain in all the annals of mankind.

This is strong language, you may say. So it seems. But it is time to call things by their right names, and I am weighing my words. Have the courage to look the facts once more in the face.

We invite the cooperation of the insurgent Filipinos against the common enemy, the Spaniards. As our allies the Filipinos do valiant and effective service. While we accept and profit from their aid as our allies, we knowingly permit them to believe that they are fighting for their own independence and that we are fighting for their independence, too, having solemnly proclaimed to the world that our war against Spain, the common enemy, was to be a war of liberation and not of conquest.

When we have no further use for our Filipino allies we begin peace negotiations with the common enemy from which our Filipino allies are sternly excluded, and behind their backs we purchase from the common enemy his title of sovereignty over them—a title utterly discredited by ourselves—so that from subjects of Spanish foreign rule they may become subjects of American foreign rule. And when then our late allies insist upon being free and refuse to be bought from the defeated enemy like a herd of cattle we slaughter them by thousands.

Look at this and consider it soberly. What have you to say? Is "infamy" too strong a word for it? I wish I could find a more scorching one to brand it as it deserves. Why, if anybody did anything like this in private life, it would be a queer kind of gentlemen that would admit him to their company. And this is what has been done in the name of the great American Republic—the Republic born of the Declaration of Independence, the Republic of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln. Again, I say, shame, where is thy blush?

And what do we hear in justification of this? Some clergymen tell us that this is one of the ways of spreading abroad Christianity, and virtue, and superior civilization. Would not these holy men do well to consider what effect the teachings involved in the justification of so criminal an outrage may have upon the Christianity, virtue, and superior civilization of their flocks at home?

GREED AND DESPOTISM.

Then we are told that those islands are rich and will be a foothold for our Chinese trade, and that therefore we must have them. Indeed, in the soundful sophomoration of the young Senator from Indiana recently delivered in the Senate a picture of the wealth of the Philippine Islands was enrolled gorgeous enough to make the mouth of the most virtuous pirate water.

He looked down with the loftiest pity upon everyone who would be so blind as not to lay hold of that wealth if he had a chance; and to make sure that our chance should be fully used, he proposed a system of government for the Philippines so absolutely despotic—a despotism so entirely undiluted with any American idea of human rights—that it would more than satisfy the sternest Russian autocrat.

No more brutal appeal to sordid greed, no appeal so utterly hostile to the vital principles of our free institutions, expressed in the most high-sounding verbiage of American patriotism, has ever been addressed to our people. If this be the spirit animating the youth of America, then the great American Republic will soon cease to be an encouragement to the progress of political liberty and become a warning example to all the world.

And this is the spirit of imperialism. I am well aware that some imperialists have protested against the cynicism with which others have appealed to sordid motives, and that the commission has framed a plan to give the Philippine Islanders a share in their government under American sovereignty. But who will deny that if the motive of pecuniary profit were taken out of the imperialist movement that movement would lose its vital impulse and speedily collapse?

When Colonel Denby, the most influential of the Philippine commissioners, some time ago publicly declared that we wanted the Philippines for our own profit, and not for their good, and that if we found their possession unprofitable we would drop them and let the Filipinos cut each other's throats if they liked—when he said that, was he not only a little more brutally candid than most of his friends? And can any sane man doubt that whatever plans of imperial government may be devised, the rule of our race over another which we consider inferior will always be essentially arbitrary and consistently beneficent only when selfish interest permits it?

Listen to the wail of misery and despair coming from the Puerto Ricans who were promised liberty and happiness under the American flag! Do not now powerful interests demand a policy which means to them poverty and oppression?

THE DEMORALIZATION OF OUR REPUBLIC.

And can you be blind to the effects which the tendencies of imperialism are already exercising among ourselves upon the popular mind? Do you not hear the scoffing levity with which the Declaration of Independence and the high ideals of liberty and human rights which so long have been sacred to our people are made sport of; how the teachings of Washington and Lincoln are derided as antiquated nursery rhymes, and how the Constitution, when it stands in the way of grasping schemes, is lightly brushed aside with the flippant word that constitutions are made for men and not men for constitutions?

It can not be repeated too often that there are things which may be done by monarchical or aristocratic governments without making them less strong as monarchies or aristocracies, but which can not be done by a democracy based upon universal suffrage without fatally demoralizing it as a democracy, and that one of those things is the arbitrary ruling of foreign populations as subjects. By the way, England is sometimes quoted as an example and called a democracy. This is a mistake. England is not a democracy, but a monarchy with democratic tendencies but very powerful and tenacious aristocratic traditions.

What a democracy, based upon universal suffrage, like ours needs most to insure its stability is an element of conservative poise in itself. This can be furnished only by popular faith in the principles underlying the democratic institutions, by popular reverence for high ideals and traditions, by popular respect for constitutional forms and restraints. Take away these conservative and ennobling influences, and the only motive forces left in such a democracy will be greed and passion. I can hardly imagine any kind of a government more repellent than a democracy that has ceased to believe in anything and in which all ambitions are directed toward a selfish use of power.

And in this direction the policy of imperialism is evidently driving us. Have you considered what this means? What will it lead to if our people accept the teaching that all our traditional creeds about liberty and the rights of men are mere sentimental rubbish; that the most solemn professions and pledges may be repudiated if they stand in the way of our ambition; that even such base treachery as has been committed against our late Filipino allies will be justifiable if it profits us; that only old fogies in their dotage talk about legal principles and constitutional restrictions when they obstruct the gratification of our desires, and that might need not be too scrupulous about right?

Many of our rich men have become imperialists, believing that the possession of the Philippines, in whatever way acquired, will offer favorable chances of gain to speculative capitalists. Have they thought of it that the

doctrine of might not needing to be scrupulous about right may be applied not only to the unscrupulous might of arms, and not only to the unscrupulous might of wealth, but also, in a democracy, to the might of numbers becoming unscrupulous? And this is the tendency of imperialism in this democratic Republic.

I am by no means blind to the commercial side of the question. I desire the greatest possible commercial expansion, honorably accomplished. And more than once have I argued that all the commercial advantages and naval facilities we can reasonably desire in the Philippines we might easily have had from the Philippine Islanders if we had faithfully respected their title to independence, and that those advantages would be much more secure with the Filipinos free and friendly than with the Filipinos subjugated and hostile. This argument has never been answered. It never will be. How criminally wanton is it to seek those commercial advantages needlessly at the price of crying injustice to others and fatal demoralization among ourselves—a price we should never pay for anything!

But now I am asked, admitting all this to be true: What can we do after having gone so far? The case is simple. Indeed, we can not wake up the dead whose innocent blood has been spilled. We can not altogether expunge the disgraceful page of history that has been written.

But the American people can rise up and declare that the great wrong attempted by misguided men in power in the name of the Republic shall not be consummated; that as we solemnly promised at the beginning of our Spanish war, that war shall stand in history as a war of liberation, and not of conquest; that our Government shall recognize the Philippine Islands as free and independent, and that if the present Congress and Executive will not do so, the people will elect a Congress and an Executive who will.

But what will become of the Philippine Islanders if unfit for independent government? Of course every man who either himself wishes to keep the Philippines or who serves the Administration strenuously insists that the Islanders are utterly unable to govern themselves. It is always so. He who seeks to make another man his subject always maintains that the other is incapable of being a freeman.

Thus, as a last resort, the agitators for imperialism are now all busily engaged in abusing the Filipinos and their leader. But here we have Admiral Dewey's emphatic and repeated official statement: "In my opinion, these people are far superior in their intelligence and more capable of self-government than the natives of Cuba, and I am familiar with both races."

Has this weighty declaration been invalidated by the subservient talk of others who thought likewise until the desire of the Administration that the Philippine people should not be held capable of independent government became public? Let our Government take the position that the Philippines are to be independent, and Admiral Dewey's original opinion will be promptly and generally accepted as the correct one.

And what of the danger that if we recognize the independence of the Philippines some other power will at once rush in to clutch them? Does any sane man believe that there will be such a danger if this great Republic forbids it? And why should not American diplomacy succeed in bringing the powers most nearly concerned to an agreement to declare the Philippines neutral territory, as Belgium and Switzerland are in Europe? I have often asked this question, and it has never been answered.

The President says in his message: "We fling them, a golden apple of discord, among the rival powers, no one of which could permit another to seize them unquestioned." Precisely. No one of them permitting another to seize them, it will be easily feasible to make them all agree to their neutrality, so that none of them shall have them.

These are phantom dangers. Neither have we a right to say that the Philippine people must be held to be incapable of independent government if they can not form an ideal republic, in which liberty and peace and order and honesty will reign in unclouded sunshine.

THE GREAT ALTERNATIVE.

I entreat you soberly to contemplate the alternative now before us. If we permit the great wrong attempted by the Administration to be consummated, our moral credit with the world will be gone forever. Having started in our Spanish war with the solemn proclamation that this would be a war of liberation and not of conquest, and then having turned that war into one of land grabbing and self-confessed "criminal aggression," nobody will ever again believe in any profession of virtue or generosity we may put forth.

It will be hooted down the world over as sheer hypocrisy disguising greedy schemes. We shall be guilty of the meanest as well as, in its consequences, the most dangerous iniquity a nation can commit—the betrayal of an ally. There is nothing so perfidious that thenceforth we shall not be thought capable of, and other nations will prudently take care not to make common cause with us for anything upon a mere assurance of good faith on our part. This is the "glory" we shall have won.

Our sister republics in this hemisphere have looked upon the United States as their natural protector, and they were our natural friends. Since we have dishonored our professions of disinterested motive, they will always suspect us of a design to stretch out our rapacious hands also against them. Already they speak of this Republic no longer as their strong and trusty friend, but as the "peligro del Norte," the "danger in the North." And they will do this so long as we hold any of our conquests.

In constant fear of our greed and perfidy they will, in case of critical complications, be inclined to coalesce even with Old-World powers against us, and we shall have secret or open enemies instead of trustful friends at our very doors. We shall have the Philippines, with a population bitterly hating us, and, in case of trouble with some foreign power, eager to kindle a fire in our rear.

We shall, instead of enjoying the inestimable blessing of exemption from the burdens of militarism, be obliged to keep up large and costly armaments to hold down our discontented subjects and to provide for our own security. And more. We shall have a bad conscience. We shall have betrayed the fundamental principles of our democracy, robbed the American people of their high ideals and beliefs, and thus destroyed the conservative element without which a democracy based on universal suffrage can not long endure.

And all this to gain some commercial advantage and naval facilities which we might have had just as fully, and much more securely, had we kept good faith with ourselves, with our allies, and with the world.

Now, contemplate the other side of the alternative. If the American people, even after the monstrous aberrations of their Government, repudiate the policy of criminal aggression and renounce their conquests; if they declare that their profession of unselfish motive and generous purpose in the Spanish war was sincere and must be maintained at any cost—what then?

They will forever put to shame the detractors of the American democracy. They will show that, although the powers of their Government may sometimes be put to base uses by men of misguided ambition, the American people are honest and can be counted upon to resist even the strongest of temptations—the intoxication of victory—and to submit even to the mortifying ordeal of a confession of wrong done in their name, in order that right, justice, and liberty may prevail.

Such an attitude will secure to the American people the confidence of mankind as it has never been enjoyed by any nation in the world's history, and with it the fruits of that confidence. Our democratic institutions will issue from the trial with a luster they never had before. By so splendid a proof of good faith this Republic will achieve a position of unexampled moral grandeur and influence. It will naturally become the trusted umpire between contending states—a peaceable arbiter of the world's quarrels. It will not only be a great world power by its strength, but the greatest of all existing world powers by its moral prestige.

It may be asked whether this is not an ideal picture. Well, this is the idealism cherished by George Washington, the soberest and most practical of men. This is what he wished and hoped the Republic of the United States, which he loved so much, to become.

But is there any chance of its accomplishment? Are not present circumstances rather discouraging? So they appear. But we old anti-slavery men have in our days seen darker situations than this. I remember the period after the compromise of 1850, which was accepted by both political parties as a finality never to be disturbed. The popular conscience concerning slavery seemed absolutely dead. Those who still spoke against slavery were on all sides, by commercialism and by the politician, denounced as bad citizens, incendiaries, traitors to their country.

A prediction of a speedy anti-slavery triumph would have sounded like the freak of a madman. But the conscience of the American people was not dead. A new condition soon illumined the question as with a flood of new light. The popular conscience suddenly rose up in its might and did not rest until slavery was wiped out.

Let the imperialists not delude themselves. If the present Congress fails to undo the great wrong that has been done, appeal will be taken to the people. And it will be kept there, and, if need be, renewed year in and year out. It will give you no rest, as the slavery question gave us no rest, until finally settled aright. And—take heed!—the longer the right settlement is delayed the greater will be its cost.

You may call the upholders of the Declaration of Independence and of the Constitution, the followers of Washington's and Lincoln's teachings, "traitors" or "bores"—no matter, they will not give up the belief that the American people are an honest people, and, like the anti-slavery men, they will not cease to appeal to the popular conscience, fully confident that the time will come when on Washington's Birthday we may feel that we are again worthy of him, and that his great monition has not been in vain.

"Observe good faith and justice toward all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all; religion and morality enjoin this conduct; and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant day, a great nation to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence."

B.

THE POLICY OF IMPERIALISM.

[Address by Hon. Carl Schurz at the anti-imperialist conference in Chicago, October 17, 1899.]

More than eight months ago I had the honor of addressing the citizens of Chicago on the subject of American imperialism, meaning the policy of annexing to this Republic distant countries and alien populations that will not fit into our democratic system of government. I discussed at that time mainly the baneful effect the pursuit of an imperialistic policy would produce upon our political institutions.

After long silence, during which I have carefully reviewed my own opinions, as well as those of others in the light of the best information I could obtain, I shall now approach the same subject from another point of view.

We all know that the popular mind is much disturbed by the Philippine war, and that, however highly we admire the bravery of our soldiers, nobody professes to be proud of the war itself. There are few Americans who do not frankly admit their regret that this war should ever have happened.

In April, 1898, we went to war with Spain for the avowed purpose of liberating the people of Cuba, who had long been struggling for freedom and independence. Our object in that war was clearly and emphatically proclaimed by a solemn resolution of Congress repudiating all intention of annexation on our part and declaring that the Cuban people "are, and of right ought to be, free and independent." This solemn declaration was made to do justice to the spirit of the American people, who were indeed willing to wage a war of liberation, but would not have consented to a war of conquest. It was also to propitiate the opinion of mankind for our action. President McKinley also declared with equal solemnity that annexation by force could not be thought of, because, according to our code of morals, it would be "criminal aggression."

Can it justly be pretended that these declarations referred only to the island of Cuba? What would the American people, what would the world have said, if Congress had resolved that the Cuban people were indeed rightfully entitled to freedom and independence, but that as to the people of other Spanish colonies we recognized no such right; and if President McKinley had declared that the forcible annexation of Cuba would be criminal, but that the forcible annexation of other Spanish colonies would be a righteous act? A general outburst of protest from our own people, and of derision and contempt from the whole world, would have been the answer. No; there can be no cavil. That war was proclaimed to all mankind to be a war of liberation, and not of conquest, and even now our very imperialists are still boasting that the war was prompted by the most unselfish and generous purposes, and that those insult us who do not believe it.

In the course of that war Commodore Dewey, by a brilliant feat of arms, destroyed the Spanish fleet in the harbor of Manila. This did not change the heralded character of the war—certainly not in Dewey's own opinion. The Filipinos, constituting the strongest and foremost tribe of the population of the archipelago, had long been fighting for freedom and independence, just as the Cubans had. The great mass of the other islanders sympathized with them. They fought for the same cause as the Cubans, and they fought against the same enemy—the same enemy against whom we were waging our war of humanity and liberation. They had the same title to freedom and independence which we recognized as "of right" in the Cubans—nay, more, for, as Admiral Dewey telegraphed to our Government, "They are far superior in their intelligence, and more capable of self-government than the natives of Cuba." The Admiral adds: "I am familiar with both races, and further intercourse with them has confirmed me in this opinion."

Indeed, the mendacious stories spread by our imperialists which represent those people as barbarians, their doings as mere "savagery," and their chiefs as no better than "cutthroats," have been refuted by such a mass of authoritative testimony, coming in part from men who are themselves imperialists, that their authors should hide their heads in shame; for surely it is not the part of really brave men to calumniate their victims before sacrificing them. We need not praise the Filipinos as in every way the equals of the "embattled farmers" of Lexington and Concord and Aguinaldo as the peer of Washington; but there is an overwhelming abundance of testimony, some of it unwilling, that the Filipinos are fully the equals, and even the superiors, of the Cubans and the Mexicans. As to Aguinaldo, Admiral Dewey is credited with saying that he is controlled by men abler than himself. The same could be said of more than one of our Presidents. Moreover, it would prove that those are greatly mistaken who predict that the Filipino uprising

would collapse were Aguinaldo captured or killed. The old slander that Aguinaldo had sold out the revolutionary movement for a bribe of $400,000 has been so thoroughly exploded by the best authority that it requires uncommon audacity to repeat it. (See Senate Document 62, page 421.)

Now let us see what has happened. Two months before the beginning of our Spanish war our consul at Manila reported to the State Department: "Conditions here and in Cuba are practically alike. War exists, battles are almost of daily occurrence. The crown forces (Spanish) have not been able to dislodge a rebel army within 10 miles of Manila. A republic is organized here as in Cuba." When two months later our war of liberation and humanity began, Commodore Dewey was at Hongkong with his ships. He received orders to attack and destroy the Spanish fleet in those waters. It was then that our consul-general at Singapore informed our State Department that he had conferred with General Aguinaldo, then at Singapore, as to the cooperation of the Philippine insurgents, and that he had telegraphed to Commodore Dewey that Aguinaldo was willing to come to Hongkong to arrange with Dewey for "general cooperation, if desired;" whereupon Dewey promptly answered:

"Tell Aguinaldo come soon as possible." The meeting was had. Dewey sailed to Manila to destroy the Spanish fleet, and Aguinaldo was taken to the seat of war on a vessel of the United States. His forces received a supply of arms through Commodore Dewey, and did faithfully and effectively cooperate with our forces against the Spaniards, so effectively, indeed, that soon afterwards by their efforts the Spaniards had lost the whole country, except a few garrisons in which they were practically blockaded.

Now, what were the relations between the Philippine insurgents and this Republic? There is some dispute as to certain agreements, including a promise of Philippine independence, said to have been made between Aguinaldo and our consul-general at Singapore, before Aguinaldo proceeded to cooperate with Dewey. But I lay no stress upon this point. I will let only the record of facts speak. Of these facts the first, of highest importance, is that Aguinaldo was "desired"—that is, invited—by officers of the United States to cooperate with our forces. The second is that the Filipino junta in Hongkong immediately after these conferences appealed to their countrymen to receive the American fleet about to sail for Manila as friends, by a proclamation which had these words:

"Compatriots, divine Providence is about to place independence within our reach. The Americans, not from any mercenary motives, but for the sake of humanity, have considered it opportune to extend their protecting mantle to our beloved country. Where you see the American flag flying assemble in mass. They are our redeemers."

With this faith his followers gave Aguinaldo a rapturous greeting upon his arrival at Cavite, where he proclaimed his government and organized his army under Dewey's eyes.

The arrival of our land forces did not at first change these relations. Brig. Gen. Thomas M. Anderson, commanding, wrote to Aguinaldo, July 4, as follows: "General, I have the honor to inform you that the United States of America, whose land forces I have the honor to command in this vicinity, being at war with the kingdom of Spain, has entire sympathy and most friendly sentiments for the native people of the Philippine Islands. For these reasons I desire to have the most amicable relations with you, and to have you and your people cooperate with us in military operations against the Spanish forces," etc. Aguinaldo responded cordially, and an extended correspondence followed, special services being asked for by the party of the first part, being rendered by the second, and duly acknowledged by the first. All this went on pleasantly until the capture of Manila, in which Aguinaldo effectively cooperated by fighting the Spaniards outside, taking many prisoners from them, and hemming them in. The services they rendered by taking thousands of Spanish prisoners, by harassing the Spaniards in the trenches, and by completely blockading Manila on the land side, were amply testified to by our own officers. Aguinaldo was also active on the sea. He had ships, which our commanders permitted to pass in and out of Manila Bay, under the flag of the Philippine republic, on their expeditions against other provinces.

Now, whether there was or not any formal compact of alliance signed and sealed, no candid man who has studied the official documents will deny that in point of fact the Filipinos, having been desired and invited to do so, were, before the capture of Manila, acting, and were practically recognized as our allies, and that as such they did effective service, which we accepted and profited by. This is an indisputable fact, proved by the record.

It is an equally indisputable fact that during that period the Filipino government constantly and publicly, so that nobody could plead ignorance of it or misunderstand it, informed the world that their object was the achievement of national independence, and that they believed the Americans had come in good faith to help them accomplish that end, as in the case of Cuba. It was weeks after various proclamations and other public utterances of Aguinaldo to that effect that the correspondence between him and General Anderson, which I have quoted, took place, and that the useful services of the Filipinos as our practical allies were accepted. It is, further, an indisputable fact that during this period our Government did not inform the Filipinos that their fond expectations as to our recognition of their independence were mistaken.

Our Secretary of State did, indeed, on June 16 write to Mr. Pratt, our consul-general at Singapore, that our Government knew the Philippine insurgents, not indeed as patriots struggling for liberty, and who, like the Cubans, "are and of right ought to be free and independent," but merely as "discontented and rebellious subjects of Spain," who, if we occupied their country in consequence of the war, would have to yield us due "obedience." And other officers of our Government were instructed not to make any promises to the Filipinos as to the future. *But the Filipinos themselves were not so informed. They* were left to believe that, while fighting in cooperation with the American forces, they were fighting for their own independence. They could not imagine that the Government of the great American Republic, while boasting of having gone to war with Spain under the banner of liberation and humanity in behalf of Cuba, was capable of secretly plotting to turn that war into one for the conquest and subjugation of the Philippines.

Thus the Filipinos went faithfully and bravely on doing for us the service of allies, of brothers in arms, far from dreaming that the same troops with whom they had been asked to cooperate would soon be employed by the great apostle of liberation and humanity to slaughter them for no other reason than that they, the Filipinos, continued to stand up for their own freedom and independence.

But just that was to happen. As soon as Manila was taken and we had no further use for our Filipino allies, they were ordered to fall back and back from the city and its suburbs. Our military commanders treated the Filipinos' country as if it were our own. When Aguinaldo sent one of his aids-de-camp to General Merritt with a request for an interview, General Merritt was "too busy." When our peace negotiations with Spain began, and representatives of the Filipinos asked for audience to solicit consideration of the rights and wishes of their people, the doors were slammed in their faces, in Washington as well as in Paris.

And behind those doors the scheme was hatched to deprive the Philippine Islanders of independence from foreign rule and to make them the subjects of another foreign ruler, and that foreign ruler their late ally, this great Republic which had grandly proclaimed to the world that its war against Spain was not a war of conquest, but a war of liberation and humanity.

Behind those doors which were tightly closed to the people of the Philippines a treaty was made with Spain, by the direction of President McKinley, which provided for the cession of the Philippine Islands by Spain to the United States for a consideration of $20,000,000. It has been said that this sum was not purchase money, but a compensation for improvements made by Spain, or a solatium to sweeten the pill of cession, or what not; but, stripped of all cloudy verbiage, it was really purchase money, the sale being made by Spain under duress. Thus Spain sold, and the United States bought, what was called the sovereignty of Spain over the Philippine Islands and their people.

Now look at the circumstances under which that "cession" was made. Spain had lost the possession of the country, except a few isolated and helpless little garrisons, most of which were effectively blockaded by the Filipinos. The American forces occupied Cavite and the harbor and city of Manila, and nothing more. The bulk of the country was occupied and possessed by the people thereof, over whom Spain had, in point of fact, ceased to exercise any sovereignty, the Spanish power having been driven out or destroyed by the Filipino insurrection, while the United States had not acquired, beyond Cavite and Manila, any authority of whatever name by military occupation, nor by recognition on the part of the people. Aguinaldo's army surrounded Manila on the land side, and his government claimed organized control over fifteen provinces. That government was established at Malolos, not far from Manila; and a very respectable government it was. According to Mr. Barrett, our late minister in Siam, himself an ardent imperialist, who had seen it, it had a well-organized executive, divided into several departments, ably conducted, and a popular assembly, a congress, which would favorably compare with the Parliament of Japan—an infinitely better government than the insurrectionary government of Cuba ever was.

It is said that Aguinaldo's government was in operation among only a part of the people of the islands. This is true. But it is also certain that it was recognized and supported by an immeasurably larger part of the people than Spanish sovereignty, which had practically ceased to exist, and than American rule, which was confined to a harbor and a city and which was carried on by the exercise of military force under what was substantially martial law over a people that constituted about one-twentieth of the whole population of the islands. Thus, having brought but a very small fraction of the country and its people under our military control, we bought by that treaty the sovereignty over the whole from a power which had practically lost that sovereignty and therefore did no longer possess it; and we contemptuously disdained to consult the existing native government, which actually did control a large part of the country and the people, and which had been our ally in the war with Spain. The sovereignty we thus acquired may well be defined as Abraham Lincoln once defined the "popular sovereignty" of Senator Douglas's doctrine—as being like a soup made by boiling the shadow of the breastbone of a pigeon that had been starved to death.

No wonder that treaty found opposition in the Senate. Virulent abuse was heaped upon the "statesman who would oppose the ratification of a peace treaty." A peace treaty? This was no peace treaty at all. It was a treaty with half a dozen bloody wars in its belly. It was, in the first place, an open and brutal declaration of war against our allies, the Filipinos, who struggled for freedom and independence from foreign rule. Every man not totally blind could see that. For such a treaty the true friends of peace could, of course, not vote.

But more. Even before that treaty had been assented to by the Senate—that is, even before that ghastly shadow of our Philippine sovereignty had obtained any legal sanction—President McKinley assumed of his own motion the sovereignty of the Philippine Islands by his famous "benevolent-assimilation" order of December 21, 1898, through which our military commander at Manila was directed forthwith to extend the military government of the United States over the whole archipelago, and by which the Filipinos were notified that if they refused to submit, they would be compelled by force of arms. Having bravely fought for their freedom and independence from one foreign rule, they did refuse to submit to another foreign rule, and then the slaughter of our late allies began—the slaughter by American arms of a once friendly and confiding people. And this slaughter has been going on ever since.

This is a grim story. Two years ago the prediction of such a possibility would have been regarded as a hideous nightmare, as the offspring of a diseased imagination. But to-day it is a true tale—a plain recital of facts taken from the official records. These things have actually been done in these last two years by and under the Administration of William McKinley. This is our Philippine war as it stands. Is it a wonder that the American people should be troubled in their consciences? But let us not be too swift in our judgment on the conduct of those in power over us. Let us hear what they have to say in defense of it.

It is pretended that we had a right to the possession of the Philippines, and that self-respect demanded us to enforce that right. What kind of right was it? The right of conquest? Had we really acquired that country by armed conquest, which, as President McKinley has told us, is, according to the American code of morals, "criminal aggression?" But if we had thrown aside our code of morals, we had then not conquered more than the bay and city of Manila. The rest of the country was controlled, if by anybody, by the Filipinos. Or was it the right of possession by treaty? I have already shown that the President ordered the enforcement of our sovereignty over the archipelago before the treaty had by ratification gained legal effect, and also that in making that treaty we had bought something called sovereignty which Spain had ceased to possess and could therefore not sell and deliver. But let me bring the matter home to you by a familiar example.

Imagine that in our Revolutionary times France, being at war with England, had brought to this country a fleet and an army, and had, without any definite compact to that effect, cooperated as an ally with our Revolutionary forces, permitting all the while the Americans to believe that she did this without any mercenary motive, and that in case of victory the American colonies would be free and independent. Imagine, then, that after the British surrendered at Yorktown the King of France had extorted from the British King a treaty ceding, for a consideration of $20,000,000, the sovereignty over the American colonies to France, and that thereupon the King of France had coolly notified the Continental Congress and General Washington that they had to give up their idea of national independence and to surrender unconditionally to the sovereignty of France, wherefor the French King promised them "benevolent assimilation." Imagine, further, that upon the protest of the Americans that Great Britain, having lost everything in the colonies except New York City and a few other little posts, had no sovereignty to cede, the French King answered that he had bought the Americans at $5 a head, and that if they refused to submit he would give them benevolent assimilation in the shape of bullets. Can there be any doubt that the Continental Congress and General Washington would have retorted that, no matter what the French King might have bought, Great Britain had no sovereignty left to sell; that least of all would the Americans permit themselves to be sold; that the French, in so treating their American allies after such high-sounding professions of friendship and generosity, were a lot of mean, treacherous, contemptible hypocrites, and that the Americans would rather die than submit to such wolves in

sheep's clothing. And will any patriotic American now deny that, whatever quibbles of international law about possible cessions of a lost sovereignty might be invented, such conduct of the French would have been simply a shame and that the Americans of that time would have eternally disgraced themselves if they had failed to resist unto death? How, then, can the same patriotic American demand that the Filipinos should surrender and accept American sovereignty under circumstances exactly parallel? And that parallel will not be shaken by any learned international law technicalities, which do not touch the moral element of the subject.

It is also pretended that, whatever our rights, the Filipinos were the original aggressors in the pending fight, and that our troops found themselves compelled to defend their flag against assault. What are the facts?

One evening early in February last some Filipino soldiers entered the American lines without, however, attacking anybody. An American sentry fired, killing one of the Filipinos. Then a desultory firing began at the outposts. It spread until it assumed the proportions of an extensive engagement, in which a large number of Filipinos were killed. *It is a well-established fact that this engagement could not have been a premeditated affair on the part of the Filipinos, as many of their officers, including Aguinaldo's private secretary, were at the time in the theaters and cafés of Manila.* It is further well known that the next day Aguinaldo sent an officer, General Torres, under a flag of truce to General Otis to declare that the fighting had not been authorized by Aguinaldo, but had begun accidentally; that Aguinaldo wished to have it stopped, and proposed to that end the establishment of a neutral zone between the two armies, such as might be agreeable to General Otis; whereupon General Otis curtly answered that the fighting, having once begun, must go on to the grim end. *Who was it that really wanted the fight?*

But far more important than all this is the fact that President McKinley's "benevolent assimilation" order, which even before the ratification of the treaty demanded that the Philippine Islanders should *unconditionally surrender to American sovereignty*, in default whereof our military forces would compel them, was really the President's declaration of war against the Filipinos insisting upon independence, however you may quibble about it. When an armed man enters my house under some questionable pretext and tells me that I must yield to him unconditional control of the premises or he will knock me down, who is the aggressor, no matter who strikes the first blow? No case of aggression can be clearer, shuffle and prevaricate as you will.

Let us recapitulate. We go to war with Spain in behalf of an oppressed colony of hers. We solemnly proclaim this to be a war not of conquest, God forbid, but of liberation and humanity. We invade the Spanish colony of the Philippines, destroy the Spanish fleet, and invite the cooperation of the Filipino insurgents against Spain. We accept their effective aid as allies, all the while permitting them to believe that in case of victory they will be free and independent.

By active fighting they get control of a large part of the interior country, from which Spain is virtually ousted. When we have captured Manila and have no further use for our Filipino allies, our President directs that, behind their backs, a treaty be made with Spain transferring their country to us; and even before that treaty is ratified he tells them that in place of the Spaniards they must accept us as their masters, and that if they do not they will be compelled by force of arms. They refuse, and we shoot them down; and, as President McKinley said at Pittsburg, we shall continue to shoot them down "without useless parley."

I have recited these things in studiously sober and dry, matter-of-fact language, without oratorical ornament or appeal. I ask you now what epithet can you find justly to characterize such a course? Happily you need not search for one, for President McKinley himself has furnished the best when in a virtuous moment he said that annexation by force should not be thought of, for according to the American code of morals it would be "criminal aggression." Yes; "criminal" is the word. Have you ever heard of any aggression more clearly criminal than this? And in this case there is an element of peculiarly repulsive meanness and treachery. I pity the American who can behold this spectacle without the profoundest shame, contrition, and resentment. Is it a wonder, I repeat, that the American people, in whose name this has been done, should be troubled in their consciences?

To justify, or, rather, to excuse such things, nothing but a plea of the extremest necessity will avail. Did such a necessity exist? In a sort of helpless way, the defenders of this policy ask, "What else could the President have done under the circumstances?" This question is simply childish. If he thought he could not order Commodore Dewey away from Manila after the execution of the order to destroy the Spanish fleet, he could have told the people of the Philippine Islands that this was, on our part, a war, not of conquest, but of liberation and humanity; that we sympathized with their desire for freedom and independence, and that we would treat them as we had specifically promised to treat the Cuban people in furthering the establishment of an independent government. And this task would have been much easier than in the case of Cuba, since, according to Admiral Dewey's repeatedly emphatic testimony, the Filipinos were much better fitted for such a government.

Our ingenious Postmaster-General has told us that the President could not have done that because he had no warrant for it, since he did not know whether the American people would wish to keep the Philippine Islands. But what warrant, then, had the President for putting before the Filipinos by his "benevolent-assimilation order" the alternative of submission to our sovereignty or war? Had he any assurance that the American people willed that? If such was his dream, there may be a rude awakening in store for him. But I say that for assenting to the aspiration of the Filipinos to freedom and independence he would have had the fullest possible warrant in the spirit of our institutions and in the resolution of Congress stamping our war against Spain as a war of liberation and humanity; and such a course would surely have been approved by the American people, except, perhaps, some jingoes bent upon wild adventure and some syndicates of speculators unscrupulous in their greed of gain.

There are also some who, with the mysterious mien of a superior sense of responsibility, tell us that the President could not have acted otherwise, because Dewey's victory devolved upon us some grave international or other obligations which would have been disregarded had the President failed to claim sovereignty over the Philippines.

What? Did not the destruction of Cervera's fleet and the taking of Santiago devolve the same obligations upon us with regard to Cuba? And who has ever asserted that therefore Cuba must be put under our sovereignty? And did ever anybody pretend that our victories in Mexico fifty years ago imposed upon us international or other obligations which compelled us to assume sovereignty over the Mexican Republic after we had conquered it much more than we have conquered the Philippines? Does not, in the light of history, this obligation dodge appear as a hollow mockery?

An equally helpless plea is it that the President could not treat with Aguinaldo and his followers because they did not represent the whole population of the islands. But having an established government and an army of some 25,000 or 30,000 men, and in that army men from various tribes, they represented at least something.

They represented at least a large part of the population and a strong nucleus of a national organization. And, as we have to confess that in the Philippines there is no active opposition to the Filipino government except that which we ourselves manage to excite, it may be assumed that they represent the sympathy of practically the whole people.

But, pray, what do we represent there? At first, while the islanders confided in us as their liberators, we represented their hope for freedom and independence. Since we have betrayed that hope, we represent, as a brute force bent upon subjugating them, only their bitter hatred and detestation. We have managed to turn virtually that whole people, who at first greeted us with childlike trust as their beloved deliverers, into deadly enemies, for it is a notorious fact that those we regard as "amigos" to-day will to-morrow stand in the ranks of our foes.

We have not a true friend left among the islanders, unless it be some speculators, and the Sultan of Sulu with his harem and his slaves, whose support we have bought with a stipend like that which the Republic in its feeble infancy paid to the pirates of the Barbary States. And even his friendship will hardly last long. Yes, it is a terrible fact that in one year we have made them hate us more, perhaps, than they hated even their Spanish oppressors who were at least less foreign to them, and that the manner in which we are treating them has caused many, if not most of the Filipinos, to wish that they had patiently suffered Spanish tyranny rather than be "liberated" by us.

But the ghastliest argument of all in defense of the President's course is that he had to extend American sovereignty over the whole archipelago, even before the ratification of the treaty, and that he was, and is now, obliged to shoot down the Filipinos, to the end of "restoring order" and "preventing anarchy" in the islands. We are to understand that if our strong armed hand did not restrain them from doing as they pleased—that is, if they were left free and independent—they would quickly begin to cut one another's or other people's throats and to ravish and destroy one another's or other people's property. We may reasonably assume that if this were sure to be the upshot of their being left free and independent they would have shown some such tendency where they have actually held sway under their own revolutionary government.

Now for the facts. We have the reports of two naval officers and of two members of the Signal Corps who traveled extensively behind Aguinaldo's lines through the country controlled by his government. And what did they find? Quiet and orderly rural or municipal communities, in all appearance well organized and governed, full of enthusiasm for their liberty and independence, which they thought secured by the expulsion of the Spaniards, and for their leader, Aguinaldo, and at the time—it was before President McKinley had ordered the subjugation of the islands—also for the Americans, whom, with childlike confidence, they still believed friendly to their freedom from all foreign rule.

We may be sure that if any anarchical disturbances had happened among them our imperialists would have eagerly made report. But there has been nothing at all equivalent to such things. The only rumors of so-called "anarchy" have come through a British consul on the island of Borneo, who writes that bloody broils are occurring in some of the southernmost regions of the Philippine archipelago, and that the Americans are wanted there. But the Americans are engaged in killing orderly Filipinos—Filipino soldiers of just that Filipino government which, on its part, would probably soon restore order in the troubled places if it had not to defend itself against the "criminal aggression" of the Americans.

The imperialists wish us to believe that in the Philippines there is bloody disorder wherever our troops are not. In fact, after the Filipinos had expelled the Spaniards from the interior of their country bloody disorders began there only when our troops appeared.

Here is an example: In December last the city of Iloilo, the second city in commercial importance in the Philippines, was evacuated by the Spaniards and occupied by the Filipinos. Gen. M. P. Miller, of our Army, was sent in command of an expedition to take possession of it. As he has publicly stated, when he appeared with his ships and soldiers before the city he "received a letter from the business people of Iloilo, principally foreigners, stating that good order was being maintained, life and property being protected, and requesting him not to attack at present." But soon afterwards he received peremptory orders to attack, and did so; and then the killing and the burning of houses and other work of devastation began. Can it be said that our troops had to go there to "restore order" and prevent bloodshed and devastation? No; order and safety existed there, and it was only with our troops that the bloodshed and devastation came, which otherwise might not have occurred.

I am far from meaning to picture the Philippine Islanders as paragons of virtue and gentle conduct. But I challenge the imperialists to show me any instances of bloody disturbance or other savagery among them sufficient to create any necessity for our armed interference to "restore order" or to "save them from anarchy." I ask and demand an answer: Is it not true that, even if there has been such a disorderly tendency, it would have required a long time for it to kill one-tenth as many human beings as we have killed and to cause one-tenth as much devastation as we have caused by our assaults upon them?

In the vocabulary of our imperialists "order" means, above all, submission to their will. Any other kind of order, be it ever so peaceful and safe, must be suppressed with a bloody hand. This "order" is the kind that has been demanded by the despot since the world had a history. Its language has already become dangerously familiar to us—a familiarity which can not cease too soon.

From all these points of view, therefore, the Philippine war was as unnecessary as it is unjust. And who will deny that this war would certainly have been avoided had the President remained true to the national pledge that the war against Spain should be a war of liberation and humanity and not of conquest? Can there be any doubt that, if the assurance had honestly been given and carried out, we might have had, for the mere asking, all the coaling stations, and facilities for commercial and industrial enterprise, and freedom for the establishment of schools and churches we might reasonably desire? And what have we now?

After eight months' slaughter and devastation, squandered treasure, and shame, an indefinite prospect of more and more slaughter, devastation, squandered treasure, and shame.

But, we are asked, since we have to deal with a situation not as it might have been, but as it is, what do we propose to do now? We may fairly turn about and say, since not we, but you, have got the country into this frightful mess, what have you to propose? Well, and what is the answer? "No useless parley! More soldiers! More guns! More blood! More devastation! Kill, kill, kill! And when we have killed enough, so that further resistance stops, then we shall see." Translated from smooth phrase into plain English, this is the programme. Let us examine it with candor and coolness.

What is the ultimate purpose of this policy? To be perfectly fair, I will assume that the true spirit of American imperialism is represented not by the extremists, who want to subjugate the Philippine Islanders at any cost and then exploit the islands to the best advantage of the conquerors, but by the more humane persons, who say that we must establish our sovereignty over them to make them happy, to prepare them for self-government, and even recognize their right to complete independence as soon as they show themselves fit for it.

Let me ask these well-meaning citizens a simple question. If you think that the American people may ultimately consent to the independence of those islanders as a matter of right and good policy, why do you insist upon killing them now? You answer: Because they refuse to recognize our sovereignty. Why do they so refuse? Because they think themselves entitled to independence and are willing to fight and die for it.

But if you insist upon continuing to shoot them down for this reason does not that mean that you want to kill them for demanding the identical thing which you yourself think that you may ultimately find it just and proper to grant them? Would not every drop of blood shed in such a guilty sport cry to heaven? For you must not forget that establishing our sovereignty in the Philippines means the going on with the work of slaughter and devastation to the grim end, and nobody can tell where that end will be. To kill men in a just war and in obedience to imperative necessity is one thing. To kill men for demanding what you yourself may ultimately have to approve is another. How can such killing adopted as a policy be countenanced by a man of conscience and humane feelings? And yet such killing "without useless parley" is the policy proposed to us.

We are told that we must trust President McKinley and his advisers to bring us out "all right." I should be glad to be able to do so; but I can not forget that they have got us in all wrong. And here we have to consider a point of immense importance, which I solemnly urge upon the attention of the American people.

It is one of the fundamental principles of our system of democratic government that only the Congress has the power to declare war. What does this signify? That a declaration of war, the initiation of an armed conflict between this nation and some other power—the most solemn and responsible act a nation can perform, involving, as it does, the lives and fortunes of an uncounted number of human beings—shall not be at the discretion of the executive branch of the Government, but shall depend upon the authority of the legislative representatives of the people. In other words, that, as much as the machinery of government may make such a thing possible, the deliberate will of the people constitutionally expressed shall determine the awful question of peace or war.

It is true there may be circumstances of foreign aggression or similar emergencies to precipitate an armed conflict without there being a possibility of consulting the popular will beforehand. But, such exceptional cases notwithstanding, the constitutional principle remains that the question of peace or war is essentially one which the popular will is to decide, and that no possibility should be lost to secure upon it the expression of the popular will through its legislative organs.

Whenever such a possibility is willfully withheld or neglected and a war has been brought upon the country without every available means being employed thus to consult the popular will upon that question, the spirit of the Constitution is flagrantly violated in one of its most essential principles.

We are now engaged in a war with the Filipinos. You may quibble about it as you will, call it by whatever name you will, it is a war, and a war of conquest on our part at that—a war of bare-faced, cynical conquest. Now, I ask any fair-minded man whether the President, before beginning that war or while carrying it on, has ever taken any proper steps to get from the Congress, the representatives of the people, any proper authority for making that war?

He issued his famous "benevolent assimilation" order, directing the Army to bring the whole Philippine archipelago as promptly as possible under the military government of the United States, on December 21, 1898, while Congress was in session, and before the treaty with Spain, transferring her shadowy sovereignty over the islands, had acquired any force of law by the assent of the Senate. That was substantially a declaration of war against the Filipinos asserting their independence. He took this step of his own motion. To be sure, he has constantly been telling us that "the whole subject is with Congress," and that "Congress shall direct." *But when did he, while Congress was in session, lay a full statement before that body and ask its direction?* Why did he not, before he proclaimed that the slaughter must go on "without useless parley," call Congress together to consult the popular will in constitutional form?

Why, even in these days, while "swinging around the circle," the President and his secretaries are speaking of the principal thing, the permanent annexation of the Philippines, not as a question still to be determined, but as a thing done—*concluded by the Executive*, implying that Congress will have simply to regulate the details.

Now, you may bring ever so many arguments to show that the President had *technically* a right to act as he did, and your reasoning may be ever so plausible, yet the great fact remains that the President did not seek and obtain authority from Congress as to the war to be made and the policy to be pursued, and that he acted upon his own motion.

And this autocratic conduct is vastly aggravated by the other fact that in this democratic Republic, the government of which should be that of an intelligent and well-informed public opinion, a censorship of news has been instituted, which is purposely and systematically seeking to keep the American people in ignorance of the true state of things at the seat of war, and by all sorts of deceitful tricks to deprive them of the knowledge required for the formation of a correct judgment. And this censorship was practiced not only in Manila, but directly by the Administration in Washington.

Here is a specimen performance revealed by a member of Congress in a public speech; the War Department gave out a dispatch from Manila, as follows: "Volunteers willing to remain." The Congressman went to the War Department and asked for the original, which read: "Volunteers unwilling to reenlist, but willing to remain until transports arrive." You will admit that such distortion of official news is a downright swindle upon the people. Does not this give strong color to the charge of the war correspondents that the news is systematically and confessedly so doctored by the officials that it may "help the Administration?"

Those are therefore by no means wrong who call this "the President's war." And a war so brought about and so conducted the American people are asked to approve and encourage, simply because "we are in it"—that is, because the President of his own motion has got us into it. Have you considered what this means?

Every man of public experience knows how powerful and seductive precedent is as an argument in the interpretation of laws and of constitutional provisions or in justification of governmental practices. When a thing, no matter how questionable, has once been done by the Government and approved or even acquiesced in by the people, that act will surely be used as a justification of its being done again. In nothing is the authority of precedent more dangerous than in defending usurpations of governmental power. And it is remarkable how prone the public mind is, especially under the influence of party spirit, to accept precedent as a warrant for such usurpations, which, judged upon their own merits, would be sternly condemned.

And every such precedent is apt to bring forth a worse one. It is in this way that the most indispensable bulwarks of free government and of public peace and security may be undermined. To meet such dangers the American people should, if ever, remember the old saying that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

I am not here as a partisan, but as an American citizen anxious for the future of the Republic. And I can not too earnestly admonish the American people, if they value the fundamental principles of their Government and their own security and that of their children, for a moment to throw aside all partisan bias and soberly to consider what kind of a precedent they would set if they consented to, and by consenting approved, the President's management of the Philippine business merely "because we are in it."

We can not expect all our future Presidents to be models of public virtue and wisdom, as George Washington was. Imagine now in the Presidential office a man well-meaning, but, it may be, short-sighted and pliable, and under the influence of so-called "friends" who are greedy and reckless speculators, and who would not scruple to push him into warlike complications in order to get great opportunities for profit; or a man of that inordinate ambition which intoxicates the mind and befogs the conscience; or a man of extreme partisan spirit, who honestly believes the victory of his party to be necessary for the salvation of the universe, and may think that a foreign broil would serve the chances of his party; or a man of an uncontrollable combativeness of temperament which might run away with his sense of responsibility—and that we shall have such men in the Presidential chair is by no means unlikely with our loose way of selecting candidates for the Presidency.

Imagine, then, a future President belonging to either of these classes to have before him the precedent of Mr. McKinley's management of the Philippine business, sanctioned by the approval or only the acquiescence of the people, and to feel himself permitted—nay, even encouraged—to say to himself that, as this precedent shows, he may plunge the country into warlike conflicts of his own motion, without asking leave of Congress, with only some legal technicalities to cover his usurpation, or even without such, and that he may, by a machinery of deception called a war censorship, keep the people in the dark about what is going on; and that, into however bad a mess he may have got the country, he may count upon the people, as soon as a drop of blood has been shed, to uphold the usurpation and to cry down everybody who opposes it as a "traitor," and all this because "we are in it!" Can you conceive a more baneful precedent, a more prolific source of danger to the peace and security of the country? Can any sane man deny that it will be all the more prolific of evil if in this way we drift into a foreign policy full of temptation for dangerous adventure?

I say, therefore, that if we have the future of the Republic at heart we must not only not uphold the Administration in its course because "we are in it," but just because we are in it, have been got into it in such a way, the American people should stamp the Administration's proceedings with a verdict of disapproval so clear and emphatic and "get out of it" in such a fashion that this will be a solemn warning to future Presidents instead of a seductive precedent.

What, then, to accomplish this end is to be done? Of course we, as we are here, can only advise. But by calling forth expressions of the popular will by various means of public demonstration and, if need be, at the polls, we can make that advice so strong that those in power will hardly disregard it. We have often been taunted with having no positive policy to propose. But such a policy has more than once been proposed and I can only repeat it.

In the first place, let it be well understood that those are egregiously mistaken who think that if by a strong military effort the Philippine war be stopped everything will be right and no more question about it. No; the American trouble of conscience will not be appeased, and the question will be as big and virulent as ever, unless the close of the war be promptly followed by an assurance to the islanders of their freedom and independence, which assurance, if given now, would surely end the war without more fighting.

We propose, therefore, that it be given now. Let the Philippine Islanders at the same time be told that the American people will be glad to see them establish an independent government, and to aid them in that task as far as may be necessary, and even, if required, lend our good offices to bring it about; and that *meanwhile* we shall deem it our duty to protect them against interference from other foreign powers—in other words, that with regard to them we mean honestly to live up to the righteous principles with the profession of which we commended to the world our Spanish war.

And then let us have in the Philippines, to carry out this programme, not a small politician, nor a meddlesome martinet, but a statesman of large mind and genuine sympathy, who will not merely deal in sanctimonious cant and oily promises with a string to them, but who will prove *by his acts* that he and we are honest; who will keep in mind that their government is not merely to suit us, but to suit them; that it should not be measured by standards which we ourselves have not been able to reach, but be a government of their own, adapted to their own conditions and notions—whether it be a true republic, like ours, or a dictatorship like that of Porfirio Diaz, in Mexico, or an oligarchy like the one maintained by us in Hawaii, or even something like the boss rule we are tolerating in New York and Pennsylvania.

Those who talk so much about "fitting a people for self-government" often forget that no people were ever made "fit" for self-government by being kept in the leading strings of a foreign power. You learn to walk by doing your own crawling and stumbling. Self-government is learned only by exercising it upon one's own responsibility. Of course there will be mistakes and troubles and disorders. We have had and now have these, too—at the beginning our persecution of the Tories, our flounderings before the Constitution was formed, our Shay's rebellion, our whisky war, and various failures and disturbances, among them a civil war that cost us a loss of life and treasure horrible to think of, and the murder of two Presidents. But who will say that on account of these things some foreign power should have kept the American people in leading strings to teach them to govern themselves? If the Philippine Islanders do as well as the Mexicans, who have worked their way, since we let them alone after our war of 1847, through many disorders, to an orderly government, who will have a right to find fault with the result? Those who seek to impose upon them an unreasonable standard of excellence in self-government do not seriously wish to let them govern themselves at all. You may take it as a general rule that he who wants to reign over others is solemnly convinced that they are quite unable to govern themselves.

Now, what objection is there to the policy dictated by our fundamental principles and our good faith? I hear the angry cry: "What? Surrender to Aguinaldo? Will not the world ridicule and despise us for such a confession of our incompetency to deal with so feeble a foe? What will become of our prestige?" No, we shall not surrender to Aguinaldo. In giving up a criminal aggression we shall surrender only to our own consciences, to our own sense of right and justice, to our own understanding of our own true interests, and to the vital principles of our own Republic. Nobody will laugh at us whose good opinion we have reason to cherish. There will, of course, be an outcry of disappointment in England. But from whom will it come? From such men as James Bryce or John Morley or any one of those true friends of this Republic who understand and admire and wish to perpetuate and spread the fundamental principles of its vitality? No, not from them.

But the outcry will come from those in England who long to see us entangled in complications apt to make this American Republic dependent upon British aid and thus subservient to British interests. They, indeed, will be quite angry. But the less we mind their displeasure as well as their flattery the better for the safety as well as the honor of our country.

The true friends of this Republic in England, and, indeed, all over the

world, who are now grieving to see us go astray, will rejoice and their hearts will be uplifted with new confidence in our honesty, in our wisdom, and in the virtue of democratic institutions when they behold the American people throwing aside all the puerilities of false pride and returning to the path of their true duty.

The world knows how strong we are. It knows full well that if the American people chose to put forth their strength, they could quickly overcome a foe infinitely more powerful than the Filipinos, and that if we, possessing the strength of the giant, do not use the giant's strength against this feeble foe, it is from the noblest of motives—our love of liberty, our sense of justice, and our respect for the rights of others—the respect of the strong for the rights of the weak. The moral prestige which, in fact, we have lost will be restored, while our prestige of physical prowess and power will certainly not be lessened by showing that we have not only soldiers, guns, ships, and money, but also a conscience.

Therefore the cry is childish that unless we take and keep the Philippines, some other power will promptly grab them. Many a time this cry has been raised to stampede the American people into a policy of annexation—in the Santo Domingo case, twenty-eight years ago, and more recently in the case of Hawaii, and in neither case was there the slightest danger—not that there were no foreign powers that would have liked to have those islands, but because they could not have taken them without the risk of grave consequences. Now the old bugbear must do service again.

Why should not American diplomacy set about to secure the consent of the powers most nearly concerned to an agreement to make the Philippine Islands neutral territory, as Belgium and Switzerland are in Europe? Because some of those powers would like to have the Philippines themselves? Well, are there not among the European powers some that would like to have Belgium or Switzerland? Certainly; *and just because there are several watching each other* the neutrality of those two countries is guaranteed. But even if such an agreement could not be obtained, we may be sure that there is no foreign power that would likely risk a serious quarrel with the United States, if this Republic, for the protection of the Philippine Islanders in their effort to build up an independent government, said to the world, "Hands off!" So much for those who think that somebody else might be wicked enough to grab the Philippine Islands, and that, therefore, we must be wicked enough to do the grabbing ourselves.

There are some American citizens who take of this question a purely commercial view. I declare I am ardently in favor of the greatest possible expansion of our trade, and I am happy to say that, according to official statistics, our foreign commerce, in spite of all hindrances raised against it, is now expanding tremendously, owing to the simple rule that the nation offering the best goods at proportionately the lowest prices will have the markets. It will have them without armies, without war fleets, without bloody conquests, without colonies. I confess I am not in sympathy with those, if there be such men among us, who would sacrifice our national honor and the high ideals of the Republic, and who would inflict upon our people the burdens and the demoralizing influences of militarism for a mere matter of dollars and cents. They are among the most dangerous enemies of the public welfare. But as to the annexation of the Philippines, I will, for argument's sake, adopt even their point of view for a moment and ask: Will it pay?

Now, it may well be that the annexation of the Philippines would pay a speculative syndicate of wealthy capitalists, without at the same time paying the American people at large. As to people of our race, tropical countries like the Philippines may be fields of profit for rich men who can hire others to work for them, but not for those who have to work for themselves. Taking a general view of the Philippines as a commercial market for us, I need not again argue against the barbarous notion that in order to have a profitable trade with a country we must own it. If that were true we should never have had any foreign commerce at all. Neither need I prove that it is very bad policy when you wish to build up a profitable trade, to ruin your customer first, as you would ruin the Philippines by a protracted war. It is equally needless to show to any well-informed person that the profits of the trade with the islands themselves can never amount to the cost of making and maintaining the conquest of the Philippines.

But there is another point of real importance. Many imperialists admit that our trade with the Philippines themselves will not nearly be worth its cost; but they say that we must have the Philippines as a foothold, a sort of power station, for the expansion of our trade on the Asiatic continent, especially in China.

Admitting this, for argument's sake, I ask what kind of a foothold we should really need. Coaling stations and docks for our fleet, and facilities for the establishment of commercial houses and depots. That is all. And now I ask further, whether we could not easily have had these things if we had, instead of making war upon the Filipinos, favored the independence of the islands. Everybody knows that we could. We might have those things now for the mere asking, if we stopped the war and came to a friendly understanding with the Filipinos to-morrow.

But now suppose we fight on and subjugate the Filipinos and annex the islands—what then? We shall then have of coaling stations and commercial facilities no more than we would have had in the other case; but the islanders will hate us as their bloody oppressors, and be our bitter and revengeful enemies for generations to come. You may say that this will be of no commercial importance. Let us see. It is by no means impossible, nor even improbable, that, if we are once in the way of extending our commerce with guns behind it, we may get into hot trouble with one or more of our competitors for that Asiatic trade. What then? Then our enemies need only land some Filipino refugees whom we have driven out of their country, and some cargoes of guns and ammunition on the islands, and we shall soon—all the more if we depend on native troops—have a fire in our rear which will oblige us to fight the whole old fight over again.

The present subjugation of the Philippines will, therefore, not only not be a help to the expansion of our Asiatic trade, but rather a constant danger and a clog to our feet.

And here a word by the way. A year ago I predicted in an article published in the Century Magazine, that if we turned our war of liberation into a war of conquest, our American sister republics south of us would become distrustful of our intentions with regard to them, and soon begin to form combinations against us, eventually even with European powers. The newspapers have of late been alive with vague rumors of that sort, so much so that a prominent journal of imperialistic tendency has found it necessary most earnestly to admonish the President in his next message to give to the republics south of us the strongest possible assurances of our friendship and good faith.

Suppose he does. Who will believe him after we have turned our loudly heralded war of liberation into a land-grabbing game—a "criminal aggression?" Nobody will have the slightest trust in our words, be they ever so fair. Drop your conquests and no assurances of good faith will be required. Keep your conquests and no such assurances will avail. Our southern neighbors—no less than the Filipinos—will then inevitably distrust our professions, fear our greed, and become our secret or open enemies. And who can be foolish enough to believe that this will strengthen our power and help our commerce?

It is useless to say that the subjugated Philippine Islanders will become our friends if we give them good government. However good that government may be, it will to them be foreign rule, and foreign rule especially hateful when begun by broken faith, cemented by streams of innocent blood, and erected upon the ruins of devastated homes. The American will be and remain to them more a foreigner, an unsympathetic foreigner, than the Spaniard ever was. Let us indulge in no delusion about this. People of our race are but too much inclined to have little tenderness for the rights of what we regard as inferior races, especially those of darker skin.

And how much good government have we to give them?

Are you not aware that our first imperialistic Administration is also the first that, since the enactment of the civil-service law, has widened the gates again for a new foray of spoils politics in the public service? What assurance have we that the Philippines, far away from public observation, will not be simply a pasture for needy politicians and for speculating syndicates to grow fat on, without much scruple as to the rights of the despised "natives?" Has it not been so with the British in India, although the British monarchy is much better fitted for imperial rule than our democratic Republic can ever be?

True, in the course of time the government of India has been much improved; but it required more than a century of slaughter, robbery, devastation, disastrous blundering, insurrection, and renewed bloody subjugation to evolve what there is of good government in India now. And have the populations of India ever become the friends of England? Does not England at heart tremble to-day lest some hostile foreign power come close enough to throw a firebrand into that fearful mass of explosives?

I ask you, therefore, in all soberness, leaving all higher considerations of justice, morality, and principle aside, whether, from a mere business point of view, the policy of subjugation is not a colossal, stupid blunder, and whether it would not have been, and would not now be, infinitely more sensible to win the confidence and cultivate the friendship of the islanders by recognizing them as of right entitled to their freedom and independence, as we have recognized the Cubans, and thus to obtain from their friendship and gratitude, for the mere asking, all the coaling stations and commercial facilities we require, instead of getting those things by fighting at an immense cost of blood and treasure, with a probability of having to fight for them again? I put this question to every business man who is not a fool or a reckless speculator. Can there be any doubt of the answer?

A word now on a special point. There are some very estimable men among us who think that even if we concede to the islanders their independence we should at least keep the city of Manila. I think differently, not from a mere impulse of generosity, but from an entirely practical point of view. Manila is the traditional, if not the natural, capital of the archipelago.

To recognize the independence of the Philippine Islanders and at the same time to keep from them Manila would mean as much as to recognize the independence of Cuba and to keep Havana. It would mean to withhold from the islanders their metropolis, that in which they naturally take the greatest pride, that which they legitimately most desire to have, and which, if withheld from them, they would most ardently wish to get back. The withholding of Manila would inevitably leave a sting in their hearts which would never cease to rankle, and might, under critical circumstances, give us as much trouble as the withholding of independence itself. If we wish them to be our friends we should not do things by halves, but enable them to be our friends without reserve. And I maintain that, commercially as well as politically speaking, the true friendship of the Philippine Islanders will, as to our position in the East, be worth far more to us than the possession of Manila. We can certainly find other points which will give us similar commercial as well as naval advantages without exciting any hostile feeling.

Although I have by no means exhausted this vast subject, discussing only a few phases of it, I have said enough, I think, to show that this policy of conquest is, from the point of view of public morals, in truth "criminal aggression," made doubly criminal by the treacherous character of it; and that from the point of view of material interest it is a blunder, a criminal blunder, and a blundering crime.

I have addressed myself to your reason by sober argument, without any appeal to prejudice or passion. Might we not ask our opponents to answer these arguments, if they can, with equally sober reasoning, instead of merely assailing us with their wild cries of "treason" and "lack of patriotism," and what not? Or do they really feel their cause to be so weak that they depend for its support on their assortment of inarticulate shouts and nebulous phrases?

Here are our "manifest destiny" men who tell us that, whether it be right or not, we must take and keep the Philippines because "destiny" so wills it. We have heard this cry of manifest destiny before, especially when, a half century ago, the slave power demanded the annexation of Cuba and Central America to strengthen the slave power. The cry of destiny is most vociferously put forward by those who want to do a wicked thing and to shift the responsibility.

The destiny of a free people lies in its intelligent will and its moral strength. When it pleads destiny, it pleads the baby act. Nay, worse; the cry of destiny is apt to be the refuge of evil intent and of moral cowardice.

Here are our "burden" men, who piously turn up their eyes and tell us, with a melancholy sigh, that all this conquest business may be very irksome, but that a mysterious Providence has put it as a "burden" upon us, which, however sorrowfully, we must bear; that this burden consists in our duty to take care of the poor people of the Philippines; and that in order to take proper care of them we must exercise sovereignty over them: and that if they refuse to accept our sovereignty we must—alas! alas!—kill them, which makes the burden very solemn and sad.

But cheer up, brethren! We may avoid that mournful way of taking care of them by killing them, if we simply recognize their right to take care of themselves, and gently aid them in doing so.

Next there are our "flag" men, who insist that we must kill the Filipinos fighting for their independence to protect the honor of the Stars and Stripes. I agree that the honor of our flag sorely needs protection. We have to protect it against desecration by those who are making it an emblem of that hypocrisy which seeks to cover a war of conquest and subjugation with a cloak of humanity and religion; an emblem of that greed which would treat a matter involving our national honor, the integrity of our institutions, and the peace and character of the Republic as a mere question of dollars and cents; an emblem of that vulgar lust of war and conquest which recklessly tramples upon right and justice and all our higher ideals; an emblem of the imperialistic ambitions which mock the noblest part of our history and stamp the greatest national heroes of our past as hypocrites or fools. These are the dangers threatening the honor of our flag, against which it needs protection, and that protection we are striving to give it.

Now, a last word to those of our fellow-citizens who feel and recognize as we do that the Philippine war of subjugation is wrong and cruel, and that we ought to recognize the independence of those people, but who insist that, having begun that war, we must continue it until the submission of the Filipinos is complete.

I detest, but I can understand, the jingo whose moral sense is obscured by intoxicating dreams of wild adventure and conquest and to whom bloodshed and devastation have become a reckless sport. I detest even more, but still I can understand, the cruel logic of those to whom everything is a matter of

dollars and cents and whose greed of gain will walk coolly over slaughtered populations.' But I must confess I can not understand the reasoning of those who have moral sense enough to recognize that this war is criminal aggression, who must say to themselves that every drop of blood shed in it by friend or foe is blood wantonly and wickedly shed, and that every act of devastation is barbarous cruelty inflicted upon an innocent people, but who still maintain that we must go on killing and devastating and driving our brave soldiers into a fight which they themselves are cursing, because we have once begun it. This I can not understand. Do they not consider that in such a war, which they themselves condemn as wanton and iniquitous, the more complete our success the greater will be our disgrace?

What do they fear for the Republic if, before having fully consummated this criminal aggression, we stop to give a people struggling for their freedom what is due them? Will this Republic be less powerful? It will be as strong as ever, nay, stronger, for it will have saved the resources of its power from useless squandering and transformed vindictive enemies into friends.

Will it be less respected? Nay, more, for it will have demonstrated its honesty at the sacrifice of false pride. Is this the first time that a powerful nation desisted from the subjugation of a weaker adversary? Have we not the example of England before us, who, after a seven years' war against the American colonists, recognized their independence? Indeed, the example of England teaches us a double lesson. England did not, by recognizing American independence, lose her position in the world and her chances of future greatness; on the contrary, she grew in strength. And secondly, England would have retained, or won anew, the friendship of the Americans, if she had recognized American independence more promptly, before appearing to have been forced to do so by humiliating defeats. Will our friends who are for Philippine independence, but also for continuing to kill those who fight it, take these two lessons to heart?

Some of them say that we have here to fulfill some of the disagreeable duties of patriotism. Patriotism! Who were the true patriots of England at the time of the American Revolution—King George and Lord North, who insisted upon subjugation; or Lord Chatham and Edwin Burke, who stood up for American rights and American liberty?

Who were the true patriots of France when, recently, that ghastly farce of a military trial was enacted to sacrifice an innocent man for the honor of the French army and the prestige of the French Republic—who were the true French patriots, those who insisted that the hideous crime of an unjust condemnation must be persisted in, or those who bravely defied the cry of "traitor!" and struggled to undo the wrong, and thus to restore the French Republic to the path of justice and to the esteem of the world?

Who are the true patriots in America to-day—those who drag our Republic once so proud of its high principles and ideals, through the mire of broken pledges, vulgar ambitions and vanities and criminal aggressions; those who do violence to their own moral sense by insisting that, like the Dreyfus iniquity, a criminal course once begun must be persisted in, or those who, fearless of the demagogue clamor, strive to make the flag of the Republic once more what it was once—the flag of justice, liberty, and true civilization—and to lift up the American people among the nations of the earth to the proud position of the people that have a conscience and obey it.

The country has these days highly and deservedly honored Admiral Dewey as a national hero. Who are his true friends—those who would desecrate Dewey's splendid achievement at Manila by making it the starting point of criminal aggression, and thus the opening of a most disgraceful and inevitably disastrous chapter of American history, to be remembered with sorrow, or those who strive so to shape the results of that brilliant feat of arms that it may stand in history not as a part of a treacherous conquest, but as a true victory of American good faith in an honest war of liberation and humanity—to be proud of for all time, as Dewey himself no doubt meant it to be.

I know the imperialists will say that I have been pleading here for Aguinaldo and his Filipinos against our Republic. No, not for the Filipinos merely, although, as one of those who have grown gray in the struggle for free and honest government, I would never be ashamed to plead for the cause of freedom and independence, even when its banner is carried by dusky and feeble hands. But I am pleading for more. I am pleading for the cause of American honor and self-respect, American interests, American democracy; aye, for the cause of the American people against an administration of our public affairs which has wantonly plunged this country into an iniquitous war; which has disgraced the Republic by a scandalous breach of faith to a people struggling for their freedom whom we had used as allies; which has been systematically seeking to deceive and mislead the public mind by the manufacture of false news; which has struck at the very foundation of our constitutional government by an Executive usurpation of the war power; which makes sport of the great principles and high ideals that have been and should ever remain the guiding star of our course, and which, unless stopped in time, will transform this Government of the people, for the people, and by the people into an imperial government cynically calling itself republican—a government in which the noisy worship of arrogant might will drown the voice of right; which will impose upon the people a burdensome and demoralizing militarism, and which will be driven into a policy of wild and rapacious adventure by the unscrupulous greed of the exploiter—a policy always fatal to democracy.

I plead the cause of the American people against all this, and I here declare my profound conviction that if this administration of our affairs were submitted for judgment to a popular vote on a clear issue it would be condemned by an overwhelming majority.

I confidently trust that the American people will prove themselves too clear-headed not to appreciate the vital difference between the expansion of the Republic and its free institutions over contiguous territory and kindred populations, which we all gladly welcome if accomplished peaceably or honorably, and imperialism which reaches out for distant lands to be ruled as subject provinces; too intelligent not to perceive that our very first step on the road of imperialism has been a betrayal of the fundamental principles of democracy, followed by disaster and disgrace; too enlightened not to understand that a monarchy may do such things and still remain a strong monarchy, while a democracy can not do them and still remain a democracy; too wise not to detect the false pride, or the dangerous ambitions, or the selfish schemes which so often hide themselves under that deceptive cry of mock patriotism: "Our country, right or wrong!" They will not fail to recognize that our dignity, our free institutions, and the peace and welfare of this and coming generations of Americans will be secure only as we cling to the watchword of true patriotism: "Our country—when right to be kept right; when wrong to be put right."

C.

CUBA AND THE PHILIPPINES—BOTH ENTITLED TO INDEPENDENCE.

To the editors of the Journal, Advertiser, Herald, and Globe, Boston, Mass.

GENTLEMEN: Will you give me space in your columns to answer a very serious attack which, I believe, all of you have published? At a meeting of the Essex Club last Saturday, Mr. Quigg, lately a Republican member of Congress from New York, after some undeserved compliment, made this statement, referring to me:

"What he wants us to do I can define in no other words than these: 'He wants us to skulk from our duty.'"

I wish to put against this statement my emphatic denial. What I wanted the American people to do in the beginning, what I have wanted them to do all along, what I want them to do now, is to do in the Philippines exactly what we have done, are doing, and expect to do in Cuba.

If we have skulked in Cuba, then Mr. Quigg may be justified in saying that I would skulk in the Philippines. We have liberated both from Spain, and we have had no thought—at least, I have had no thought—of giving either back to Spain. I should as soon give back a redeemed soul to Satan as give back the people of the Philippine Islands to the cruelty and tyranny of Spain.

Indeed, since they got arms, an army, and an organization, I do not believe it would have been in the power of Spain to subdue them again.

But the United States never, in my judgment, should have allowed her to make the attempt. Having delivered them from Spain, we were bound in all honor to protect their newly acquired liberty against the ambition or greed of any other nation on earth, and we were equally bound to protect them against our own. We were bound to stand by them, a defender and protector, until their new governments were established in freedom and in honor; until they had made treaties with the powers of the earth and were as secure in their national independence as Switzerland is secure, as Denmark is secure, as Belgium is secure, as Santo Domingo or Venezuela is secure.

Now, if this be a policy of skulking from duty, I fail to see it. Perhaps I am not so familiar with the history or the vocabulary of liberty as Mr. Quigg.

We based our policy in regard to Cuba (did we not?) on the ground that it was the policy of righteousness and liberty. We did not tempt the cupidity of any millionaire, or even the honest desire for employment of any workmen, by the argument that if we reduced the people of Cuba to our dominion we could make money out of her and she could not help herself.

In those days we were appealing to the great, noble heart of America and not to the breeches pocket.

If we were bound in honor and in righteousness, bound by the history of our own past, bound by the principles and pledges of our people, to abstain from depriving Cuba of the liberty we had given her because it was right, we are, in my judgment, all the more bound to abstain from depriving the people of the Philippine Islands of their liberties because it is right.

If I am right in affirming this as a matter of principle (and I am a little curious to see who will stand up and dispute it on Massachusetts soil, or who will speak any other doctrine to the sons of Essex), then the question becomes a question of fact.

Are the people of the Philippine Islands as well entitled to their freedom and independence as the people of Cuba?

Had they contributed as much to achieving their independence as had the people of Cuba?

Do they desire their independence as do the people of Cuba?

Are they fit to govern themselves as are the people of Cuba?

Have they forfeited their right to their independence by any misconduct, such as attacking the Army of the United States wantonly and without provocation?

Now, the facts which enable us to answer all these questions, about which the people have been so much misled during the last summer, come to us at length from the reports of the commanders of our army and navy in the Philippine Islands.

I have two witnesses to call—Otis and Dewey. While I may not adopt all their conclusions as to *policy* (and it is not the special business of soldiers and sailors to determine the policies of the country), I have no desire to go beyond them and the men for whom they vouch in the matter of *fact*.

But before citing the evidence, let me state what I would do to-day, as I have stated what I desired to do before the war broke out. The Philippine armies are scattered. General Lawton said they were the bravest men he had ever seen. But they have been beaten in every battle. Aguinaldo is a fugitive and in concealment. They are in the condition that Spain was in after Napoleon had overthrown her navies and driven out her King at the beginning of the Peninsular war, with a

* * * host as huge and strong as e'er defied
Their God and placed their trust in human pride.

Whether they will repeat the history of Spain, dispersing like foam when they are attacked, coming together again like the thundercloud, and in the end wear out the patience of the conqueror, it is not worth while to speculate.

It is not from any fear of any foeman, powerful or insignificant, that the American people are to determine their duty.

If the thing be right, they mean to do it. If it be wrong, they will not do it. I would send General Wood or General Miles or Admiral Dewey to Luzon. I would have him gather about him a cabinet of the best men among the Filipinos who have the confidence of the people and desire nothing but their welfare. In all provinces and municipalities where civil government is now established possessing the confidence of the people, I would consult with their rulers and representatives.

I would lend the aid of the Army of the United States only to keep order. I would permit the people to make laws and to administer laws, subject to some supervision or inspection till the disturbed times are over and peace has settled down again upon that country, insuring the security of the people against avarice, ambition, or peculation. So soon as it seems that government can maintain itself peacefully and in order, I would by degrees withdraw the authority of the United States, making a treaty with them that we would protect them against the cupidity of any other nation and would lend our aid *for a reasonable time* to maintain order and law.

Now, if this be skulking, if this be ignoble, if this be unworthy of an American citizen or a Massachusetts Senator, then I must plead guilty to Mr. Quigg's charge. But these are the things I would have done, and this is the thing I would do now.

If this counsel had been followed, not a man would have died on either side; not a drop of blood would have been spilled: not a recruit would have been needed by Army or Navy since the day when Manila capitulated to Otis. Nearly all of the 36 war vessels, with their 5,000 or 6,000 men, could have been ordered home more than a year ago. Our army there—greater than that with which Lee defended his lines so long; greater than that which Sherman led to the sea; greater than our armies of the Revolution, or of the war of 1812—would all have come home, except a small garrison.

I have carefully read Dewey's dispatches, including the testimony of two naval officers, whom he sent on a two months' tour through Luzon, before the conflict between our troops and those of Aguinaldo, which, under his own signature, he declares to be the best statement of the condition of things there that has been made. I have read many of the dispatches of General Otis. A few of these have been published. Some of them have, so far, been withheld from public knowledge. They establish, beyond reasonable doubt, clearly:

One. That Aguinaldo is an honest, patriotic, and brave man. Indeed, that is the express testimony of Mr. Schurman, president of Cornell University,

and president of the commission appointed by our Government to investigate matters there.

Two. That Aguinaldo was the chosen leader of the people of the Philippine Islands.

Three. That that people have from the beginning desired independence and desire it now.

Four. That this desire was communicated to our commanders when they gave them arms, accepted their aid, and brought Aguinaldo from his exile when he was put in command of 30,000 Filipino soldiers, who were already in arms and organized.

Five. That the people of the Philippine Islands, before we fired upon their troops, had delivered their own land from Spain, with the single exception of the town of Manila, and that they hemmed in the Spanish troops on land by a line extending from water to water.

Six. That we could not have captured the Spanish garrison, which was done by an arrangement beforehand, upon a mere show of resistance but for the fact that they were so hemmed in by Aguinaldo's forces and could not retreat beyond the range and fire of the guns of our fleet.

Seven. That during all this period from the beginning to the final conflict the Filipinos were repeatedly informing our Government, not only by communications addressed to the commanders on land and sea, but by those addressed to the President of the United States, that they desired their freedom, and that they were never informed of any purpose on our part to subdue them.

Eight. That they were fit for independence. They had churches, libraries, works of art, and education. They were better educated than many American communities within the memory of some of us. They were eager and ambitious to learn. They were governing their entire island, except Manila, in order and quiet, with municipal governments, courts of justice, schools, and a complete constitution resting upon the consent of the people. They were better fitted for self-government than any country on the American continent south of us, from the Rio Grande to Cape Horn; or than San Domingo or Haiti, when these countries, respectively, achieved their independence, and are fitter for self-government than some of them are now. They are now as fit for self-government as was Japan when she was welcomed into the family of nations.

Nine. That the outbreak of hostilities was not their fault, but ours. A patrol, not a hostile military force, approached a small village between the lines of the two armies, a village on the American side of the line of demarcation to which some of our soldiers had been moved in disregard of the rule applicable to all cases of truce. When this patrol approached this town it was challenged. How far the Filipinos understood our language or how far our pickets understood the reply that they made in their own language does not appear. *But we fired upon them first.* The fire was returned from their lines. Thereupon it was returned again from us, and several Filipinos were killed. As soon as Aguinaldo heard of it he sent a message to General Otis saying that the *firing was without his knowledge and against his will; that he deplored it*, and that he desired hostilities to cease, and would withdraw his troops to any distance General Otis should desire. To which the American general replied, that as the fighting had begun, it must go on.

Now, how absurd for the persons who could have stopped it at any time from the beginning with a single word of assurance that they meant to respect the liberties of the people of the Philippine Islands to charge the men who have been constantly begging them to say that word with being responsible for the continuance of the war!

Ten. That on December 28, 1898, the two sides being at peace, although great uneasiness and irritation had already manifested itself on the part of the Filipinos, who were afraid we meant to subjugate them, President McKinley sent to Otis a proclamation. Remember that a dozen times during the spring and summer and autumn Aguinaldo had proclaimed that his people were seeking their independence, and had implored the "great American people, by all their great history and traditions," with which he appears to have been quite familiar, not to interfere with it.

Now, on December 28, 1898, the President sent to Otis a proclamation, which he commanded him to issue. Otis, on reading it, to use the language of his report:

"After fully considering the President's proclamation and the temper of the Tagalos, with whom I was in daily discussion of political problems and the friendly intentions of the United States Government toward them, I concluded that there were certain words and expressions therein, such as 'sovereignty,' 'right of cession,' and those which directed immediate occupation, etc., though most admirably employed and tersely expressive of actual conditions, might be advantageously used by the Tagalo war party to incite widespread hostilities among the natives. The ignorant classes had been taught to believe that certain words, as 'sovereignty,' 'protection,' etc., had peculiar meaning disastrous to their welfare and significant of future political domination."

The ignorant people of America have been taught to believe just such things. I have seen such things in the writings of Washington and Adams and Jefferson, of Whittier and Garrison and Nathan Dane and Rantoul, and others of the men of Essex. Now Otis goes on to say:

"It was my opinion, therefore, that I would be justified in so amending the paper that the beneficent object of the United States Government would be brought clearly within the comprehension of the people."

Whereupon Otis proceeds to amend the President's proclamation by striking out everything in it which contains a purpose to assume sovereignty or protection, and which was significant of future political domination, and instead thereof he issued, on January 4, 1899, less than eight weeks before the outbreak of hostilities, a proclamation which he gives in a report, in which *he suppressed all these utterances*, and assures them that it is the purpose of the people of the United States to give them, "in every possible way, the full measure of individual rights and liberty which is the heritage of a free people." And he adds:

"I am convinced that it is the intention of the United States Government to seek the establishment of a most liberal government for the islands, in which the people themselves shall have as full representation as the maintenance of law and order will permit, and which shall be susceptible of development, on the lines of increased representation and the bestowal of increased powers, into a government as free and independent as is enjoyed by the most favored provinces of the world."

That assurance which Otis gave to the people of Manila is just what I have always wanted, and all I have always wanted, to give them. But, unhappily, Otis's proclamation was frustrated In the meantime he had sent a copy of the President's proclamation to Miller, who was lying opposite Iloilo, burning for a fight, and who, much to Otis's distress, as his dispatches show, published it. So you had the commanding general denying all purpose of domination or of interfering with their independence, on the one hand, and the President of the United States, on the other, asserting that purpose; and the Filipinos were naturally alarmed and shocked.

Otis goes on to tell how Aguinaldo appealed to his people to stand by their independence; how the Filipino newspapers took it up in angry articles, and *how the people, who were beginning to be pacified and hopeful, were excited again*, and justly.

Now, put yourselves in the places of these people. What would your fathers have done if Gage and Lord North had been the actors? What would any people on the face of the earth, whose bosoms are capable of holding the sentiment of liberty, have done?

Is it not infamous for anybody to turn around and tell you that the men who believe that the Filipinos should have been assured just what Otis tried to assure them of are responsible for the outbreak of the war? Otis says that the proclamation which actually came out, through Miller's departure from his intentions, *was calculated to cause, and did cause, the hostilities* and excite alarm and indignation in the bosoms of that freedom-seeking people.

I do not know what other men may think or what other men may say, but there is not a drop of blood in my veins, there is not a feeling in my heart that does not respect a weak people struggling with a strong one.

Some of our friends tell us that that the Filipinos are not "a people." President McKinley says they are, and that he desires "in every possible way to insure them the full measure of their individual rights and liberty which is the heritage of a free people." Otis says they are and that it is the intention of the United States Government to appoint the representative men of the Philippine islands to civil positions of trust in a government as "free and independent as is enjoyed by the most favored provinces of the earth."

When Patrick Henry was making his great speech in the old court-house in Virginia, ending with the words, "Give me liberty or give me death," he was interrupted by somebody with a shout of "treason." He finished his sentence, and replied, as every Essex schoolboy knows, "If this be treason, make the most of it."

I am unworthy to loose the latchet of the shoes of Patrick Henry; but I claim to love human liberty as well as he did, and I believe the love of human liberty will never be held to be treason by Massachusetts.

There were five of my name and blood who stood in arms at Concord bridge in the morning of the Revolution, April 19, 1775. My grandfather stood with John Adams and Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin when they presented to the Continental Congress that great paper, the bringing in of which was the foremost action of human history, which declares that the just powers of government rest upon the consent of the people, and that when a people desire it the laws of nature and the laws of God entitle them to take a separate and equal station among the nations of the earth.

And these Filipinos, as President McKinley says, and as Otis says, "are a people," and so entitled to be independent.

I have no right to feel any peculiar pride in the action of any ancestor of my own in those great days which tried men's souls, and when all true Americans thought in that way, although I should be disgraced and ought to hide my head from the gaze of men if I were to depart from those principles. But I have a right to feel a just pride in and to boast of something much higher than any personal kindred. I am a son of Massachusetts. For more than three score years and ten I have sat at her dear feet. I have seen the light of her beautiful eyes. I have heard high counsel from her lips. She has taught me to love liberty; to stand by the weak against the strong when the rights of the weak are in peril; she has led me to believe that if I do this, however humbly, however imperfectly, and whatever other men may say, I shall have her approbation and shall be deemed not unworthy of her love. Other men will do as they please. But as for me, God helping me, I can do no otherwise.

I am, faithfully yours,

GEO. F. HOAR.

D.

PLATFORM OF THE AMERICAN ANTI-IMPERIALIST LEAGUE.

We hold that the policy known as imperialism is hostile to liberty and tends toward militarism, an evil from which it has been our glory to be free. We regret that it has become necessary in the land of Washington and Lincoln to reaffirm that all men, of whatever race or color, are entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We maintain that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. We insist that the subjugation of any people is "criminal aggression" and open disloyalty to the distinctive principles of our Government.

We earnestly condemn the policy of the present National Administration in the Philippines. We deplore the sacrifice of our soldiers and sailors, whose bravery deserves admiration even in an unjust war. We protest against the extension of American sovereignty by Spanish methods.

We urge that Congress announce to the Filipinos our purpose to concede to them the independence for which they have so long fought and which of right is theirs.

The United States have always protested against the doctrine of international law which permits the subjugation of the weak by the strong. A self-governing state can not accept sovereignty over an unwilling people. The United States can not act upon the ancient heresy that might makes right.

Imperialists assume that with the destruction of self-government in the Philippines by American hands all opposition here will cease. This is a grievous error. Much as we regret the war of "criminal aggression" in the Philippines, greatly as we regret that the blood of the Filipinos is on American hands, we more deeply resent the betrayal of American institutions at home. The real firing line is not in the suburbs of Manila. The foe is of our own household.

Whether the ruthless slaughter of the Filipinos shall end next month or next year is but an incident in a contest that must go on until the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States are rescued from the hands of their betrayers. Those who dispute about standards of value while the foundation of the Republic is undermined will be listened to as little as those who would wrangle about the small economies of the household while the house is on fire. The training of a great people for a century, the aspiration for liberty of a vast immigration, are forces that will hurl aside those who in the delirium of conquest seek to destroy the character of our institutions.

We deny that the obligation of all citizens to support their government in times of grave national peril applies to the present situation. If an Administration may with impunity ignore the issues upon which it was chosen, deliberately create a condition of war anywhere on the face of the globe, debauch the civil service for spoils to promote the adventure, organize a truth-suppressing censorship, and demand of all citizens a suspension of judgment and their unanimous support while it chooses to continue the fighting, representative government itself is imperiled.

We hold with Abraham Lincoln, that "no man is good enough to govern another man without that other's consent. When the white man governs himself, that is self-government, but when he governs himself and also governs another man, that is more than self-government—that is despotism." "Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in us. Our defense is in the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men in all lands. Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves, and under a just God can not long retain it."

We cordially invite the cooperation of all men and women who remain loyal to the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

[Adopted by the Chicago conference, October 18, 1899.]

THE PRESIDENT'S POLICY—WAR AND CONQUEST ABROAD—DEGRADATION OF LABOR AT HOME.

[Address by Hon. George S. Boutwell, president American Anti-Imperialist League, at Masonic Hall, Washington, D. C., January 11, 1900, slightly revised by Hon. JOHN S. WILLIAMS.]

In the discussion on which I now enter I pass by the moral considerations which are incident to any comprehensive treatment of the Philippine war, and I address myself to the questions of business and labor in which the country is much concerned.

In some of the aspects of life ethical and moral questions occupy the highest place, but the public mind can not be directed to ethical and moral questions when the masses are not in the enjoyment of a satisfactory degree of domestic comfort. That degree of comfort can be found only where there is also a good degree of public prosperity, which itself must rest upon a public policy that secures constant employment and reasonable wages for the laboring population.

My inquiry for the moment is this: Will the subjugation of the Philippine Islands and their incorporation into the Union as equal States, or their attachment to the Government as colonial dependencies, elevate or depress the laboring population of the United States?

I omit the consideration of other interests. They are all subordinate. A public policy which secures to the laborers of the United States constant employment with remunerative wages is the best security, not perfect security—that can not be had—but the best security attainable for the prosperity of all classes.

We have undertaken, in the Chinese exclusion bill, to protect the American laborer against the actual presence of the unpaid laborers of other countries. Shall that policy be reversed?

The inhabitants of Luzon, as an example, must be treated by us, when we are called to decide upon our policy in that island, either as capable of self-government or as incapable. The population of the island is not less than 4,000,000, or 95 persons to the square mile, not excluding the portion that is covered by water. If these people are an uncivilized people, as it is alleged, and a warlike people, as warlike as they are, how many troops will be required upon a territory as large as the States of New Hampshire and Maine combined, to keep this vast multitude in subjection and in peace?

Or, how many troops will be required to maintain military stations within 10 or 20 miles of each other over the 42,000 square miles of territory? How much time will be required for that degree of peace when 10 soldiers can march 10 miles in safety in any and every part of Luzon?

How much time will be required to bring into view one native of Luzon who will in truth say: "I vote with the Army that wears the uniform and carries the flag of my country," meaning the flag of the United States?

If the inhabitants of Luzon are incapable, as they are represented to be by the President and his supporters; if they number 4,000,000 or 5,000,000, and are a warlike people, as we know they are, are there any considerations that should lead us to make war for the conquest of such a race? We may overrun the island, but its subjugation to a condition of quiet peace under the law is an impossibility. And this is the entertainment to which we are invited, and upon the theory that the inhabitants of Luzon are an incapable people. The difficulties which are thus indicated will be magnified not less than twofold when we contemplate the subjugation of the entire group.

Turn now to the other aspect of the case. Assume that they are what they are, a capable people, and that they are competent for the work of self-government; that they have received the ideas that are set forth in our Declaration of Independence. Assume, also, that the war which they are now carrying on against us is by them waged, as they think, in defense of the principles of justice, of equality, of the right of self-government, indeed, then, I inquire, how long is this crusade to be prosecuted by us in the hope of conquering a quiet peace?

If they are a people capable of self-government, then, upon the theory of the President, they are in the right and we are in the wrong. If the Filipinos are a capable or an incapable people, who can say that this war is wise and just? By what process of reasoning can it be taken out of the catalogue of national follies and crimes, and who can defend successfully those who are responsible for the inauguration and prosecution of this criminal war?

If the Filipinos are incapable of self-government, if they are living in a semibarbarous state, who rises to say that it is the part of wisdom for us to continue a contest for the subjugation of a people *whom we can not accept as political associates?*

If they are what the President maintains they are, then there is no avenue through which they can be permitted to become a part of our Government under the existing Constitution.

Our Territorial system is not a training school for the reformation of criminals or for the enlightenment of half-civilized races; but our Territories, when created, are in the quality of the inhabitants equal to the duties of statehood, wanting in numbers only. The Philippine Islands furnish inhabitants adequate for ten States. If we hold them they are with us as States or as vassals. Whoever—and in this word "whoever" I include the President of the United States—whoever accepts them, either as equals or as vassals, is the enemy of the Republic.

The war is carried on upon the theory that the Filipinos are incapable of self-government. Everywhere and always there is the admission implied, if not expressed, that if the Filipinos were capable of self-government it would be a crime in us to arrest or to thwart their enjoyment of the right. But the war itself, however viewed, is only a step toward evil results of greater magnitude if the President's policy should be sanctioned by the country. Those results I am to consider.

This question I put to the defenders of this war: What is the end that you seek? Is it the vassalage of these people? If so, then you are the enemies of the Republic and the betrayers of the principles upon which the Republic thus far has been made to rest.

If you intend to endow them with statehood in the American Union, then, whether they are a capable or an incapable people, you betray the Union to a fatal ending. Does anyone believe that with safety we can receive into this Union the millions of Asia who have no bonds of relationship with us except that they are of the human family?

The President and his adherents say, "We will prosecute this war until these people are subdued, and then we will tell you what we propose to do with them." They have not disclosed their purpose to the American people.

Terror stricken by the foreshowing of the questions that are to arise in case of success in war, the imperialists are about to submit an amendment to the Constitution by which colonial vassalage shall be made constitutional. Thus by a simple process they propose to end the Republic and create an empire. Do you ask for the evidence on which this statement is based? I answer, events are their masters. Questions are arising which can not be met, and therefore they must be avoided. The laborers and producers of this country must be deceived or cajoled or the cause of the President is lost. Whenever it is decided—and the President says that it is already decided—that Puerto Rico and the Philippines are within the jurisdiction of the United States, then the country may be called to accept the provision of the Constitution as operative in the islands, or the imperialists must show how it may be avoided.

"All duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

The novel theory is raised that the islands may be treated as American territory for certain purposes and as a foreign territory for other purposes. We are to enter upon an open-market policy in the East. The commerce of Russia, England, China, the states of Continental Europe, and all the rest, from Japan to Australia and New Zealand, is to pass in and out of the ports of Puerto Rico and the Philippines on a free-trade basis, while as to the United States not a cargo of coffee, rice, sugar, hemp, tobacco, or fruits can be brought from the islands into our continental territory except upon the payment of such duties as might be exacted upon the importation of like products from Brazil or the British West Indies. It is apprehended by the Administration, and with sufficient reasons, that the Supreme Court will say:

"The islands, being within the jurisdiction of the United States, the duties, imposts, and excises must be the same as in the country generally." Such a decision is not only required by the Constitution, but there can be no freedom of trade between the islands and the mainland unless the duties, excises, and imposts are the same.

For the purpose of government the District of Columbia is a cipher, yet no one has ever broached the notion that it was possible, under the Constitution, to establish one system of customs and excise duties for the District and another for States.

The Administration must apprehend what everybody else foresees as certain, namely, this: Whenever the Supreme Court shall reach the conclusion that the islands are within the jurisdiction of the United States, the Court will hold also that the duties, imposts, and excises must be the same in the dependencies as in the States and that the freedom of trade between Manila and New York must correspond to the freedom of trade between New York and Boston.

Such a decision means full freedom of trade between the islands and the States, and it means much more. The inhabitants of the islands, from Luzon to Sulu, slave and free, are made citizens of the United States, and no puny legislative scheme, such as has been proposed for Hawaii, can bar them out.

What does citizenship mean? First of all, it means the right, the unrestricted right, of movement, of travel, of residence, the right to labor everywhere, in everything, and in competition with everybody; the right of purchase of every form of property, from a boy's marble to the stateliest mansion in Fifth avenue.

In fine, by one unfortunate treaty, the work of an hour, we have called into existence 10,000,000 American citizens, all of another race, all ignorant of our language, ignorant of our traditions, and yet they are to be endowed with the rights of citizenship, or they are to be held in a condition of vassalage. If the Supreme Court shall prove faithful to the ideas and doctrines on which it has acted through a long century, a condition of vassalage will be impossible. Freedom and an equality of rights for these 10,000,000, and for all their descendants through the centuries of the future, or an amendment to the Constitution by which colonial vassalage shall be authorized as fundamental law of the Republic, is the alternative which the policy of this Administration opens to the country.

The laboring classes should have in mind the certain truth that free trade between the colonies and the States will follow the establishment of a colonial system, and without much delay. Such has been the policy of England.

The question before the country will be this: Shall the laboring and producing classes of America be subjected to a direct and never-ending competition with the underpaid and half-clad laborers of Asia, or shall the Republic of America be transformed into a colonial empire with like consequences to the laboring classes? This, the gravest question ever submitted to men, is the question before the country to-day, but happily a way of escape is before us if the way can be accepted now.

The way of escape must be accepted now. There must be no delay. In the month of November, 1900, the future of the nation will be decided. Republic or empire? That is the question, the only question of any importance before the country.

If any false financial or industrial policies are entered upon by a new Administration, adequate corrections may be applied in four or eight years, but a policy by which Puerto Rico and the Philippines are incorporated in the Union, or attached to it as vassal dependencies, can never be reversed until this Republic is numbered among the states that have fallen through an unjust and criminal greed of empire and power.

To me the contest of 1900 is not doubtful. We are summoning, and summoning successfully, the laboring and producing millions from every field of industry, and while we shall appeal to them upon the higher considerations of justice, of duty, of regard for the rights of others, we shall not hesitate to appeal to the selfish interests of those who are most concerned in preserving for themselves the share of independence and power which the laborers of America have enjoyed.

Some of the supporters of the Administration, particularly some of the newspapers, have scouted the assertion that the annexation of Puerto Rico and of the Philippines can work any competition with the laboring classes of the United States.

I ask: Are we to compel millions to submit to our authority and exact allegiance from them, and then deny to them the right to travel and to labor in the country to which they belong? Are we to extort from them contributions of money in peace, and exact service of them in time of war, and yet deny to them the privilege of visiting the capital of the country that they serve?

These promises of security to the laboring populations are vain. *The acquisition of these islands, in whatever form the acquisition may be made, will be followed by freedom to travel, freedom to labor, freedom to pursue every industry, freedom to practice every art, and in the next generation, if not earlier, freedom to take an equal part in the government of the country.* At this point I interject an observation: If the President's claim that these islands are now in our jurisdiction is a valid claim, and if judicial decisions are of any value as precedents, the inhabitants of Puerto Rico and the Philippines are citizens of the United States and already entitled to the freedom of which I have spoken.

The attempt to ingraft a colonial policy upon the Republic is beset with difficulties, with perils, in every direction.

We are demanding an open door to all the markets of China and heralding the demand with a menace of war. If we establish our tenancy in the Philippine Islands can we press a demand upon China and close the Philippines to the Chinese?

And if not to China, how about England and the rest of the world? Where is our open-door, free-trade policy to end? And with what results to American labor and American industries? If we establish our tenancy in the Philippine Islands, do not the islands become an open door for the free ingress of the Mongolian race—peoples in no way distinguishable from the present occupants of the islands? If the islands are treated as of the United States, then the United States becomes the receptacle of the Mongolian race. The thousand islands are so near to each other that passage from neighbor to neighbor is a journey of minutes or hours only, and a police of the islands to prevent immigration into them or migration from island to island is an impossibility. Thus does the Administration invite the country to a policy by

which these islands are to become an open avenue through which so many, and as many as may choose to pass over, are to have an opportunity to pass over to this continent.

On what ground and for what reasons have we excluded Chinese Mongolians from the States and Territories of the American Union? For this, and this assuredly—that they outnumbered our millions many times over, and that in labor contests our laboring classes would be broken down, impoverished, and ruined. That was our defense, and a sufficient defense for a policy which otherwise was indefensible. But now, by a course of indirection on which the Administration has entered, that bar which was wisely set up is to be broken down.

When this country shall realize the truth that the perils of which I am speaking are not imaginary, but that they are inevitable in some degree of magnitude, and when the Administration shall be forced to admit the existence of these perils, there will then be set before us two ways of escape, and I assume that the resources of statesmanship can not furnish a third.

For a long twelvemonth the anti-imperialists have been the advocates of a way of escape, and to that way they adhere. They claim that the Philippine Islands, either as one state or as several states, may set up and maintain independent governments, guided, if such shall be their wish, by our friendship and protecting hand. For this and for this only, for this is the extent of our demands and the aim and end of all our doings, we have been arraigned as the enemies of the country by General Otis, in Manila, and by the President in America. On the issue so raised the judgment of the country will be rendered in November next.

The country has a right to know the object, the specific object, for which the war is now prosecuted.

The Congress has not spoken. The President conceals his purpose, but from the circumstances it may be inferred, in part at least, with unerring certainty. He intends to prosecute the war until the Filipinos are subdued. This is announced. We demand peace without delay, and without submission on the part of the Filipinos. If the outcome of the war shall be victory and the abject submission of the Filipinos, their exercise of the right of self-government must depend upon our opinion of their ability to govern themselves. Such is the policy and the purpose of the President. It can not be the purpose of the President to admit the Filipinos to the right of self-government, as that admission must bring the war to an end at once, and it would be admission also that the war is unnecessary and unjust. Thus is the proof sufficient that the President intends to hold the Philippines as subjugated possessions.

Our claim is that the Filipinos shall be free, and set up such a government as may be agreeable to them and independently of any dictation by us. This plan so presented to the country, in the presence of the perils that are incident to the acceptance of the Philippines, either as colonial possessions or as prospective States, will compel the Administration imperialists to present a counter scheme.

It is affirmed, with a show of probability, that a scheme has been prepared or contemplated already.

The scheme must be this:

An amendment of the Constitution by which the United States may be authorized to acquire and to hold colonies, and to exercise full and exclusive jurisdiction over them. Thus is the Republic to be transformed into an empire.

Nothing less will meet the exigency in which the Administration will be involved.

Fortunate it is for us that the question of an amendment to the Constitution must be delayed, and that the question arising on our demand takes precedence in time.

Our issue is made up for November next, and on that issue we expect a controlling vote from the laboring and industrial classes, if not indeed a unanimous vote, which is our reasonable demand in the circumstances that exist. We shall be told that the laborers need not fear competition, and that the laborers of America are so intelligent and expert that they may defy competition.

The experience of the country is answer to these delusive promises. The Chinese will pursue employment and attractive wages the world over, and they become imitative workers in every branch of industry. Of this we have knowledge from experience. I now repeat what I said of the Chinese on a former occasion, and as long ago as December 28, 1898. I then said: "They can defy competition, and that peculiarity is the only adequate defense for our hostile legislation. They can manage a bank or run a laundry with a certainty of success that can not be foretold of any other people, whether English or American or Hebrew."

The laborers of this country have now an opportunity, and the only opportunity they can ever have, to put an end to the scheme of establishing a colonial empire, to be followed by the degradation of the laboring population through competition with the laborers of the East. Whatever may be the purpose of the President, his policy contemplates the establishment of a colonial empire and the downfall of the labor class, which now is a necessary and intelligent force in the civilization of America and the progress of the world.

There are those who affect to excuse the President upon the ground that he is in the hands of men abler than himself. At this point I am with the President in not accepting that excuse. It is now many months since I gave the President credit for signal ability in the work of transforming this Republic into an empire. Since that time his conduct and career have strengthened my conviction that he is supreme over all the men who are around him, whether of the Cabinet or of the members of the Republican party in Congress who give him their support.

By the criminal law every man is responsible for the natural consequence of his acts. This rule is applied in affairs of government. Nor can any public officer plead good motives as a defense for bad doings, and in an intelligent magistrate good motives and bad doings can never be associated.

The protocol was dictated by the President; the treaty was extorted from Spain through a commission that was subservient, Democrat as well as Republican, and without a show of resistance; the treaty was ratified by his persistency and the aid of such appliances as he could command; and, finally, his proclamation of power and purpose, of December 21, 1898, became a declaration of war without the authority of Congress, as early as the 5th day of January, 1899, by its publication in the city of Manila.

It is now eleven months since war flagrant was begun, and it is now eleven months since General Otis first, and the President afterwards, refused to listen to terms of peace or to concede an hour's delay in the prosecution of the war.

An account current can not now be written, but trustworthy general statements may be made.

Thousands of young men have fallen in the skirmishes, or died in the morasses, or lingered in the hospitals to a fatal ending, and thus grief inextinguishable has been sent into thousands of otherwise happy homes. Of these, and many unknown, I mention Lawton and Howard and Logan, and others whose names are familiar to the country. What return has as yet been made for these sacrifices? What return is promised by those who defend the war? Some say it means an enlargement of the field for missionary undertakings, as though the propagation of any form of religion can justify war and the sacrifice of human life.

Some say it means more markets and more trade, forgetting that human life is more valuable than merchandise, and that the lives of our young men already sacrificed can not be compensated for by the extension of markets for liquors and cotton cloths. Some believe that new markets can be gained by making enemies of mankind.

Some are animated by a vindictive spirit, and they urge on the war that the Philippines may be punished for refusing to submit to our demands. And some there are who fear that they may be counted as "Little Americans," and they vainly imagine that something of honor may come to *them* if America shall be recognized as a world power.

And some there are who favor the war because they have outgrown the Declaration of Independence and the preamble of the Constitution, and they are urging the country on to the same conclusion.

If the war should be closed in February, 1900, our expenditures will have then exceeded $200,000,000, and of the deficiency of $51,000,000 now called for a large part will be required for the support of the Army during the current six months.

Thus far what has been accomplished? I ask. Commissioner Worcester boasts that two regiments can march anywhere in Luzon. That is not a condition of peace. It is a condition of war.

We hold a number of posts in Luzon and in other islands. Wherever we are in force, there is peace and there are pretended friends; wherever we are not in force, there are enemies and threatenings of war. The ground that we occupy is under our rule, but all else is foreign territory.

In Luzon we may have one soldier to every square mile. In the other islands we may have one soldier for every 5 and 20 square miles. In Luzon the natives number 95 to the square mile, and in the group they number 75. The President demands military rule for the Philippines. One foreign soldier to rule and 75 natives to obey. And yet the President tells us that liberty, equality, and justice go with the flag!

Ours is a policy of justice, a policy of peace. This policy ends the war in the Philippines; it ends the sacrifice of the youth of America; it puts far away the perils to which the laboring populations are now exposed; it guarantees to us perpetual friendship of new-born republics, and it relieves us from the suspicion that we are to cooperate with England in an attempt to subjugate the weaker states of the world to the domination of the Anglo-Saxon race.

E.

A LIBERTY CATECHISM.

[By Frederick W. Gookin. Slightly revised by Hon. JOHN S. WILLIAMS.]

Our defense is in the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men in all lands everywhere. Destroy this spirit and you have planted the seed of despotism at your own doors.—*Abraham Lincoln.*

I never had a feeling politically that did not spring from the sentiments embodied in the Declaration of Independence. * * * Now, my friends, can this country be saved upon this basis? If it can, I shall consider myself one of the happiest men in the world if I can help to save it. If it can not be saved upon that principle it will be truly awful. But if this country can not be saved without giving up that principle, I was about to say I would rather be assassinated on this spot than surrender it.—*Abraham Lincoln. From speech in Independence Hall, 1861.*

Q. What is the underlying principle upon which the Government of the United States of America is based?

A. That governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. This is the foundation stone upon which our institutions rest. To deny its applicability to all men in all lands is to repudiate it altogether, to declare self-government merely an expedient and despotism right. There is not one great natural law of human rights for us alone and another law for those whom we may think not entitled to rank with us in the scale of civilization.

Q. Can not the United States have "subjects?"

A. No. Under the Constitution of the United States all the people living within its jurisdiction must be either its citizens or aliens owing it no allegiance.

Q. How about the American Indians?

A. They are aliens under our protectorate or suzerainty, and, except in so far as it has been justified by the necessity for self-defense, our treatment of the Indians has been and is inconsistent with our institutions and the principles upon which they are founded. It is a blot upon our civilization and shows more clearly than any theoretical argument how ill-adapted a republican government is to rule over subject peoples.

Q. Why can not the United States have dependents who are not its citizens?

A. It would be contrary to the Constitution, and would nullify the fundamental idea that all men are born equal and have an inherent right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. In acquiring dependents the country must necessarily be false to its principles and its traditions and thereby proclaim to the world that its citizens no longer hold these principles and traditions to be true.

Q. Why so?

A. Because in assuming the right to take away or to curtail the liberty of other people and to govern them without their consent the first principle of the Declaration of Independence has been violated, and manhood suffrage virtually declared a failure.

Q. But may not this country govern dependent peoples better than they can govern themselves?

A. Possibly, but not probably. Even though we could govern a dependent people better than they could govern themselves, to make the attempt would be a monstrous wrong both to them and to ourselves.

Q. Why would it be a wrong to them?

A. Our Supreme Court, the authorized interpreter of our Constitution, has said: "A power in the General Government to obtain and hold colonies and dependent Territories over which they (the Congress) might legislate without restriction *would be inconsistent with its own existence in its present form.*" (Scott *vs.* Sanford, 19 How., 397.)

In another case that court has said: "The power of Congress over the Territories is limited by the obvious purposes for which it was conferred, and those purposes are satisfied by measures which prepare the people of the Territories to become States in the Union." (Murphy *vs.* Ramsey, 114 U. S. Rep., 15.)

In still another case it said: "The Territories acquired by Congress, *whether by deed of cession from the original States or by treaty with a foreign country,* are held with the object, as soon as their population and condition justify it, of being admitted into the Union as States, upon an equal footing with the original States in all respects." (Shively *vs.* Bowlby, 152 U. S., 1.)

In still another case it said: "The Constitution was made for the benefit of every citizen of the United States and there is no citizen, *whatever his condition or wherever he may be within the territory of the United States,* who has not a right to its protection." (U. S. *vs.* Moore, 3 Cranch, 159.)

And in defining the rights of the inhabitants of Territories it said: "The personal and civil rights of the inhabitants of the Territories are secured to them, as to other citizens, by the principles of constitutional liberty, which restrain all the agencies of government, State and national. (Murphy *vs.* Ramsey, 114 U. S. Rep., 15. See also Mormon Church *vs.* United States, 136 U. S. Rep., 1.)

The fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States provides that "all persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof are citizens of the United States."

Chief Justice Marshall, for the entire court, defined the term "United States" as follows: "Does this term designate the whole or any particular portion of the American empire? Certainly this question can admit of but one answer. It is the name given to our great Republic, which is composed of States and Territories. The District of Columbia or the territory west of the Missouri is not less within the United States than Maryland or Pennsylvania." (Loughborough *vs.* Blake, 5 Wheaton, 137.)

Judge Cooley, whose commentaries are universally accepted as conclusive interpretations of our constitutional law, summarizes the doctrine as follows: "*And when territory is acquired, the right to suffer States to be formed therefrom and to receive them into the Union must follow of course, not only because the Constitution confers the power to admit new States without restriction, but also because it would be inconsistent with institutions founded on the fundamental idea of self-government that the Federal Government should retain territory under its own imperial rule and deny the people the customary local institutions.*" (Cooley's Principles of Constitutional Law, 170.)

Because all peoples have an inherent and inalienable right to their liberty—the right to live their own lives in their own way and to govern themselves or to be governed as they choose and by whom they choose. Whether such government be good or bad does not in the slightest degree affect that right. * * *

Q. Why would it be a wrong to ourselves?

A. Because we can not trample on the liberty of others without blunting our ability to distinguish between right and wrong where liberty is concerned. It is incredible folly to think even for a moment that either by virtue of our intelligence or our numbers we are so superior as to be emancipated from the weaknesses of human nature. * * *

Q. Are there other reasons why it would be a wrong to ourselves to attempt the government of an unwilling people even though it be for their good?

A. Yes. The only way in which we can govern a distant dependency is by permitting the Executive to exercise powers which must ever be a menace to the liberty of our citizens. The danger in this may seem remote, but it is a short step from the deprivation of the liberty of some of the people to the curtailment of the liberty of all.

Q. But surely this is taking fright at a bugaboo of the imagination. The danger is not one that the people of such a strong nation as the United States need consider?

A. The danger is not imaginary. Political, that is party, prejudice easily lures people into a sense of security and of acquiescence in a course which, under the guise of beneficence and with the noisy acclaim of patriotism, is nevertheless insidiously stealing away their liberties. How many of the American people realize that President McKinley is now waging a war for which he has not the sanction of Congress? Think of this and what it portends! How many realize that the people are without official information about the causes which led to the outbreak? And yet the Administration asks to be supported blindly in whatever it may do. "On the principles of this argument," to quote the words of Edmund Burke, "the more mischiefs we suffer from any administration, the more our trust in it is to be confirmed. *Let them but get us into a war, and then their power is safe, and an act of oblivion passed for all their misconduct.*"

Q. But is it not the duty of the citizen to uphold the Administration and be loyal to it under all circumstances?

A. The duty of the citizen is to be loyal to his *country* under all circumstances and to be prepared to give his life for it if need be. But loyalty to an administration is an entirely different thing. The most unpatriotic and most disloyal thing, short of actual treason, of which a citizen can be guilty is to support an administration which is pursuing a policy that he believes to be detrimental to his country's welfare and fundamentally wrong. His duty under such circumstances is to denounce both the measures and the men, and to use all the lawful means at his command to bring about a change for the better. Is the President, who is the servant of the sovereign people, superior to the laws of the land and the limitations imposed by the Constitution? Shall we as citizens permit him to create any new condition whatsoever and sit by in silence, abrogating our right to criticise his acts and to call him to account for them? No—a thousand times no, for that were the end of self-government. "Respect for the office of President may not release the humblest citizen from the duty of bringing its incumbent before the bar of public opinion when he transgresses."

Q. But surely this can not be his duty in time of war?

A. A clear distinction should be made between a war which threatens the integrity of the nation and one like the present, which is a war of "criminal aggression," and which we can stop at any moment we choose.

The moral code for a nation is not different from that for an individual. For the one as for the other to recede from a wrong position is honorable; to persist in maintaining it is dishonorable.

Q. Why do you characterize the war in the Philippine Islands as "criminal aggression"?

A. It is a war the purpose of which is the subjugation of the people of those islands, or, in other words, a war of "forcible annexation," which President McKinley has properly declared to be, by our code of morality, "criminal aggression."

Q. But it is absurd to speak of "forcible annexation" in this connection. Were not the islands already annexed by purchase from Spain before the war with the Filipinos began?

A. The vender of property can convey no better title than he has. Spain sold the United States something she had already lost. At the time the treaty was negotiated the entire country of the Philippines, with the exception of the city of Manila and a few ports occupied by Spanish garrisons, was in possession of the insurgent Filipinos, and these places were closely invested and in imminent danger of falling into their hands also. We acquired no better moral right to the Philippine Islands by the purchase of them from Spain than we would have acquired to Mexico had Spain ceded that country to us also. Our title of sovereignty over the Philippines is precisely identical with the title to rule over this country which France would have acquired, if, while the Revolutionary war was in progress, she had destroyed the British fleet in the harbor of New York, with our aid had captured that city, and, being successful in European waters, had forced England to cede the American colonies to her on payment of $20,000,000. It is inconceivable that the American people can recognize the validity of such a title.

* * * * * * * *

And even if we were to admit, for the sake of argument, that the United States has a valid legal title to the Philippine Islands, that would not in the slightest degree alter the case so far as the right and the wrong of our treatment of their inhabitants is concerned. Moreover, it must be borne constantly in mind that the forcible subjugation of these people, if allowed to proceed unchallenged, will establish a precedent dangerous to our liberty, a precedent likely to lead to other encroachments on liberty, the extent of which can not be predicted. Only by "eternal vigilance" can liberty be preserved. We who inherit it as our political birthright are in danger of not appreciating how easily that birthright may be stolen away.

* * * * * * *

It is the politicians who brand as "traitors" and as "Little Americans" those who have the courage to protest against their wanton acts. And if the United States is to have colonial dependencies, unless they are placed under military rule, it is these same politicians who will govern them either in person or by proxy and doubtless plunder their people. It is they who will have additional and despotic powers.

Q. But politicians are not all corrupt or incompetent. Why should you assume that the President will appoint unfit men to govern the Philippine Islands.

A. We do not say that unfit men would necessarily be selected. We do, however, assert that the teaching of experience as regards other political appointments is such that no thinking man can reasonably expect that the government of the islands will be purer and more free from corruption than are the governments of our great cities here at home. There is every probability that it will be much worse. Our system is one of self-government. The safety of the people against misgovernment lies in their power to "turn the rascals out" on election day.

The people of the Philippine Islands would have no such power. Unless made citizens of the United States, with full rights as such, for them there would be merely "taxation without representation," a thing which our forefathers declared to be intolerable tyranny. Who knows what kind of men future Presidents may appoint, or, indeed, what may be expected of the man who has violated his own and his party's solemn promises, and has debauched the civil service in the interest of his political hangers-on. No reliance can be placed on a President who keeps the people of the United States in ignorance of what caused the outbreak of hostilities, and, so far as he can, of what is going on at the seat of war.

Q. Surely you do not question the wisdom of the censorship established by the commander of the American troops in the Philippines?

A. So far as it relates to the plans of the campaign or any information that might aid our antagonists, it is entirely justifiable as a military measure. So far as anything and everything else is concerned, it is an unwarrantable interference with the constitutional rights of the American people.

Q. To what rights do you refer?

A. The right of freedom of speech and the liberty of the press, which neither Congress nor the Executive may in any way interfere with or abridge. These rights are guaranteed to the people by the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States. The power of voting means that the voter, as a preparation for voting, must have liberty to hear what is said on both sides of every question. In view of this right, the exclusion from the mail for the Philippines of Mr. Edward Atkinson's pamphlets is an absolutely unjustifiable outrage against the citizens of the United States as a whole. Even in time of war American soldiers are American citizens. Every citizen of the Republic has the right to express his opinion upon any subject, at any time, without let or hindrance.

Q. But is it not treasonable in time of war to express opinions in opposition to the policy which the Government is pursuing—opinions which may encourage the enemy or discourage our troops and incidentally result in more casualties in our Army than there might be otherwise?

A. No. The Constitution of the United States defines treason thus: "Treason against the United States shall consist *only* in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid or comfort. No person shall be convicted of treason unless on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act, or on confession in open court."

Chief Justice Story, in his book on the Constitution, says that this definition was made because "free governments, as well as despotic governments, have been ready to convict, upon the most slender proof, some of their most distinguished and virtuous statesmen, as well as persons of inferior character. *They have inflamed into the criminality of treason acts of just resistance to tyranny, and tortured a manly freedom of opinion into designs subversive of the Government.*" As for "sedition," there is and can be no such thing in the United States. The Federalists tried to create that offense and failed in ignominy.

Q. But were not the so-called "copperheads" during the civil war justly regarded as traitors by the people of the North?

A. The copperheads were justly execrated, because the nation was engaged in a struggle for its existence. But even in the heat of that bitter conflict the right to express any opinion, not excepting sympathy with those who were attempting to destroy the Union, was recognized and respected.

Q. And why should not the anti-imperialists be classed with the copperheads and be viewed with the same opprobrium?

A. There is no resemblance whatever between them. The copperheads were disloyal to their country in speech, if not in deed, and were traitors at heart. * * * The anti-imperialists neither sympathize with traitors nor with their country's enemies at home or abroad. They are sincerely sorry that the lives of brave soldiers of the United States should be sacrificed in attempting to deprive a struggling people of their liberty.

They do not, as charged by Senator PLATT, want their country's arms to be defeated, nor rejoice when casualties to our troops are reported. What the anti-imperialists desire is to hold the United States true to the ideals of human equality and freedom; their aim is the preservation of government by the people.

* * * * * * * *

Q. What do the anti-imperialists believe in regard to the Philippines?

A. They believe that the people of the Philippine Islands are and of right ought to be free and independent.

Q. But the Administration's design is purely one of "benevolent assimilation," and contemplates the establishment of a just and humane government under our protection, with a prospect of self-government as soon as they are fit for it. Why should fault be found with such a beneficent programme?

A. 1. The Administration has no lawful power to prescribe any form of government, nor can it in the absence of legislation by Congress say what shall be done.

2. The form of government outlined by the Philippine Commission during the conference with the representatives of the Filipinos in April, 1899, is open to the same objections that were urged against the proposition for autonomy made by Spain to Cuba, which the press and the people of the United States pronounced incompatible with liberty or even reasonable safety from tyrannous aggression.

3. The Filipinos may be unfit for self-government, but the assertion that they are not fit is a gratuitous assumption. It is the plea of the tyrant uttered under the dictates of supposed self-interest. When they have had the opportunity of trying to govern themselves and have failed, then, and not until then, will it be time for us to pronounce them unfit. While opinions in regard to their fitness vary, the views of the most competent observers are uniformly favorable to the Filipinos.

Admiral Dewey is on record as saying that he considers them "far superior in their intelligence and more capable of self-government than the Cubans." These words were used in a telegram to the Secretary of the Navy

dated June 23, 1898. Two months later, in a letter dated August 29, he referred the Department back to this expression, and added: "Further intercourse with them has confirmed me in this opinion." The constitution under which they are now working is in itself the strongest kind of testimony to their ability. Mr. John Barrett, late minister from the United States to Siam and an ardent imperialist, says that by the middle of October, 1898, Aguinaldo "had assembled at Malolos a congress of 100 men who would compare in behavior, manner, dress, and education with the average men of the better classes of other Asiatic nations, possibly including the Japanese. These men, whose sessions I repeatedly attended, conducted themselves with great decorum, and showed a knowledge of parliamentary law that would compare not unfavorably with the Japanese Parliament." In the same month two officers of Admiral Dewey's fleet, Paymaster W. H. Wilcox and Cadet R. L. Sargent, made a tour of nearly 600 miles through the interior of Luzon. Their report to the Navy Department, extracts from which were printed in the Evening Bulletin, Philadelphia, February 1, 1899, shows that they found everywhere peace and order under organized civil government.

4. As Americans, who believe in self-government, no form of government in the Philippines should be acceptable to us which does not come from the people themselves. We should simply protect them from foreign interference while they work out their own problem, or fail in so doing, should they prove incapable.

5. *Submission to arbitrary rule from without does not fit a people for self-government. Fitness for it has never fallen upon a people like manna from above. It has everywhere been a self-achievement, a growth from within, not a benefaction from without.*

Q. What then do the antiimperialists believe should be the policy of the United States in regard to the Philippines?

A. They believe that we should turn the islands over to their inhabitants, help them establish a proper and responsible government on liberal principles, and withdraw as soon as we can with dignity do so, continuing only our protection for a reasonable time against any outside interference with their freedom. This, it may be remarked, is far different from "giving the islands over to anarchy." As stated by President Jordan, of Leland Stanford University:

"It is bad statesmanship to make these alien people our partners; it is a crime to make them our slaves. If we hold their lands there is no middle course.* Only a moral question brings a crisis to a man or nation. In the presence of a crisis only righteousness is right and only justice is safe."

Q. You are proceeding upon the false assumption that Aguinaldo and his followers represent the entire Philippine people instead of a small fraction only of one tribe out of the many which inhabit the islands. Would it not be a crime to deliver the people of the islands into the hands of this unscrupulous man, who, in December, 1897, betrayed them by accepting a bribe of $400,000 from Spain, and whose sole purpose in carrying on the war is "not the liberty of the Filipino peoples, but the continuance of his own arbitrary and despotic power?"

A. If hostilities are suspended it will be easy to provide that the inhabitants of the Philippines shall all have an opportunity of choosing the kind of government they want. Should they prefer to set up two or more independent states instead of one, that is a matter about which we need not concern ourselves.

As to Aguinaldo, it is not likely that the people who are making such stubborn resistance to the Army of the United States in the hope of gaining their freedom will long submit to his rule should it prove oppressive. The charge that he accepted a bribe from Spain has been thoroughly disproved.†

Q. But would you haul down the American flag when once it has been hoisted over a land as a part of our country's possessions?

A. The United States flag has always hitherto been a symbol of liberty. It stands, first of all, for self-government. It is a degradation to the flag when it is raised over a people who are not made free and to whom, therefore, it becomes a symbol of slavery. It is an honor to the flag and to the nation to remove it from any place where it ought not to be; *and it ought not to be in any place where it does not signify freedom and self-government for all over whom it waves.*

Q. If this sentiment is right, why should not the flag be withdrawn from Cuba and Puerto Rico as well as from the Philippines?

A. It should, unless we are prepared to make these islands a part of the United States—that is, to grant their people all the rights and privileges of citizenship, which they on their part accept, at the same time freely consenting to all the duties and obligations thereby incurred. Notwithstanding Mr. McKinley's declaration that wherever the flag is raised "it stands not for despotism and oppression, but for liberty, opportunity, and humanity," to the people of Puerto Rico, Cuba, and the Philippines it signifies both despotism and oppression. It may signify "liberty and opportunity" for Americans in those islands, but not for their natives. It would not be liberty for them to be governed by us. It is not liberty for any people to be governed by another unless they freely consent to be so governed.

Q. How would it benefit the Filipinos if we should grant them independence? As we have no constitutional warrant for establishing a protectorate over them, would it not mean that the islands would be seized by some European power desirous of increasing its domain in the Orient?

A. The probability of such a seizure is pure assumption. It would never take place if, as is most likely, the people of the United States, through their representatives in Congress, can find some lawful way in which to give notice to the rest of the world that no other nation will be allowed to interfere with the independence of any people whom the United States has made free.

This is the only tenure by which the South American Republics have held or do hold their independencies. We have undoubted constitutional right to enter into a treaty with any people whose independence we recognize, and by a provision of that treaty guarantee such people our protection.

But even in the event of such a seizure it is probable that the lot of the Filipinos would be no worse than under our dominion.

Q. Why not? Do American ideals count for nothing?

A. The American ideal is self-government. It is inconceivable that a succession of American "carpet-baggers," each ruling, in all probability not longer than four years, would govern a dependent people more wisely and humanely than the trained officials of such countries as England, France, or Germany. However this may be, we have no more right to govern the Filipinos without their consent, because forsooth some other nation might do so if we should not, than a man has to loot his neighbor's house on the theory that if he does not do it some one else will.

Besides that, leaving the Filipinos, their rights and their interests, out of the question, it is not to our interest. Keeping them hurts us, and will continue to hurt us. If you held a hot brick which was burning you, would you hesitate to drop it for fear some one else would pick it up?

Q. But how can we withdraw from the Philippines without compromising our dignity, if we do so without first chastising Aguinaldo and his followers into submission? Would not our withdrawal be a cowardly confession of impotence?

A. Our physical courage and power are not in question; they are recognized the world over. But what shall be said of our moral courage if we dare not do what is right and just? The question of withdrawal presents difficulties only to those whose reasoning faculties are suspended by what has been called "war drunkenness," whose ideas of "honor" are those of the duelist. It is all the easier because we were the aggressors and caused the conflict needlessly.

Q. What evidence is there that we were the aggressors?

A. The preponderance of testimony appears to show that the material facts in the case are the following: We made the Filipinos our allies. Through Consul-General Pratt at Singapore, Consul-General Wildman at Hongkong, and others, we led them to believe that in return for their cooperation we would assist them in gaining their independence. At the urgent request of Admiral Dewey General Aguinaldo joined him in Hongkong before the fleet sailed for Manila. In his official dispatch to the Secretary of the Navy on June 27, 1898, Admiral Dewey said:

"Aguinaldo, insurgent leader, with 13 of his staff, arrived May 19, by permission, on the *Nashan*. * * * I have given him to understand that I consider insurgents as friends, being opposed to a common enemy. He has gone to attend a meeting of insurgent leaders *for the purpose of forming a civil government.*"

On July 4, 1898, General Anderson wrote to Aguinaldo formally soliciting his "cooperation" against the Spanish forces. (See Senate Document No. 62, Fifty-fifth Congress, p. 300.) After General Otis assumed command of the United States forces in the Philippines the treatment of the Filipino soldiers generally changed, and if the conflict was not deliberately provoked, the tactics adopted by the American commander in forcing the lines of Aguinaldo's troops were such as could scarcely fail of such a result. Apparently no attempt was made to conciliate the Filipinos.

Instead we refused for months to give them any answer to their questions as to our plans, and both in Paris and in Washington we rejected and insulted their envoys. On December 21st, before the treaty had been ratified either by the United States or by Spain, President McKinley, without authority of law, and usurping power not then vested in him, issued a proclamation directing General Otis to take possession of the islands and establish a military government therein, saying: "The *actual occupation and administration* of the entire group of the Philippine Islands becomes immediately necessary." At the time these words were uttered we were in possession of Manila and Cavite; all the remainder of the country was held by the Filipinos.

That the Filipinos should oppose the President's order is not strange, for it was so worded as to be *tantamount to a declaration of war* against them. Nevertheless, the conflict did not begin at once, nor is it known what led up to it. It is known, however, that shortly before it began a regiment of our troops was thrown forward in a V-shaped wedge in such a manner as to separate the Filipino camp into two parts. Communication between the two divisions of the Filipinos was thus interrupted. The fight began, we are told, between a sentry, Private W. W. Grayson, of Company D, First Nebraska Volunteers, and a Filipino soldier who was passing by and declined to halt when challenged.

According to Grayson's story the man replied "halto" in a mocking voice, "and so," says Grayson, "I thought the best thing was to shoot him, and fired." Which side began the conflict is not material. We are told that Aguinaldo promptly disavowed any responsibility for the affair and offered to move his troops to a distance and establish a neutral zone between the armies, thus affording an opportunity for the peaceable adjustment of the difficulty. The reply of General Otis was that the fighting having begun, it must go on to the bitter end, unless, indeed, the Filipinos should surrender unconditionally.

Q. Why does not the Administration respond to the demand of the people of the United States for information about what led to the conflict with the Filipinos and publish "*verbatim et literatim*" the instructions given to General Otis?

A. We can not tell what reasons the Administration may have for keeping silence in spite of the demand, but the inevitable inference is that the President and his Cabinet are afraid to let the people of the country know the whole truth.

Q. Have the people of the United States a right to know?

A. Yes. The people are sovereign. The President and his advisers are, or should be, their servants, not their masters. The rights of every citizen are equal to the rights of every other citizen. Public policy may justify withholding some information from the whole people for a time, but only when the interests of the people as a whole might suffer from its publication. Fear that knowledge of facts might alienate the support of a majority of the people from the party which happens to be in office is not a valid reason for concealment. As it is impossible to conceive how the interests of the people as a whole can suffer by disclosing what is now asked, the antiimperialists challenge the Administration to proclaim the facts without diminution or enlargement.

Q. If this challenge is not accepted, what then?

A. The people will know that the Administration does not dare to let them know all the facts.

Q. If the facts were made kn own you would find some way to belie them

* The Supreme Court of the United States has said: "Every nation acquiring territory, by treaty or otherwise, must hold it subject to the constitution and laws of its own government." (Pollard *vs.* Hogan, 3 How., 312.)

And in another case, decided in 1898, defining the rights of a Chinaman born of alien parents, it held that: "All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside." (United States *vs.* Wong Kim Ark, 169 U. S. Rep., 649, 703.)

Under these decisions and those previously quoted, it is clear that all children born in annexed territory will be citizens of the United States.

† The facts are that the $400,000 paid to Aguinaldo by the Spanish Government was a part of the sum promised at the treaty of Biac na Bato, in December, 1897, as a pledge for certain reforms, in consideration for which the insurgent leaders agreed to leave the country. In the memoranda on the Philippines sent to the peace commission, August 30, 1898, by our General Greene, he refers to "the very honorable position taken by Aguinaldo" in regard to this matter, and says: "Aguinaldo claimed that the money was a trust fund and was to remain on deposit until it was seen whether the Spaniards would carry out their promised reforms, and if they failed to do so it was to be used to defray the expenses of a new insurrection. No steps have been taken to introduce the reforms * * * and Aguinaldo is now using the money to carry on the operations of the present insurrection." For further and more detailed information see Senate Document No. 62, Fifty-fifth Congress.

However, the Filipinos will soon be forced to submit. That will settle the whole question, will it not?

A. No; most assuredly it will not. It will not even settle the question what is to be done with the unfortunate Filipinos in the immediate future; and the greater question of right and wrong will still remain and will be no less a burning question then than it is to-day. The conquest of these people will intensify rather than remove the menace to free government at home which, as has already been pointed out, imperial democracy necessarily involves.

Q. You are wasting your sympathy. Can you deny that the people of the English colonies are much better off than when they governed themselves?

A. We do not deny it, though for the most part they were never self-governing peoples in the democratic sense, and the case of England and her dependencies furnishes no parallel for us. And we do not deny that the Filipinos would most likely be better off under American rule than they were under Spanish dominion. Even great wrongs may be followed by some good results. *The serious question for the people of this country to consider is what effect the imperial policy will have upon ourselves if we permit it to be established.* The welfare of the Filipinos is but an incident in the proposed departure from fundamental American principles.

Q. The serious question to my mind is whether we shall throw away a golden opportunity. Do not the Philippine Islands promise a rich harvest for the people of the United States which should be realized at all hazards?

A. The greater the probable harvest the greater the crime of wresting the islands from their rightful owners. But there will be no harvest for the people of the United States. A handful of them may amass riches through the grant of valuable concessions; the mass of the people will surely have to contribute through taxation to the maintenance of the troops necessary to reap the harvest for the few.

Q. Well, there is some force in what you say. But surely you must admit that we have a duty to perform and that this duty should determine the destiny of the Filipinos.

A. Yes, we have a duty to perform, a great and sacred duty, a duty to ourselves and to civilization—the duty of living up to our principles if these principles are right. It is not our duty to rob another people of their country nor to murder them for defending their liberty. The moral law is the same for nations as for individuals.

Q. Well, never mind that point. Really, you know we are not so very far apart in our views, except as to what should be done. I disapproved at first of the idea of taking the Philippines, but now that we have taken the islands, how can we let them go? If we do so, will it not stultify us in the eyes of the world, and lead to the downfall of the Republican party?

A. The way to let go of the Philippines has already been pointed out. If for any reason it should prove impracticable, then some other way can be found. There are no difficulties which will not disappear when once we determine to be rid of the useless and dangerous burden which the government of these islands by the United States necessarily involves. Half the mental effort expended in the vain attempt to justify our present policy would solve any troublesome questions which the change to an anti-imperial policy might bring up. In reality, a foolish and wicked pride of consistency is the sole obstacle to a speedy settlement of all difficulties.

So far as our position in the eyes of the world is concerned, we are now stultifying ourselves by pursuing a course diametrically opposed to the principles set forth in our Declaration of Independence. If to be consistent, to be honorable, to be just, to be merciful, to do what is right, is to stultify ourselves, then in heaven's name let us dare do what we ought and let the rest of the world sneer if it wishes.

It is far more likely to sneer if we go on as we are going at present. The scoffers who have predicted that our "experiment" in self-government must, sooner or later, break down are already pointing out that we have entered upon the downward path. As to the probability that withdrawal from the Philippines would cause the Republican party to lose at the polls in 1900, nothing is more likely to bring that about than a continuance of the present policy of the Administration.

Q. Do you expect me to listen to such irrational talk as that? Now that President McKinley has declared the policy of the Administration in regard to the Philippines, ought it not to "clear the political atmosphere" and "raise the discussion of the question to a higher plane?" Are you quite sure you do not misunderstand what that policy is?

A. Mr. McKinley's words, as reported in the newspapers, are: "Peace first; then, with charity for all, establish a government of law and order, protecting life and property and occupation for the well-being of the people who will participate in it under the Stars and Stripes." Translated into plain English this declaration reads as follows: Subjugation first; then, "with charity for all," the establishment of a despotic government of military law and order, and the careful protection of our material interests in the islands. The Filipinos, forsooth, are not to have liberty, but "charity!" Out on such cant! Does Mr. McKinley think to hoodwink the American people with it?

Q. You are not fair to the President, and put a strained construction on his words. Since the speech from which you quote was delivered Mr McKinley has asserted over and over again, as he did in Minneapolis on October 12, that "the future of these new possessions is in the keeping of Congress," and that the Filipinos "will not be governed as vassals or serfs or slaves; they will be given a government of liberty, regulated by law, honestly administered, without oppressing or exacting taxation, without tyrnnay, justice without bribery, education without distinction of social conditions, freedom of religious worship, and protection in life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." What more could any people desire?

A. The President's words sound well until an attempt is made to penetrate their meaning. Read them carefully and it will be perceived that they constitute a promise of liberty with all real liberty left out. Moreover, if the future of these new possessions is in the hands of Congress, by what authority does Mr. McKinley assert what action Congress shall take in regard to them?

With much less temptation to be arbitrary, witness the shameful manner in which the majority in Congress would govern Puerto Rico—exploiting its people outside of the Constitution for selfish interests of persons and trusts having influence.

Be this as it may, the important point to be considered in connection with his profuse declarations that we are fighting the Filipinos in order to give them liberty without independence is that it is absolutely impossible. *There are only two ways in which Congress can grant liberty to the Filipinos. One is to recognize their independence; the other is to make them citizens of the United States,* with full rights as such, including the right to help govern us.

Q. But the President does not use the word "liberty" in the sense that you do. He means liberty regulated by laws made by us. It is a condition, not a theory, which confronts us, and in meeting it why should we be afraid of making precedents?

A. The people of the United States should view with the gravest alarm any precedent which involves the slightest invasion of the great principle of human liberty. Such a government of dependencies as is proposed by the Administration can not be lawfully undertaken by the people of the United States without first amending the Constitution.* The Constitution as it stands is the supreme law of the land. Neither Congress nor Mr. McKinley can lawfully override its provisions. Should they do so on the plea that they represent the sovereign people, who, by the fact of their sovereignty, are superior to any artificial restrictions of their own creation, it would, if permitted to stand, constitute a precedent appallingly dangerous in its possibilities. If one extra constitutional step can be taken, why not many? What, then, would become of the charter of our liberties? This is a matter of far greater importance to the people of the United States than is the political welfare of the Filipinos.

Q. It is plain that the real animus of your hysterical raving about principles and liberty is nothing more or less than blind and unreasoning prejudice against our noble and self-sacrificing President, and that you are working to undermine his chances for reelection next year. Under the circumstances how can you expect good Republicans to pay any attention to your arguments?

A. In reply to this charge, the anti-imperialists wish to assert most positively that their only desire is to save the United States from the effects of imperialism, and they are quite as willing to work with one party as with the other in order to accomplish that result. It is true that the anti-imperialists do not share your admiration for William McKinley or your confidence in him. It is you and not they who are blinded by prejudice. You judge Mr. McKinley by his words; they judge him by his acts. * * * It has been more than a suspicion for some time that Mr. McKinley is working more for himself and his fellow-politicians than for the good of the country. How else can it be explained that he has so often preached one thing and done the opposite?

* * * * * * *

The events of the last twelve months have brought us face to face with a grave crisis in the affairs of our beloved country. The time has come when we must think and act if we are to preserve and maintain the system of government founded by our forefathers. The question which each one of us must answer is: Shall we continue to stand upon the solid ground of the Declaration of Independence, or by pursuing a course diametrically opposed to its basic principle, place in the hands of a political "machine" power which, while it exists, must always be a menace to our liberty, and in the end is almost certain to destroy it. The decision rests with us. Let us ponder the question carefully, for the longer we pursue a wrong course the more difficult will it be to turn back.

Abraham Lincoln and William McKinley stand for diametrically opposite views of the rights of man. If we uphold McKinley, we must declare that Lincoln was wrong. * * * For the question of self-government or subjection for the Filipinos is the old question of slavery placed before us again in another form. Nothing can be more certain than the fact that the Republican party of to-day is in the hands of men who by their imperialistic policy are undoing much of the great work of the Republican party in the sixties. Surely those of you who are old enough to remember those memorable days, and who gave your strength, your voices, your most earnest efforts, and even, it may be, risked your lives for the cause of liberty and justice, can not have turned away from the high ideals of your youth.

Will you then consent to be partners in the gigantic crime of forcing an heroic and liberty-loving people to abandon their desire for self-government? Will you who helped to free the black man help now to enslave the brown man who is fighting for his independence? Will you help to establish a precedent which practically nullifies the bill of rights contained in the Declaration of Independence? Think of it and of what it may mean for you and for your posterity, if your decision be not for the right. As James Russell Lowell says:

> "Once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide,
> In the strife of truth and falsehood, for the good or evil side."

And let the immortal words of Abraham Lincoln ring in your years:

"What constitutes the bulwark of our own liberty and independence? It is not our frowning battlements, our bristling seacoasts, our Army or our Navy. These are not our reliances against danger. All of these may be turned against us without making us weaker for the struggle. Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in us. Our defense is in the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men in all lands, everywhere. Destroy this spirit and you have planted the seed of despotism at your own doors. Familiarize yourself with the chains of bondage and you prepare your own limbs to wear them. Accustomed to trample on the rights of others you have lost the strength of your own independence and become the fit subjects of the first cunning tyrant who rises among you."

And again:

"No man is good enough to govern another man without that other's consent. When the white man governs himself, that is self-government, but when he governs himself and also governs another man, that is more than self-government—that is despotism. Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in us; our defense is in the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands, everywhere. They who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves, and under a just God can not long retain it."

F.

An arraignment of President McKinley's policy of extending by force the sovereignty of the United States over the Filipinos.—History of events leading up to present situation.

I.

On the 24th day of April, 1898, Secretary Long, of the Navy Department, telegraphed to Dewey as follows:

"DEWEY, *Hongkong, China:*

"War has commenced between the United States and Spain. Proceed at once to the Philippine Islands. Commence operations at once, particularly

*In the case of Scott *vs.* Sanford (19 How.) the Supreme Court said: "It (the Government) enters upon territory with its powers over the citizen strictly defined and limited by the Constitution, from which it derives its own existence, and by virtue of which alone it continues to exist and act as a Government and sovereignty. It has no power of any kind beyond it, and it can not, when it enters a Territory of the United States, put off its character and assume discretionary or despotic powers which the Constitution has denied to it. It can not create for itself a new character separated from the citizens of the United States and the duties it owes them under the provisions of the Constitution. The Territory being part of the United States, *the Government and the citizen both enter it under the authority of the Constitution, with their respective rights defined and marked out, and the Federal Government can exercise no power beyond what that instrument confers, nor lawfully deny any right which it has reserved.*

against the Spanish fleet. You must capture vessels or destroy them. Use utmost endeavors."

* * * * * * *

On that same 24th day of April an interview was had at Singapore between United States Consul-General Pratt and Aguinaldo. Aguinaldo at that time offered to begin a new insurrection in the Philippine Islands and to operate there in conjunction with the United States Navy. Consul-General Pratt thereupon telegraphed to Dewey at Hongkong as follows:

"Aguinaldo, insurgent leader here, will come Hongkong, arrange with commodore for general cooperation insurgents Manila, if desired. Telegraph."

Dewey replied: "Tell Aguinaldo come soon as possible."

In pursuance of this arrangement, Aguinaldo left Singapore for Hongkong April 26, and was taken, with seventeen other revolutionary Filipino chiefs, to Manila on the United States naval vessel *McCulloch*.

They were landed at Cavite, and were furnished by Dewey with guns, ammunition, and stores to be used by Aguinaldo against the Spanish forces.

On the 8th of June, 1898, Consul-General Pratt, in a speech at Singapore, said:

"I am thankful to have been the means of bringing about the arrangement between General Aguinaldo and Admiral Dewey which has resulted so happily."

On July 4, 1898, General Anderson, then in command of American troops at Manila, addressed a letter to Aguinaldo as commanding the Philippine forces, in which he said, among other things:

"For these reasons, I desire to have the most amicable relations with you, and to have you and your people cooperate with us in military operations against the Spanish forces.

"General Anderson wishes you to inform your people that we are here for their good, and that they must supply us with labor and material at the current market prices."

On July 6, General Anderson, in a letter to Aguinaldo, said:

"It must be apparent to you that we do not intend to remain here inactive, but to move promptly against our common enemy. * * * I am solicitous to avoid any conflict of authority which may result from having two sets of military officers exercising command in the same place."

* * * * * * *

General Merritt, in his official report, says:

"Shortly after the naval battle of Manila Bay the principal leader of the insurgents, Gen. Emilio Aguinaldo, came to Cavite from Hongkong, and with the consent of our naval authorities, began active work in raising troops and pushing the Spaniards in the direction of the city of Manila.

"Having met with some success and the natives flocking to his assistance he proclaimed an independent government of republican form, with himself as president, and at the time of my arrival in the islands the entire edifice of executive and legislative departments and subdivision of territory for administrative purposes had been accomplished, at least on paper, and the Filipinos held military possession of many points in the islands other than those in the city of Manila."

General Whittier, in giving testimony before the Peace Commissioners, in answers to questions as to the number of insurgents got together by Aguinaldo, at Manila, before the surrender, said:

"His forces went around the city, taking the waterworks and the north part of the city, and running up the railroad."

I asked that question of several, and the opinions differed widely—all the way from 8,000 to 30,000 or 40,000 men.

To the question, "Do you think he had as many as 8,000 men before the surrender?" he answered "Yes, sir; the environment of the city took a great many men." He said, "Aguinaldo's headquarters are at Malolos, 23 miles up the railroad. His troops control all the settled parts of the island (Luzon) except Masulo, as well as much of the southern country." He said he meant by the "southern country" those islands below, (i. e., below Luzon).

On and before the 12th day of August, 1898, the city of Manila was in the possession and control of Spain, but it was invested by the United States forces under the command of General Merritt on the water side of the town, and on the land side by the insurgent forces under General Aguinaldo, who had set up and claimed to have established in the island of Luzon a revolutionary and *de facto* government by proclamation issued on the 23d day of June of that same year.

II.

Such was the situation when the so called peace protocol was signed at Washington on August 12, 1898.

This protocol provided that hostilities between the United States and Spain be suspended, and that "notice to that effect be given as soon as possible, by each Government, to the commanders of its military and naval forces."

The third article of this protocol was in these words:

"The United States will (i. e., may or shall) occupy and hold the city, bay, and harbor of Manila, pending the conclusion of a treaty of peace which shall determine the control, disposition, and government of the Philippines."

* * * * * * *

The possession of Manila, which General Merritt, in ignorance of the peace protocol, had gained by war, was by that protocol converted into the possession or right of occupation as set forth in the protocol itself, and General Merritt should have taken that view of the situation and acted accordingly. Instead of doing so, he, on the 17th day of August, issued his proclamation for establishing there a government "of military occupation," as if hostilities had continued there, the protocol to the contrary notwithstanding.

III.

When the peace commissioners of the two countries came together in Paris, October 1, 1898, to put the terms of the protocol into the form of a treaty for ratification, it turned out that they were at variance as to the construction of the third article of the protocol.

It was contended on the part of Spain that while under and by virtue of the third article of protocol the United States was to have possession of the city, bay, and harbor of Manila until the treaty of peace should be concluded or put in form for ratification, it was still left to the joint commissioners, and them alone, to determine as to the future permanent control and government of the Philippine Islands, and, consequently, that the Spanish commissioners were entitled to have an equal voice in that determination with the American commissioners; and when the American commissioners came to demand, as they did, the cession of all those islands to the United States, the Spanish commissioners demurred, and insisted that no such cession was contemplated by Spain as embraced within the terms of the protocol, and for that reason they refused to yield to the demand, and proposed that arbitration be resorted to as a means of determining the correct construction of the protocol in that regard.

The American commissioners said in reply that their view was plainly correct, and that of Spain clearly wrong, so that they would not consent to submit the question to third parties, and they called upon the Spanish commissioners to yield their opinion in order that "a peaceful solution may [might] be reached," meaning thereby, as understood by the Spanish commissioners, that unless they did yield to the demand of a cession of the Philippines the United States would resume hostilities and obtain by conquest what they had failed to obtain by diplomacy. The American commissioners, however, added that while unwilling to modify their demand for a cession of the entire Philippine Archipelago, they had been "authorized to offer to Spain, in case the cession should be agreed to, the sum of $20,000,000, to be paid in accordance with the terms to be fixed in the treaty of peace." In answer to this proposition the Spaniards said:

"The Spanish commissioners are now asked to accept the American proposition in its entirety, and without further discussion, or to reject it, in which latter case, as the American commissioners understand, the peace negotiations will end and the protocol of Washington will consequently be broken.

"The Government of Her Majesty, moved by reasons of patriotism and humanity, will not assume the responsibility of again bringing upon Spain all the horrors of war. In order to avoid them it resigns itself to the painful strait of submitting to the law of the victor, however harsh it may be, * * * and she accepts the only terms the United States offers her for the concluding of the treaty of peace."

It was under this pressure that the Spanish commissioners finally yielded to the demand of President McKinley for the cession by Spain of the Philippine Islands, protesting at the time that they did so to avert the horrors of warfare with which Spain was threatened if she refused to comply, in disregard or violation, as they believed, of the spirit and meaning, if not of the words, of the protocol.

IV.

Hostilities with Spain were temporarily suspended by the protocol of August 12, and brought to a final end by the treaty of December 10, 1898, and yet after the expiration of nearly a year we find that President McKinley is now making war against the inhabitants of the island of Luzon for the professed purpose of subjecting them to his rule or that of his military governor, General Otis. The President is waging this war upon his own responsibility and without any authority from Congress. From President McKinley's order to General Otis of December 21, 1898, it would seem that he then supposed himself to be enforcing certain rights gained by the United States in its war with Spain or under and by virtue of the treaty of peace. In that order the President uses language as follows:

"The destruction of the Spanish fleet in the harbor of Manila by the United States naval squadron, * * * followed by the reduction of the city and the surrender of the Spanish forces, practically effected the conquest of the Philippine Islands and the suspension of Spanish sovereignty therein."

"With the signature of the treaty of peace between the United States and Spain * * * on the 14th instant, and as the result of the victories of American arms, the future control, disposition, and government of the Philippine Islands are ceded to the United States.

"In fulfillment of the rights of sovereignty thus acquired * * * the actual occupation and administration of the entire group of the Philippine Islands became immediately necessary, *and the military government heretofore maintained by the United States in the city, harbor, and bay of Manila* is to be extended with all possible dispatch to the whole of the ceded territory."

WHAT WAS THIS, IF NOT A DECLARATION OF WAR?

In his message to Congress of December 5, 1898, the President said:

"The last scene of the war was enacted at Manila, its starting place. On August 13, after a brief assault upon the works by the land forces * * * the capital surrendered unconditionally. * * *

"By this, the conquest of the Philippine Islands, virtually accomplished when the Spanish capacity for resistance was destroyed by Admiral Dewey's victory of the 1st of May, was formally sealed. * * *

"I do not discuss at this time the government or the future of the new possessions which will come to us as the result of the war with Spain."

In a speech at Savannah, December 17, 1898, the President said:

"If, following the clear precepts of duty, *territory falls to us*, and the welfare of an alien people requires our guidance and protection, *who* will *shrink* from the responsibility, grave though it be? * * *

"It is not a question of keeping the islands of the East, but of leaving them.

"Dewey and Merritt took them and the country instantly and universally applauded."

When the President said this, he well knew that at the date of this protocol no territory in the Philippine Islands had fallen to or been acquired by us from Spain, and that by the protocol we had no right to hold permanently the city, bay, and harbor of Manila, and that the only right given us by the third article of the protocol was the right of occupying those places temporarily, or until the treaty of peace should be put in form by the joint commission and signed.

The President, therefore, was wrong, either knowingly or unknowingly, in making the statements above quoted, to the effect that the United States had acquired the Philippine Islands by conquest in the war with Spain. We are supported in this respect by Judge Day, the chairman of the American Peace Commission, who, in a letter recently published, referring to the doings of the Peace Commission at Paris, said:

"It was not claimed that the United States had a right to the Philippine Islands as a matter of conquest. * * * The capture, after the signing of the protocol, by General Merritt and his forces, whatever its legal effect may have been, included no more territory than we were entitled to hold under the protocol."

In his more recent utterances the President has put his claim to the Philippines also upon the ground of cession. In a speech made by him in September last at Pittsburg he said:

"Peace brought us the Philippines by treaty cession from Spain."

In addressing the Home Market Club at Boston the President said:

"The Philippines, like Cuba and Puerto Rico, were intrusted to our hands by the providence of God."

He had probably forgotten his instructions to the peace commissioners on their leaving Washington for Paris, to "take Luzon," as we are told by Senator and Commissioner Frye that he did.

V.

Let us now inquire whether or not the President is correct in stating that the United States has come into the possession and legislative control of the Philippine Islands, either by the hand of God, by treaty, or in any other way. This treaty of cession could carry with it and give to the United States only such property, land, or territorial rights in the Philippines as belonged at the time to Spain.

It did not include any lands or property then belonging to the inhabitants in their individual capacity, or to corporate bodies or institutions, ecclesiastical or lay. The treaty itself does not purport to have any such operation, and could not so operate even if it did so purport, and it does not appear that Spain then owned or possessed public lands of any considerable value or extent.

Coming then to the question whether the treaty with Spain has operated to convey to the United States the right to regulate the political rights of the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands, it is provided by the ninth article of the treaty that "the civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants of the territories hereby ceded to the United States shall be determined by Congress."

For the purposes of this discussion we will limit our inquiry to the effect of this treaty upon the political and civil rights and condition of the inhabitants of the island of Luzon alone, not including the city of Manila and vicinity or the occupants of lands now in the possession or control of General Otis as military governor. The question really is, whether or not, by this treaty, the native inhabitants of this island of Luzon have at the present time been subjected in any way to the legislative powers of the Congress of the United States. This rule is styled sovereignty in monarchical countries. This term does not seem appropriate in the United States, where the people themselves are the sovereigns and law-makers, and where it is not now possible for the Federal Government to hold or govern colonies, no such possessions being contemplated or provided for by the framers of the Constitution of the United States.

Filipinos not "rebels"—owed us no allegiance.

VI.

After this so-called rebellion shall have been suppressed by him without putting to death the entire population, how does the President propose to govern the island of Luzon or its surviving inhabitants?

If the ninth article of the treaty did not place them in the power or government of the United States Congress, as claimed by President McKinley, then he is guilty not only of "criminal aggression," but of wholesale slaughter also, in ordering General Otis to enforce that order by force of arms.

If the Filipinos were not by the treaty with Spain subjected to the dominion and control of the United States, we do not see how they can be held or ruled over as colonists of the United States.

It is quite true that they had been colonists of Spain, and that Spain's right over them as colonists was recognized by William McKinley and bid for and purchased by him from Spain. *But even if they had been a marketable commodity at any time, they had ceased to be so after the power of Spain over them had been successfully resisted and overcome* before the treaty of peace was made.

Chancellor Kent, in his Commentaries, Volume I, page 178, referring to territories added or acquired, said:

"Full sovereignty can not be held to have passed by the mere words of the treaty without actual delivery. To complete the right of property, the right to the thing and the possession of the thing must be united. This is a necessary principle in the law of property in all systems of jurisprudence. * * *

"This general law of property applies to the right of territory no less than to other rights. The practice of nations has been conformable to this principle, and the conventional law of nations is full of instances of this kind."

In a treatise on international law, by Sir Shurston Baker, just published at Boston, by Little, Brown & Co., at page 61, that author says:

"In modern times sales and transfers of national territory to another power can only be made by treaty or some solemn act of the sovereign authority of the State. *And such transfers of territory do not include the allegiance of its inhabitants without their consent, express or implied.*"

At page 355, the same author says:

"The rule of public law with respect to the allegiance of the inhabitants of a conquered territory is, therefore, no longer to be interpreted as meaning that it is absolutely and unconditionally acquired by conquest, or transferred and handed over by treaty as a thing assignable by contract and without the assent of the subject."

"On the contrary, the express or implied assent of the subject is now regarded as essential to a complete new allegiance."

VII.

Let us see what was the situation in the island of Luzon, which had previously been the seat of the war between the United States and Spain, on the 10th day of December, 1898, when the treaty was signed. The Spanish army, consisting of 12,000 men, before then besieged in the city of Manila by the American forces on the water side and the insurgent Filipinos on the land side, had surrendered to General Merritt on the 14th day of August, 1898, and possession was then taken of the captured city and its suburbs by General Merritt.

The insurgent forces had assisted in that siege and capture and expected and claimed the privilege of entering the captured city with the American troops, but were denied that privilege, so that the city and its suburbs were placed by the Spanish surrender in possession of the United States troops, and continued to be held by them at the time of the treaty of peace, and is still so held.

The country outside of Manila and its suburbs remained as before in the possession and military control of the native inhabitants, *organized as a revolutionary government in opposition to Spanish rule under the lead of Aguinaldo as head of the army and president.*

This government was established and existed de facto in the island of Luzon for some time previously to the conclusion of the treaty of peace.

Such was the exact state of things in the island of Luzon from and after the surrender of the city of Manila, the rest of the island being in the occupation of the Filipino troops and held by them both by force of arms and under the authority of the de facto civil government established by Aguinaldo, as above stated, when William McKinley, as Commander in Chief of the Army of the United States, on the 21st day of December, 1898, issued his military orders to General Otis, directing him to extend the military government previously maintained by him in the city, harbor, and bay of Manila, not only over the whole island of Luzon, but over the entire group of Philippine Islands.

By that order the Filipinos were told that the United States had succeeded to the sovereignty of Spain over them, and that they were to be brought under the beneficent rule of the United States; that those who submitted to this rule would receive the reward of its support and protection, and that those who did not submit to that rule would be "brought within it with firmness, if need be," meaning thereby the persuasion of gunpowder.

In vain did the Filipinos remonstrate and try to get access to General Otis for purposes of negotiation and conciliation. He assigned various reasons for not listening to them, among others that under instructions received by him from the President the only terms of peace he could entertain was that of their unconditional surrender.

Repeated attempts of this kind were made by them, always with the same result.

Aguinaldo had before then been recognized by Commodore Dewey and Generals Anderson and Merritt as an associate or ally in carrying on the war against Spain, and heartily welcomed by them in that relation, but when they had succeeded in defeating Spain, and had no further need of Aguinaldo's assistance, *he objected to President McKinley's assuming to exercise the same sovereignty over him formerly wielded by Spain*, and by so doing did not become a rebel against the authority of the United States.

VIII.

If President McKinley really desired to secure peace with Aguinaldo why did he refuse to adopt the usual and only practicable method of making peace after disputes have been submitted to the arbitrament of war?

He said substantially to Aguinaldo,—"You must submit yourself and your people to my authority and dictation, or take the consequences. These troops of mine are here to compel you to obey, and you can not successfully resist them. The honor and defense of the American flag which I have set up in the island of Luzon require this, and you must either surrender and submit, or be killed."

There stood these armed men in battle array on both sides; on one side the trained soldiers of the United States, placed there to enforce obedience to President McKinley's tyrannical order, and on the other the half-clad, raw, and undisciplined troops of Aguinaldo with weapons furnished them by Commodore Dewey to throw off the yoke of their former master, Spain, determined to resist with their lives President McKinley's assertion of sovereignty over them by assignment from Spain.

The President and his supporters would have the people of this country believe that the Filipinos are now and for some months have been in rebellion against the authority or sovereignty of the United States, and that he as President might, lawfully and in his civil capacity, employ the American Army in suppressing such rebellion.

If the rules of international law, as above quoted by us, are correct, it can not be true that the Filipinos are now or ever have been in rebellion against the sovereignty of the United States, as is pretended and claimed by the Administration now in power.

In a speech recently made to the people of Illinois by Attorney-General Griggs, of the Cabinet, that gentleman said:

"That to-day the United States of America possesses by solemn treaty the only lawful sovereignty over these (Philippine) islands; * * * that in one of these islands one of these numerous tribes has raised an army of insurrection against the American flag and has attempted * * * to drive the lawful authority of the United States from the island of Luzon."

If that gentleman were to consult the dictionary he would find that rebels are defined as "those who oppose lawful authority by violence," and that he should not call the Filipinos by that name unless he is prepared to show that they owe allegiance to the United States Government.

Did that bring on the conflict?

IX.

We think the President seeks also to justify his course in using the American Army to put down these Filipinos upon the plea that they brought on the conflict by making the first attack. In his speech at Pittsburg, Pa., he said:

"The first blow was struck by the insurgents."

In a speech made by him as late as October 13, at Fargo, N. Dak., he said:

"We never dreamed that the little body of insurgents whom we had just emancipated from Spain * * * would turn upon the flag that had delivered them from Spain.

"Then it was that the insurgent leader made an attack upon our men and then our boys let loose."

We can not believe the President was correct in that statement except that part of it which shows that the insurgents had been previously emancipated and delivered from the power of Spain by the United States.

The truth of this matter, as understood by us, really is that on the night of February 4, 1899, a single Filipino, probably armed, but without hostile intent, was fired upon by an American sentry at his post and killed, and that thereupon the Filipino soldiers were so enraged that they at once made an attack upon the Americans, probably without any orders or authority from headquarters.

General Otis himself, referring to this incident, said:

"It is not believed that the chief insurgent leaders wished to open hostilities at this time, as they were not completely prepared to assume the initiative."

Strictly speaking, therefore, the first blood shed was that of a Filipino, recklessly fired upon and killed by the American sentry under the circumstances above stated.

X.

The President's claim of sovereignty over both the Philippine Islands and their inhabitants is now rested upon the treaty of peace and that alone.

By the third article of that treaty Spain cedes to the United States the archipelago known as the Philippine Islands—that is, she transfers to the United States her territorial sovereignty in those islands, whatever it then was.

The ninth article relates to "the civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants of those islands," and by this article Spain undertakes to confer upon Congress the power of determining the future civil rights and political status of the Filipinos.

By the President's military order of December 21, 1898, General Otis was directed to inform the inhabitants of the islands that the United States had succeeded to the sovereignty formerly exercised by Spain over them, and that this claim of sovereignty was to be enforced by the Army of the United States placed there under the command of General Otis, as military governor of all the Philippine Islands.

If this was not the initiation of a hostile movement against the inhabitants of Luzon then enrolled under the banner of Aguinaldo as the head of a *de facto* government there established by him, and the commander of a small army raised by him for its defense, what was it? These forces did not come into actual collision until the night of February 4, 1899, as hereinabove stated, and Aguinaldo on the next day sent an officer under a flag of truce to General Otis, stating that the fighting of the night before had not been authorized by him; that he wished that hostilities should be stopped, and proposing the establishment of a neutral zone between the two armies for that purpose.

The reply of General Otis was that the fighting once begun must go on.

XI.

It was not until October 31, 1898, when the peace commissioners had been in joint session at Paris a month, that President McKinley demanded of Spain cession of the Philippine Islands to the United States with a threat of renewing hostilities if that demand was not acceded to. That demand was acceded to very reluctantly on the 28th day of November, 1898, and a treaty of peace framed accordingly was made and signed December 10, 1898.

The ninth article of that treaty purports to confer upon Congress the power of determining the "civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants of the territories * * * ceded to the United States."

It thus appears that Spain not only relinquished its sovereignty in the Philippine Islands, but undertook to transfer to the Congress of the United States the power of exercising sovereignty over the native inhabitants of those islands.

The Constitution of the United States gives to Congress expressly the power "to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States."

It is generally understood that this clause was intended to refer to territory then belonging to the United States, considered as property, and not to refer at all to the future civil rights or political status of the very few persons then residing in such territory.

President McKinley seems to have adopted a very different construction of the meaning of this third section of Article IV of the Constitution, when

he undertook by proclamation issued through his subordinate, General Otis, early in January, 1899, to subject the native inhabitants of the Philippine Islands to his absolute and despotic military rule.

XII.

Résumé.

This action was taken by the President while Congress was in session and before the ratification of the treaty, and therefore before it had any existence in a legal sense.

It is not to be supposed that the President after the conclusion of a treaty of peace could continue to exercise powers only authorized by a state of war, and if the quotations from writers upon international law above made by us are reliable and authoritative, it would seem that by that treaty Spain could not convey to the United States any dominion or power of legislation over the civil rights or future political condition of the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands.

It would therefore seem as if the President, in issuing the proclamation above mentioned, not only exceeded the powers belonging to his high office, but took a course calculated to provoke the armed resistance which very soon followed.

The President could not have expected that a people who had taken up arms to gain their independence from Spain were willing to be put under the despotic military rule of any other foreign power, however profuse it might be in its professions of friendship and benevolent purposes.

If sovereignty were a commercial commodity, and capable of transfer by one nation or government to another for a pecuniary consideration, we can not think that the people of the United States desire to take advantage of the bargain of the President with Spain, which purports to give Congress the same dominion over the Filipinos which had been formerly exercised by Spain, and from which the President of the United States claimed to have delivered them.

Can the United States consistently with its own sense of honor consent to deal thus treacherously and cruelly with these poor and deluded people after having recognized them as allies in carrying on the war against Spain?

This question is, as we suppose, soon to be submitted to and passed upon by Congress.

Army Appropriation Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. STEPHEN M. SPARKMAN,

OF FLORIDA.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, March 27, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 8862) making appropriation for the support of the Regular and Volunteer Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901—

Mr. SPARKMAN said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I rise not so much for the purpose of antagonizing this bill as for the purpose of submitting some remarks on the policy which has produced the necessity for the large appropriation which this bill carries. I have had neither time nor the opportunity for studying the measure in detail, but I dare say the appropriations to be made by it are not materially greater than the necessities of the large army for which we are to provide may require. It is of the conditions which have created this large military establishment which I complain, and of which I propose to speak.

There should, Mr. Chairman, have been no necessity for this great increase in our Army. For more than a century, except during the civil and other wars in which the United States has been engaged, we got along without any such large army as that we are providing for to-day. Why is it needed now? Because, sir, we are trying to do something we ought not to do; because we have abandoned our old-time policy and are trampling under foot the principles which have made us great and strong.

Our Government was framed with a due regard to the inalienable rights of man, and was based upon the consent of the governed, and for a hundred years these principles obtained in the administration of the affairs of this Government. At least that was true when the Democratic party controlled the destinies of the country. Now a change has come upon us, and a large army is the order of the day. Republican simplicity is receding, and a new order of things is taking its place.

Once it was our pride that the customs and conditions which prevailed in European countries were not our customs and conditions; that having a government based upon the consent of the governed, whose foundations were laid deep in the affections of the people, a large standing army would not be necessary, and that a national militia could be relied upon to fight our battles on land and to protect our territory and home from invasion by foreign foes. Nor was this difficult of accomplishment; our territory was, with one exception, compact and contiguous, so that in case of war with any first-class nation, save possibly one, that of Great Britain, we could have acted wholly upon the defensive in so far as the military arm of the Government would have been called upon to strike.

But now how different! Our territory is no longer confined to the North American continent, but is found westerly near to the very doors of China, and in the southeast among the West Indies, where we become neighbors of the most powerful and rapacious nations on the earth. Instead of the compact territory which afforded us this immunity from attack by foreign powers, thousands of miles of water now intervene between our western possession and our eastern islands, while a line from one to the other would extend halfway around the globe.

This acquisition of territory occurred almost in a day; no great effort was put forth to accomplish the result. An insignificant war with Spain, beginning and ending almost as soon as begun, was the pretext and the occasion for the abandonment of our old-time policy. But insignificant as was the occasion, and rapid as were the processes through which we moved to the acquisition of this territory, the changes have been great and the results startling.

For three decades the expenses of keeping up our Army had been comparatively small. Indeed, not since the civil war and the two or three years following it have the expenses necessary to keep up the Army been so great by nearly a third as these expenses will be during the next two years. Throughout that long period of time and up to the breaking out of the Spanish war the average cost of the Army of 25,000 men had not been greater than $45,000,000 per annum; while this bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, calls for an expenditure of $111,000,000 for an Army in the neighborhood of 100,000 men. But this is not all, for the amount appropriated by the bill is several millions of dollars less than the estimates of the War Department for the same period of time, which calls for nearly $128,000,000—more accurately, $127,712,133.55. So that while the bill appears to make a saving over the estimates of $16,672,779, it is not a saving in fact, for no doubt the next session of this Congress will be called upon to make good this difference, with several more millions added, because the War Department holds out no hope that the Army will be reduced or that the expenditures for its support will be less.

Now, this is a startling showing. From an average expenditure of about $45,000,000 during the twenty-seven years prior to 1898 the cost of the Army has suddenly, and within two years, climbed up to nearly $128,000,000 per annum.

I know it will be said that this large increase in the cost of our military establishment and in the Army itself is due largely to the war in the Philippines and the necessities growing out of the possession of these and other islands recently acquired by us. But, sir, while that is no doubt the reason, it furnishes no sufficient excuse for the burdens that are thus entailed upon the American people. For there was no necessity for this war in the Philippines, as it could have been avoided by a proper course of action; neither was it necessary to burden ourselves with this insular territory, for we need not have taken these islands.

We went to war with an avowed purpose of freeing the Cubans, and, incidentally, avenging the loss of the *Maine*, but disclaimed at the time any intention of territorial aggrandizement. If we had adhered to this laudable purpose, if, when we had ascended with the evil one up into the high mountain of temptation, we had put the tempter behind us as he pointed out to us the glories of empire and demanded our homage, we would not to-day be engaged in war with the Philippines; we would not be appropriating millions to feed the starving Porto Ricans, nor in equipping our military establishment; neither would we be confronted with the great problems, both foreign and domestic, which now meet us no matter in what direction we turn our faces. We would not be troubling ourselves with the question as to how far the Constitution extends beyond the limits of the States. "Duty and destiny" would not be disturbing the dreams of the President and those whose political fortunes are linked with his, nor would he be oscillating between the two extremes of protection at home and free trade with the people he has forced upon us; neither would the specter of imperialism be disturbing patriots throughout the land.

Mr. Chairman, let us for a moment consider the immediate future of the Army and the burdens which its increase will cast upon us if we are to pursue this policy of colonization and imperialism. I say the immediate future, because no one can tell what the more distant future may have in store for us if we pursue longer the path of empire in which a foolish policy has placed our feet. Already we can see our Army increased to 100,000 men at a cost of more than $125,000,000 per annum. But, sir, in this I do not refer to the cost of the war with Spain, amounting to $200,000,000; nor to our efforts to subdue the Philippines, covering a period of a little more than a year and aggregating an expenditure of $164,000,000.

I only at present refer to what is likely to be the continued annual expenditures of our military establishment if we are to hold all of our insular possessions. Does anyone think our standing Army, with the present conditions confronting us, will be much if any below 100,000 men? If so, he deceives himself. The Filipinos will never be willing subjects, nor can we count on the everlasting love and friendship of the Porto Ricans, to say nothing of the fact that our actions toward the Cubans in taking and holding forcible possession of their island, ignoring their appeals

for freedom, and governing them with the sword, is not likely to create feelings of amity and love among them for us, nor to make them friendly neighbors.

So that to defend these distant possessions from foes without and within, from the powerful neighbors near whose doors they lie, and the unwilling subjects we have made of the inhabitants, a large army will ever be necessary if we hold them.

It is, therefore, safe to say that our military establishment will never again be smaller than the Regular and Volunteer Army is to-day, and $125,000,000 is a small estimate for its cost, to say nothing of the increased expenditures of the Navy and of the pension list, an expense which war always makes necessary. The increased cost of the Army alone will be in the neighborhood of $80,000,000 per annum over and above the average cost of the Army for the years between 1870 and 1898.

Somewhere I have seen an estimate, which I regarded as an extravagant one, of the business which we are likely to do with the Philippines and Porto Rico, and with China and Cuba by reason of our ownership of the Philippines and Porto Rico and the control we propose to exercise over Cuba. This estimate, made no doubt by some enthusiastic imperialist, placed our trade with the Philippines at $120,000,000, and that with Porto Rico and Cuba at $150,000,000, or $270,000,000 in all. Now, mark you, this is based upon the assumption that we will get all this business, and if realized would only be the gross business done as a consequence of our ownership of these islands, not the profits we are to make.

Then, again, it is not our entire population who would share in these profits, for very few of them would be able to engage in the business which we would do with the people of the Philippines, China, and Porto Rico. A large majority of them would neither share the business or the profits which this enthusiast puts at 15 per cent, aggregating only about $40,000,000 per annum, and which is the sum total of all the commerce and business we would get for this vast expenditure of money and for the precious lives sacrificed in our efforts to fasten our power upon an unwilling people.

Why, Mr. Chairman, the increased cost of the Army alone is $80,000,000, or $40,000,000 more than can be gotten out of the transaction, even according to the most extravagant estimate made by the most imaginative advocate of "benevolent assimilation." Then from the standpoint of commercialism or business this policy of imperialism is actually a failure, and so it will prove. There is no money in it, as has been fondly hoped and asserted by those who take a roseate view of expansion. We are to pay annually these vast millions for the poor boon of following in the footsteps, even at an humble distance, of England and other imperialistic establishments just across the sea, whose policies and institutions we have heretofore despised.

But, sir, there is another view of this matter which will not commend itself to a large number of our people; something that was not considered in the beginning by those who gave direction to the movement. Of all the parties that have ever existed in this country, the Republican has been the strongest protectionist party, and of the members of that party the present incumbent of the White House has stood out as the most prominent protectionist of them all. He enjoyed not many years ago the distinction of having the most pronounced tariff bill ever passed by Congress named for him, and to-day when we wish to emphasize the doctrine of protection we call it McKinleyism. There had been protectionists, it is true, before, and there have been protectionists since, but McKinley has towered far above them all.

Other tariff laws, affording protection to a greater or less extent, have been passed by both Democratic and Republican Congresses, but none was ever so distinctly protective as was the McKinley law of the Fifty-first Congress; yet it remained for him, as President of the United States, to advocate and adopt a policy which, if carried out, will cripple if not overturn his protective policy as well as all the industries which this policy has builded up; and, as is usually the case, this change falls more heavily on the producing classes than it does upon any other. The sugar, tobacco, and citrus fruit producers will be the first to suffer by the admission of the Philippines, together with Hawaii, Porto Rico, and Cuba, if it should eventually be annexed, as is no doubt intended by those who shape the policies of the Administration. The sugar industry would be absolutely wiped out of existence, while the citrus fruits and tobacco industries would be injured beyond measure.

I say this because no matter how much those who favor the doctrine of protection in its entirety may wish to place and keep a tariff on the importations from these islands into this country, they will not be able long to do so. It will make no difference whether the Constitution permits or prohibits such duties. They will be of short duration. The same forces which demand the free importation of Porto Rican productions to-day will demand the free introduction of those from the Philippines and of all other territories we now own or which we may own in the future. When these influences come, no matter from what source they spring, whether from that sentiment which would extend our institutions in their purity and force to all our people and over every foot of our territory, whether from a belief that our Constitution prohibits discrimination against any land or people over which our flag shall wave, or whether from business or commercial interests, or from all combined, they will be too strong to resist.

I say nothing as to the constitutionality of laws which would undertake to discriminate against these new possessions and in favor of our home institutions, for the courts will soon be called upon to decide this question, and we must all bow to their conclusion. But no matter what that decision may be, there will in a few years at most be absolute free trade between the States and the most distant territory we may purchase or conquer. True, our people will not go to these islands in any great numbers, for America, with its salubrious clime, its productive soil, and its varied resources offers a more attractive home for the American and European than do the storm-swept and sun-scorched isles of the Pacific or the West Indies. But these fertile islands will soon pass into the hands of wealthy Americans, who will multiply every production possibly a hundredfold, for which American markets must be found. Then the subtle but powerful influences which money can exert will open wide the door of American markets to those productions, even if the patriotic sentiment of the American people now in favor of the application of the open-door policy should fail to accomplish that result. Then what will become of our much-vaunted protective policy? What will become of the industries which that policy may have fostered and builded up?

But, sir, it will not be the manufacturers that will suffer most. No; the farming and agricultural classes, as I have before stated, will have to bear the burden and competition which these productions of tropical countries will bring about.

No wonder the tobacco-growing and sugar-producing sections are alarmed; for if a check is not put to the expansion policy of the President these industries will be injured in all of the States where they are carried on, and in many will be wiped out of existence, while the orange growers in Florida and California will receive a heavy blow.

Mr. Chairman, why, in our solicitude for the black races of the Pacific and of the inhabitants of other countries, do we forget our own people, their welfare and happiness? Abating not a jot or tittle of charitable impulse, I think we should first look out for our own homes and people. Then, perchance, we would be better able to do a little missionary work abroad.

But, sir, these are not all nor the greatest evils which will flow from this policy. The greatest danger is to our institutions. All others can be corrected, all other wrongs righted; but the liberties of a people, once overthrown by their own consent, can not be revived again. If the Army is enlarged beyond a proper limit, it can be reduced by the hand which created it. If tariff laws are unwise or their schedules are too high or too low, a corrective may be applied by the legislative branch of the Government; but when liberty's sun has once set upon a nation it has never in all the centuries that have come and gone been known to rise and shine again upon that land or its people; and so it will be with us if we pursue the path of imperialism on which we have ventured.

A republic such as ours can not own and control colonies and long remain a republic. We can not maintain our free institutions and govern a people who have no voice in the administration of our governmental affairs. Colonization sooner or later leads to imperialism, and there can be no empire in a republic. The forces which uphold the one and control the other are antagonistic and the two can not be joined together under the same government and live. It must be all republic or all empire. This has been the lesson taught by the past, and if we try the experiment the wreck of one more—the greatest of all republics—will be added to those strewn along the pathway of nations.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is a remedy for all this; there is yet a way out of the difficulties in which an unwise policy has entangled us; there is yet time for us to undo what we have done; yet time to retrace our steps and set our feet in the path marked out by the fathers, when our Republic was started on that career of progress which has been the marvel of the ages, and the admiration of liberty's votaries everywhere. Let us in the end give freedom to the Philippines; and hold out the bow of hope and promise to the people of all other islands over which our flag may float; let us carry out our promise made to the Cubans and to the world in their behalf, and leave them to govern themselves in their own way. All this can be done without loss of prestige on our part, and in such a way as to make of them friends and allies in peace and in war, in trade, in commerce, in progress and development. Let us hasten to do this, and the perplexing questions of domestic and foreign affairs will disappear, and the clouds and mists now gathering about our republican institutions will fade away in the brighter light of the new century into which we are now carrying the progress and development made in that we are leaving behind. [Applause.]

Army Appropriation Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWIN R. RIDGELY,

OF KANSAS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, March 28, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 8582) making appropriation for the support of the Regular and Volunteer Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901—

Mr. RIDGELY said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think I shall have to oppose the motion to strike out; and in doing so I wish at this particular point to call the attention of the House to the fact that, as we have progressed with this bill, passing item after item, we are but emphasizing the fact of the constantly growing burden and expense upon the people by reason of the growth of our standing Army and its present misdirected use.

While on the floor I will ask the chairman of the committee for information upon a matter which we shall reach a little further on in the bill. I understand this bill to provide an appropriation for the extra pay of officers when they serve in a higher rank than that for which they are commissioned. I will ask the gentleman whether there is any requirement as to the length of time that officers must so serve before extra pay shall begin?

Mr. HULL. We shall have an amendment to offer when that part of the bill is reached. I prefer not to answer questions affecting a part of the bill which we have not reached.

Mr. RIDGELY. I shall probably not want to take up time just then, and I merely wish to remark that we find officers taking every advantage of this provision to draw extra pay. For instance, when the colonel of a regiment gets leave of absence, if but for a few days, there is for the time being promotion all along the line, and officers temporarily fill positions higher than their real rank—often for a very short time—draw, as I am informed, extra pay, while the colonel also draws his full pay. In this way a great many thousands and even hundreds of thousands of dollars are taken from the taxpayers of the country. I will also, in behalf of the taxpayers, call the attention of the House to the fact that in this Congress we have enacted a gold-standard law that will inevitably result in increasing the cost of every dollar that the people have to raise to sustain this Army.

Mr. Chairman, I will not detain the committee longer, but shall avail myself of the privilege of including in my remarks a letter by Mr. SULZER, a member of this House from New York, published in the Albany Sunday Press of the 25th instant, bearing upon this feature of the burdens which this Congress is heaping upon the people. The Sunday Press is said to have the largest circulation of any weekly paper in the State of New York; in publishing the letter the editor gave it this significant heading and editorial notice:

THE CURRENCY QUESTION AND NATIONAL CAMPAIGN—OPINIONS OF PROMINENT MEN ON WHAT WILL BE THE LEADING POLITICAL ISSUE NEXT FALL—STATEMENT BY HON. WILLIAM SULZER.

While other issues will be prominent factors in determining the result of the coming national political campaign, it is generally conceded that the currency question will, as in 1896, play the leading part. The Sunday Press presents below the opinions of three prominent men on the subject. Congressman WILLIAM SULZER pays his respects to the gold standard bank currency and bond law in the following signed statement, prepared exclusively for this paper:

Editor Albany Sunday Press:

"By the signature of the President the iniquitous Republican gold standard bank currency and bond bill is now a law, and the people will ere long have an opportunity of feeling and observing its disastrous and oppressive operation.

"The Republican party has made this law a party question, and it can not be eliminated from discussion as a leading issue in the coming campaign.

"The law was passed not because it was a proper measure, but because the money power to-day behind the Republican party demanded the enactment of this legislation. It is the final consummation of the contract made in the campaign of 1896 between MARK HANNA, representing the Republican party, and the national banks. It is the carrying into effect of the last and most villainous act in the great political drama of the last national campaign. By this act the Republican party surrenders unconditionally to the sordid greed of the money power.

ONE OF THE MOST VICIOUS MEASURES.

"It is one of the most vicious political measures ever passed through Congress. It commits the Government unalterably by law to the single gold standard and makes all obligations, public and private, payable in gold. It strikes out the word "coin," which means gold or silver, in all Government bonds, inserts in its place the word "gold," and in addition thereto it authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bonds without end whenever he pleases, and makes the bonds payable in gold. It refunds the national debt and turns the finances of a mighty people over to the money lenders. It violates the obligations of the contract between the Government and the bondholder and provides that the currency of the people shall be issued by the national banks and gives them the right at will to expand or contract the currency.

A DARING DEPARTURE.

"It is the most startling and the most daring departure from the time-honored and well-fixed financial principles ever made in our history, and the result will be as disastrous as it is far-reaching. It reverses our financial system, repudiates the platforms of both parties, and revolutionizes the monetary methods of a century.

"The money power, the bondholders and their agents, the trusts, the syndicates, and the plutocrats secured the passage of this law. They are in favor of changing the terms of the contract so that they shall hold the option instead of the Government. They would commit treason against the Government in order to gain a monetary advantage.

AGENT OF THE MONEY TRUST.

"The Republican party to-day is the mere agent of the money trust and in every department of the Government carries out its wishes and registers and records its decrees.

"The people will soon realize how they have been duped and betrayed by the unscrupulous bond dealers and the scheming bankers.

"The history of all the past teaches in unmistakable terms that gold and silver at a fixed ratio is the basis for the currency of the world. I am neither a gold monometallist nor a silver monometallist. I am a bimetallist. I believe in both gold and silver, and I would not destroy or demonetize either. Both precious metals should be admitted to the mints of the country and freely coined, not for the Government, but for and on account of the depositor. Herein is the distinction and the substance of the whole matter. This act destroys silver as a part of the money of the world, and should be an additional incentive to every true friend of humanity to work harder and more earnestly for the free and unlimited coinage of both precious metals. There will be no sure, no lasting, and no permanent prosperity until it is done. Temporary expansion will only be temporary prosperity. That is all.

WILL NOT SETTLE THE CONTROVERSY.

"Make no mistake. The enactment of this law will not settle the controversy, but will only define more certainly the issue, make it more clear, and bring about more quickly its ultimate triumph. No great question is ever settled until it is settled right. Bimetallism is a living issue, and will be of paramount importance to mankind as long as civilization uses money for trade and commerce. Gold never was the friend of liberty. It never fought a battle for humanity. No people in a great crisis ever found it a faithful ally. It has been the agent of panic, the minister of despair, the advocate of calamity, and the high priest of cruelty. I am against the gold standard. In time it will have to go. This law simplifies the fight.

MUST NOT BE DISCOURAGED.

"The friends of humanity and bimetallism must not be discouraged by this temporary triumph of Republican treachery. The Democratic party will be true to its principles, true to the Constitution, and true to bimetallism. In its next national convention it will take no step backward on the money question. It will reaffirm its declaration of 1896 for the free and unlimited coinage of gold and silver at the present legal ratio without waiting for the consent of England, and denounce in unmeasured terms this last, most infamous, and most abject surrender of the Republican party to the sordid greed of the money trust.

BONDS ADVANCING IN PRICE.

"Already we witness the first evils of this culminating atrocity of class legislation. United States bonds are advancing in price as a matter of course. When the refunding begins under the Republican financial scheme, the premium paid by the Government for the old bonds will amount to so enormous a sum that, added to the extension of time, the national debt will be increased by several hundred millions, all of which goes into the pockets of the bankers and money lenders and comes out of the pockets of the people. This mortgage on posterity is easily figured. The interest-bearing debt amounts to $850,000,000 and has nine years to run at 4 per cent; increased to thirty years, to run at 2 per cent, with premium on old bonds now quoted at 134 and advancing. Let any elementary arithmetician make the calculation.

THE PRODUCERS PAY.

"Who gets this profit, and who pays for it? The bondholders, foreign and domestic, get the profit, and the producers of our country pay it.

"In my opinion one of the worst features of this act is that part of it which consummates the bargain made by MARK HANNA with the national bankers of Wall street during the campaign of 1896. They aided the Republicans then, and now they receive their share of the spoils. For three years the Republicans have waited and hesitated to pass this abomination, fearing the wrath of an outraged and indignant people. But another national campaign is near at hand. They need help again and, in order to get it, have unconditionally surrendered to the money power and turned the finances of a great Government over to the national banks. It is awful to contemplate, and the result can not be overestimated.

DANGEROUS POWERS.

"The powers this act gives the national banks are far-reaching and most dangerous. It turns over to them the finances of the people—the lifeblood of trade and commerce—and gives them the right to contract or expand the currency at will. This right should never be surrendered by the Government. I say, and time will demonstrate it, that if you give the control of the money supply to the national banks, they will soon absorb the wealth of the people and own the Government.

"It is an enormous power; a power that can cause panic or prosperity, happiness or misery, to thousands and millions of people. I say it is a power too great to be given to any corporation and, if once given and set in motion for selfish ends and for sordid purposes, will be a fruitful source of woe and misery to hundreds and to thousands of our fellow-citizens.

CREATES THE GREATEST TRUST.

"Talk against trusts! This act creates the greatest trust the world has ever seen—a national-bank trust, controlling the finances of a mighty people. This act makes the banks supreme. They will act in accord for a common purpose and be one great, gigantic trust, octopus-like, with tentacles reaching all over and to every part of the land, holding, squeezing, and controlling every other trust, every other industry, and all the people.

It marks the final consummation of the money power to enslave the industrial masses of our land, assassinate labor, strangle opportunity, paralyze trade, stagnate commerce, and pauperize toiling humanity.

A REPUBLICAN LAW.

"This is a Republican law, and the Republican party stand sponsor for it. It gives the monopoly of issuing money to the national banks, and hence the right to expand or contract the currency of the people whenever it suits their convenience. No corporation shouldhave this power to make or destroy. It deprives the Government of one of its greatest attributes of sovereignty and

gives to the national banks the right to paralyze at their will every industry in the country. It is the most daring attempt the banks have ever made by law to seize one of the greatest weapons for good or evil known to civilized man. For the Government to surrender this prerogative and delegate away this power is a crime against every citizen in this land and will work woe and misery to millions yet unborn.

TOO MUCH POWER.

"I am opposed to the Government delegating away its powers to the national banks. The Democratic party should vigorously oppose conferring additional powers on or granting any greater privileges to the national banks. In my judgment they already possess entirely too much power. They are doing to-day, only to a greater extent, what the United States Bank did in the days of Andrew Jackson. The right to coin and issue money is one of the greatest prerogatives of the Republic and one of the highest attributes of its sovereignty. It should not be delegated, transferred, assigned, or set over to any national bank, to any trust, or to any monopoly.

"As Democrats, we should resist the encroachments of national banks on the liberties of the people with the same zeal and the same courage that Andrew Jackson in his day resisted the audacious claim of the United States Bank. And when the national banks impudently declare that the Government should go out of the banking business, we answer that the banks must go out of the governing business.

"In Jackson's day there was only one Nick Biddle. To-day, by virtue of this law, there is a Nick Biddle in every national bank in the land.

"The Democratic party demands its repeal, and on this issue, if there were none other, in the coming campaign we will sweep the country and restore the government of the people to the people.

"WM. SULZER."

This letter is significant, Mr. Chairman, in many respects, not alone for the clear and truthful exposé of the iniquity of the banker's monopoly law, but it is significant because its author is a member from the city of New York, serving his third erm in this House, having been reelected in 1896, and again in 1898, while boldly defending the "Chicago platform" and Government issue of money as against national-bank notes. It is significant that it is published at this time in the most widely circulated paper in the great State of New York, with editorial indorsement. These facts clearly proclaim that the desire for exclusive Government money, together with the Chicago platform, is steadily gaining strength in New York and the East.

Porto Rico.

SPEECH

OF

HON. EBENEZER J. HILL,

OF CONNECTICUT,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, April 11, 1900.

The House having under consideration the bill (H. R. 8245) entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues for the relief of the island of Porto Rico, and for other purposes," and the Senate amendments thereto—

Mr. HILL said:

Mr. SPEAKER: Availing myself of the general leave to print concerning an act temporarily to provide revenues for the relief of the island of Porto Rico, etc., I propose to put into the RECORD a portion of a letter to a constituent, together with extracts from the official report of H. K. Carroll, special commissioner from the United States to Porto Rico, and also from the report of Gen. George W. Davis, military governor of the island, together with some deductions of my own, made after a somewhat careful study of these reports.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 7, 1900.*

MY DEAR SIR: Your letter received. I send herewith (and request your careful reading) the speech of Senator CHARLES W. FAIRBANKS, of Indiana. I will also send, as soon as I can get it, the speech of Senator SPOONER upon this same subject.

In the fall of 1898 I visited Porto Rico with the express purpose of studying the conditions there, so that I might vote intelligently upon the question when it arose. If I am wrong in my vote, every Republican Senator with the exception of five or six and every Republican Representative with the exception of five are equally wrong. If I am wrong, every Army officer now stationed in Porto Rico, including the commanding general of the island, is equally wrong. If I am wrong, the President of the United States, who was obliged to revise his opinion after the testimony before the House and Senate committees, is equally wrong.

The trouble about this whole question is that the generous, hearty sympathy of the American people fixed and defined the course which was to be pursued before the case was in court and the evidence submitted; and even the President of the United States, in the face of his own message, labored earnestly and faithfully with the members of Congress and Senators to vote for the pending bill. It is to his everlasting credit and honor that he did allow his judgment upon the presentation of the facts to control his warm-hearted sympathy for this little island. The trouble, my friend, in regard to this whole question is that we all, in making up our opinion concerning the people of Porto Rico, looked upon them as we would upon the same number of Anglo-Saxon people under like conditions, whereas they are like us in nothing. Never since Adam was driven out of Eden has any people been treated with the generosity which has been manifested by the United States toward Porto Rico.

When the American occupation came the little island was subject to a system of taxation which, for municipal and insular budgets, robbed them of 12,000,000 pesos annually, or substantially $12,000,000. A peso is exchangeable now by Executive order at 60 cents on a dollar. The agricultural interests of the island were practically bankrupt; the land mortgaged for almost its full value, with an interest charge ranging from 6 to 24 per cent and averaging between 12 and 18 per cent. The sugar industry was practically destroyed. There was but one thing to do, and that was to reduce taxes. The taxes on land were 12½ per cent on the whole income from it, and other taxes in like proportion. The tariff tax on a barrel of flour, together with the consumption tax in the island, was $6.24. Even a common laborer was taxed on a basis of one-sixth of his daily wages, and against that a tax of 12½ per cent was laid.

The first thing that the Americans did was to abate this robbery perpetrated under the plea of taxation; and after a careful study of the whole question I have not the slightest doubt whatever that in the twenty months since we went there fully one-half, or 10,000,000 of pesos, has been abated. The insular budget alone has been reduced from five and one half millions of pesos to less than $2,000,000 for the present year. Five hundred thousand dollars sent annually to Madrid for civil and military pensions has been stopped; $200,000 paid annually for the salaries of the clergy in the island has been stopped; $1,250,000 paid for war expenses has been stopped, and the entire military expenses of the island have, since the occupation, been paid out of the United States Treasury; $225,000 naval contribution to Spain has been stopped, and no charge to the island made by the United States for its naval expenses.

In addition to this, $750,000 has been generously given by the United States for the hurricane sufferers, and now $2,000,000 of tariff taxes have been refunded, and all duties, whether collected in the island or in the United States from goods going either way, will be paid into the Porto Rican treasury. The generosity of this treatment is perfectly unparalleled in the history of the world! The expenses of the island must be paid somewhere and somehow. It is impossible under existing conditions to properly adjust the internal-revenue taxation there and collect sufficient to meet the necessities of the case, and there are only two ways in which relief can come:

First. By tariff duties, every dollar of which will be refunded to the Porto Rican government, or by a straight appropriation from the United States Treasury, the effect of which would unquestionably be to benefit a few speculators and pauperize the rest of the island. The bill on which I shall vote during the coming week provides for an abatement of the existing tariff to the extent of 85 per cent of the present duties; for the collection of the remaining 15 per cent and the payment of every dollar of it back to help meet the expenses of the island; for the organization of a civil government, which is authorized to provide its own system of taxation, and, when the President of the United States is satisfied that such a system has been provided, for the immediate cessation of all duties between the island and the United States.

In my judgment, this bill for a civil government, which will be passed in response to the demand of the American people, is a very serious mistake and one which will bring us quick and lasting trouble, for I have not the slightest hesitation whatever in saying that the island of Porto Rico, which has been subjected for four hundred years to Spanish tyranny, and which, out of a million population, contains but 28,000 adult males 21 years of age who can read and write, is no more fit for self-government than the Indians in the Northwest are to-day; but if they do develop a capacity within six days or six weeks or at any time in the future, and can provide a system of taxation to meet the exigencies of the case, all customs duties automatically cease.

The subject is a great one, and there are vast issues involved, compared with which the question of a tariff in Porto Rico is a trivial incident, but neither my time nor your patience will permit me to go into them. Kindly read the two speeches which I will send you, and I shall be pleased to answer any further questions which you may see fit to ask, after you have done this.

With kind regards, I am, very truly, yours,

E. J. HILL.

TAXATION.

Page 57, report of General Davis.

Here follows an abstract of the budget of receipts and expenditures of Porto Rico for the fiscal years 1897-98 and 1898-99, both for the island proper and for the provincial deputation:

	1897-98.	1898-99.
RECEIPTS.		
Budget of the island:	*Pesos.*	*Pesos.*
1. Land and other taxes	576,200.00	901,200.00
2. Customs	3,132,900.00	3,377,900.00
3. Taxes on monopolies	184,200.00	312,200.00
4. State property	9,300.00	9,300.00
5. Contingent receipts	36,900.00	181,900.00
Budget of provincial deputation:		
Total of receipts	1,217,700.00	324,592.89
Total for both budgets	5,157,200.00	5,117,092.89
EXPENDITURES.		
Budget of the island:		
1. General liabilities	498,501.60	498,501.60
2. Justice	423,818.80	454,773.80
3. War	1,252,377.76	1,252,377.76
4. Finance	260,800.00	225,825.00
5. Navy	222,698.20	222,698.20
6. State	878,175.83	592,653.83
7. Interior		1,210,527.12
Budget of provincial deputation:		
1. Deputation provincial	221,261.48	227,772.80
2. State	210,254.00	.....
3. Interior	786,184.52	96,820.00
Total for both budgets	4,754,042.19	4,781,920.20

The year 1897-98 was wholly under Spanish control. The budget for 1898 and 1899 was made up by the insular authorities under the system of autonomy granted by Spain at that time.

These taxes were derived as follows, and I now quote from the report of H. K. Carroll, special commissioner of the United States:

Customs duties were levied both on imports and exports. There was a special tax on the loading and unloading of freight, the embarkation and disembarkation of passengers, and transitory dues of 10 per cent on duties on imports. There was a system of direct taxation resting on the basis of income and not on valuation.

The territorial tax affected urban and suburban property; the industrial and commercial included all kinds of manufactures and industries, all branches of the mercantile and banking business, and all occupations. The industrial and commercial tax was divided according to the population of

cities and towns, classified according to character of business, and graded according to amount of business. There were six divisions on the basis of population. Then there were five classes of tariff. The first, with eight grades, included merchants, wholesale and retail; the second, importers and exporters, money lenders, transportation, salaries of officials of banks, railroads, and other companies; the third, the manufacture of sugar, rum, machinery, chemicals, chocolate, ice, etc.; the fourth, the professions and occupations, and the fifth, patents or new shops, factories, etc., which had to pay a special installation tax.

Merchants, wholesale or retail dealers in various lines of wares, on commission or on their own account, paid according to the first grade; retail shops, hotels, and restaurants, according to the second; pharmacies, shoe, provision, and other retail stores were in the third; stationery shops, in the fourth; wholesale and retail tobacco shops, in the fifth; cafés for sale of soda water, etc., in the sixth; boarding houses, in the seventh, and shops for the sale of native flowers and plants, in the eighth.

The second tariff embraced salaries, wages, commissions, and the like.

Governors or directors of banks, railroad companies, etc., paid 5 per cent of their wages and salaries; contractors, 6 per cent of the amount of their contracts; banks, 10 per cent of their profits; importers and exporters, receiving and remitting, buying and selling, shipping, and conducting banking operations, paid $700 in cities of the first division.

No kind of business seems to have escaped the sharp eye of the State experts. Public baths, balls, and concerts; periodicals, including daily papers; laundries, funeral agencies, gymnasiums, livery stables, all kinds of industries, even the manufacture of artificial feet, were taxed.

Blacksmiths paid, according to the town in which their business was conducted, from 12 to 3 pesos, architects from 36 to 6, dentists and pharmacists the same, physicians and surgeons 48 to 12, nurses and midwives 18 to 5, veterinarians 15 to 5, barbers 8 to 2, lawyers, registers of property, and notaries 48 to 16, while carpenters, cabinetmakers, bookbinders, florists, tailors, milliners or dressmakers, professors of music and languages, painters, etc., paid according to their class and grade.

Among the exceptions may be noted washerwomen, barbers without shops, clerks in commercial houses, and similar classes.

Day laborers were assessed on the basis of one-third of the value of a half year's wages.

The territorial tax was levied on the income of real estate, both rural and urban. In valuing the income of a farm, the commissioners would fix a certain price for the respective products. All taxes were payable quarterly. The amount assessed for the benefit of the State was 5 per cent both on urban and suburban property.

The rate for the municipality varied according to its needs, but was generally 7 or 7½ per cent.

The income of municipalities was derived from the consumo tax on articles (food, drink, and fuel), from the tax on territorial, industrial, and commercial (being 9½ per cent of the valuation by the State), and from fines, leases, licenses, rents, etc. The income from licenses was for construction of buildings, scaffolds, sidewalks for street vending, for billiard tables, cockfighting, prostitutions, and even street begging.

From this brief review of the systems of taxation it will be seen that if the laws had been faithfully administered no person and no article or form of property could have escaped his or its share of the public burden. The direct taxes seem to have been extremely onerous.

The earnings of merchants, manufacturers, and other producers were subject to a tax of 12½ per cent or more, according to the financial exigencies of the treasuries, provincial and municipal.

If a merchant's income were valued at $10,000 a year, he would pay in direct taxes $1,230. He would also pay for his cedula or personal passport, the amount of which was graduated, according to personal means, from 12 cents up to $25 or more. He would pay a direct tax on his residence and furniture, and on his horses and other live stock, if not used for labor. If he were just starting in business, he would pay a patente or tax for the privilege. And yet the general testimony was to the effect that taxation was not really oppressive, or would not have been if it had been impartially assessed and collected. But the fact that it was so heavy doubtless had an influence in inducing people to conceal their property as much as possible and undervalue their annual income.

Articles of common use, such as rice, flour, corn, charcoal, wines, etc., not only paid heavy import duties, but were subject, with fresh beef, milk, and sugar produced in the island, to a consumo tax at the gates of the municipalities.

Flour, which had paid a duty of $4 at the custom-house per hundred kilos, paid at the city gates $2.50 consumo tax, or a total of $6.50, which was at the rate of about $3 per hundredweight. Rice, the common article of diet, paid $2.70 import duty and $1 consumo tax. Fresh beef paid a consumo tax of $5 a hundred kilos or 220 pounds. This was in addition to the head tax paid the city by the slaughterer.

This was the condition of taxation upon the date of American occupation. What changes have been made? From the budget of 1898–99 were stricken general liabilities, $498,501.60, all of which went to Madrid for expenses of the colonial ministry, etc., for payments to returned soldiers and marines and for pensions, civil and military pensions amounting to $362,700; for the clergy, $197,945; for the army, $1,252,378; for the navy, $222,668; leaving a total of $2,610,428 for that fiscal year, or a reduction in taxation which would have been levied upon Porto Rico, but for American occupation, of $2,171,493.

The budget for the year 1899–1900 makes still further reductions. It is as follows:

Imposts	$332,200.00
Miscellaneous	139,349.14
Customs	1,357,841.00
Postal	81,000.00
Total	1,910,390.14
Expenditures (estimated)	1,943,678.71

With this carried into effect, the reduction of taxation for this current year over the Spanish estimate for last year will be $2,838,241.49. In addition to this, large reductions have been made in the municipal taxes. The tax on agricultural land has been reduced one-half. The uses of stamped paper and all stamp taxes have been abolished. Fisheries have been made free. Church appropriations have ceased. Lotteries have been abolished. The principal consumo taxes on food, fuel, and drink have been abolished.

Notarial fees have been reduced from $1.88 to $1, from $4.50 to $1, from $11 to $1, from $1 to 50 cents, according to class of documents, and other fees have been canceled. The cost of the insular police has been reduced about $200,000.

Notwithstanding the large reduction of taxation this year, $119,709.30 will be expended in excess of last year for educational purposes.

All export duties have been discontinued. The customs tariff has been largely reduced, the estimated receipts under the military tariff of 1900 being $1,357,841 as against 3,377,900 pesos in the 1898–99 budget, which, as I have stated, was made up by the insular government after autonomy was promulgated.

Now, by vote of Congress the entire amount of all customs duties collected on Porto Rican products brought to the United States since American occupation and to be collected hereafter under the Dingley law have been refunded to the treasury of Porto Rico. This amount to January 1, 1900, was over $2,000,000. Surely Congress has at least dealt generously with Porto Rico. Besides these changes many others have been made, all in the interest of the taxpayer and in the line of removal of special burdens upon commerce. I call special attention to the preliminary report of H. K. Carroll, made in 1898, in December, upon the tariff. He says:

The Spanish tariff, like all other Spanish methods of raising money, was designed to secure the revenue needed with the least possible disadvantage to Spain. It was, of course, natural and proper that Spanish imports should be favored and that the productions of other nations should bear the chief burden. Consequently the rate paid on goods from the Peninsula averaged about 10 per cent, while the charges on those from other countries were high, in some instances so high as to be practically prohibitive.

When prohibitive duties are levied, it is usually for the purpose of excluding undesirable goods or of protecting home products. Prohibitive duties do not, of course, yield revenue; and if revenue is sacrificed, it must be in order that some other object deemed more important may be gained. But the Porto Rican tariff was so levied as to suppress, or at least repress, Porto Rican industries, and in some instances without benefiting those of the mother country. There seems to have been an utter disregard of insular interests. If Spanish producers were not affected, the framers of the tariff showed little concern as to how high or low the rates were put.

As between Spanish and Porto Rican producers and manufacturers the latter had no chance. Nor were the needs of Porto Rican consumers, however urgent they might appear from the insular point of view, treated as worthy of serious attention. Indispensable articles of food not produced in the island had to come in a roundabout way through the hands of the merchants in Spain or pay enormous duties if imported direct from other countries.

The Porto Ricans thought that some of the many streams of the island might well furnish power to mills to grind wheat from the United States or Canada into flour; but the government at Madrid punished these aspirations by making the duty on wheat almost as high as that on flour. Flour paid $4 per sack of 92 kilos (about 200 pounds), and wheat $3.15, and flour paid also, for municipal purposes, a consumption tax of $2.90. There were mills in Spain, and by importing wheat for them from the United States they could be kept going. The millers of Spain profited; the people of Porto Rico suffered.

The entire subject of tariff reform is treated exhaustively in this report, specific recommendations for the revision of each schedule being made by a committee of Ponce merchants. I cite from that relating to food stuffs. First, they recommend a gradual abolition of export duties on island products, extending over a ten-year period. These are wholly removed now. They advise a reduction of duties on wheat flour, unhulled rice, jerked beef, pork and lard, olive oil and olives, cheese, and butter. Codfish and salt fish may continue to pay the same duties. Wheat and unhulled rice should pay half the duty assessed against flour and hulled rice.

At that time the following Spanish duties were in force:

	Per 100 kilograms.
Wheat flour	$4.10
Wheat	3.25
Corn	3.25
Corn meal	4.10
Pork and lard	4.60
Hulled rice	2.88
Jerked beef	2.45
Codfish and salt fish	1.00
Cheese	15.10

Now, the duties on these same articles under the American military tariff are:

		Present duty.	Under proposed bill.
Wheat flour	per 100 kilograms	Free.	Free.
Wheat	do	$0.60	$0.09
Corn	do	.18	.027
Corn meal	do	Free.	Free.
Pork	do	Free.	Free.
Lard	do	1.70	.255
Hulled rice	do	.60	.09
Jerked beef	do	2.50	.375
Codfish	do	Free.	Free.
Salt fish	do	.50	.075
Cheese	do	3.00	.45

But it is said that in view of the high Spanish tariff against other countries food supplies came from Spain without duty except the war tax. This is not true.

During the year 1896 86,369 kilograms of codfish were imported

from Spain exempt from import duty, against 12,703,176 kilograms from other countries subject to duty.

Of cheese, 16,008 kilograms came from Spain exempt, against 311,872 kilograms subject to duty from other countries.

Who doubts that in all of these food products Spain received the full price paid for these things from other countries, with the duty added?

At that time they also recommended a reciprocity provision of 20 per cent reduction on the respective tariffs of the United States and Porto Rico, with a revision of rates every five years.

In view of all these facts, how remarkable is the suggestion that Congress is not dealing generously with Porto Rico when even the 15 per cent of existing rates is to be wholly paid into the insular treasury.

On February 17, 1899, Mr. Carroll reported upon the tariff to the Secretary of the Treasury on the large reductions made under the military tariff and quoted from a commercial bulletin as follows:

The new tariff reduction, considering the duties on articles of prime necessity, betters the conditions of the poorer classes, who form the majority of our population, and the cheapening augments the consumption, thus increasing the volume of business. The suppression of export duties is another of the improvements of the new tariff whose benefit requires no demonstration and will relieve somewhat the losses suffered by the low price of coffee and the want of markets for our tobacco.

Through the press of the country and in the progress of this debate, it has been repeatedly said that the military governor advocated immediate free trade, but, on page 54, General Davis says:

The island must, it is supposed, ultimately derive its principal revenue from internal taxation, but this can not be until a new scheme of taxation for the whole island can be worked out. This work requires very careful consideration and can not be properly done until the general policy to be pursued with respect to the future status of Porto Rico is known.

Regarding general legislation by Congress, it is recommended that the trade between the United States and the island be left as free as possible and that the customs revenues collected here be left to the island temporarily as an income for local expenditure. As soon as a new local internal-revenue tax law can be framed and put into operation the custom-house collections will inure to the General Treasury, but for a few years it will be very difficult to balance the budget without this aid.

The foregoing is from his official report. On March 31 he says as follows:

SAN JUAN, PORTO RICO.

In an interview to-day Governor-General Davis said:

"I have not felt it proper for me to discuss Congressional matters, filling, as I do, an executive position. I have expressed my views fully, however, on Porto Rico's needs; and I might say if Congress should adopt free trade, the receipts of the custom-houses would naturally cease. One million five hundred thousand dollars has been collected during the fiscal year, and with free trade this will fall off. What will then run the island?

"Although I have received no official advices regarding an appropriation, I understand through the newspapers that an appropriation was decided upon, and I infer that this appropriation will be spent on insular government expenses.

"If free trade is adopted I can not see how the necessary funds for the conduction of the affairs of the island are to be raised by myself or those who succeed me. Two million dollars are the present expenses, and this amount will be needed annually. There is only a small revenue incoming from stamps, liquors, tobacco, and mercantile licenses, and it is impossible to collect taxes because of the conditions."

So much for taxation. Concerning self-government and the capacity of the people to exercise this great privilege, I wish also to quote from this statesmanlike report:

SELF-GOVERNMENT.

I have found it to be necessary, as I believed, in the discussion of civil affairs, past and present, to advert in strong terms to the general unfitness of the great mass of the people for self-government, and, unfortunately, the number of the intelligent, learned, and responsible natives bears a very small ratio to the illiterate and irresponsible. If the percentage of those who are not able to read and write was as small as that of those who can, I would have the greatest pleasure in recommending the immediate endowment of the island with full autonomy.

The census of 1897 showed a population of 899,394, of which 75,824 were pure-blood negroes and 242,000 mulattoes, or of colored 317,824. Of the whole population he says on page 17:

A calculation was made by a local authority to show the number of electors on the supposition that the franchise should be exercised only by male natives over 21 years of age who could read and write or were taxpayers of record. The number of these two classes are given as—

Those who could read and write	28,073
Those who were taxpayers	26,285
Total	54,358

On the 25th day of July, 1899, an election was held in Adjuntas for municipal officers, and the registration was made in conformity to General Orders, No. 112:

The order imposed the following qualifications for electors: Men over 21 years old, able to read and write, or who were taxpayers of record, who had been actual residents of the island for at least two years and of the municipality for six months preceding the date of the election. The number who proved these qualifications before the board of registration was 906, out of a population, according to the census of 1897, of 18,505; that is, less than 5 per cent could vote under the conditions stated.

There was much public interest in this election, and it is believed that about all who were eligible were registered. This incident indicated that in the whole island there may be approximately 45,000 who could vote under the conditions of the order above referred to.

The class who can not fulfill these conditions, say 75 per cent of the males over 21 years of age, are usually in a state of abject poverty and ignorance, and are assumed to include one-fifth of the inhabitants.

They are of the class usually called peons. This word in Spanish America, under old laws, defined a person who owed service to his creditor until the debt was paid. While those laws are obsolete, the condition of these poor people remains much as before. So great is their poverty that they are always in debt to the proprietors or merchants. They live in huts made of sticks and poles covered with thatches of palm leaves. A family of a dozen may be huddled together in one room, often with only a dirt floor. They have little food worthy of the name and only the most scanty clothing, while children of less than 7 or 8 years of age are often entirely naked. A few may own a machete or a hoe, but more have no worldly possessions whatever. Their food is fruit, and if they are wage-earners, a little rice and codfish in addition.

They are without ambition and see no incentive to labor beyond the least that will provide the barest sustenance.

All over the island they can be seen to-day sitting beside their ruined huts, thinking naught of to-morrow, making no effort to repair and restore their cabins nor to replant for future food.

The remarks of Mr. James Anthony Froude, in his work on the English in the West Indies, apply with full force to these people:

"Morals in the technical sense they have none, but they can not be said to sin because they have no knowledge of law, and therefore they can commit no breach of the law. They are naked and not ashamed. They are married but not parsoned.

"The women prefer the looser tie, that they may be able to lose the man if he treats her unkindly, yet they are not licentious. * * * The system is strange, but it answers. * * * There is evil, but there is not the demoralizing effect of evil. They sin, but they sin only as animals, without shame, because there is no sense of doing wrong. They eat the forbidden fruit, but it brings with it no knowledge of the difference between good and evil. * * * They are innocently happy in the unconsciousness of the obligations of morality. They eat, drink, sleep, and smoke, and do the least in the way of work they can. They have no ideas of duty, and therefore are not made uneasy by neglecting it."

Between the negro and the peon there is no visible difference. It is hard to believe that the pale, sallow, and often emaciated beings are the descendants of the conquistadores who carried the flag of Spain to nearly all of South America and to one-third of North America.

One family of industrious people, such as are found all over the United States, contributes more to the general prosperity and wealth of the country than ten families of these peons.

Spain maintained in Porto Rico before the war a force of upward of 4,000 regular troops, about 1,600 more than the number now in the island, while the Spanish guardia civil had double the strength of the present insular police.

The former government, it is said, was administered with great rigor and the civil guards were the agents for apprehending violaters of the laws and of royal decrees and orders. The accounts given of the barbarities practiced by these men tell of a condition that is scarcely conceivable. The island was peaceful, but it must have been such a peace as exists only where the inhabitants are subjected to a reign of terror.

With the departure of the Spanish forces came a swing of the pendulum to the opposite side. The pressure was released. The people, good and bad, had yet to learn and see that there could be no rule of order or well-being without subjection to the ordinary requirements of organized society.

It was difficult for them to conceive of a reign of law without display or constant exercise of force. Obedience to law for the common benefit of all seemed to them incomprehensible, and the inculcation of this doctrine has been far from easy. But notwithstanding the unfavorable conditions much progress has been made, though the advance from day to day and from month to month has been scarcely perceptible. But comparing the past with the present it is not difficult to recognize the general advance and progress toward a greatly improved system of administration, a system that will insure peace and tranquillity and that will furnish a fair opportunity for the island to prove its capacity and to take its place as one of the well-governed communities of the world.

The steps by which this result has been attained are stated in the circular of August 15 herewith, and it is unnecessary to enumerate them a second time.

In any country where more than one-half of the population is continually on the verge of starvation or are pinched by hunger; where labor, when employed at all, is remunerated only to the extent of from 20 to 35 cents per day; where thousands upon thousands are unable to secure work at any rate; where only 10 or 15 per cent of the inhabitants can read and write; where the ordinary standards of public morality are largely ignored; where half the children are illegitimate; and, finally, where the functions of the government have been used to discourage, repress, or prevent initiative, and the people have no knowledge of any duty or obligation but to obey the orders of the governing classes—it would be strange if, under such conditions, murder was unknown, and pilfering, stealing, and plundering were uncommon.

Let it be supposed that under conditions such as are recited a government of repression should be suddenly relaxed and for it another substituted, which these ignorant people have heard of as one under which freedom is the predominating characteristic; it would be still less strange if, when released from restraint, the tendency to lawlessness should greatly increase and a reign of terror should take the place of a reign of oppression.

The people of this island have been long and thoroughly taught an unfortunate object lesson. They have seen the island governed and exploited by a class in the interest and for the benefit of a few.

The Spanish governing element has disappeared, but their example remains. There is no lack of natives of learning and ability ready to take the place of their former masters, step into their vacant shoes, and take up the government laid down. And, having power, would they not use it as their predecessors did? So long have the people been accustomed to this kind of control and absolute subordination that the most of them would accept it as a matter of course.

There is no lack on the part of these people of pretension to all the virtues, and as beautiful theories of government as were ever propounded by the wisest statesman are put forth continuously. The cause of the brotherhood and the rights of man has as ardent expounders in Porto Rico as could have been found in France in 1793 or in Philadelphia in 1776. There are here a few really public-spirited men who appear to have ideas of government other than self-seeking, but the number is very small. Were the mass of the inhabitants educated and possessed of some conception of the duties of citizenship and experience in civil government, their immediate endowment with rights and privileges equal to those enjoyed by our own citizens would be gladly recommended.

But in view of the profound illiteracy of 85 per cent of the people, of their total unfitness to exercise the elective franchise, of the corruption and maladministration that now characterize the affairs of many municipalities, and of the misuse that would almost certainly be made of political power by those who would inevitably secure it, I can not find warrant or justification for a recommendation to now vest Porto Rico with the faculties and power

of self-government—an investiture that I think should be withheld until there shall have been a plain demonstration of their competence to exercise it. When they govern municipalities well, they may have larger duties devolved upon them.

There are very learned and able men in both parties, and their profession of principles and political platforms would receive warm commendation by the most ardent patriot. But I have no knowledge of any country where Latin Americans, released from arbitrary control, have established well-ordered representative institutions within a generation succeeding their liberation, and there are to day many unfortunate illustrations of their incapacity to do so in countries which have been independent for sixty or seventy years. History tells us that usually in Spanish-American republics there is a revolution or civil war at intervals of a few years, except when despotic use of power has prevented it. In vain have I diligently sought for a reason justifying a confidence that Porto Rico would be able to make a better record.

I also quote concerning conditions prior to American occupation, pages 7 and 8:

THE FORMER RÉGIME.

The régime prevailing in Porto Rico previous to the adoption of the autonomic system was a constant source of discontent to the natives of the country and a permanent cause of social and economic unrest. All the governmental and administrative machinery being placed in the hands of one man, the cooperation of valuable and responsible native elements was systematically rejected, individual initiative of every sort was rendered ineffectual, empiricism was transformed into a system of government, and routine formed the basis of public administration. The natural consequence of such a régime was the stagnation of the country, and this was the actual result.

There were other respects wherein the system was extremely prejudicial to public interests. It fostered the creation of a political party composed of Spanish residents of the islands, into whose hands was completely surrendered the interior administration in return for the service of helping at all times to elect for representatives of Porto Rico in the Spanish Cortes deputies and senators identified with the politics of the home cabinet. This policy of do ut des converted the island into a fief of a group of foreigners and their native allies; and, as was to be expected, the most absolute administrative corruption resulted therefrom, especially in the matter of tax assessments, the natural sequel being standing grievances and continual uneasiness.

As the result of long-continued complaints and as an outgrowth of the Cuban war, an autonomous government was granted and elections were held for the national and insular parliaments; but the few autonomists elected (see page 9) "as a protest against the scandalous elections which were asserted to have been conducted by the secretary of government in combination with the alcaldes, resigned their places in the government and decided not to attend the insular parliament."

Commenting upon political conditions, General Davis says, on page 10:

In order to permit American customs and policy to take root in this island and to prepare it for transformation into an organized Territory, it is desirable to set aside personal politics, which is one of the inherited vices here. The public mind must also be disabused of the idea, still dominant, that the whole art of politics consists in securing power in order to give offices to one's friends. It has been too much the rule here for officeholders to neglect public interests and to blindly obey those who, having put them in office, can also remove them. Their endeavors are directed chiefly to obtaining high salaries, and they give little return therefor. Besides, it is necessary to instill vigor into municipal life by granting full local autonomy. This will accustom the people to act for themselves and not look to the Government for everything, as has been the case until now.

It is especially necessary to wipe out all those inherited vices and to prepare the country for a real democratic régime, to suppress all abuses, and to install new methods of administration and government, so as to allow the people to take part in the control of their local affairs without the predominant influence of persons having only political ambitions to serve.

This, it seems to me, must be done under superior supervision; for to hastily abandon the island to local control unrestrained by superior power would, or might, result in the greatest disaster.

TRADE STATISTICS.

For 1895, 1896, and 1897 Porto Rico exported—

	Pesos.
Coffee	35,579,151
Tobacco	2,315,455
Sugar and molasses	13,264,162
Total	51,158,768
Average	17,052,922

Of this Spain took—

Coffee	9,735,772
Tobacco	640,825
Sugar and molasses	2,986,326
Total	13,362,923

Cuba took—

Coffee	9,105,570
Tobacco	1,530,856
Total	10,636,426

In coffee our market is and has been free, and the markets of England, Germany, France, and Italy, which absorbed one-half of the whole product, are unchanged.

Cuba took one-quarter of the coffee and five-eighths of the tobacco. The duties there are in response to Cuban demand and, under Cuban independence, will undoubtedly be retained or only given up in exchange for a free market for Cuba in the United States.

Spain took only about one-quarter of each of these products. The United States took three-quarters of the sugar and molasses, and practically nothing else, and this came to us under full tariff rates, 85 per cent of which are now proposed to be withdrawn, and all of the remainder will be paid back to the insular government. Surely this is not ungenerous treatment. Concerning the sugar industry the report says:

At the present time there is but one new sugar mill being erected, and those who are investing their capital in this enterprise—Americans—are doing so because they believe that sugar will soon be admitted free into the United States. But for this belief the enterprise would not have been undertaken. I am not in possession of data giving the number of existing cane mills—I presume the number would reach 300—but the ruins of many such structures can be seen here and there, abandoned because the owner could not afford to improve his machinery—in other words, abandoned or idle—because the business does not pay.

The sugar export of the island has fallen from a total of 170,000 tons in 1879 to 57,000 tons in 1897. On the basis of the ruling price of sugar that prevailed here during the years 1895-1899, inclusive, about 2 cents per pound, no new mill will be erected; and as the old ones get beyond economical repair they will be abandoned and the cane lands pertaining thereto will be used only to pasture cattle.

AGRICULTURE.

The entire industrial future of the island depends on agriculture; it has, and can have, no other reliance, and this fact must never be overlooked in considering any measures with a view to the development of its wealth.

There is a superabundance of labor here; no other West India island except Barbados is so densely populated. But labor is increasing much more rapidly than the capacity of the island to employ it, and the natural consequence is low wages.

In any country where labor is rewarded by compensation of but about 20 or 30 cents per day, the prospect of speedily reaching a high state of civilization and industry must not be expected. The wage rate throughout nearly all Spanish-speaking American territory is not above the figures given. In the British, French, Dutch, and Danish West Indies the laborer receives only from 16 to 25 cents per day for his services. In Brazil, whence comes over 70 per cent of the world's coffee supply, the cost of labor is but about 10 to 15 cents per day. If higher rates than now are ever paid here, it will only be when better prices are obtained for home productions.

So great is the bounty of nature here that the inhabitants can live—that is, exist—without any remuneration. Work not being a necessity, therefore, the present incentive to labor is so small that it seems to matter little to the average peon whether or not he is employed at all. On the other hand, if wages were to be largely increased, there would come hordes of immigrants from neighboring islands to share the benefit unless this was prevented by the adoption of restrictive measures.

Better rates of labor than now prevail can not be expected until there is an advance in the price of the principal products. Were the sugar planter now confronted with the necessity of paying 50 cents in gold per day for field and mill hands—a result which is looked for to follow free trade with the United States—nearly all sugar estates would have to be abandoned. Last year sugar polarizing 96° netted the producer just about 2¼ cents per pound, American money. This year the net returns are slightly better, but the duty paid on sugar imported into the United States is burdened with a tax of 1.685 cents the pound on polariscope test of 96°. Could this tax be abated the producer would receive this year nearly 4¼ cents per pound and wages of 50 cents or more could be paid.

But would such wages be paid? The inference is wholly to the contrary, for the report proceeds to show that—

The small proprietors are disappearing, for the capitalist so arranges his business in Porto Rico and nearly everywhere else as to force the small proprietors to sell their holdings. The tendency in the sugar business, as in all other requiring large aggregations of capital, is to combine or consolidate. While the population is steadily increasing, the number of small proprietors is steadily decreasing, as shown by statistics.

In producing coffee and tobacco the necessities or advantages of combination are not so urgent; but since sugar can not be produced at a profit without large concentrated investments, it is only through combines and trusts that the best commercial success will be attained. Should the development of the cane industry in Porto Rico approximate that achieved in Mauritius, Barbados, and Hawaii, the cane lands will be ultimately owned or practically controlled by these huge "central" proprietors. There will be a few thousand owners, managers, overseers, clerks, etc., and many hundreds of thousands of peon laborers, whose social and, if we may judge by numerous examples in other countries, industrial conditions will be the same as now, and without hope of improvement.

Nowhere in the world, save in the United States and Hawaii, is sugar now extensively produced on a basis of a wage rate for field and mill hands exceeding, say, 30 cents per diem, and in many tropical countries the rate is not above 20 cents.

Considering the world's enormous acreage suitable to cane cultivation and the teeming population available, it is probable, indeed almost certain, that, whatever be the price at which sugar may be sold, the peon will still remain in a state of serfdom, and generation after generation, living in fief to a merchant monopoly, will be able to earn only the wherewithal to indulge in drink, debauchery, and vice. Some of the most instructively warning pages in West Indian history deal with these diverse interests of the population.

This is a gloomy picture, but, turn it how we will, no brighter side appears for the swarming hordes of human beings who now exist here and who will increase and multiply indefinitely.

Yet the country will increase in wealth, trade will flourish, roads will be made, public buildings will rise, harbors will be enlarged, vessels in increasing numbers will be freighted with riches, and the wealth of nations will go on augmenting. Such appear to be everywhere the inevitable tendencies of modern industrial and commercial development.

Notwithstanding these gloomy reflections, it is hoped that the inhabitants of this beautiful and rich tropical island may have a better lot in store. If the legislation for Porto Rico is wise and if an extension of commercial privileges to the sugar grower is conditioned upon an obligation on the part of the proprietors to ameliorate the condition of their employees, to provide near-by schools for children, hospitals for the sick, and asylums for the old and infirm, an example may be given that will be unique in the history of government of tropical lands.

It will not escape your observation that the value of the coffee crop exported is two and two-thirds times as great as that of the sugar, and was nearly seven-tenths of the value of all the exports of the island during the three years, 1895-1897. It will be noticed that more than half of all the coffee sent out of the island went to Cuba and Spain, markets that are now practically lost to this island. Had former prices been maintained, this loss of more than half of the markets would have been of no moment, but with the closing of the doors to this staple came the very great fall in price, due probably in a large degree to the phenomenally heavy export from Brazil and other coffee-producing countries.

Nevertheless, had the same trade relations existed between this island and Cuba that formerly existed, Porto Rico would certainly have enjoyed some

advantage from her favorable and convenient situation for supplying the needs of her near neighbor. And this deprivation has seemed the harder to Porto Rico because both islands were under the American flag. As a result, Cuban needs have been met by importations from Brazil by way of the United States, involving a voyage of more than 4,000 miles and two rehandlings, whereas this island would have sent its coffee direct to Cuba, a voyage of but one-fourth or one-fifth as long, and without rehandling, but it was and is shut out from its old established market with an import tax of 5.5 cents (gold) per pound, or over 9 centavos to the pound.

Although the Porto Rican berry is much more highly esteemed by many coffee users than the product of Brazil, it is unknown in the United States, and can not now be sold there at a price which would net the producer more than 4 or 5 cents per pound. In 1897 the exportations of coffee hence to the United States did not reach 110,000 pounds of the total export of 23,505,000 pounds. Of this last amount Spain consumed nearly 17,000,000 pounds, a fact that points clearly to the great desirability of establishing such trade relations with Spain as might permit freer commercial intercourse than now. But in any event it is not believed that the output of coffee will be largely increased. It does not seem probable that the high prices of 1896-97 can be maintained.

New York, Hamburg, and Havre fix the prices, and since Brazil, Central and South America, Mexico, and the islands of the Pacific can produce coffee in vast quantities and market the same at 5 cents per pound, this island must expect to adjust its prices accordingly. Ten centavos per pound is about all the producer can expect to receive for this product, unless Porto Rican coffee should become well known in the United States and so much preferred to other grades as to put it on a level with Mocha and so-called Java. If the export keeps to the average since 1892, bringing annually to Porto Rico from 10,000,000 to 14,000,000 pesos, the island will be fortunate.

TOBACCO.

The great bulk of the tobacco export has been sold in Cuba, from which it is now shut out; but under the proposed bill it will have an advantage in the markets of the United States of 85 per cent less duties than the Cuban product, and consequently 85 per cent better standing than when it came into the United States through Cuban ports.

The Late Richard Parks Bland.

REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM SULZER,
OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, April 7, 1900.

The House having under consideration the following resolutions:

"*Resolved*, That the business of the House be now suspended in order that suitable tribute may be paid to the high character and eminent public services of the Hon. RICHARD PARKS BLAND, late a most distinguished member of the House of Representatives of the United States from the State of Missouri.

"*Resolved*, That as a mark of respect for the memory of the deceased the House, at the conclusion of these memorial exercises, shall stand adjourned.

"*Resolved*, That the Clerk of the House transmit a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased statesman and inform the Senate of the action of this body"—

Mr. SULZER said:

Mr. SPEAKER: With all that has been so eloquently and so affectionately said here to-day regarding the life and character of the late RICHARD P. BLAND I concur, and I would not be true to myself and to my friendship and admiration for him if I did not on this sad occasion place on record my humble tribute to his memory.

For years Mr. BLAND has been a prominent national figure and his name a household word. He had friends and followers and admirers in every hamlet and every State in the Union. His untimely death was a sad and terrible shock to us all, and to his country an irretrievable loss. When he died, the whole nation mourned and sympathized with his bereaved family, and the Republic lost as true and sincere a patriot as ever lived. He was a true man, a friend of the plain people, generous and forgiving, sincere and patriotic, honest and truthful, zealous and indefatigable in the cause of right and justice. For a quarter of a century he was a towering pillar of the Republic. The work he did is a part of the history of our country, and it is fitting and proper that his colleagues in this House should set aside a day to justly commemorate his name and fame. As the years come and go he will be better understood and more appreciated. Posterity will give him a higher place in the Temple of Fame, and future generations will pay his memory greater homage.

RICHARD PARKS BLAND was born near Hartford, Ky., on the 19th day of August, 1835, and died at his home in Lebanon, Mo., on the 15th day of June, 1899. He received an academic education. He was an unwearied student and an apt scholar. In 1855 he removed to Missouri and shortly thereafter to California, thence to that portion of Utah now Nevada, locating in Virginia City, where he practiced law for a time. He was interested in mining operations in California and Nevada; was county treasurer of Carson County, Utah Territory, from 1860 until the organization of the State government of Nevada; returned to Missouri in 1865; located at Rolla, Mo., and practiced law with his brother, C. C. Bland, until he removed to Lebanon in August, 1869, and continued his practice there; was elected to the Forty-third, Forty-fourth, Forty-fifth, Forty-sixth, Forty-seventh, Forty-eighth, Forty-ninth, Fiftieth, Fifty-first, Fifty-second, Fifty-third, Fifty-fifth, and Fifty-sixth Congresses.

The work he did for the toilers of the land and the beneficent results he accomplished for struggling humanity during his long career as a member of this House must ever be a part of the imperishable history of the country, and the future historian impartially writing the legislative story of the last twenty-five years of the American Congress will place him in the front rank of constructive statesmen. That record is the heritage he left his countrymen and will be for all time to come the monument of his undying fame. It stands for absolute truth, exact justice, eternal principles, equality before the law, and equal rights for all.

He was no respecter of persons, no hero worshiper. He believed in humanity and trusted the people. He had faith in the greatness and the endurance of the Republic, and battled all his life to perpetuate our free institutions and hand them down unimpaired to future generations. He was a plain, simple man who loved his fellow-man. He was a believer in the fundamental principles that constitute our national existence and he trod the path of the patriot fathers. He was a disciple of Thomas Jefferson and struggled to keep the Government pure and in the control of the people. He turned his back on caste, combated privilege, and was the relentless foe of monopoly. He was a unique man in many ways. His nature was without guile; he hated cant, spurned pretense, and despised hypocrisy. He was the friend of the Constitution, and no argument, no sophistry, could persuade him from the path of duty. He did his work bravely and fearlessly in the face of obstacles that would appall a weaker and a more timid man.

In the great battle for the people's rights he never wearied, and the marshaled hosts of error never conquered him. Year in and year out he fought the good fight; he kept the faith. He lived truly, he thought truly, and he spoke truly. His life was as placid as a summer stream, and made him loved by all who knew him. His words uttered here for the defenseless were always respectfully listened to by admiring friends and doubting opponents, and were read and reread by innumerable millions. He spoke the truth for the countless who were robbed and oppressed for the enrichment and the benefit of the few, and he knew the truth would ultimately triumph and that his efforts for the rights of the people would sooner or later be crowned with success.

Think truly, and thy thought
Shall the world's great famine feed;
Speak truly, and each word of thine
Shall be a fruitful seed;
Live truly, and thy life shall be
A grand and noble creed.

Such a man was RICHARD PARKS BLAND—a truly great, a truly good, a truly honest man in all things.

The great and immortal truths he uttered were not uttered in vain. They have borne and will continue to bear abundant fruit. His cause will live, and, in my opinion, the day is not far distant when the principles he contended for will be written on the statute books of America, an everlasting monument to his wisdom, his foresight, and his unerring judgment. The martyr dies, the cause survives. Man goeth to his long home, but his works live after him.

Mr. BLAND was a faithful public servant. He never betrayed a friend, a trust, or a principle. He always fought fair and open and aboveboard. He never resorted to trickery, to device, or to chicanery. He had no tricks of speech. He was a plain, blunt man, who never used words to conceal thoughts. He told the truth and told it in the simplest and most direct way. He went to the root of the subject. His heart was in all he did, in all he said, and he was great and eloquent and impressive because he was simple, honest, and sincere, and every word he uttered had the genuine ring of truth. He never despaired. He had the rectitude and patience of the rocks, the hope of the stream rushing to meet the ocean, the fidelity of the sun.

He believed in equal opportunity, encouraged worth, applauded manly effort, and wanted man to be free and stand erect. He was a great commoner; he sympathized with those who toil and struggle; he believed in the love of home, the sanctity of the hearthside, and his great responsive heart went out to comfort the sad, the sorrowing, and the disconsolate. He was the foe of tyranny, the enemy of bigotry, the eternal adversary of oppression. He was the champion of the masses, the friend of the downtrodden, the pioneer and the leader of the reform forces of the Republic against the serried ranks of the predatory classes.

Humanity was his constituency, to do good his political creed. He stood for the weak against the strong, for the lowly against the powerful, for the oppressed against the oppressor, for the right against the wrong, for truth against error, for every cause that lacked assistance, and, above all and beyond all, he stood, in all places and at all times, for the rights of man. When he died a great tree in the forests of the people fell and a great light in the

Republic went out. We who follow after him, imbued with his noble example and inspired by his civic virtues, will heroically take up his burden, push forward his cause, and continue his fight until the battle is won and the mighty principles he contended for are forever triumphant. I believe if he were here to-day this would be his message, his wish to us, and that he would say to all as the poetess of America has so truly said to the world:

Let those who have failed take courage,
Though the enemy seemed to have won,
Though his ranks are strong, if he be in the wrong,
The battle is not yet done.
For sure as the morning follows
The darkest hour of the night,
No question is ever settled
Until it is settled right.

O man bowed down with labor,
O woman young, yet old,
O heart oppressed in the toiler's breast
And crushed by the power of gold,
Keep on with your weary battle
Against triumphant might,
No question is ever settled
Until it is settled right.

Late Representative Sydney P. Epes.

REMARKS
OF
HON. R. C. DE GRAFFENREID,
OF TEXAS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, March 24, 1900.

The House having under consideration the following resolutions:

"*Resolved*, That the business of the House be now suspended that opportunity may be given for tributes to the memory of Hon. SYDNEY P. EPES, late a member of the House of Representatives from the State of Virginia.

"*Resolved*, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, and in recognition of his eminent abilities as a distinguished public servant, the House, at the conclusion of these memorial proceedings, shall stand adjourned.

"*Resolved*, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

"*Resolved*, That the Clerk be instructed to send a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased"—

Mr. DE GRAFFENREID said:

Mr. SPEAKER: Seldom, if ever, in the history of this House has it been moved by the death of a member with such profound sorrow and grief as that which manifested itself in the hearts of all by the demise of the Hon. SYDNEY P. EPES, late Representative of the Fourth district of Virginia. Sudden and unexpected, in the full flush and vigor of manhood, with a career opening before him which gave promise of great and glorious things, the spark of life went out, but his memory lives, and will live orever, in the hearts of those who knew and loved him.

Nature had endowed him with fine physique and stamped upon his brow and every clear-cut feature strength, grace, and dignity of bearing, which would have marked him as distinguished in any assembly of men.

Born in the grand old State of Virginia, of an honored family, cradled in the lap of liberty, reared amid its surpassing scenery and picturesque environment, educated in the schools of our Republic, by profession a journalist, always a student, his mind was a magazine of knowledge. He was a gentleman of the old Virginia type—brave, noble, generous, affable alike to all with whom he came in contact. "As particles of iron are drawn to the magnet," so he drew his fellows to him, and always to cheer by a genial and sunny nature.

As an editor he wielded a facile pen, his style clear and cogent, his diction pure, and in the broad sweep of his intellectual vision no question of public moment escaped him, and no subject was presented to his versatile mind which he did not illumine.

I knew him to love and respect him, and will ever honor and cherish his memory, and I shall ever regard myself fortunate indeed to have been brought in contact with him. His presence carried with it an atmosphere so pure, so enobling, that all who came within its sphere were enriched and inspired to nobler manhood. His fellow-countrymen were not slow to detect the sterling traits of his character, the intellectual force and vigor which preeminently fitted him to become a leader among men; hence from the quiet walks of like, surrounded by a host of friends and neighbors, who vied with each other in doing him homage, he was called upon to take upon him one public trust after another in the Commonwealth of Virginia, which he discharged with such care and efficiency that he was finally selected as the standard bearer of his party to represent his district in Congress; elected by a fair majority to the Fifty-fifth Congress, his seat was contested and lost to him by a party vote on the floor; his constituents, stung by the injustice of the procedure, rallied to his support with renewed energy and unanimously declared him their candidate for the Fifty-sixth Congress, and swelled his majority at the polls to such proportions that his opponent did not dare to again contest. And, though his active Congressional life was of brief duration, it was marked by a high order of statesmanship, industrious, alert, courageous, looking ever to the interests of his constituents, no duty was left undone, no service seemed small, no task, however arduous, was ever shirked. He held close to his heart the interests and general welfare of his State, and every national question was carefully weighed in the balance; and, when called upon, as he was frequently, for counsel and advice, he was ever ready with clear answer and argument, showing conclusively that he had fully digested and mastered the subject in question; and it is not too much to say had he lived he would have been returned again and again by his loyal and faithful people to the post of honor and duty, and each new session of Congress would have found him nearer and nearer the goal, and other honors in his State and the nation's gift would have been his, and history would finally have placed him among that galaxy of stars which proud Virginia may well boast and which a grateful nation claims for her own.

He was comparatively a poor man in worldly possessions, but rich in intellectual, moral, and social endowments; his heart was centered in his home; his wife, children, and aged parents were all in all to him; those who had the privilege of the welcome and hospitality of his home saw him at his best in the family circle—a dutiful son, a faithful brother, a devoted and loving husband, an affectionate father.

No words of mine can give a just estimate of his life and character—a manly man, equable in disposition, matchless in bearing, the personification of honesty, integrity, and truth. No greater tribute can be offered than that around the open grave. Thousands had gathered there from every section of his district; State and nation were there represented; all the pastors of his town, men, women, and children from every station in life were there; garlands of flowers, chaplets of roses intertwined with evergreen exhaling their fragrance, which rose like incense; tears that fell from sad eyes, sighs from broken hearts in attestation of tender affection and devoted love, which speak more eloquently of his worth than tongue, or pen, or brush.

Tell me not that SYDNEY P. EPES is dead; he lives in the hearts of those who knew and loved him; he lives in the deeds of mind and muscle; he lives in the thoughts conceived and uttered; he will live again in lives inspired by his undying example, yea, he lives in the realms beyond the sunset glory of death, or rather what we call death, for death is not an extinction of being, it is but an epoch, an event in the grand eternal march of existence. "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." His body sleeps in the bosom of mother earth, but his soul sweeps on in unbroken continuity to larger, grander life and usefulness.

And thou, who o'er thy friend's low bier
Sheddest the bitter drops like rain,
Hope that a brighter, happier sphere
Will give him to thy arms again.

Of him not eulogy, but truth, may say:

Earth never pillowed upon her bosom a truer son, nor heaven opened wide her portals to receive a manlier spirit.

Government for the Territory of Hawaii.

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES M. ROBINSON,
OF INDIANA.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, April 6, 1900,

On the bill (S. 222) to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Under the privileges accorded by the action of the House during the consideration of the Hawaiian bill, I embrace the opportunity of presenting to Congress and to the country an address by Hon. William J. Bryan, which speaks sentiments good when they were uttered in Washington a year ago and highly appropriate at this very hour:

[Extract from speech delivered at Washington Day banquet given by the Virginia Democratic Association at Washington, D. C., February 22, 1899, by William J. Bryan.]

AMERICA'S MISSION.

When the advocates of imperialism find it impossible to reconcile a colonial policy with the principles of our Government or with the canons of morality; when they are unable to defend it upon the ground of religious duty or pecuniary profit, they fall back in helpless despair upon the assertion that it is destiny. "Suppose it does violate the Constitution," they say; "suppose it does break all the Commandments; suppose it does entail upon

the nation an incalculable expenditure of blood and money; it is destiny and we must submit."

The people have not voted for imperialism; no national convention has declared for it; no Congress has passed upon it. To whom, then, has the future been revealed? Whence this voice of authority? We can all prophesy, but our prophecies are merely guesses, colored by our hopes and our surroundings. Man's opinion of what is to be is half wish and half environment. Avarice paints destiny with a dollar mark before it; militarism equips it with a sword.

He is the best prophet who, recognizing the omnipotence of truth, comprehends most clearly the great forces which are working out the progress not of one party, not of one nation, but of the human race.

History is replete with predictions which once wore the hue of destiny, but which failed of fulfillment because those who uttered them saw too small an arc of the circle of events.

When Pharaoh pursued the fleeing Israelites to the edge of the Red Sea he was confident that their bondage would be renewed and that they would again make bricks without straw, but destiny was not revealed until Moses and his followers reached the farther shore dry-shod and the waves rolled over the horses and chariots of the Egyptians.

When Belshazzar, on the last night of his reign, led his thousand lords into the Babylonian banquet hall and sat down to a table glittering with vessels of silver and gold he felt sure of his kingdom for many years to come, but destiny was not revealed until the hand wrote upon the wall those awe-inspiring words, "Mene, Mene, Tekel, Upharsin." When Abderrahman swept northward with his conquering hosts his imagination saw the Crescent triumphant throughout the world, but destiny was not revealed until Charles Martel raised the cross above the battlefield of Tours and saved Europe from the sword of Mohammedanism.

When Napoleon emerged victorious from Marengo, from Ulm, and from Austerlitz he thought himself the child of destiny, but destiny was not revealed until Blücher's forces joined the army of Wellington and the vanquished Corsican began his melancholy march toward St. Helena. When the red coats of George the Third routed the New Englanders at Lexington and Bunker Hill, there arose before the British sovereign visions of colonies taxed without representation and drained of their wealth by foreign-made laws, but destiny was not revealed until the surrender of Cornwallis completed the work begun at Independence Hall and ushered into existence a Government deriving its just powers from the consent of the governed.

We have reached another crisis. The ancient doctrine of imperialism, banished from our land more than a century ago, has recrossed the Atlantic and challenged democracy to mortal combat upon American soil.

Whether the Spanish war shall be known in history as a war for liberty or as a war of conquest; whether the principles of self-government shall be strengthened or abandoned; whether this nation shall remain a homogeneous republic or become a heterogeneous empire—these questions must be answered by the American people. When they speak, and not until then, will destiny be revealed.

Destiny is not a matter of chance; it is a matter of choice. It is not a thing to be waited for; it is a thing to be achieved.

No one can see the end from the beginning, but everyone can make his course an honorable one from beginning to end by adhering to the right under all circumstances. Whether a man steals much or little may depend upon his opportunities, but whether he steals at all depends upon his own volition.

So with our nation. If we embark upon a career of conquest no one can tell how many islands we may be able to seize or how many races we may be able to subjugate; neither can any one estimate the cost, immediate and remote, to the nation's purse and to the nation's character; but whether we shall enter upon such a career is a question which the people have a right to decide for themselves.

Unexpected events may retard or advance the nation's growth, but the nation's purpose determines its destiny.

What is the nation's purpose?

The main purpose of the founders of our Government was to secure for themselves and for posterity the blessings of liberty, and that purpose has been faithfully followed up to this time. Our statesmen have opposed each other upon economic questions, but they have agreed in defending self-government as the controlling national idea. They have quarreled among themselves over tariff and finance, but they have been united in their opposition to an entangling alliance with any European power.

Under this policy our nation has grown in numbers and in strength. Under this policy its beneficent influence has encircled the globe. Under this policy the taxpayers have been spared the burden and the menace of a large military establishment and the young men have been taught the arts of peace rather than the science of war. On each returning Fourth of July our people have met to celebrate the signing of the Declaration of Independence; their hearts have renewed their vows to free institutions and their voices have praised the forefathers whose wisdom and courage and patriotism made it possible for each succeeding generation to repeat the words—

"My country, 'tis of thee,
Sweet land of Liberty,
Of thee I sing."

This sentiment was well-nigh universal until a year ago. It was to this sentiment that the Cuban insurgents appealed; it was this sentiment that impelled our people to enter into the war with Spain. Have the people so changed within a few short months that they are now willing to apologize for the War of the Revolution and force upon the Filipinos the same system of government against which the colonists protested with fire and sword?

The hour of temptation has come, but temptations do not destroy, they merely test the strength of individuals and nations; they are stumbling-blocks or stepping-stones; they lead to infamy or fame, according to the use made of them.

Benedict Arnold and Ethen Allen served together in the continental army, and both were offered British gold. Arnold yielded to the temptation and made his name a synonym for treason; Allen resisted and lives in the affections of his countrymen.

Our nation is tempted to depart from its "standard of morality" and adopt a policy of "criminal agression." But, will it yield?

If I mistake not the sentiment of the American people, they will spurn the bribe of imperialism, and, by resisting temptation, win such a victory as has not been won since the battle of Yorktown. Let it be written of the United States: Behold a Republic that took up arms to aid a neighboring people struggling to be free; a Republic that, in the progress of the war, helped distant races whose wrongs were not in contemplation when hostilities began; a Republic that, when peace was restored, turned a deaf ear to the clamorous voice of greed, and to those borne down by the weight of a foreign yoke spoke the welcome words, "Stand up; be free." Let this be the record made on history's page, and the silent example of this Republic, true to its principles in the hour of trial, will do more to extend the area of self-government and civilization than could be done by all the wars of conquest that we could wage in a generation.

The forcible annexation of the Philippine Islands is not necessary to make the United States a world power. For over ten decades our nation has been a world power. During its brief existence it has exerted upon the human race an influence more potent for good than all the other nations of the earth combined, and it has exerted that influence without the use of sword or Gatling gun.

Mexico and the Republics of Central and South America testify to the benign influence of our institutions, while Europe and Asia give evidence of the working of the leaven of self-government. In the growth of democracy we observe the triumphant march of an idea—an idea that would be weighted down rather than aided by the armor and weapons proffered by imperialism.

Much has been said of late about Anglo-Saxon civilization. Far be it from me to detract from the service rendered to the world by the sturdy race whose language we speak. The union of the Angle and the Saxon formed a new and valuable type, but the process of race evolution was not completed when the Angle and the Saxon met. A still later type has appeared, which is superior to any which has existed heretofore; and with this new type will come a higher civilization than any which has preceded it. Great has been the Greek, the Latin, the Slav, the Celt, the Teuton, and the Anglo-Saxon, but greater than any of these is the American, in whom are blended the virtues of them all.

Civil and religious liberty, universal education, and the right to participate, directly or through representatives chosen by himself, in all the affairs of government—these give to the American citizen an opportunity and an inspiration which can be found nowhere else.

Standing upon the vantage ground already gained, the American people can aspire to a grander destiny than has opened before any other race.

Anglo-Saxon civilization has taught the individual to protect his own rights; American civilization will teach him to respect the rights of others.

Anglo-Saxon civilization has taught the individual to take care of himself; American civilization, proclaiming the equality of all before the law, will teach him that his own highest good requires the observance of the commandment: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Anglo-Saxon civilization has, by force of arm, applied the art of government to other races for the benefit of Anglo-Saxons; American civilization will, by the influence of example, excite in other races a desire for self-government and a determination to secure it.

Anglo-Saxon civilization has carried its flag to every clime and defended it with forts and garrisons; American civilization will imprint its flag upon the hearts of all who long for freedom.

To American civilization, all hail!

"Time's noblest offspring is the last!"

The Insincerity and Dishonesty of Imperialism.

I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than to private affairs that "honesty is always the best policy."—*George Washington.*

Hanna, McKinley & Co. say to the Filipinos, Unless you submit to our rule we shall shoot you to death; and to the Porto Ricans, If you do submit we shall tax you to death.

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN J. LENTZ,
OF OHIO,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, March 27, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 8582) making appropriation for the support of the Regular and Volunteer Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901—

Mr. LENTZ said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are discussing a bill appropriating $112,000,000. The estimate of the War Department was $128,000,000, and we have scaled this bill $16,000,000 in the committee. Last year an appropriation bill was brought to this House from the Military Committee for $80,000,000, and before we had finished the year's work it was necessary, as you remember, to bring in a war deficiency bill for $37,000,000, making in the aggregate $117,000,000.

To-day we start with $112,000,000, having cut it down $16,000,000; and if the present policy of imperialism, extravagance, and Presidential commissions is to continue, I am willing to go on record predicting that by the time we get through with next winter's session we shall bring in at least $28,000,000 more of deficiency instead of the last one of $37,000,000. In round figures, we shall tax the people of the United States in the neighborhood of $140,000,000 for the next year's Army expenditure. Two years ago we were going down into the pockets of the masses for about $23,000,000 to $25,000,000 for the Army.

To-day, "according to our code of morals," we are asking the people of the United States for five times as large an appropriation to carry on our work of "criminal aggression." Is this "our plain duty?" Are we not already on the career of imperialism and militarism? Is our taxation of the Porto Ricans without representation anything less than the criminal aggression of George the Third? How shall we maintain this system of taxation without representation, this violation of the laws of decency and humanity, without imperialism and militarism? This appropriation of $112,000,000 is not for the present. This is for next year. From the 1st day of July, 1900, to the 1st day of July, 1901, we shall be expected to deliver out of the Treasury for the military establishment alone one-fifth, at least, of the entire gross expenditures of the Government.

What else can this be except militarism? It is time that we stop and consider whither we are drifting. It was once asked of James Russell Lowell, by Guizot, the French historian, "How long may the Republic of the United States reasonably be expected to endure?" And Mr. Lowell replied, "So long as the ideas of its founders continue dominant."

Are these the ideas of the founders? Are these the figures of the founders? Study the summaries of the receipts and expenditures of our Government from the beginning of the Republic down to the beginning of the empire and you will find that we are now assessing upon the people of the United States for the purposes of the National Government, in round figures, $10 per capita for every man, woman, and child in the Union, while in the days of Thomas Jefferson this Government carried on its business, maintained its defenses against foreigners, reduced its national debt, and all this with an assessment of $1.50 per capita, or rather a taxation only one-seventh as large as we propose to put upon the people to-day. What a contrast between the days of the beginning of the Republic and the beginning of the empire!

Militarism in the United States means more than the extravagance of this appropriation. It means permanently saddling upon this country an army of 100,000 men. When we came to Washington at the opening of this session it was confidently expected by the majority side of this House, and fully believed by the minority side, that an Army bill would be brought in providing for a permanent military establishment of 100,000 men.

Knowing, however, that we are about to go into a Presidential election, it was evidently assumed that it was not advisable to bring such a measure in at this term, and I venture the prediction that no such bill will now be brought forward until after the November elections. But the appropriation is being made on that scale, and the purpose is quite manifest to continue such a military establishment as must be contemplated in the appropriation of $112,000,000.

It does not become us to waste our time differentiating about a million or half a million at one place or another in this bill. The great, persistent, and apparently irresistible tendency of the whole Republic toward imperialism ought to be the question and concern of every philanthropic and philosophic mind in the American Congress. What will it lead to? Who will profit by this expenditure of $112,000,000? Let us review the history of the past two years. In March, 1898, it was common on this floor to have thrown back to us the statement that this Government was for "peace at any price." To-day with this appropriation it is apparent that the Government is now for "war at any sacrifice."

We have in two years changed our policy absolutely. Two years ago we declared to the world that our purpose in going to the relief of Cuba was not conquest, that it was not the acquisition of territory. In the resolutions that were passed the night we stayed in session here until 3 o'clock in the morning we declared to the world that the people of Cuba "are and of right ought to be free."

That was our declaration and promise to all humanity. That was the promise to the Philippine Islanders; that was the promise to the people of Porto Rico; that was the promise to the people of Cuba, and to every human being upon the face of the earth. That was when we were still fighting for the principles of the Declaration of Independence. We were still copying the language of Thomas Jefferson; we were still within the spirit of the Constitution of the United States; we were still permeated and animated by the principles of the Monroe doctrine.

Two years have gone by, and now what do we see? Servile, cringing, humble followers, imitating the European monarchies. Such seems to be the order of the day. How sadly we have degenerated, and how rapidly we have fallen. The Monroe doctrine, what has become of it? If this military policy is to be perpetuated, the Monroe doctrine is absolutely blotted out. Up to the last three months we believed that the Monroe doctrine was

A PART OF THE UNWRITTEN CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES.

From 1823 down to this hour it had stood substantially unchallenged by any American patriot or any American statesman. Under that Monroe doctrine and its benign influence 17 republics have been established south of the Rio Grande River. Under that Monroe doctrine there is not a monarchy left south of our southern line. Under that Monroe doctrine 47,000,000 people now live and govern themselves, all of them permeated more or less with the same Spanish ideas and Spanish thought and Spanish blood that permeates the Philippine Islanders, the Cubans, and the Porto Ricans. Yet these seventeen republics to-day flourish.

Now and then it may be they have some little insurrection or rebellion; but those are soon quieted, and the governments go on. Those people are working out their own salvation. Until recently no man in America has been dishonorable enough to repudiate the Monroe doctrine or repudiate the products of the Monroe doctrine on the American continent. We said to the world, "You on the other side of the sea believe in the divine right of kings; we believe in vox populi, vox Dei."

We believe that God speaks through the masses and not through the princes or the plutocrats of the earth. We said to the monarchs of Europe: "Stay on the other side of the sea and work out your theory and policy of government under the proposition of the "divine right of kings;" but we shall insist on reserving the American continents for the experiment of government by the people, of the people, for the people." That was, in substance, the language and the challenge of Jefferson, Monroe, Franklin, and Washington, and all the other patriots and philosophers from the early days of our Republic; reenforced, ratified, and confirmed by Abraham Lincoln, and never abandoned or questioned until the beef trust and the Standard Oil bank took possession of the Government at Washington. Our ancestors said the American continent shall be reserved for the experiment of government by the people, and it was Lincoln's fondest hope "that government by the people should not perish from the face of the earth."

If we mean to follow the teachings of the fathers; if we mean to adhere to the principles of the fathers; if we have any respect left for the Monroe doctrine; if we are in earnest in going around to the other side of the earth with our theories of government and planting the Stars and Stripes in the Philippine Islands and in Porto Rico, then it becomes us to say at least a word or two of sympathy in behalf of all republics on the face of the earth wherever they may be, whether in Europe or Asia or South Africa. [Applause.]

You can no longer limit the Monroe doctrine. The man who says that the Monroe doctrine is to be limited to the South American continent, at the same time that he prates and boasts about our duty and our destiny to carry the Stars and Stripes into the Orient, is a coward unless he has manhood enough within him to express sympathy and hope for all those who are struggling for the right of self-government. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I hear it said on the majority side of this House that the Philippine Islanders are expecting their sympathy and their support from the Democrats in this House. I might say, in answer, that Mr. Taylor, of the Boston Globe, has just been in the Sulu Islands, and he reports that

THE SULTAN OF SULU EXPRESSES HIS DESIRE AND HOPE THAT WILLIAM M'KINLEY WILL BE REELECTED.

I take it from what I know of the Boston newspapers and what I have been told of Mr. Taylor that the statement is as reliable as any statement in any of the most worthy newspapers can be.

So much for what they are looking for in the Philippine Islands. Senator HOAR has been good enough to say that the decline of the American Republic will begin with McKinley's reign. There are men, like John Sherman, who have been honest enough to say that this war in the Philippine Islands is an uncalled-for war. That is a pretty severe arraignment. Not many Democrats have said more.

But Mr. Sherman went further than that in his speech to the old soldiers at Mansfield last August, and in addition to the words "uncalled for" he added the word "unnecessary." Not stopping with the statement that it is an unnecessary war, John Sherman added another adjective and said that it is an "unjust" war. This Nestor of the Republican party, this man who has studied statecraft from his boyhood until his old age, says that you are carrying on an "unnecessary," "uncalled-for," and an "unjust" war.

But John Sherman, speaking as a philosopher in statecraft, is not the only man who finds it "an unnecessary, uncalled-for, and unjust war." Recently we were invited to attend the funeral of one of the heroes of the Philippine war, General Lawton, and in this connection I wish to read an extract from an interview given out by General Lawton, so that all may know what he thought of this Philippine war. The interview appeared originally in the Congregationalist, of Boston, Mass., and was reproduced in the Anti-Imperialist, as follows:

GENERAL LAWTON'S PROTEST—"WE WANT TO STOP THIS ACCURSED WAR."—THE FILIPINOS INDOMITABLE—ALL THEY WANT IS JUSTICE—IT IS TIME FOR DIPLOMACY AND MUTUAL UNDERSTANDINGS.

In the current number of the Congregationalist, Boston, Rev. Peter MacQueen, who has been in the Philippines for the past year in service with the army, quotes Maj. Gen. Henry W. Lawton as saying:

"The Filipinos are a very fine set of soldiers. They are far better than the Indians. The latter never fight unless they have the absolute advantage. The Tagals are what I would call a civilized race. They are good mechanics, imitative; they manufacture everything. They have arsenals and cartridge factories and powder mills. They can manufacture everything they need. There is a rude arm they are getting the knack of making. Taking everything into consideration, the few facilities they have, the many drawbacks, they are a very ingenious and artistic race. And taking into account the disadvantages they have to fight against in arms, equipment, and military discipline, without artillery, short of ammunition, powder inferior, shells reloaded until they are defective, inferior in every particular of equipment and supplies, they are the bravest men I have ever seen.

"The Filipinos are not military by nature. They are rather domestic in tastes and habits, peace loving and industrious. Nine-tenths of the people of the islands will strongly favor peace, even at the expense of some of their theories, wishes, and hopes. I believe that with a liberal government, such as the United States can and will establish, they will be a peaceable, thrifty, happy people. I believe that it was a great misfortune that we were not able to give them a chance to sample our government before hostilities opened. The only thing we have to fear is from ambitious youths, who want to obtain control for financial reasons, that they may practice what the Spanish have taught them.

"Among the Filipinos there are many cultured people who would ornament society anywhere in the world—ladies who have studied and traveled, men who have had a good education and a fine brain. Take them as a class, there can as many of them read and write as the inhabitants in many places in America. As for their treachery, you would not have to come so far as this to find that. There is plenty of it in North America. All nations are treacherous more or less. Some men and nations have treachery trained out of them more than others. What we want is to stop this accursed war. It is time for diplomacy, time for mutual understandings.

"These men are indomitable. At Bacoor bridge they waited till the Americans brought their cannon to within 35 yards of their trenches. Such men have the right to be heard. All they want is a little justice. I established a civil government at Belinag, with the government entirely in the hands of the natives. It worked to perfection. All these people need for self-government is the protection of our troops till affairs have quieted, and then they will, I have no doubt, advance as rapidly as the Japanese, perhaps more rapidly. I am very well impressed with the Filipinos."

This interview was given to the public through the Congregationalist, of Boston, Mass., and repeated through many papers as the judgment of General Lawton. Immediately certain Administration papers stated that this was not a true interview and that it was a falsified statement. To get at the truth of the matter a few weeks ago I wrote Rev. MacQueen the following letter:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,
Washington, 9th February, 1900.

Rev. PETER MACQUEEN,
Care of the Congregationalist, Boston, Mass.

MY DEAR SIR: Some time ago my attention was called to an article in the Anti-Imperialist, crediting you with a quotation from General Lawton. I am told that General Lawton himself denied your statement, but in these days when falsehood, blasphemy, and sacrilege are resorted to to bolster up imperialism I am not prepared to believe that you were misquoted until I have something from you direct.

I shall greatly appreciate it if you will kindly tell me over your own signature, and permit me to make use of your statement. I am discussing the Philippine question before the public, and shall within a short time have occasion to discuss the question on the floor of the House, and I want to know I am right, before I go ahead, in every statement I make.

Hoping you will give me at your earliest convenience a statement as to these alleged denials of Lawton's, because naturally you have considered them and weighed them and know the source of the denial and the purpose of the denial, I remain, Yours, faithfully,

JOHN J. LENTZ.

In answer to this inquiry came a prompt and positive reply, in such plain terms that he who runs may read, and I send the letter to the Clerk and ask him to read to the American Congress and the American people what Rev. MacQueen says of the Lawton interview.

The Clerk read as follows:

[Peter MacQueen, pastor
Day Street Congregational Church.]

WEST SOMERVILLE, MASS., *February 11, 1900.*

Mr. JOHN J. LENTZ, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your favor of the 9th instant, addressed to Mr. MacQueen, Mr. MacQueen directs me to say that the interview which he had with General Lawton, as published in the Congregationalist of some months ago, is absolutely authentic.

He wrote the article from notes taken at the time of the interview, and General Lawton was quoted verbatim, with the exception of the word "damnable," which Mr. MacQueen, in writing for a religious paper, changed to "accursed."

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

HERMAN TRUE VAN DUSEN.
Secretary to Mr. MacQueen.

Now, gentlemen, the only change made by Rev. MacQueen was to soften down one word. He says in his own letter that he wrote this interview from his notes as he took them down in the conversation with General Lawton. Now, reading General Lawton's statement as to the conditions in the Philippine Islands by restoring the word "damnable" and eliminating the word "accursed," we find his judgment of the President's war summed up in these words: "*What we want is to stop this damnable war. It is time for diplomacy, time for mutual understandings.*"

Such is the sacred decree of the patriot and hero of three wars, whose death came in a war which John Sherman says is uncalled-for, unnecessary, and unjust. And hence it follows that had our imperial Administration accepted General Lawton's advice as to diplomacy and mutual understandings, General Lawton's widow and children and thousands of others would not now be sorrowing and weeping because their loved ones will never return. General Lawton never withdrew a line or a word of the MacQueen interview, although he was serving as a loyal soldier under an Administration which was giving orders for a censored press and doing other acts of tyranny in keeping with those who are carried away with the vainglory of conquest and empire.

It has been demonstrated to every reading American citizen that these Philippine Islanders were our friends during the war with Spain. There was no hostility on their part. They supposed that the great American Republic meant what it said when it said that the Cubans "are and of right ought to be free." They knew that Admiral Dewey had testified in his report that the people of the Philippine Islands were superior to the people in Cuba and that he had said, "I am familiar with both races." If they are superior to the people in Cuba, then they are entitled to the same freedom; and even if they are not superior, they had helped us and we had helped them defeat the Spaniards, and honors were even. No charter for the American Republic has yet been written declaring that it is our mission to go out upon the face of the earth with battle-ax and spear to make other men our equals. We have declared that "all men are born equal."

It is common among the Administration supporters and cuckoos to say, "God has not been preparing the English-speaking people for a thousand years for nothing. He has made us master organizers of the world to establish system where chaos reigns. He has made us trustees of the world's progress, guardians of its righteous peace." Rome, in all her greed and gluttony, could have said the same! The Saracen, with his sword and fire, promulgated the same buncombe, and the Spaniards for three hundred years, with arrogance and vainglorious pretense, never claimed any other mission than that of "benevolent assimilation."

But let us come down to the earth among plain, honest men, men whose highest ability was their integrity and sincerity, men whose loftiest ideal was to promote liberty through self-government, and who never dreamed of a republic whose sole purpose was to promote the profits of plutocracy and trusts. Let us study the language of the men whose

FIDELITY TO THE RIGHTS OF MAN

is guaranteed by their prayers at Valley Forge and the sacrificial offerings of their heart's blood at Bunker Hill and Yorktown. Let us search their Declaration of Independence, their Constitution of the United States, and the Monroe doctrine, all three of which are democratic instruments.

The Declaration of Independence does not say "we are created for the purpose of making others our equals," but it does say "all men are created equal." The Declaration of Independence does not say "some men are to be the trustees of the unalienable rights of others." The Declaration of Independence does not say "we are to pursue the life, liberty, and happiness of others." The Declaration of Independence does not say "governments are instituted among men in order that a part of them may secure their governmental powers from the consent of the others."

Thomas Jefferson, John Hancock, John Adams, and Benjamin Franklin never subscribed to the proposition that it is your business or my business to decide what is the form of government for another people with entirely different history and environments. Many of you are older than I am, and may think you have a right to resent all I have said, but I must insist that it is not so many years since I learned my lessons of American patriotism from the great charters of human rights, and therefore it is possible that I have not had so long a time to forget so much as you seem to have forgotten, and believing, as I do, that there is no such thing as total depravity, I am still hopeful of redeeming you at the eleventh hour.

I believe that the doctrine of imperialism, as promulgated and promoted by HANNA, McKinley & Co., is the beginning of dry rot; that it means eventually the prostitution of every American sentiment and principle to the purposes of greed, and that to tolerate this thing which is now being perpetrated on the other side of the earth under the American flag is merely playing with fire which is very much in danger of becoming a conflagration. Witness the inconsistency and insincerity of this new doctrine of imperialism as administered by HANNA, McKinley & Co., who say to the Filipinos, "Unless you submit to our rule we shall shoot you to death," and to the Porto Ricans, "If you do submit we shall tax you to death." And while mentioning the subject of Porto Rico, let me ask the Republicans of this House and the President to tell us why you changed from "Our plain duty" to "Taxation without representation;" and while answering why you changed, please tell us when you changed and where you were at the time and who was present.

But, my friends, when will you know how to govern the Philippine Islands? Why, this Congress does not know enough to govern the city of Washington as it ought to be governed. [Laughter.] Govern a country 10,000 miles from home! Most of you who come from cities know that your own neighbors, yourself included, do not know enough to govern the city you live in as it ought to be governed.

Many of you who are here do not know enough to govern your own boys as they ought to be governed, much less minding the business of people on the other side of the earth. [Laughter.] The trouble is that since the 1st of December we have run along through December, January, February, and March—four full months—and almost that entire time has been taken up without legislating for or even considering the interests of our 80,000,000 of people. We shall have more than enough to do if we do our duty at home, and I insist upon it that he who neglects his own family is worse than a heathen.

Mr. RICHARDSON. You have good Scripture authority for that.

Mr. LENTZ. Yes; there is Scripture for that and there is Scripture that teaches nations, as well as individuals, that we shall not bear false witness, and that we shall not steal; but we are doing both in the Philippines and in Porto Rico, although

in Porto Rico we are only to steal at the rate of 15 per cent. And speaking of false witnesses reminds me that the War Department is deceiving the President or the President the people, but I am here to defend the President. The President has been imposed upon. He has been deceived. There are a number of men over in the War Department who must have been falsifying the reports to the President. Listen to what the President has said under his constitutional duty to the American people in his message sent to this Congress at the beginning of this session.

I read from page 41:

The noble self-sacrifice with which our soldiers and sailors whose terms of service had expired refused to avail themselves of their right to return home as long as they were needed at the front forms one of the brightest pages in our annals.

You know that you learned through the press associations that we offered these men $500 travel pay as a bounty if they would reenlist and remain to assist in the war against our friends and allies in the Philippine Islands. On the 19th of April, 1899, a telegram came from General Otis to the War Department of which the President must have been ignorant, or he would not have put that statement in his message. In that telegram, of the 19th of April, 1899, General Otis said, "Volunteers will not reenlist; volunteers will render willing service until return transports available."

In other words, the Department had the information before it that the volunteers were not willing—that they had absolutely refused to remain there after their term of service had expired. Yet the President says that they were willing to remain, and that they refused to avail themselves of their right to return home. Otis said they were only willing to wait until the boats got there; but "They will render willing service until the transports are available." Who would not have waited until the boats got there? It has been two thousand years since it was fashionable for men to walk upon water. [Laughter.] You and I would have waited until the boats came to bring us home.

IT IS NOT EASY TO SWIM 7,000 MILES

from Manila to San Francisco. Of course the men would wait until the boats were available.

But that is not the only evidence. I myself, writing to the War Department last September, asked that Peter Francesco, of Company D, Seventeenth Regulars, be discharged—a mere poor, humble private, whose mother needed him at home—and received from the War Department this answer:

WAR DEPARTMENT, ADJUTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, September 15, 1899.

Hon. JOHN J. LENTZ, M. C., *Columbus, Ohio:*

The best interests of the military service will not make it possible to comply with your request to discharge Private Peter Francesco, Company D, Seventeenth Infantry. The Department is flooded with requests of this character, and all are treated alike.

W. A. SIMPSON,
Assistant Adjutant-General.

Here it appears that those who were still in the service were "flooding" the Department with appeals that they might return home instead of rendering willing service long after their terms had expired.

A little later on, in October, I applied for the release of Joseph J. Otto, Company K, Fourth United States Infantry, and received a letter, dated on the 6th of October, 1899, the original of which is here in my hand and open for inspection by anyone. The letter is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT, ADJUTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, October 6, 1899.

Hon. JOHN J. LENTZ, *Columbus, Ohio.*

SIR: Referring to your request for discharge from military service of Cook Joseph J. Otto, Company K, Fourth United States Infantry, the Assistant Secretary of War instructs me to inform you that the best interest of the military service will not make it possible to comply with your request for the reasons given in this case. The Department is flooded with applications of this character, and all are treated alike.

Very respectfully,

THOMAS WARD,
Assistant Adjutant-General.

On the 22d of January I received another reply to a request for the discharge of a young man whose record shows that he had been lying bedridden for four months, reduced in weight from 195 pounds to 125 pounds, and after having been in this condition for four months is still unable to get a physician's certificate of discharge. I propose to read a part of the answer to my application for the discharge of this poor invalid—and the only wonder is that he could live at all at that weight after falling from the weight I have mentioned. In fact, I wonder whether he is living now or whether this infernal war has not only murdered General Lawton, but also my friend, who is a college graduate and one of the best young men in central Ohio. I read that part of the letter showing that very few seem willing to remain in the Philippines, which is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., January 22, 1900.

Hon. JOHN J. LENTZ, *House of Representatives.*

DEAR SIR: Referring to your inquiry, I would state that some time since the number of discharges of enlisted men of the Regular Army had grown so numerous as to seriously interfere with the discipline and effectiveness of the service. Many Senators and Congressmen complained that numerous applications were made to them, and the officers of the Army complained that their men were dissatisfied and unsettled because of the prevailing idea that they could secure discharges by obtaining the intervention of their friends—members of Congress and others. The applications by gentlemen who were entitled to consideration mounted up into the thousands, and it became necessary to adhere firmly to the rule and grant no discharges by way of favor, and none have been so granted for the past three months.

Very respectfully,

G. D. MEIKLEJOHN,
Assistant Secretary of War.

Does this look as if our boys are rendering willing service long after their terms have expired, when the Department is "flooded" with petitions and prayers that they may be brought home from this "unnecessary and unjust" war against a people who could be reduced to quietude and peace by mutual understandings, according to General Lawton, if a little diplomacy were exercised instead of saying that "we are in it and we can not stop; we admit that we are wrong, but we must go on in the wrong to the grim end."

Now I read from a clipping found in the Washington Star of the 24th of February, a month later than this letter of the Assistant Secretary of War, as to these men who are rendering willing service long after their terms had expired. It shows again how the officers of the Administration are fooling the President.

Mr. LACEY. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. LENTZ. I can not yield now; I want to read this clipping and will yield to the question later.

Mr. LACEY. I would like to put the question in this connection.

Mr. LENTZ. I can not yield now, for I want to read this clipping in connection with this other evidence. The Evening Star of the 24th of February, 1900, says:

SHIRKING SUSPECTED—PRACTICE OF SELF-MAIMING AMONG THE TROOPS IN THE PHILIPPINES.

According to the recent mail advices from the Philippines, it seems that the practice of self-maiming has prevailed to a greater or less extent among the troops in the Philippines.

The matter was brought to the attention of General Otis by Col. A. A. Woodhull, deputy surgeon-general and chief surgeon of the Department of the Pacific, in a letter in which he said:

"Self-inflicted wounds of the hand and occasionally of the feet, claimed to be accidental, usually occurring on outpost, are so frequent that I have the honor to suggest that all such cases be carefully investigated by a board of survey similar to that called for in case of desertion, to determine the circumstances under which they actually occurred, and especially in relation to line of duty. All of these men become disabled for military duty, with usually a minimum amount of maiming for civil occupation, and thus secure discharge."

General Otis incorporated this letter in a general order to the troops and directed that all cases of the character referred to and all cases where there was reason to believe that the wounds were self-inflicted be promptly investigated and reported to the headquarters of the Department of the Pacific.

I fail to see how the War Department could have deceived the President without the President rebuking the War Department, and particularly three or four of his assistants in the War Department. I hope he will not remain ignorant of these facts after to-morrow, or a week hence, because I shall continue to call his attention to the falsehoods which have been imposed upon him by the assistants in the Adjutant-General's Department and the assistants in the office of the Secretary of War. General Otis wired that they would not reenlist, and in the Adjutant-General's Office is the evidence showing that by the thousands the boys are "flooding" the Department with their appeals and prayers, their petitions and supplications, to be allowed to return home to the flag of the Stars and Stripes, to the land of self-government instead of government by force which they are compelled to inflict upon innocent men, women, and children. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

You talk about supporting these soldiers. Aye; more than 30,000 of them are already petitioning to be placed upon your pension rolls. Hurry along with your 600,000 applications of the soldiers of the civil war for pensions, so that you can take care of these boys and their mothers and their fathers, who are already

BEATING AT THE DOORS OF THE PENSION DEPARTMENT

for just treatment; the boys whose health was injured in the war with Spain are not yet getting a hearing. Treat them with some consideration; treat the boy who has wasted from 195 pounds down to 125 pounds with some honest consideration.

If you have men who are willing to stay long after their term of service has expired, substitute them for the boys who are flooding the Department with their prayers that they be permitted to come home. Substitute those who are willing to remain for some who have been bedridden for four months and want to come home to recover their health or die receiving the gentle tone and loving touch of relatives and friends.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Call their attention to the fact that there are hundreds of insane soldiers.

Mr. LENTZ. I have been advised to call your attention to the insane. I have no definite information about that. I have only a newspaper account. Some of the statements I have seen about the insanity of the men in the Philippine Islands are so extravagant and large that I refuse to believe them. I would require the

affidavits of a number of men before I would believe the statements of the papers made a few days ago—that a thousand sets of handcuffs and leg cuffs had been sent for the purpose of restraining those who are insane. I do not believe that, and therefore I dismiss it without further comment.

But I was surprised and inclined to discredit the following statement, which I found in the Philadelphia North American and there credited to the New York Evening World:

BY THEIR OWN HANDS.

These twenty-nine officers and men of the United States Army have committed suicide in the Philippines:

Bernard, A. E., private, Hospital Corps, October 9, 1899.
Bowman, D. T., lieutenant, Thirty-seventh Volunteers, January 9, 1900.
Brereton, J. J., lieutenant-colonel Thirty-third Volunteer Infantry, December 2, 1899.
Briggs, George, private, First Wyoming Volunteer Infantry, April 11, 1899.
Craddock, P. B., private, Fourth Cavalry, January 6, 1900.
Crawford, E. C., private, Twenty-third Infantry, July 21, 1899.
Curtis, George W., private, Eighteenth Infantry, January 11, 1900.
Dickelman, F., private, Hospital Corps, August 29, 1898.
Durham, Fred A., hospital steward, August 3, 1899.
Gregory, W., private, Eleventh Volunteer Cavalry, January 23, 1900.
Hiatt, Charles, sergeant, Fourth Cavalry, July 4, 1899.
Hillis, M. A., corporal, Thirty-sixth Volunteer Infantry, December 15, 1899.
Hudson, John G., private, Twenty-third Infantry, February 2, 1900.
Kehoe, J. J., private, Second Oregon Volunteer Infantry, June 5, 1899.
Kellerman, A., private, Fourth Infantry.
Knox, George N., private, Sixth Artillery, February 23, 1900.
Lov, Christof, private, Twentieth Infantry, May 12, 1899.
McDowell, H. A., private, First Colorado Volunteer Infantry, December 4, 1898.
McHenry, M. R., private, Fourteenth Infantry, August 2, 1899.
Montag, G., private, Thirty-fifth Volunteer Infantry, December 2, 1899.
Moore, J. L., lieutenant, Fifty-first Iowa Volunteer Infantry, July 19, 1899.
Moran, P. E., sergeant, Sixth Infantry, October 20, 1899.
Pearce, F. A., lieutenant, Sixth Artillery, June 6, 1899.
Rock, Thomas, private, Twentieth Infantry, May 31, 1899.
Sell, J. H., private, Thirteenth Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, August 2, 1898.
Scorknecht, August, musician, Seventeenth Infantry, March 26, 1900.
Waugh, John R., lieutenant, Thirty-ninth Volunteer Infantry, February 27, 1900.
Weber, Louis P., lieutenant, Forty-second Volunteer Infantry, March 9, 1900.
Zaisser, C. A., private, Sixth Infantry, October 31, 1899.

I went to the War Department and submitted this list of names, and was there informed that the list is correct; and the entire list was corroborated by giving me the date of the death of each, which they added, and to that extent I have modified the original account as it appeared in the North American.

And while at the War Department I also asked for a list of all the deaths from all causes among our boys in the Philippines, and was advised that we have lost 43 officers who were killed or died of wounds, and 26 officers who died of disease, and that we have also lost 539 privates, who were either killed or died of wounds, and 1,077 privates who died of disease.

In the aggregate we have sacrificed 69 officers and 1,616 enlisted men, a grand total of 1,685 men, almost every one of whom has been sacrificed to a war of conquest and criminal greed. Was ex-Congressman John Sherman, ex-Senator John Sherman, ex-Secretary of the Treasury John Sherman, ex-Secretary of State John Sherman right when he said, "This war is uncalled for, unnecessary and unjust?" If he is right, then upon whose head rests the responsibility for this blood and this ruin and the responsibility for these tears of the mothers and wives, of the sisters and daughters, who refuse to be comforted because their loved ones are not.

Verily, the times are out of joint. The great immediate need of the hour is a Chief Executive who will not translate "criminal aggression" into "benevolent assimilation" and who will not convert in a day and a night "our plain duty" to the Porto Ricans into the imperialism of George III, demanding taxation without representation. Verily, verily—

> The time is ripe and rotten ripe for change.
> There is more force in names * * *
> Than most of men dream of; and a lie will keep
> Its throne a whole age longer if it skulk
> Behind the sound of some fair seeming name.
> Let us call tyrants, tyrants; * * *
> For men in earnest have no time to waste
> In patching fig-leaves for the naked truth.

Mr. LACEY. Will the gentleman yield to me now?

Mr. LENTZ. I will now yield for the question.

Mr. LACEY. I understand the gentleman claims that the service of the soldiers there is an unwilling service.

Mr. LENTZ. I made no such claim. I said that the War Department said so. But the President said: "Our soldiers and sailors whose terms had expired refused to return home as long as they were needed at the front."

Mr. LACEY. But you say that some are unwilling.

Mr. LENTZ. The War Department tells me that it is flooded with applications of those in the service who are unwilling to remain.

Mr. LACEY. One other suggestion——

Mr. LENTZ. Let me say to the gentleman from Iowa that I say our good President has been deceived. He has been imposed upon, and I want him to take Simpson and Ward and Meiklejohn and the Evening Star to task. I want him to reduce these men to telling the truth, so they will agree with him in the statement that the men are willing to remain "as long as they are needed." They say, and I read from the official records, that the War Department is flooded with applications of men who want to be brought home.

If the President's statement in his message is correct, that he has men there willing to remain after their terms of enlistment have expired, why not put those men in the place of the boys that are

FLOODING THE WAR DEPARTMENT WITH THEIR PRAYERS TO BE BROUGHT HOME?

I am not responsible for these statements. I only offer them that Congress and the people may know the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth and that the great American jury may bring in a proper verdict at the next trial.

Once in a while the President goes off on a campaign tour, and makes statements there which I certainly have a right to answer and correct here.

Last October the President went off to Chicago to lay a corner stone for a post-office. It was the most laid corner stone ever laid in the history of the world. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] It was laid for half a month several times every day. The press associations say that 100 speeches were made laying that corner stone. [Laughter.] There were not that many speeches made in laying all the corner stones of all the pyramids of Egypt. [Laughter.]

In connection with that Chicago corner stone, one of the corner-stone speeches was made at Quincy, Ill., another at Madison, Wis., another was made at Evanston, Ill., and one at Youngstown, Ohio, all the while laying the corner stone for the post-office in the city of Chicago. [Laughter.] In laying that Chicago corner stone, in the speech made at Youngstown on the 18th day of October, as reported by the Associated Press in the Chicago Inter-Ocean, the President is reported to have said, with reference to the boys in the Philippine Islands:

> They are there because in the providence of God, who moves mysteriously, that archipelago has been placed in the hands of the American people.

I challenge that statement—that God had anything to do with it. I do not believe that the Deity is in any closer communion with the President of the United States than he is with a justice of the peace. [Laughter.] At least, not when he is laying corner stones in Youngstown for the city of Chicago. [Laughter.]

Mr. STEELE. Is the gentleman authorized to speak for the Almighty?

Mr. LENTZ. Well, no; I will leave that prerogative to the gentleman from Indiana. I want now to call attention to the fact that on the 13th day of August, 1898, we have the official record as to who was responsible for our being in the Philippine Islands, and I want to compare it with the Youngstown-Chicago corner-stone speech.

You will bear with me when I remind you that the 13th of August, 1898, is the day when Manila was surrendered. Here is a telegram sent by the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, directed by the President of the United States to be sent according to this report, and I read from page 122 of the operations of the Asiatic station, a report given out by the Secretary of the Navy.

Remember, Manila had just surrendered:

WASHINGTON, *August 13, 1898.*

DEWEY (care American consul), *Hongkong:*

The President desires to receive from you any important information you may have of the Philippines; the desirability of the several islands—

Now, if God was in the real estate business, why could He not know all about that without wiring through William McKinley and the Assistant Secretary of the Navy. I read again—

the character of their population—

Do not you suppose that Deity knew something about that without a cablegram to Dewey? But I read again—

coal and other mineral deposits.

Think of Deity asking the President of the United States to ask Dewey about the coal and other mineral deposits in the Philippine islands!

For the life of me—and I have been reading this cablegram month after month—up to this hour I am unable to understand what Deity wanted with coal in the hot month of August. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] If the gentleman in charge of the government below had been looking for a coaling station, getting ready for some of the members of the American Congress and the Cabinet, I could understand why he wanted more coal. [Great laughter.] I might say that the chairman of the Republican National Committee is the man that knows more about coal and pig iron than any man in the American Congress, and I suspect that he had more to do with sticking that sentence into that telegram than Deity had.

I can not escape the thought that somebody who was in the coal or other mineral business was the fellow who wrote that telegram on the announcement of the surrender of Manila. But

that is not all. Admiral Dewey, and not Deity, on the 20th of August replied:

Luzon is in all respects the most desirable to retain.

Why did not Deity tell us which of the islands to retain if we are to go into the real-estate business?

And Dewey further answered:

Luzon produces all the good tobacco.

Was Deity interested in the good tobacco of Luzon, or was it the American tobacco trust?

And Dewey further answered:

Iloilo second commercial port; center of sugar trade.

Tobacco, sugar, and coal. But Deity did not know whether we wanted the islands or not until the Navy Department secured the information from Admiral Dewey as to what products we could rely upon in that country.

That is not all. In a speech made in Evanston, Ill., in connection with this corner-stone business, the President said:

The boys who carry our flag in that distant possession will be sustained by our people.

IF THE BOYS WHO CARRY OUR FLAG ARE TO BE SUSTAINED

by our people, then the War Department, which is flooded with their prayers to be brought home, will bring them home to America in time to vote for William Jennings Bryan next November. [Applause.]

But not stopping here, the President, when laying the Chicago corner stone in Evanston, said:

The flag the boys carry there is the flag we carry here.

And when the President says, "The flag the boys carry there is the flag we carry here," I take issue with him. If you take out of this flag its history and its meaning, then you reduce it to the low grade of a common rag. These Stars and Stripes speak a language to the American people that neither William McKinley nor any of his imperialistic partners intends shall ever be spoken to the Filipinos. Some tell us that this flag represents free thought, free speech, free press, free schools, and a free ballot.

The poet tells us the stars and field of blue were taken from heaven's own dome, that its stripes of white were taken from the Milky Way, and its stripes of red from the morning dawn; but the faithful historian will tell you that these red stripes were painted with the hearts' blood of martyrs from the sacrificial offerings of the patriots of Bunker Hill and Yorktown; and under every red stripe are the two simple and unmistakable words "self-government," and when you take out of these Stars and Stripes the two words "self-government," you repudiate the messages burnt with sword and fire by George Washington into the very hide of George III of England. When you take out of the Stars and Stripes the two words "self-government," you obliterate and deface the name of Abraham Lincoln from the world's lexicon of fame.

Our flag in the Philippines means bullets; here in America it means ballots. There it is a flag of blood and government by force; here it is the flag of peace and government by consent. The flag that we carry here is not the same flag that we carry there, and that is why the "boys" are flooding the War Department with their petitions to be allowed to come home. The very best witnesses in the world, the very best jury in the world, are testifying in that flood of appeals that we ought not to carry on this war, which

GENERAL LAWTON SAID WAS DAMNABLE.

Poor General Lawton sacrificed his life like a hero and a soldier, obeying the command of men who had sent him in the wrong direction, in a wicked cause. General Lawton's life, General Lawton's words, are the greatest condemnation of the present policy; and I insist upon it that had General Lawton been listened to the Administration could have avoided war by any one of three courses:

First. If the Filipinos had been told that they were to be independent, or were told to-day that they should have their independence, the war would be at an end.

Second. If the Filipinos were told that they were to have our friendly interest and protection without interference, except upon failure to establish law and order within a reasonable time by their own efforts at self-government, the war would be at an end.

Third. If they had been or were now assured that the intention of this Government is to give them like treatment with that promised to the Cubans, the war would be at an end.

If we should say to these people that the world should keep its hands off, that they should be a neutralized archipelago, corresponding to the condition of Switzerland in Europe, the war would be at an end to-day, and we would save hundreds of millions of treasure, and tens of thousands of lives would be saved from disease and death.

But there are the Sulu Islands. We expelled Mr. Roberts from this House because he was a polygamist. We needed him here to help us legislate for the Sulu Islands, for he and the President's polygamous postmasters in Utah are the only men in this country who know how to govern harems. [Laughter.] Why, sir, I am in favor of creating a secretary of harems, so that the President may have Orson Smith, of Logan, or John C. Graham, of Provo City, Utah, to help him run the polygamous establishment which we have taken under our care over in the Orient. I know of no man so well trained and equipped to occupy the position in the Cabinet which I have just named as John C. Graham or Orson Smith, of Utah.

But, my friends, not only have we done this for the Sulu Islanders, but we have placed the flag over Mohammedanism and polygamy; and we are pensioning certain polygamist Mohammedans nearly $10,000 a year for running that establishment, and at the same time we are refusing to make proper provision for the thousands of old soldiers and widows of honest soldiers of our civil war.

Listen to the names of the men who signed that agreement. I wish we could get the lawyer who drew the Sultan part of that agreement to draw an agreement for us with England in reference to the Nicaraguan Canal. The lawyer who drew that agreement for the Sultan of Sulu so framed it that they got everything and we got nothing. We plant the flag there and pay $10,000 a year for the maintenance of those officials, with their institutions of Mohammedanism and polygamy, while we are shooting down Christians in Luzon who are fighting for liberty.

Bear with me while I read this Sulu agreement and pronounce the names of your new cousins:

ARTICLE 1. The sovereignty of the United States over the whole archipelago of Sulu and its dependencies is declared and acknowledged.

ART. 2. The United States flag will be used in the archipelago of Sulu and its dependencies on land and sea.

ART. 3. The rights and dignities of His Highness the Sultan and his datos shall be fully respected; the Moros shall not be interfered with on account of their religion; all their religious customs shall be respected, and no one shall be persecuted on account of his religion.

ART. 4. While the United States may occupy and control such points in the archipelago of Sulu as public interests seem to demand, encroachment will not be made upon the lands immediately about the residence of His Highness the Sultan unless military necessity require such occupation in case of war with a foreign power, and where the property of individuals is taken, due compensation will be made in each case.

Any person can purchase land in the archipelago of Sulu and hold the same by obtaining the consent of the Sultan and coming to a satisfactory agreement with the owner of the land, and such purchase shall immediately be registered in the proper office of the United States Government.

ART. 5. All trade in domestic products of the archipelago of Sulu, when carried on by the Sultan and his people with any part of the Philippine Islands and when conducted under the American flag, shall be free, unlimited, and undutiable.

ART. 6. The Sultan of Sulu shall be allowed to communicate direct with the Governor-General of the Philippine Islands in making complaint against the commanding officer of Sulu or against any naval commander.

ART. 7. The introduction of firearms and war material is forbidden, except under specific authority of the Governor-General of the Philippines.

ART. 8. Piracy must be suppressed, and the Sultan and his datos agree to heartily cooperate with the United States authorities to that end and to make every possible effort to arrest and bring to justice all persons engaged in piracy.

ART. 9. Where crimes and offenses are committed by Moros against Moros, the Government of the Sultan will bring to trial and punishment the criminals and offenders, who will be delivered to the Government of the Sultan by the United States authorities, if in their possession. In all other cases persons charged with crimes or offenses will be delivered to the United States authorities for trial and punishment.

ART. 10. Any slave in the archipelago of Sulu shall have the right to purchase freedom by paying to the master the usual market value.

AND I WILL SHOW LATER ON THAT SLAVERY EXISTS IN ITS WORST FORM.

ART. 12. At present Americans or foreigners wishing to go into the country should state their wishes to the Moro authorities and ask for an escort but it is hoped that this will become unnecessary as we know each other better.

ART. 13. The United States will give full protection to the Sultan and his subjects in case any foreign nation should attempt to impose upon them.

ART. 14. The United States will not sell the island of Sulu or any other island of the Sulu Archipelago to any foreign nation without the consent of the Sultan of Sulu.

ART. 15. The United States Government will pay the following monthly salaries:

To the Sultan	$250
To Dato Rajah Muda	75
To Dato Attik	00
To Dato Calbe	75
To Dato Joakanain	75
To Dato Puyd	60
To Dato Amir Haissin	60
To Habji Buter	50
To Habib Mura	40
To Serif Saguin	15

Signed in triplicate, in English and Sulu, at Jolo, this 20th day of August, A. D. 1899 (13th Arakuil Akil 1317).

The SULTAN SULU.
Dato RAJAH MUDA.
Dato ATTIK.
Dato CALBE.
Dato JOAKANAIN.

Signed:
J. C. BATES,
Brigadier-General, U. S. V.

And with it all we have ratified polygamy, Mohammedanism, and piracy. No; they agreed to give up piracy. That is the only thing that they have agreed to do; and this Government protects the harems of that institution and shoots down the congress of the Christians in the island of Luzon. I think we are departing from the ideas of the founders. The ideas of the founders are radically

different from the ideas that permeate the practices of the Government to-day.

This Sulu agreement reminds me of an old German police judge who had a fellow brought up before him for polygamy. The German had been elected from wood sawyer to judge. While he was holding his court, a man was accused of having a plurality of wives. They could not call it bigamy, for he had seven wives, as the evidence showed. The arguments were in and the case was concluded, and the judge said, "Vell, the evidence is very blain. You got too many vimmins. Und under the law I must find you guilty of pleurisy. [Laughter.] Now you git right out of here."

The lawyers saw the man walk out of the court-house, and the prosecutor got up and said: "Why do you let him go when he is guilty. Why do you not bind him over? The evidence is very plain." So the old German said, "Yes; the evidence is wery blain. This man has got too many vimmins. I only got von and dat poor devil has got seven. He has trouble enough. Let him go." [Laughter.] And so the President thinks the Sultan of Sulu has trouble enough and too much; hence he pensioned him, and all the while allows the Hon. H. Clay Evans to withhold pensions from the American soldier.

Let us be one nation not like the heathen, interfering with everybody's business and neglecting our own.

Let us, as American citizens, demand that if this Republic is to spend its hundreds of millions and sacrifice the lives and health of tens of thousands of its young manhood, it shall be done in irrigating the great continent that lies west upon the Rocky Mountain watersheds of our Republic; that it shall be done in constructing magnificent and adequate levee systems for the Mississippi and other rivers, redeeming richer soil for a happier climate, and for the hundreds of millions of American citizens yet unborn.

Let us construct not only the Nicaragua Canal, but our ship canals, connecting our Great Lakes with the ocean on the east and the great rivers of the Central States. Let us add to our postal system a governmental telephone and telegraph, and thus bring our Government in line again with the principles of the founders, and not make it a military, European-imitation government, carrying fire and blood and ruin to the homes of weak and defenseless patriots struggling for liberty on the other side of the earth.

Let us be honest with ourselves and with the world. If our real purpose in the Philippines is to carry home as the spoils of war their cheap labor and their cheap commodities, let us be manly enough to say so. If our real purpose is to use the Philippines as a fulcrum upon which to rest our crowbar and pry up the commerce of the Orient, let us have the courage to say so, and not with hypocrisy and cant add to the sacrilege that has already disgraced nearly every generation of humanity by pretending that we are doing God's service. But, my friends, if we are in the Philippines on the low, sordid basis of speculation and peculation, then I insist upon it that we stop long enough to see whether this is the best possible business proposition in sight.

If we are going to war, like the Romans of old, for the sake of booty and spoils, if we are to invest gunpowder and human blood simply because there are millions in it, then let us choose the best possible investment. Let our energies and resources be directed where the least expenditure of money and human life will secure the largest return and profit. England has taught us and encouraged us in this thirst for blood.

WHY NOT TURN OUR 13-INCH GUNS UPON CANADA

and reduce that country to our possession?

The roar of the very first cannon will be met with words of welcome. It would be a matter of only a few days or a few weeks until we should be in possession of every foot of territory from the Gulf of Mexico to the North Pole and from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean. There is an additional reason why this work should be begun at once. Just at this time England has her hands full and, according to the latest returns, has more than she can well care for, fighting the little Dutch Republic in South Africa, and this would make it easy and quick work to bring into our own family 6,000,000 people who are already entitled to fellowship and all the rights of self-government, and who would come to us bringing with them billions of property already carved out and billions more in prospect.

Is it possible that the President's Philippine policy is promoted by the vainglorious thought that he is not only to be President of the United States, but emperor of islands on the other side of the earth, so that he may make the vain boast of Philip II of Spain, who said over three hundred years ago: "I am accredited to be the richest man in the baptized world; the sun never sets on my possessions."

SOME LESSONS OF EMPIRE.

In our effort to imitate and pattern after Europe let us not forget that the Empire of the Romans has come to naught, and let us not forget that the Mohammedan advanced from province to empire with sword and fire, and yet came to naught. Spain in all her pomp and in all her wealth weakened herself, destroyed herself, when she became vainglorious, and to-day we see Great Britain in her decline.

Commercially Germany and America are taking away from her millions of trade which until recently she had monopolized. If any other evidence is necessary to show her decline, it is sufficient to remind you that while Great Britain has boasted for hundreds of years that she is the proud mistress of the seas, yet we have seen her for many weeks, with battering-rams and Krupp guns, so weak and impotent as to be unable to break even so much as a window in the humblest little home in the land of the Boers.

Let us hope that this first taste of blood in the Philippines will not turn us to brutish beasts, with an unquenchable thirst, and lead us into all manner of foreign complications in our greed,

CARRYING OUR BATTLE-AXES AND SPEARS, LIKE THE ROMANS,

into every clime and every nation. If commercial greed and trade justify our course in the Orient, why not look after additional trade in Europe also? Why not offer England $20,000,000 for Ireland, telling her we need the island as a coaling station, in order to extend our commerce and to carry our flag across Great Britain and the Continent? If England refuses to accept the $20,000,000, let us shoot benevolent assimilation into her and all the while increase our prosperity.

No, my friends; let us not become a nation of savages; let us not become a nation of liars; let us remain true to the principles of the fathers; let us have higher and holier ideals; let us be ambitious that the Stars and Stripes may some day wave over China and India, Russia, Germany, and Great Britain, but let our flag be placed there by the people themselves taking new hope, new courage, and new inspiration, by the example we set them and by the lessons and precepts we give them.

Let us remember the lesson of our Bartholdi statue, the gift and jewel of France, our statue of Liberty Enlightening the World. Let us expand America and promote the cause of the Stars and Stripes by the example and precept of the purest, the best, and the most ennobling Government on the face of the earth, hoping that some day Old Glory may be the emblem of "peace on earth and good will to men," and that even Great Britain may yet become a republic, and that an Irishman may be elected her president.

I agree with Senator HOAR when he says:

"WE HAVE DISHONORED OUR GREAT HISTORY."

I agree with Senator HOAR'S resolution, introduced in the Senate weeks ago, which nearly all of the Administration papers of the country were too cowardly and too unjust to their readers to print. I insist upon it that our imperialistic policy is a policy that requires a censored press, requires a suppression of the truth and the facts, and therefore that imperialism is a shameful policy that resorts to falsehood and secrecy, fit instruments and emblems of all those who work in the dark and are guilty of criminal aggressions.

And now, my friends, in closing, it seems to me there can be nothing more appropriate than the poem and prayer of Dr. Howard S. Taylor, of Chicago, the poet laureate of the reform forces:

THE CONFESSIONAL.

God of our sires who hither fled
  Across a strange and stormy sea,
Who suffered exile, toiled and bled
  To make themselves and children free—
God of the Pilgrims! Smite us not!
We have forgot! We have forgot!

How runs the story? Far away
  We hear the epoch opening gun
Fired by our minute-men at bay
  Upon the green at Lexington.
But far and faint, we heed it not;
Lord God of Hosts, we have forgot!

The Bill of Rights our fathers signed,
  And sealed with shot and saber stroke,
Their just appeal to all mankind,
  Their prayers sent up through battle smoke,
Their faith humane, without a blot—
Lord Christ, forgive—we have forgot!

Ah, if where sunset islands lie
  Thy brave brown men their blood shall spill—
Shall strike for liberty and die,
  Slain by the heirs of Bunker Hill—
Thou wilt remember, wilt thou not,
Though we, thy people, have forgot?

We have forgot! A Roman lust
  Profanes our ancient holy things;
We trample justice in the dust;
  We have the rabies of the kings—
The scarlet rage of gun and sword!
Have mercy on thy people, Lord!

Thou wilt remember, wilt thou not,
Though we, thy people, have forgot?
God of the Pilgrims! Smite us not!
We have forgot! We have forgot!

Special Privileges and Special Burdens in Finance.

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD T. NOONAN,

OF ILLINOIS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, March 13, 1900.

The House having under consideration the conference report on the bill (H. R. 1) entitled "A bill to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes"—

Mr. NOONAN said:

Mr. SPEAKER: The House is about to adopt the report of the conference committee and enact into law the pending bill as amended.

The bill has already been engrossed and awaits the immediate signature of the Speaker when the vote shall have been announced, and the Treasury Department has anticipated the schedule time for final legislative action by making the necessary arrangements to comply with the provisions of the new law.

Therefore, at this late hour, it would be idle for me to presume to add to the diffusion of knowledge which the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD discloses regarding the causes and effects of this bill.

In my humble judgment many of its provisions are pernicious, and some are fraught with grave potential evils, the discussion of which at this time will subserve nothing more than to leave a record.

The first section of the amended bill declares that the gold dollar shall be the standard unit of value, and all forms of money issued or coined by the United States shall be maintained at a parity of value with this standard, and the Secretary of the Treasury is charged with the duty of maintaining such parity.

I am satisfied as to the fallacy of such a proposition and the futility of such a permanent policy.

I believe the purchasing power of money is determined by the quantitative law, and that the quantitative law is affected by natural and artificial supply and demand. In fact, my observation has been that in all avocations for pecuniary profit the tendency is to combat, with more or less success, the operation of the so-called immutable laws of supply and demand.

For stability as a standard of value and as a medium of exchange I am opposed to a single standard and favor bimetallism.

I appreciate the influences which have operated for a third of a century to establish by legislation the single gold standard throughout the commercial world, and am aware of the temporary favorable conditions which render it expedient for its advocates to enact the single standard into the law of this country, and thus include the accumulated wealth and property, the existing debts, the domestic and foreign commerce of this great debtor nation in that hazardous financial experiment. For, in my opinion, it is on more than a forced experiment, prejudicial and disastrous in many parts of the world (notably in Russia and India) where it has been adopted, which even the present favorable conditions do not relieve its acuteness.

The experiment is dangerous in itself, but the manner in which it is sought to render it effective makes it doubly so.

While the business and values of this country are always more or less affected by external and internal disturbances, this bill increases the jeopardy from foreign sources and presents opportunities for financial shocks by domestic influences.

The effect of the gold standard is to enhance the purchasing power of gold and lessen the exchange price of all other commodities.

Its beneficiaries are the holders of gold, the creditor class, which holds evidences of debt, and holders of outstanding contracts, and those persons skilled in the arts of finance, whose trade is to buy and sell money, whose wealth and power enable them to made loans to nations, to undertake the flotation of gigantic enterprises, and to absorb or control, by concerted action, sufficient of the world's stock of gold to create an artificial demand, resulting in a trust of all trusts, a trust of the world's redemption money.

Its sufferers are the holders of property, the debtor class, which owes public or private debts, and the great mass of mankind, being the industrial classes, whose only property or capital is labor, who patiently bear the burden of unequal taxation, who pay all the profits of class legislation, which circumscribes their opportunities, and whose inertia and indifference are of "The Man with the Hoe."

The financial centers of this country have not yet recovered from the shock occasioned last December by the effect on the commerce of the world of the war between the great British Empire and the little African Republic (whose total population is less than my district), which produced a panic in London, Frankfort, Paris, Berlin, Wall street, Beacon street, Chestnut street, and La Salle street; which, in spite of the enormous balance of trade in our favor, presented the singular spectacle of the United States shipping gold to Europe.

When such a war by Great Britain with a small republic produces such a result, I fear to speculate upon the potential financial disasters which would arise from a war between any of the Great Powers.

The Bank of England replenished its stock of gold from the United States and the Bank of France. The Bank of France exercises its option to pay in coin, either gold or silver.

Arbitrage brokers of Wall street will take advantage of difference in the rate of European exchange of one-eighth of 1 per cent profit to ship gold to Europe.

WORLD'S STOCK OF GOLD INADEQUATE.

In my opinion, the world's stock of gold, even with the increased production thereof, is inadequate to meet the demand and requirements of its use as redemption money for the commerce of the world. And that fact will be demonstrated by foreign political disturbances serious enough to impair international commercial confidence whereby a demand for redemption money will result.

With the discovery of new mines and the invention of new processes in chemistry and electricity for working low-grade ores and cheapening the cost of production, it is estimated that the world's stock of gold in 1899 was $312,000,000.

The increase in the population of the world and the progress of commerce and civilization render the production of more gold imperative so long as it is the redemption money of the world. On the other hand, we know that mines become exhausted.

While it is a matter of speculation whether the production of gold will increase commensurate with its demand, there is no uncertainty as to the development of trade and commerce.

Only an ardent Utopian can conceive of the metaphysical possibility of altruistic nations guaranteeing to mankind the blessings of arbitration and perpetual peace.

Even if the peace conference of The Hague had stipulated a treaty of perpetual peace and disarmament, and thereby opened to the arts and marts of peace the war chests of Europe, in which the hoarded hundreds of millions of gold are now kept intact by the Great Powers for self-preservation from the imperialism of their sister nations, separated from the correlative premise of peace, in my opinion, the release of this hoarded gold would be a tonic to industry of temporary advantage, and of no more value in affording a permanent solution of the financial question than would an increase in the production of gold to an equal amount.

The accumulated wealth of this country is estimated by statisticians to be $65,000,000,000. The total debt of this country is estimated to be $20,000,000,000.

It is almost impossible to estimate the domestic trade of this country. Only a partial idea can be obtained from the total clearing-house transactions of 72 cities of the United States, which for the year ending September 30, 1899, were the enormous aggregate of $88,909,661,776. The total stock of money in the United States was estimated, March 1, 1900, by the Department to be $2,267,626,865. The total stock of gold, upon which all rests by this bill, was estimated to be $1,025,825,162. The estimated population of the United States is 77,395,000; circulation per capita, $26.12.

This great debt and the great commerce of this country rest upon a comparatively small amount of gold. How utterly impotent that small amount of gold would be can be readily appreciated if all the creditors were to insist upon payment in redemption money, which is 20 to 1. Particularly is this true when the greater part of our debt is held by foreigners.

I have seen no estimates of the accumulated wealth of the world, the existing debts of the world, or the volume of commercial transactions of the world for any given year.

In 1899 the total population of the world was estimated at 1,318,100,000. The world's stock of money was estimated as follows:

[Report of Bureau of the Mint January 1, 1900.]

The total stock of gold	$4,631,700,000.00
The total stock of silver	3,836,100,000.00
The total paper money	2,836,300,000.00
Total stock of all money	11,304,100,000.00
Per capita of money	8.57
Per capita of gold	3.51

How slender is the proportion of gold in the world must be readily recognized.

The United States, with one-twentieth of the population of the entire world, owns about one-fourth of the entire stock of gold in the world.

Our per capita circulation of $26.12 is less than many other nations, and the issue of bank-note circulation, encouraged by this bill, is an admission that this country needs more money in circulation.

As the rest of the world progresses in civilization it will require more money in circulation, and in crises the redemption money

will be demanded. Then what will become of our gold? Such a disproportion can not continue permanently.

I hope that the production of gold will continue to increase in the future as it has in the past, and in that event sooner or later the objection on the part of the money power of the world will be, not to bimetallism, but to the single standard of gold, and in favor of a single silver standard, or some new standard more susceptible to their influence and control.

FOREIGN TRADE.

The producers and manufacturers of this country are making greater strides for foreign trade than ever before. The Philadelphia Commercial Museum is entitled to great credit for its efforts in this behalf.

The economics of the fields for their greatest opportunities—the Orient and South America—in my opinion, are arguments in favor of bimetallism.

Our newly acquired possessions bring this economic question closer to home, and its importance to this country is now more fully realized.

Mr. Edward W. Harden, special commissioner of the United States on financial and industrial conditions of the Philippines, in his report says:

> The question of the future currency of the Philippines is one which is of vital importance to all business men of the islands. The best informed men in Manila are unanimous in their opinion that under present conditions a silver currency is the only one suited to the islands. A great deal of the trade of the Philippines is with China, Japan, the Straits Settlements, India, and Australia. In China, Japan, and India the whole trade is on the silver basis. Though Japan has adopted the gold standard, it has, however, as the basis of its currency the gold dollar, which is approximately worth only 50 cents, and its currency, therefore, in effect is on the silver basis, the same as China and India. (Report Comptroller, 1899, Volume I, page 42.)

The per capita of money in the Philippines is about $2.50; China, $1.96; India, $2.07; Japan (metallic), $1.75; Central American States, $3.65; South American States, $2.67; Cuba (metallic), $1.94; Mexico, $9.12.

India and China, with an estimated population in 1899 of 683,400,000, have no gold to speak of and a stock of silver estimated at $1,318,400.

The foreign commerce of the Pacific is estimated by statisticians to aggregate $2,000,000,000 annually, of which our Republic enjoys less than one-tenth.

The doors of commerce of Asia and Oceania are now only partially open to the world. When the material and moral progress of civilization develops the physical and mental wants of the untold hundreds of millions of people of the Orient and dark continent, what will be the aggregate of their accumulated property, and what will be the aggregate of their domestic and foreign commerce, all of which it is sought to measure and exchange by the single standard of gold?

INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT.

The necessity of a uniform currency of the world has been the subject of discussion by financiers and statesmen for centuries, but more particularly of recent years. Political parties of this country have made it a subject of planks in their platforms.

The Republican platform of 1888 is, in part, as follows:

> The Republican party is in favor of the use of both gold and silver as money, and condemns the policy of the Democratic Administration in its efforts to demonetize silver.

The platform of the Republican party in 1896 is, in part, as follows:

> We are therefore opposed to the free coinage of silver except by international agreement with the leading commercial nations of the world, which we pledge ourselves to promote, and until such agreement can be obtained, the existing gold standard must be preserved.

The bill now pending is, in part, as follows:

> SEC. 14. That the provisions of this act are not intended to preclude the accomplishment of international bimetallism whenever conditions shall make it expedient and practicable to secure the same by concurrent action of the leading commercial nations of the world, and at a ratio which shall insure permanence of relative value between gold and silver.

In 1888 the Republican party condemned the unfriendliness of the Democratic Administration to silver. In 1896 it pledged itself to promote an international agreement for bimetallism. It now withdraws from its pledge and enacts, the mere surplusage, that this new law is not intended to forever preclude an international agreement establishing bimetallism.

The international conferences of 1878 and 1881 accomplished nothing because of the opposition of England, whose statesmen frankly avowed that as the creditor nation it would be unwise for it to lessen the purchasing power of the money in which her credits were paid.

The commissioners who went to Europe in 1897, under the resolution of Congress, were seriously retarded in their efforts to obtain a conference because of the cold water thrown upon the matter by the Administration.

European financiers and statesmen at the present time are unanimous in the opinion that the initiative for international bimetallism should be taken by this country.

THE BANK OF THE UNITED STATES.

Banking associations, within the range of legitimate operation of deposit and discount, subserve a useful function of industrial economics.

But national banks enjoy special privileges as banks of issue, and exercise in some respects the functions of the Government, and truly become, as the name would imply, banks of the nation for deposit and circulation.

At the time the Constitution was ordained the power of the Government of the United States regarding national banks was the subject of controversy between the two schools of constitutional construction.

In 1791 Alexander Hamilton, notwithstanding Jefferson's opposition, secured the enactment by Congress of a bill creating a bank of the Union.

In 1811, when a bill was introduced to recharter the bank, Jefferson was successful in his opposition, and the bill was defeated.

Again, in 1816, another act was passed by Congress to establish "The Bank of the United States." It enjoyed a checkered career, first, because of mismanagement, then with the difficulties and opposition by the various State legislatures.

The controversy between the bank and the States was settled in 1819 by the Supreme Court in the elaborate opinion handed down by Chief Justice Marshall, in the celebrated case of McCulloch *vs.* The State of Maryland, Daniel Webster appearing for the bank, in which it was held that the act chartering the bank was constitutional (4 Wheaton, 316).

From 1825 to 1829 the bank and its 25 branches began to exert a controlling influence in industrial affairs throughout the nation. Nevertheless President Andrew Jackson, in December, 1829, in his annual message to Congress, stated:

> The charter of the Bank of the United States expires in 1836, and its stockholders will most probably apply for renewal of their privileges. In order to avoid the evils resulting from precipitancy in a measure involving such important principles and such deep pecuniary interest, I feel that I can not in justice to the parties interested too soon present it to the deliberate consideration of the legislature and the people.
>
> Both the constitutionality and the expediency of the law creating this bank are well questioned by a large portion of our fellow citizens; and it must be admitted that it has failed in the great end of establishing a uniform and sound currency.

This resulted in the memorable political struggle between Andrew Jackson and the money powers of that time, in which Jackson was reelected, and his veto of the bill passed by Congress to extend the charter of the bank was sustained. In February, 1836, thirteen days before the expiration of its charter, the bank received a charter from the State of Pennsylvania. During the panic of 1837 its stock sold at a premium of $37 per share. The bank closed its doors in 1843, and its capital of $28,000,000 was lost to its stockholders.

Thus ended the career of the second and last Bank of the United States.

STATE BANKS.

From time to time since 1782 the legislatures of the respective States authorized banks of the State, State banks, and savings banks.

The Government influences, at the time of the civil war, discriminated against banks of the States and State banks.

Secretary of the Treasury Chase, afterwards Chief Justice, in his report for 1861, said:

> It has well been questioned by the most eminent statesmen, whether a currency of bank notes, issued by local institutions under State laws, is not, in fact, prohibited by the national Constitution. Such emissions certainly fall within the spirit, if not within the letter of the constitutional prohibition of the emission of bills of credit by the States, and of the making by them of anything except gold and silver coin a legal tender in payment of debts.

The State banks were first taxed 2 per cent, then the tax was divided into monthly installments, in order that the volume of circulating notes would be ascertained.

The act of March, 1865, provided that every national bank shall pay a tax of 10 per cent on the notes of any person or State bank used for circulation or paid by them.

The act of July, 1866, provided that State banks should pay 10 per cent on the amount of their notes, all notes of any person or other State bank used for circulation and paid out by them.

This resulted in the conversion of about 1,000 State banks into national banks.

The Supreme Court of the United States declared these acts constitutional in 1869, in the celebrated case of Bank *vs.* Fenno (8 Wall., 533).

While the Federal tax is prohibitive in the issuance of bank notes by State institutions, nevertheless, the various legislatures have enabled the establishment of trust companies which have fiduciary powers and privileges in addition to that of banking not enjoyed by national banks.

The report of the Comptroller of the Currency for 1899 contains a table showing that statements of the condition were submitted by 9,732 incorporated and private banks for the year ending June

30, 1899. And, by a report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, it was found that 12,804 banks and bankers paid war tax on capital stock and surplus.

From the statements submitted, and the estimate on the tax of those not submitted, the total deposits of said banks and bankers are $4,264,162,361.

NATIONAL BANKS.

In the exigencies of the civil war and the necessity of the Federal Government to secure a better market for its bond issues is found the cause for granting franchise to the private corporation known as a national bank.

Secretary Chase, in his report for 1861, recommended the gradual issue of national-bank notes secured by Government bonds, and stated the following to be its advantages:

A currency of uniform security and value, protection from losses in discounts and exchanges, increased facilities to the Government in obtaining loans, a diminution in the rate of interest, or participation by the people in the profits of circulation, an avoidance of the perils of a great money monopoly, and a distribution of the bonds of the nation to the leading monetary associations of the country, thus identifying their interests with those of the Government.

In his report for 1862 Secretary Chase earnestly advocated the passage of the national-bank bill. He said—

That the United States bonds would be required for banking purposes, a steady market would be established, and their negotiation greatly facilitated, a uniformity of price for the bonds would be maintained at a rate above funds of equal credit, but not available to banking associations.

Congress in 1863 and 1864 authorized the establishment of national banks, with a franchise for twenty years, authorizing the issue by them of national-bank notes to the amount of $300,000,000, to be secured by Government bonds.

These acts were replete with restrictions and limitations upon the powers granted to national banks. From time to time new acts of Congress have tended to enlarge the powers and lessen the restrictions imposed upon these financial institutions.

The act of 1865 limited the amount of circulating notes furnished to banks in proportion to paid-up capital. Associations whose capital does not exceed $500,000, 90 per cent; between $500,000 and $1,000,000, 80 per cent; whose capital exceeds $1,000,000, but less than $3,000,000, 75 per cent; whose capital exceeds $3,000,000, 60 per cent.

The act of 1870 increased the authorized issue to $354,000,000. One hundred and fifty millions shall be apportioned according to representative population; one hundred and fifty millions shall be apportioned by the Secretary of the Treasury with due regard to existing banking resources, capital, and business. The remaining fifty-four millions shall be apportioned to those having, under the apportionment above prescribed, less than their full proportion.

In December, 1874, the amount issued reached $352,000,000.

No bank organized after 1870 shall have a circulation in excess of $500,000.

The acts of 1875 and 1882 repealed all previous laws restricting the aggregate amount of circulation, and since that date all banks have had the right to increase and decrease their circulation at their pleasure, subject to certain restrictions of those acts.

From the report of the Comptroller it appears that on December 2, 1899, the number of national banks was	3,602
Capital stock paid in	$606,725,265
Surplus fund	250,367,691
Undivided profits	113,958,857
Individual deposits	2,380,610,361
Due State banks and bankers	293,721,662
National-bank notes outstanding	204,925,357
United States deposits	73,866,941

The interesting facts as to the national banks of the large cities and sections of the country are as follows:

	Capital stock.	Aggregate resources.
New York	$47,700,000	$352,231,515
Boston	39,000,000	272,626,773
Chicago	18,450,000	236,451,153
Philadelphia	19,505,000	217,652,461
Pittsburg	13,250,000	115,091,144
St. Louis	11,400,000	84,705,899
Baltimore	11,058,280	66,630,563
Cleveland	9,900,000	57,237,953
The 11 Eastern States	191,113,115	1,906,650,783
Southern States	64,123,430	366,220,594
Middle States	159,661,880	1,165,001,649
Western States	29,919,100	215,310,003
Pacific States	19,307,000	127,01[illegible],633

The national banks of the city of New York hold about one-fourth of the aggregate assets of the national banks of the country. The trust companies and State banks and bankers of that city hold an equal share of the aggregate assets of those institutions. And I have no doubt that within the next twenty years the city of New York will be the financial center of the world.

The 11 Eastern States own one-half of the national-bank resources of the country and more than one-half of the assets of trust companies, State banks, and private bankers.

The greater part of the profits of these institutions come from the rest of the country; hence the necessity of governmental limitation and regulation of their powers.

RESERVE FUND.

Section 2 of the bill as amended provides that the Secretary of the Treasury shall set apart as reserve fund $150,000,000 of gold coin and bullion to redeem in gold the outstanding United States notes, aggregating $346,681,016, and the Treasury notes of 1890, aggregating $87,198,000, said notes, when redeemed, to be used—

1. By exchanging for any gold coin in the general fund.
2. By accepting deposits of gold coin in exchange for said notes.
3. By purchasing gold with any bonds or notes of the United States at such and upon such terms as the Secretary may deem most advantageous.

If, for any reason, the Secretary of the Treasury is unable to restore or to maintain the reserve fund by these three methods, and that the amount of gold in said fund shall fall below $100,000,000, it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to restore the fund to $150,000,000 of gold by selling 3 per cent gold bonds.

The present law requires the reserve of $100,000,000 in gold. There is no reason, in my opinion, why this reserve fund should be increased to $150,000,000. There is no necessity for impounding and withdrawing from circulation $50,000,000 in gold. The law would operate just as well between $50,000,000 and $100,000,000 as between $100,000,000 and $150,000,000.

ANOTHER ENDLESS CHAIN.

By reason of the practices of the Treasury Department, and the construction of existing law by previous Secretaries, the endless chain was established. To remove that evil is one of the objects in which the present bill found its first excuse.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I raise the point that the endless chain is not broken. By the provisions of section 2 of the conference report, the United States notes of $346,000,000 and the Treasury notes of $87,198,000 may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, be exchanged for gold, or they may be exchanged to purchase or redeem any of the bonds of the United States, or they may be used for any other lawful purpose which the public interest may require, except not to be used to meet deficiencies in current revenues.

It further provides that when any of the United States notes ($346,000,000) are redeemed they shall be reissued, but held in the reserve fund until exchanged for gold. When more than $50,000,000 of the United States notes and Treasury notes are in the reserve fund, whereby the gold in the reserve fund is below $100,000,000, it is the duty of the Secretary to sell 3 per cent bonds to replace the reserve.

In the event of a bond sale the gold received therefor is placed in the general fund, and then drawn therefrom with the United States and Treasury notes in the reserve fund, and the general fund receives the United States notes and Treasury notes, and in the course of events they are paid out of the general fund in the ordinary expenditures and appropriations of the Government. Greenbacks and Treasury notes in circulation which are presented for redemption for gold go into the reserve fund, from the reserve fund into the general fund, and from the general fund into circulation again, which is another endless chain.

Again, they may go into circulation to purchase or redeem any of the bonds of the United States, or they may again go into circulation for any lawful purpose which the public interest may require, in the discretion of the Secretary. The only limitation is that the Secretary shall not use them to meet deficiencies in the current revenue.

This provision is ambiguous. I am not aware that the Secretary was ever authorized to use any given fund to meet deficits in the revenue.

REFUNDING OF BONDS.

The bill further provides that certain outstanding bonds of the United States becoming due in 1904, 1907, and 1908 may be refunded for thirty-year gold bonds bearing interest at 2 per cent at a valuation equal to an income of 2½ per cent.

The bonds provided for by this provision, according to figures I got from the Department, are as follows:

Fives of 1904	$95,000,700
Fours of 1907	545,345,200
Threes of 1908	198,791,440
Total	839,146,340

Premium, of which the payment will be in cash, to make them bear 2½ per cent to maturity, was, February 1, 1900, $86,495,821.

The Treasury Department points with pride that it is refunding these bonds at a premium to make the bond worth 2½ per cent, and that it is giving in lieu thereof a 2 per cent bond, and therefore saving to the Government the difference of one-fourth of 1

per cent for the remaining term of the bond, amounting to $22,695,609.

I see no occasion for the Department to point with pride for such a so-called saving. It is merely a premium of 1 per cent on the bonds which expire in 1904, 1½ per cent on the bonds which expire in 1907, and 2 per cent on the bonds which expire in 1908 for the privilege of having same extended as gold 2 per cent bonds twenty-six, twenty-three, and twenty-two years, respectively. In other words, a saving of $22,695,609 to pay $343,992,000 interest in gold for the extended time, and the additional privilege to national-bank holders to use same for deposit upon which to issue an equal amount of bank-note circulation at an expense or taxation of one-half of 1 per cent per annum.

The bonds of the United States not included nor authorized to be refunded by this bill are the twos, past due, $25,364,500, and the fours of 1925, $162,315,415. The reason these bonds were not included is that the twos are past due, and to refund the fours to pay 2½ per cent would require an advance of about $60,000,000 cash.

BANK CIRCULATION.

The act of 1882 extended the national-bank charters for twenty years. At that time it was charged that the national banks were attempting to perpetuate and protract the national debt merely to furnish security for national-bank circulation.

The Comptroller of the Currency in his annual report for 1882 strongly opposed the continuance of the national-bank circulation after the public debt shall have been paid off.

Based on any other security, banks would not receive each other's notes.

The discontinuance of the national-bank system was then the subject of public discussion.

The issuance of national-bank notes based upon municipal or corporate bonds or bank assets was deprecated.

That distinguished writer on finance, Horace White, said:

At all events, it would be a great mistake for us to perpetuate or prolong the national debt merely to furnish security for bank notes. While the debt exists, while the Government has not the means of paying it off and relieving the taxpayers of an annual interest charge, it may be usefully employed as security for the holders of bank notes; but to tax the people longer than is necessary for this purpose would be indefensible and would furnish good ground for the charge made against national banks that they oppress the community.

The purpose of this bill in refunding the bonds of the Government is to furnish a basis for profitable circulation by the national banks.

Under the provisions of this bill, the National City Bank of New York, which has a capital of $10,000,000, and which holds $10,000,000 to $15,000,000 of Government deposits, can use the Government deposits to buy $10,000,000 of these new Government twos, deposit the Government twos with the Treasury Department, and thereupon receive authority to issue $10,000,000 circulation. The $10,000,000 circulation will restore its Government deposits (less the premium which it will acquire by sinking fund); and it will thereafter, for thirty years, receive $200,000 a year interest on the bonds, and after paying the tax and sinking fund and charges, will have a net profit of $140,000 a year without the expenditure of any money of its own except the temporary advance of the premium on the bonds.

The difference between the profits it enjoys from the Government deposits secured by bonds and the bank circulation secured by bonds is that the deposits may be withdrawn on demand by the Secretary, while the bank circulation is at the pleasure of the bank for thirty years. And there can be no criticism as to discrimination in the bank circulation.

LIMITATION UPON WITHDRAWAL OF CIRCULATION REPEALED.

Section 12 of the conference report, which is about to be agreed to, is that part of the bill which provides for the national-bank circulation, and contains, among other things, the following clause:

And so much of an act entitled "An act to enable national banking associations to extend their corporate existence, and for other purposes," approved July 12, 1882, as prohibits any national bank which makes any deposit of lawful money in order to withdraw its circulating notes from receiving any increase of its circulation for the period of six months from the time it made such deposit of lawful money for the purpose aforesaid, is hereby repealed, and all other acts or parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this section are hereby repealed.

This clause expressly repeals the prohibition on national banks from receiving circulation. The first part of the clause expressly repeals the limitation imposed by the act of 1882, that when national banks deposit money for the purpose of withdrawing circulation said national banks can not receive any increase in circulation for the period of six months from the time of the said deposit to withdraw.

The distinguished chairman of the Senate Finance Committee [Mr. ALDRICH], in explaining this clause, says that "it is repealed in order to render the circulation elastic."

And certainly the effect of this repeal is to permit national banks to withdraw and reissue circulation at their pleasure.

The last part of the repealing clause of section 12 is as follows:

And all other acts or parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this section are hereby repealed.

The construction of the repealing clause is important.

The section in question is section 12, which relates to national-bank circulation. The national-bank act of 1882 contains the following provision regarding the deposit of lawful money for the purpose of withdrawing circulation:

Provided, That not more than $3,000,000 per month shall be deposited for this purpose.

I contend that this limitation of $3,000,000 per month in the withdrawal of bank circulation is expressly repealed by the foregoing clause of section 12, for the following reasons:

By the simple rules of statutory construction, this limitation is repugnant to, in conflict with, contrary to the scope and intent of, and inconsistent with the effective operation of this last expression of the legislative will relating to the issue of circulation by national banks.

Section 12 authorizes circulation to the extent of $839,000,000. It authorizes the reissue of circulation, and encourages the reissue of circulation by expressly repealing the six-months' limit.

The amount of circulation outstanding last December was $204,000,000. It is expected that under the provisions of this bill four times that amount will ultimately be issued.

This $3,000,000 per month limit of the act of 1882 operates on the authorized circulation and reissued circulation.

The purpose of this section of the bill is to increase the national-bank circulation by increasing the profits to be derived therefrom by national banks and to reduce the burdens and restrictions imposed regarding same. It repeals the limitation of 90 per cent of the par value, and authorizes banks to issue to the par value of the bonds. It reduces by one-half the tax imposed by the Government on the circulation of national banks. It provides for the increase in the number of national banks by authorizing organization of small banks. It encourages the withdrawal and reissue of circulation by removing former restrictions thereon.

If this limitation in the act of 1882 be not repealed by this new law, it defeats the operation of the new law in the increase and withdrawal from circulation under the new law.

The franchise of existing national banks is for the term of twenty years from the date of their organization, or the time of their extension under the act of 1882.

Section 12, which authorizes the issue of circulation to the extent of $839,000,000 and the reissue of circulation of national banks, necessarily gives the right to said banks to make the necessary deposits and withdrawal from circulation during the term of their respective franchises. With the limitation of $3,000,000 per month in withdrawals, this could not be effected.

I contend that the repealing clause sweeps away every limitation, and in my contention I am sustained by some of the high officials of the Department.

The national banks issue circulation because it is profitable to them. They will withdraw the same if conditions make it unprofitable.

They may expand or contract the volume of the money of the nation in circulation to the extent of hundreds of millions of dollars.

Financiers hold that elastic currency is desirable for business, but it may be used as a source of profit to the business of the bank and as potential evil to the community when that elasticity is controlled by the banks themselves.

POTENTIAL EVILS.

National banks constitute no part of the Government. They are private corporations, organized for private gain and managed by officers of their own selection.

While the Comptroller of the Currency exercises supervision over them and the national-bank acts circumscribe their corporate powers, yet the Government is in no wise responsible for their acts.

While a national bank may be designated as a national depository of the Government funds, that does not change the character of its organization or convert its managers into public officers.

The present economic evolution of centralization, with the advantage of profit and power accruing therefrom, has also been felt and appreciated by banking corporations. In financial centers national banks of large capital have consolidated.

Clearing-house associations have time and again adopted rules and practices to subserve the self-interest of its members, to the loss of other financial institutions and the public in general.

The large corporations and trusts are represented in the directory of the large national banks, or as depositors or borrowers influence their policy.

The stock exchanges of the country are associations subserving public good wherein they afford an immediate market for known securities. The stock exchanges have the power to regulate the corporations of the country whose stocks and bonds are sold on their floors.

The rules governing these exchanges are more honored in the breach than in the observance.

The failure of their governors to restrict and regulate trading in unlisted securities; their permission to corporations whose securities are listed to issue new stock, to issue bonds, to declare dividends of 100 per cent, or to pass dividends without the record or the publicity to the exchange or the public of facts and figures justifying same; the toleration of bear raids and bull pools of unlimited capital for the purpose of artificially controlling the market to wreck unprotected corporations on the one hand, or to exploit others to the public on the other hand; and the toleration of the manipulation of call money to 186 per cent per annum by the call-loan crowd, are matters of constant recurrence worthy of the investigation of the lawmakers in the respective States and of this House.

The consolidated national banks which, with affiliated corporations, stock-exchange and clearing-house influences, are potential of evil to the business community of the country by the arbitrary exercise from time to time of powers and functions properly governmental beyond the control or regulation of the people or the legislative will.

With the present trend of events such powers and privileges should be restricted rather than enlarged. The purpose of this bill is to enlarge such powers.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, whenever this House grants special privileges to one class by legislation, it imposes special burdens upon another class by legislation. This bill, from the caption to the last word, is fraught with special privileges, except in one place, which provides that greenbacks redeemed in gold may be reissued for lawful purposes which the public interest may require.

That is the only place in the bill where the public interest is mentioned, and even there the public interest reposes in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury.

It grants special privileges to the money trust of the world, special privileges to the bondholders, and special privileges to national banks.

Its fallacies and weaknesses will be disclosed in the first panic. It will be sadly shattered by the domestic financial turmoils which it promotes, and will not survive serious international disturbances, which it courts.

And I hereto set my hand and seal this day to be able to say, "I told you so." [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Agricultural Appropriation Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. BURLEIGH F. SPALDING,

OF NORTH DAKOTA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, April 9, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 10338) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture—

Mr. SPALDING said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: As a new member of this House, and, I trust, possessed of some of the modesty becoming in a new member, I have occupied very little of the time and attention of this body.

I have the honor to attempt to represent a constituency numbering in the vicinity of 300,000 people, and I apprehend about as large a constituency as any member from a district represents on the floor of this House.

My people occupy a vast empire, 250 by 350 miles in extent, and are probably more exclusively agricultural in their pursuits than the people of any district in the Republic. It is a prairie land, beautiful and fruitful as any that greets the rays of the morning sun. Its people, coming not only from every State in the Union, but from Scandinavia, Germany, Russia, Great Britian—in short, from all the civilized countries of the Old World—and intermingling for one common purpose, have developed a wonderful unanimity of thought and opinion, uncommon in those States of widely diversified industries and interests.

They are not only educated, intelligent, and cultured, but practical and fully equipped with common sense, that greatest of all endowments.

The State has hardly been settled twenty years and has been a member of the Union of States barely ten years, but its people believe in education, not only for the rest of the world, but for themselves. They are progressive and liberal, yet at the same time conservative.

EDUCATION.

I find that Vermont, with 82,370 children of school age, expended for schools in 1898, $933,000; Virginia, with 582,100 children, spent $1,927,000; South Carolina, with 473,200 children, spent $697,000, and North Carolina, with 620,000 children, spent $931,000; while North Dakota, with 96,180 children, expended $1,280,000, or, with a little more than one-seventh of the number of children, spent about one-third more for education than North Carolina.

The interests of the State of Mississippi are protected on the floor of this House by seven members, who in 1898 received a combined vote of 22,365 out of a total Congressional vote of 27,187, yet the people of North Dakota showed sufficient interest in the issues of the day to visit the polls and cast 27,776 votes for its one Representative, or 5,411 more than the total for the seven Mississippi members and 589 more than the total Congressional vote of the seven districts of that State.

I mention this not to boast, but to show that the people of North Dakota are not only capable of exercising their right of suffrage intelligently, but that they take enough interest in the welfare of the nation to exercise it, even with less than one-seventh the object for doing so possessed by the people of Mississippi.

LEGISLATION FOR AGRICULTURE.

Mr. Chairman, much is said and printed in these days about special legislation and special privileges, and it is repeatedly urged that Congress has never done anything for the farmer. I am interested in the farmer. I am a farmer myself, and my neighbors and friends are farmers. Let us see what this bill does. It appropriates more than $66,000 for editors and their assistants to prepare documents and compile statistics for the benefit of the farmer; about $37,000 for chemists, surveys, pomology, and kindred scientific investigations for his benefit; about $12,000 for forestry and gardens.

BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY.

It appropriates $1,078,830 for the Bureau of Animal Industry, to which we are indebted for experiments and information regarding diseases of farm animals and the distribution of vaccine and other preventives of and remedies for diseases of stock. The beneficent results of the work of this Bureau are very apparent in my own State, from which I have lately received hundreds of letters testifying to the great resulting benefits.

This Bureau has done a great work for the animal industry. Its results can not be estimated. Fifty thousand dollars are set aside to quarantine diseased animals; $100,000 for making investigations, collecting statistics and other like work, and for investigation as to the feasibility of extending the demand for our agricultural products in foreign lands; $20,000 to investigate and test seeds, fiber, and purposes incidental thereto; $20,000 to investigate the history and habits of insects injurious and beneficial to agriculture and horticulture, etc., and ascertaining the best means to destroy those found to be injurious, and similar experiments; $28,000 to investigate diseases of fruits, fruit trees, grain, cotton, vegetables, etc.; $40,000 for investigation and information as to forests and how to preserve them, and experiments in growing trees in treeless regions; $20,000 for experimental garden; $25,000 to investigate relation of soils to climate, texture and composition of soils, how to reclaim alkali lands, etc.; $17,000 to experiment with grasses, forage plants, and animal foods, for the purchase of seeds and grasses.

EXPERIMENTAL STATIONS.

It gives $780,000 for agricultural experimental stations. Mr. Chairman, the late Senator Morrill, when he made provision for these stations, builded better than he knew. By reason of longer existence some of the stations may be more effective than that in my State, but the benefits derived from that station alone are inestimable. Last year through the courtesy of one of our railroads more than 1,700 farmers from distant parts of the State saw its work and thereby an interest was created that is most effective in disseminating the results of the work of this Department and improving the methods of farming. It gives $14,000 to investigate system of road management and making and the best road-making materials for different States, and publishing and distributing reports on the subject; $37,500 for publication of farmers' bulletins containing the results and conclusions from the different investigations; $47,500 for publishing and distributing other documents and reports.

SEEDS.

It appropriates $17,000 for purchase and distribution of valuable seeds, bulbs, plants, etc. Here I may say that I understand this feature to be intended, not to supply any farmer with all the seeds he may need, but rather to give an opportunity to test and experiment with a few different varieties and give the rest of the world the benefit of the results through the Department. I have distributed my quota on this plan.

These, Mr. Chairman, with items of a similar nature in the bill, make a total of $4,116,800 for the direct benefit of the farmer, who, if he profits by the results of the experiments and investigations, is saved time and expense without measure.

The newly settled States will derive the greater benefit from this measure. Mr. Chairman, after seeing only the little I have seen of the work of this Department, it will give me great pleasure to cast my vote for this appropriation.

Gentlemen may sneer at some parts of this bill and may read poetry on "the seeds that never grow," but I suspect they may be more interested in cultivating the muse or the risibilities of the House than in cultivating the soil.

OTHER MEASURES OF INTEREST TO FARMERS.

But there are other measures in which the farmer is interested, even though they omit any direct reference to him.

It is said that there resides in an Eastern State—we have none such in the West—a lawyer whose faculty of generalization is so cultivated that when engaged in the preparation of a brief he examines the various digests and law dictionaries and cites every case containing the name of the subject under consideration—that is, if briefing a question under contracts refers to every case found containing the word "contract." I suppose the persons who so persistently contend that there has been no legislation for the farmer proceeds on the same principle as does this lawyer, and because the word farmer is not in the act, in large letters, conclude it can not benefit him.

Yet there are many laws now on our statute books in which no direct reference is made to agriculture by which it is benefited beyond measure. Oftentimes only the certainty that some measure will be enacted into law works to the immediate advantage of the agriculturist; on the other hand, the fear that some existing law will be repealed or some measure enacted proves equally detrimental.

RELATIONS OF THE FARMER TO THE LABORER.

We are dependent one on the other. Whatever benefits the laborer and the merchant benefits the farmer, and whatever uplifts the farmer elevates the rest of the community. The surplus of the artisan supplies the market for the farmer, and his profits make employment for the mechanic. It is only another statement of the old principle that supply and demand, other things being equal, regulate the price. The mechanic uses the wheat and the farmer the boots and shoes and machinery. If there is no mechanic the produce will rot on the farm, and without the farmer the product of skilled labor accumulates in the warehouse; and without a stable measure of value all is uncertainty.

THE TARIFF.

The protective tariff, primarily intended to encourage manufactures, has proven of untold benefit to the workman by furnishing him employment, and at the same time has supplied consumers for the products of the farm and increased the price. With a low tariff all manufacturing industries have languished and the farmer has been the greatest financial sufferer. With a high tariff all is changed, labor is employed, capital invests, manufactories flourish, agriculture finds a ready market for its products, and the whole country revels in prosperity.

THE CURRENCY.

A sound and stable currency, good at par in all countries, is likewise beneficial to agriculture. With different standards and uncertain values the farmer suffers both in selling and buying. With certainty and confidence combined, certainty of a market and confidence in the measure of value, he reaps the greatest reward.

ATTITUDE OF THE PARTIES.

We find the two great political parties in conflict on these propositions in the past. The people remember with sorrow and bitterness the record of Democratic rule. They now experience with delight and satisfaction the results of Republican administration. Compare the ruin and disaster during the last Democratic Administration with the prosperity and contentment everywhere seen to-day. It is equally apparent in every form of industry—the shop, the store, and the farm—like conditions have resulted in every branch of industry.

BENEFITS OF REPUBLICAN RULE.

Three years ago I passed through the manufacturing cities of Ohio and Pennsylvania. The machinery was idle; the fires out; men unemployed and their families hungry and naked. A short time ago I passed through the same States. Smoke was issuing from every chimney, and they number thousands; no idle men were seen; all were employed at paying wages; their children were in school, and happiness reigned everywhere. I visited one establishment with 3,000 men in its employ, and was told that it had been weeks since a man had presented himself seeking employment.

On the farms, in the cities and villages, where, under Democracy, men by the dozens applied at each house daily for employment or food, now, during Republican administration, it has become impossible to get a man to saw your wood or make a garden. Where formerly great armies encamped along the highways seeking work or some way to earn a living, and without means to pay for a lodging, the camping grounds are now deserted and their former occupants are finding employment at remunerative wages wherever sought.

Statistics show that the value of farm products in the United States was $1,600,000,000 more in 1890 than in any year of Democratic depression. Live stock increased in value $700,000,000 and crops $600,000,000. Agricultural real estate in 1890 was worth $1,220,000,000 more than in 1889. During this period mortgages on farms occupied by owners decreased $800,000,000, and millions were saved to the farmers by decrease in interest rates. Such are the blessings of Republican doctrine when put in operation by a President who has the confidence of the business world and the affection of the common people.

This is not all. While accomplishing these vast changes of conditions, which alone would have caused this Administration to pass into history as among the most efficient in all time, it has fought a foreign war and achieved more speedy and bloodless victory than history elsewhere records.

While, Mr. Chairman, maintaining that the Administration of William McKinley has been well-nigh perfect, I do not consider that the only criterion by which to judge any Administration. When such vast interests are involved and such gigantic transactions are daily occurring in the conduct of this nation, rendering it impossible to give each detail the full and calm consideration which might be given it if no others were pressing, the proper view is from the standpoint of comparison, and what would have resulted with our opponents in power, putting into effect the theories for which they have contended?

We should then have seen war declared without ammunition for one conflict with the enemy; we should have seen money withheld for carrying on the war, after urging it upon the Administration; we would have seen our flag held in contempt by every nation, from the mightiest to the weakest; and not satisfied with this, we should have become involved in entangling alliances with foreign powers, the result of which no man can surmise. We should have seen our promises to pay at a discount instead of at a premium, our rates of interest increased, and our currency debased. Distress and humiliation everywhere would abound.

SMALL BANKS.

But notwithstanding the unparalleled prosperity and glory and honor which have attended this Administration, the Democracy is not satisfied; the offices are held by the Republicans, and the only hope of success lies in finding errors of omission or commission; so since this Congress convened not one subject, explored or unexplored, has escaped attack from the Democrats.

They occupied weeks in discussing the money question, free coinage of silver at 16 to 1, expressing their horror of being in the power of the national banks and their detestation of the banking system; yet, Mr. Chairman, that bill contained one feature which from their standpoint is more dangerous than all others. The power to organize national banks with a capital of $25,000 can, in my judgment, have no other effect than to double the number of national banks within five years and increase the strength of their grasp at the throats of the American people, as they term it, beyond measure. This feature of the bill was passed over lightly by the Democrats.

Did they attack this provision and direct the country to its dangers? Did they fail to see that it would in the near future result in placing banks where none now exist? Did they warn the farmer and the common people of the approaching danger? No, Mr. Chairman; to have done so would have totally obliterated this law as an issue. They know that the agricultural States, and the South especially, want more banks rather than less. National banks do meet with their approval in use, though they condemn them in stump speeches.

They constantly inquired who were asking for the enactment of a sound-money law. I can tell them, so far as my part of the country is concerned. It was the farmer and the laborer, the German, the Scandinavian, and the Russian, educated, intelligent sons of toil all, and not a millionaire among them.

Mr. Chairman, the subject of free coinage was first discussed in my State by two eminent Senators of the United States, who visited the capital as a committee on irrigation during the session of the convention which framed our constitution in 1889. They were invited by that convention, of which I had the honor to be a member, to become its guests and address its members on the subject of irrigating arid lands. They accepted the invitation, and while doing so imposed upon their hosts to exploit the doctrine of 16 to 1. From that day it was talked on the farm, in the store, and on the street.

It is related that if, in passing through the State in 1892-1896, you approached a town of any considerable size you would hear a confused murmur, which would grow louder and louder as you approached nearer, until on entering the place you would discover that it was a street orator discussing 16 to 1, and the burden of his song would be, "Millions, millions, millions, billions, billions, and billions," until his audience became entranced by the accumulation of figures and came to the conclusion that where there were so many figures there must be some reason to vote against the Administration, and, accordingly, the electoral vote was divided equally among the three parties, each securing one elector.

But these figures and theories did not bear scrutiny, and in 1894

the Republicans had 2,500 majority; in 1896, 6,000, and in 1898, 10,000 to 12,000. In 1900 we confidently expect it will be unanimously Republican. The greater the consideration of the subject the greater became the demand for sound money, and if I was sent here with any one instruction it was to cast my vote in its favor.

DEMOCRATIC DESPERATION.

But, Mr. Chairman, this was not the only disclosure of the motives of the opponents of the Administration, nor did their defeat on this bill result in their only discomfiture. They investigated the Secretary of the Treasury; they insisted on inspecting the mail of little Macrum, and in attempting to create many other issues to detract from the glory of the Administration; but each and all were dismal failures, from which they retired as gracefully as their anger and exhaustion would permit.

But to carry the comparison further, these same patriotic legislators and statesmen cry out against our government of the Philippines. They contend that the Constitution, immediately upon our acquiring these islands, extended over them and made each one of their inhabitants a citizen of the United States. If this be so, they can not withdraw, neither can we drop them from the Union; but in the same breath they say we should let them go.

They cry for free trade with Porto Rico. Do they favor it on account of their consideration for the Porto Ricans? Not at all; but simply because they want free trade everywhere, and must have an issue. Do they favor it out of consideration for the poverty and helpless condition of those people, and on account of their color are they so solicitous for their welfare? If they are, let them first show their generosity and their desire for justice nearer home. I recently heard a distinguished Democratic Senator state that they bulldozed them (the negroes), they shot them, they stuffed the ballot boxes, and are not ashamed of having done so.

In all its history what act has the Democratic party performed or what policy advocated that hasshed one ray of light upon mankind or in any way tended to lighten the burdens of the farmer and the producer? I will concede to it all the greatest examples of expansion under prior Administrations, and these are the only bright spots in its history. But they turn their backs upon Jefferson and Jackson and seek to efface and ignore their precepts, all for the purpose of raising an issue on which they hope to fool the people.

They deplore the evils of expansion, yet glory in the Louisiana purchase. They contend that it is unconstitutional to acquire territory. If this were true, we must confine our wars with foreign countries to the mere destruction of life and property. There are only three methods by which we can conquer an enemy—by destroying life and property and by capturing his territory. If we eliminate this last and most powerful factor, we place ourselves on the lowest plane of barbaric warfare. This is utterly absurd.

It is unnecessary for me to enter into further details. The people of the United States are familiar with the history of both great parties. They know that every prediction of the Democratic party in 1896 has proven false, while every promise of the Republican party has been fulfilled and its every prediction come true.

In view of this knowledge, Mr. Chairman, is it to be feared that the Democratic party on false and flimsy issues, raised by members of this House, can fool the people of the United States in 1900 as it fooled them in 1892? For my part of the country, Mr. Chairman, I can say that while it fooled many then, it can fool very few now. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Does the Constitution Follow the Flag?

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHESTER I. LONG,

OF KANSAS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, April 11, 1900.

The House having under consideration the bill (H. R. 8245) temporarily to provide revenues for the relief of the island of Porto Rico, and for other purposes—

Mr. LONG said:

Mr. SPEAKER: In my remarks on this bill on February 21, 1900, I referred to a number of documents and orders showing that Jefferson and other Democratic leaders prior to John C. Calhoun did not consider that the Constitution went into acquired territory of its own force without an act of Congress, and carried with it uniformity of duties.

I now give some of the documents to which I referred.

LOUISIANA.

The treaty with France for the purchase of Louisiana was ratified October 21, 1803.

The act of October 31, 1803, authorized the President to take possession of Louisiana. Section 2 of that act was as follows:

SEC. 2. *And be it further enacted*, That until the expiration of the present session of Congress, unless provision for the temporary government of the said territories be sooner made by Congress, all the military, civil and judicial powers, exercised by the officers of the existing government of the same, shall be vested in such person and persons, and shall be exercised in such manner, as the President of the United States shall direct for maintaining and protecting the inhabitants of Louisiana in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property and religion.

On November 14, 1803, Albert Gallatin, Secretary of the Treasury, issued the following order:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, *November 14, 1803.*

H. B. TRIST, Esq., *Collr, Fort Adams.*

SIR: The President of the United States having decided that until otherwise provided for, you shall immediately after the occupation of New Orleans by the United States, exercise the powers heretofore vested in the administrator or Collector, Treasurer of the Revenues at New Orleans, and authority for that purpose is transmitted to you by this mail. You will therefore be pleased immediately to proceed to New Orleans, appointing a deputy to act during your absence in the Mississippi district, or remaining at Fort Adams yourself, you will appoint a deputy to proceed to New Orleans.

In the exercise of this temporary authority, it is impossible to prescribe from this Department any precise rules of conduct and much must necessarily depend on your zeal & judgment, on both which perfect confidence is placed.

You will only be pleased to observe—

1st. That the taxes & duties to be collected under your direction are precisely the same which by the existing laws or regulations of Louisiana were demandable under the Spanish government at the time of obtaining possession.

2d. That in those taxes & duties are included specially those on imports, exports, transfer of shipping, &c., which were collected under those officers whose powers are vested in you & generally all other taxes and duties which made part of the general revenue of the province.

3d. That taxes raised for local purposes, such as those collected in the city of New Orleans, on meat, flour, markets, &c. for the purpose of lighting & watching and other City objects, are not included amongst those which you are to collect or superintend, unless they should by the laws of the place, be placed under your authority in which case those amounts must be stated and applied for the purposes of their appropriation.

4th. That you are only to secure or collect duties accruing after possession obtained by the United States and not to collect or receive any debts due on account of duties accrued whilst the Spanish government was in possession of New Orleans.

5th. That in the exercise of your office, you are perfectly independent from the person in whom the powers of Intendant have been vested by the President, anything in the Spanish regulations to the contrary notwithstanding; it being the intention of the President that you should be alone responsible for whatever relates to the collection of the Revenue, in the same manner as if you were under a law of the United States regularly appointed Collector of the Port of New Orleans.

6th. That you shall be accountable to the Treasury for all monies received by you in the same manner as for those you received as Collector of the Miss. district; and must therefore, make in every respect as far as practicable, similar returns to the several offices of this department.

7th. That you have the same powers to remove from & appoint to all the subordinate offices of Searcher, Weigher, Measurer, guards, Inspectors, &c. which by law you might exercise as collector; as also that of consolidating any of such offices as you shall think proper; and you may also abstain from filling any vacancy which may happen to any of them.

8th. That the said subordinate officers shall be entitled to receive allowances not larger than those heretofore authorized; and that you will yourself receive no salary, but the same commission on all monies received by you, which by the laws of the United States, is allowed to Collectors of ports not specially enumerated, viz: three per cent.; and also such fees corresponding with those allowed to collectors by the laws of the United States as may be demandable under the existing revenue regulations of Louisiana; out of which allowances you shall, as other collectors of the United States, defray the expenses of clerk hire, stationery, rent and other contingencies.

9th. That you may defray those several expenses from the revenue collected by you at New Orleans and also may with the monies arising from the said revenue purchase the Bills which the Department of State has authorized the officer exercising the powers of Governor & Intendant to draw to an amount not exceeding Ten thousand dollars; taking for that purpose triplicate Bills which you will make payable to the Treasurer of the United States and remit to him.

10th. That until otherwise provided for, the same duties are to be collected on the importation of goods, in the Mississippi district from New Orleans and vice versa, as heretofore.

I am very resp y Sir Yr obt Sert—

ALBERT GALLATIN.

On February 24, 1804, Congress passed an act abolishing all duties on goods, wares, and merchandise coming into the United States from the territory acquired by the treaty with France and on all goods going into the territory from the United States. The act provided that it should not go into effect until thirty days after its passage.

On February 27, 1804, the Secretary of the Treasury issued the following order:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, *Feby. 27th, 1804.*

H. B. TRIST, Esq.,
Collectr, New Orleans.

SIR: You will herewith receive the transcripts of two laws entitled "An Act for laying and collecting duties and imports and tonnage within the territories ceded to the United States by the treaty of the 30th of April 1803, between the United States and the French Republic and for other purposes" and "An Act relating to the recording, registering and enrolling of ships or vessels in the district of New Orleans."

You will perceive that by the sixth section of the first mentioned act, it is provided that vessels belonging to citizens of the United States, coming from France or Spain and their colonies and laden with the produce of those countries are not permitted to unlade at any other port within the ceded Territories than that of New Orleans—and that they are therefore precluded from unlading at Bayou St. John the other port of delivery in the district.

This provision was inserted in order to place vessels of that description, in conformity with the treaty of cession, on the same footing with French or Spanish vessels coming from the same countries with similar cargoes. But as Natchez which is made a distinct district does not lie within the ceded Territories, vessels of the United States coming from any country on this side of the Cape of Good Hope, and bound to that port, must be permitted to proceed there: whilst no foreign vessel whatever can be allowed that privilege: Natchez not being one of those districts in which foreign vessels are admitted.

As to the period of time preceding the 25 day of March 1804 on which the above mentioned act commences to operate, I have only to observe that in conformity with the Spanish laws heretofore in force, articles exported before that day from New Orleans to the United States, and to any other country, Spain excepted, were liable to pay the export duty; that articles imported before that day into New Orleans from any country whatever and even from the United States unless deposited under the privilege of deposit, were liable to pay the import duty; and that articles exported before that day from New Orleans to Spain, ought not to have paid the export duty. In case where that duty may have been levied on such exportations to Spain, it must therefore be refunded.

Should Mr. Morgan, who is appointed naval officer refuse to accept, you will be pleased to give immediate notice of such refusal to this Department. Should Mr. Garland who is appointed Surveyor of New Orleans, decline his appointment, you will give a similar notice and by virtue of the general powers vested by law in collectors, fill the place by a temporary appointment.

No person having yet been appointed Surveyor of the port of Bayou St. John, you will place an Inspector at the landing place near the mouth of said Bayou to perform such duties as that situation may require.

It is presumed that the laws will be sufficient guides in the execution of your duties except on one point of great importance and delicacy which requires particular instructions.

The United States claim as part of Louisiana under the treaty of cession, all that tract of country which formerly made part of the British province of West Florida and which lies south of the 31 degree of latitude between the Mississippi on the West and the river Perdido on the East. It is however understood that owing to instructions received from Spain, the officers of that government have not delivered possession of that Territory. This subject being considered as proper matter of negotiation between the two countries, it is not the intention of the President of the United States to occupy the same by force; and you are therefore to exercise no act of Territorial jurisdiction within the said limits, though part of your district, nor to commit any act which may endanger the peace of the U. States. But in the meanwhile the inhabitants on both sides should enjoy the advantages of a friendly intercourse; and some regulations are necessary for the protection of the revenue and to prevent the sufferance of possessions in Spain from being abused for purposes injurious to the United States. With that view the following rules must be observed.

1st. All articles of the growth, produce or manufacture of the said disputed Territory may be freely imported into the ports of New Orleans and of Bayou St. John as American produce and without paying any duty.

2d. Boats and vessels of less than —— tons burthen which are employed solely in the River or Lake trade, and owned by persons residing within the said Territory, may when coming direct from the place where owned and laden solely with articles not liable to pay duty, be admitted without paying Tonnage duty in the ports of New Orleans and Bayou St. John. And Boats and vessels not decked or if decked not masted, thus employed, owned and laden may in the River Mississippi and Lake Ponchartrain respectively be considered as American Boats and Vessels of the same description.

3d. That part of the said Territory which lies east of the entrance into Lake Ponchartrain from the sea, is in every other respect, so far as relates to the revenue laws, to be considered at present, as a Spanish Colony.

But the intercourse between it and that part of the same territory which lies on the Lakes Ponchartrain and Maunpas, in boats or vessels of less than Fifty tons, employed, owned, and laden as above mentioned, must not be interrupted.

4th. That part of the said Territory which lies on the Mississippi between the Iberville and the 31 degree of latitude, is in every respect, except that you shall commit no act of Territorial jurisdiction therein, to be considered, so far as relates to the revenue laws, as part of the United States and within your district. No foreign vessel either armed or unarmed must therefore be permitted to proceed there, nor higher than New Orleans which is the sole port of entry; and duties must be collected at New Orleans on any goods wares and merchandise liable to pay duty which are destined therefor, in same manner as if they were destined for any other part of your district. It would be highly expedient to apply the last mentioned rule to the part of the said territory which lies within the lakes between the Ibberville and the eastern entrance into Lake Ponchartrain from the sea. For the admission of armed Spanish vessels in the Lake may endanger the safety of New Orleans and if Spanish unarmed vessels or even the coasting vessels from Mobile, the admission of which is permitted by the 3d Rule, shall be allowed to introduce into that part of the said territory goods liable to pay duty, a system of smuggling across the Lake and by the way of Baton Rouge may take place which would be destructive of the revenue of the United States. On the other hand not being in actual possession of both banks at as New Orleans, such vessels may not be prevented by a mere act of the civil authority nor have we the necessary information respecting the present force of Spain and our own on the Lake.

You are therefore vested with a discretionary power on that subject, which you will exercise according to circumstances and on which you will consult the Governor.

The two objects which you must keep in view, are, on the one hand, to prevent any gross attempt to smuggle, and on the other, to abstain from any act, which might be considered as hostility, or might endanger the peace of the United States. And you will be pleased to lose no time in communicating every information to enable the President to form a proper decision on that subject, together with your own opinion on the best plan that can be adopted.

As connected with that subject, I will also thank you to communicate your ideas on the propriety of having any other port of delivery established in the district; on the proper station for a Revenue Cutter and the species of vessel best calculated for that service, and on the measures generally, which from the peculiar situation of your district, seem necessary for the security of the Revenue.

You are authorized in the meanwhile, to appoint and station a sufficient number of Inspectors and other subordinate Custom house officers, and to employ one or two Boats or Barges on the Mississippi and Lake Ponchartrain. And you are also in conformity with the seventh section of the act to repeal the internal taxes, designated to prepare and furnish the certificate, accompanying foreign distilled spirits, wines and teas.

It being considered important to conciliate the minds of the inhabitants of Louisiana, by every reasonable measure, you will be pleased to give the most liberal construction to the Act allowing registers, &c. to vessels owned by them.

For the same reason whilst you execute the Revenue laws with substantial strictness, so as effectually to prevent frauds of any kind; deviations from mere forms arising from ignorance and not essentially injurious to the revenue, must be overlooked, and every opportunity embraced to inform, satisfy and reconcile persons who have business at the Custom house. It is necessary also to impress the people with a high sense of the justice, honor and strict integrity of the officers of government; and for that purpose great care must be taken in selecting Inspectors and other subordinate officers and their conduct should be watched with strict attention. Indeed on this subject the President of the United States has directed me to say that he expects particular vigilance and energy shall be used by the Collector, Naval officer and Surveyor, for the purpose of eradicating the shameful and systematic corruption which has heretofore prevailed at New Orleans: that every subordinate officer who shall connive at any fraud, be guilty of extortion, or accept bribes or extra fees, ought to be immediately discharged and punished; and that every legal means should be adopted to bring to condign punishment every individual who shall offer a bribe or attempt to commit any fraud on the revenue.

I perceive two mistakes in the two above mentioned acts—The title of the act relative to registers uses the words, "District of New Orleans instead of "district of Mississippi". As the operative words of the Act in that respect are, "the territories ceded to the United States" &c., you need not attend to the mistake in the title, and as those words embrace that part of the British Province of West Florida claimed under the treaty of cession by the United States, you are to give them that construction, and permit vessels owned by persons residing there at the time mentioned by the act, to be registered, recorded, enrolled, or licensed, provided that the owners shall request it, and shall take the oath of allegiance and in other respects comply with the provisions of the act. It is also proper to observe that although the words "French or Spanish registers" are used in one part of the act, yet as in a subsequent part of the act the words "Register and other papers", &c. are used, it will not be necessary in order to entitle a vessel to the benefit of the act, that she should have had a *register;* but that any vessel which was navigated under Spanish or French *papers* and coming in other respects within the purview of the Act, shall be entitled to those benefits.

The other mistake is in the act "for laying and collecting duties, &c." The proviso at the end of the first section, which proviso relates to the registering of vessels owned in Louisiana, was as I am informed, struck out in Congress, and a distinct law, which is the other act now transmitted has actually passed for that purpose.

It is presumed that the proviso was nevertheless inserted in the enrolled Bill by the transcribing clerk. But as the act passed for that special purpose goes further than the proviso, and being passed one day later than the act which contains the proviso, virtually repeals any contradictory provision which might be contained in it, you will be directed in the execution of the laws, by the said special act of the 25 inst., and not by the proviso, on the same subject, of the act of the 24 instant.

For the sake of perspicuity you will be pleased to keep a distinct account of the revenue accrued between the 20 Decr., 1803, and the 25 March 1804, and of the monies received and paid on account of that revenue. You will receive from the Comptroller's office the usual forms in relation to subsequent transactions.

Permit me to request the favour of your opinion, which shall be considered as perfectly confidential and may be communicated in a private letter, respecting the most proper characters to fill the places of Naval officer and Surveyor, if any of the gentlemen who have been appointed should decline. Will it be good policy to give one of the offices to one of the French inhabitants? And is there any such who unites the proper qualifications of integrity and intelligence to a competent knowledge of the English language? Mr. D'Herbigny has been recommended. If he is qualified what is his standing amongst the French inhabitants?

I have the honor to be, Very respectfully Sir Yr obt. Sert

ALBERT GALLATIN.

On March 19, 1804, the following order was issued modifying the above order of February 27, 1804:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, *March 19, 1804.*

H. B. TRIST, Esq.,
Collec'r of New Orleans.

SIR: The President of the United States having taken into consideration the instructions respecting the disputed territory with Spain, contained in my letter of the 27 ulto, has thought fit to direct that so much of the said instructions as prohibited Spanish vessels bona fide bound to Baton Rouge & other settlements on the east side of the Mississippi yet in the possession of Spain from proceeding higher up than New Orleans, should for the present be rescinded.

You will therefore consider all the said territory whether on Lake Ponchartrain or on the Mississippi in the same light as that part of it which lies east of the P. Lake; that is to say, that with the exception prescribed in the two first rules laid down in my letter of the 27th ulto in relation to the produce and shipping of the said disputed territory, you are to consider Baton Rouge & other settlements now in possession of Spain whether on the Missi. Iberville, the Lakes, or the sea coast, as foreign ports.

If therefore Spanish vessels bound to Baton Rouge or other settlements on the Missi., in the possession of Spain, shall arrive at New Orleans they may be permitted to proceed to their place of destination under the regulations and restrictions of the 3d Section of the Collection law, that is to say without securing the duties, if they shall have in the manifest first delivered to any officer receiving the same, been reported as destined for such place, but giving bond as directed by the P. Section. It will be proper also to place an inspector on board such vessels till they reach their destination, and to have an inspector placed at the Iberville, another at Fort Adams, and if from numerous such importations any danger of smuggling is entertained, a barge or boat leave the Iberville to watch & examine boats coming down the river.

In no instance however you are to allow drawbacks for goods which have been landed & may afterwards be reported to such places; and Spanish vessels which may be employed in that trade; must be strictly watched & without hesitation seized in case of any attempt to smuggle or otherways infringe the Revenue laws.

I have the honor to be with respect Sir Yr Obt. Sert.

ALBERT GALLATIN.

On February 28, 1804, the Secretary of the Treasury issued the following circular:

[Circular.]

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, *February 28, 1804.*

SIR: As it may be some time before you can be furnished with a printed copy of an Act entitled "an Act for laying and collecting duties on Imports and Tonnage within the Territories ceded to the United States by the Treaty of the thirtieth of April, One Thousand eight hundred and Three, between the United States and the French Republic and for other purposes," passed on the 24th of the present month, I have deemed it proper for your government therein, to inform you, that by the third Section of the said Act, so much of any law or laws imposing duties on the Importations into the United

States of Goods wares and Merchandize from New Orleans, which is the only port of entry in the said Territories has been repealed. But as the Act in question does not commence to be in force until thirty days after its date, Articles which have been or may be thus imported before the 25th of March ensuing, must pay the same duties as heretofore.

I am, very respectfully, Sir, your Obed^{t} Servt,

A. GALLATIN.

TEXAS.

On March 1, 1845, Congress passed a joint resolution for the annexation of Texas.

The President of the United States was officially notified that the convention of Texas, as well as the Congress of the republic of Texas, had sanctioned and adopted the joint resolution, yet after receiving this notification, R. J. Walker, Secretary of the Treasury, on July 29, 1845, issued the following order:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, *July 29, 1845.*

To Collectors and other Officers of the Customs.

The President of the United States has received official intelligence, that the Convention, as well as the Congress of the Republic of Texas, have sanctioned and adopted the joint resolution of the Congress of the United States of the first of March last, for the admission of Texas as a State of the Union.

By the 24th section of the act of Congress of the United States of the 30th August, 1842, it is provided: "That it shall be the duty of all Collectors and other Officers of the Customs to execute and carry into effect all instructions of the Secretary of the Treasury relative to the execution of the Revenue laws; and in case any difficulty shall arise as to the true construction or meaning of any part of such Revenue laws, the decision of the Secretary of the Treasury shall be conclusive and binding upon all such Collectors and other Officers of the Customs." In conformity with this provision of the law, it becomes my duty to communicate the views and instructions of this Department upon various important questions arising out of the new relations between Texas and the United States.

First. Although there is now a solemn compact obligatory upon both parties for the admission of Texas as a State of the Union, yet, until further action of the Congress of the United States upon this subject, and instructions founded thereon from this Department, you will collect duties, as heretofore, upon all the imports from Texas into the United States.

A similar question arose in relation to exports from Florida into New Orleans in 1819, when it was decided by the Treasury Department "that all goods which have been, or may be, imported from Pensacola, *before an act of Congress shall be passed, erecting it into a collection district*, and authorizing the appointment of an officer to reside thereat, for the purpose of superintending the collection of duties, will be liable to duty."

If, then, as is apprehended, imports should now be made from foreign ports into Texas, with a view to introducing here free of duty from Texas, upon her formal admission by Congress as a State of the Union, such exemption from duty, in conformity with the decision before quoted in relation to Florida, could not be permitted, "before an act of Congress shall be passed erecting it (Texas) into a collection district." When Congress shall pass such an act, ample provision can be made therein to prevent the sacrifice of our Revenue by the evasion of our laws, as now believed to be contemplated.

Second. In all cases where application is made to enter goods with the privilege of drawback of duties on exportations into Texas, before granting the debenture certificate, you will diligently inquire into the circumstances of the case, with a view to ascertain whether this exportation is intended for the consumption of the cargo in Texas, or for reimportation into the United States; and any attempt to obtain a drawback of the duties, where the goods are really designed for consumption within our limits, is a manifest fraud on our Revenue laws, which will be prevented by all the lawful means within the power of this Department.

After the acquisition and occupation of Louisiana, by an order of the Treasury Department, the Collector at New Orleans was directed "to consider Baton Rouge and other settlements now in possession of Spain, whether on the Mississippi, Iberville, the lakes, or the sea-coast, as foreign ports." In the same order it was declared: "in no instance, however, you are to allow drawbacks for goods which have been landed, and may afterwards be exported to such places." This order was issued by one of my predecessors, Albert Gallatin, and was sanctioned by Mr. Jefferson, then President of the United States.

By the 80th section of the act of Congress of the 2nd March, 1799, it is provided: "That the Collector aforesaid may refuse to grant such debenture or debentures, in case it shall appear to him that any error has arisen, or any fraud has been committed; and in case of such refusal, if the debenture or debentures claimed shall exceed one hundred dollars, it shall be the duty of the said Collector to represent the case to the Comptroller of the Treasury, who shall determine whether such debenture or debentures shall be granted or not." An entry for drawback, with a view to reimportation, free of all duty, into the United States, is a fraud within the meaning of this act: and in all such cases it is the duty of the Collector to refuse the debenture certificate. In all cases where the debenture shall not exceed one hundred dollars, the Collector will judge for himself, whether such fraud as is before designated is contemplated; and, in the language of the law, "if the debenture or debentures claimed shall exceed one hundred dollars, it shall be the duty of the said Collector to represent the case to the Comptroller of the Treasury, who shall determine whether such debenture or debentures shall be granted or not."

By the 76th section of the act of 2d March, 1799, it is provided as follows: "And the said exporter or exporters shall likewise make oath that the said goods, so noticed for exportation, and laden on board such ship or vessel, previous to the clearance thereof, or within ten days after such clearance, are truly intended to be exported to the place whereof notice shall have been given, *and are not intended to be relanded within the United States*, otherwise the said goods, wares, and merchandise shall not be entitled to the benefit of drawback."

If, then, in point of fact, the goods thus exported to Texas, are "intended to be relanded within the United States," they are not entitled to drawback, and if relanded, are subject to seizure and forfeiture, as well as the vessel in which they are thus introduced.

Great vigilance will be required in obtaining ample security upon all export bonds, as those bonds may not be cancelled in any case of exportation of goods to Texas, with the privilege of drawback, until the numerous and important questions arising under such bonds shall have been fully adjudicated.

You will in no case omit to publish in the newspapers, as now required by law, the names of all persons who shall be found guilty of the violations of the Revenue laws therein prescribed, as well as to seize, for forfeiture, the goods, vessel, tackle, apparel, and furniture, in all such cases.

As the speculations referred to would diminish the Revenue, and affect injuriously the interests of the people of the United States, and of Texas as a part of the Union, the utmost vigilance and the most cordial co-operation are expected from all Officers of the Customs in carrying these instructions most fully into immediate effect.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

R. J. WALKER,
Secretary of the Treasury.

On December 29, 1845, Congress passed an act the first section of which was as follows:

That all the laws of the United States are hereby declared to extend to and over, and to have full force and effect within, the State of Texas, admitted at the present session of Congress into the Confederacy and Union of the United States.

Why was this necessary if the Constitution and laws extended into acquired territory by their own force?

Up to and including the admission of Texas it had been uniformly held that the constitution and laws were not in force in acquired territory until made so by act of Congress.

The doctrine is clearly stated by Chief Justice Taney, in Fleming *vs.* Page (9 Howard, Page 616,) as follows:

This construction of the revenue laws has been uniformly given by the administrative department of the Government in every case that has come before it. And it has, indeed, been given in cases where there appears to have been stronger ground for regarding the place of shipment as a domestic port. For after Florida had been ceded to the United States, and the forces of the United States had taken possession of Pensacola, it was decided by the Treasury Department that goods imported from Pensacola before an act of Congress was passed erecting it into a collection district, and authorizing the appointment of a collector, were liable to duty.

That is, that although Florida had by cession actually become a part of the United States and was in our possession, yet under our revenue laws its ports must be regarded as foreign until they were established as domestic by act of Congress; and it appears that this decision was sanctioned at the time by the Attorney-General of the United States—the law officer of the Government. And although not so directly applicable to the case before us, yet the decisions of the Treasury Department in relation to Amelia Island and certain ports in Louisiana, after that province had been ceded to the United States, were both made upon the same grounds.

And in the latter case, after a custom-house had been established by law at New Orleans, the collector at that place was instructed to regard as foreign ports Baton Rouge and other settlements still in the possession of Spain, whether on the Mississippi, Iberville, or the seacoast. The Department, in no instance that we are aware of since the establishment of the Government, has ever recognized a place in a newly acquired country as a domestic port from which the coasting trade might be carried on, unless it had been previously made so by act of Congress.

EXTENSION OF SLAVERY COMPELS CHANGE.

On February 19, 1847 (Congressional Globe, volume 17, second session Twenty-ninth Congress, page 455), Mr. Calhoun introduced the following resolutions in the Senate:

Resolved, That the territories of the United States belong to the several states comprising this Union, and are held by them as their joint and several property.

Resolved, That Congress, as the joint agent and representative of the states of this Union, has no right to make any law, or do any act whatever, that shall directly, or by its effects, make any distinction between the states of this Union, by which any of them shall be deprived of its full and equal right in any territory of the United States acquired or to be acquired.

Resolved, That the enactment of any law which should directly, or by its effects, deprive the citizens of any of the states of this Union from emigrating, with their property, into any of the territories of the United States, will make such discrimination, and would, therefore, be a violation of the constitution and the rights of the states from which such citizen emigrated, and in derogation of that perfect equality which belongs to them as members of this Union, and would tend directly to subvert the Union itself.

Resolved, That it is a fundamental principle in our political creed, that a people, in forming a constitution, have the unconditional right to form and adopt the government which they may think best calculated to secure their liberty, prosperity, and happiness; and that, in conformity thereto, no other condition is imposed by the federal constitution on a state, in order to be admitted into this Union, except that its constitution shall be republican; and that the imposition of any other by Congress would not only be in violation of the constitution, but in direct conflict with the principle on which our political system rests.

These resolutions went no further than to deny the power of Congress to prohibit slavery in the territories. When New Mexico and California were acquired, their soil was already free, and these resolutions prohibiting Congress from legislating against slavery in the territories did not answer the purpose. An effort was made to extend the constitution to these territories by act of Congress but failed. Mr. Calhoun then asserted the dogma for the first time that the constitution of its own force, without an act of Congress, was in force in the territories.

On June 27th, 1848, he thus announced the doctrine:

But I deny that the laws of Mexico can have the effect attributed to them, (that of keeping slavery out of New Mexico and California). As soon as the treaty between the two countries is ratified, the sovereignty and authority of Mexico in the territory acquired by it becomes extinct, and that of the United States is substituted in its place, carrying with it the constitution, with its overriding control over all the laws and institutions of Mexico inconsistent with it.

Following this doctrine, and showing how fully Calhoun dominated the administration of Polk on this question, and how quickly the same Secretary of the Treasury who made the order about Texas could change his position, R. J. Walker, on October 7, 1848, issued the following order, announcing that the constitution was in force in California:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, *October 7, 1848.*

On the 30th of May last, upon the exchange of ratifications of our treaty with Mexico, California became a part of the American Union, in consequence of which various questions have been presented by merchants and collectors for the decision of this Department.

By the Constitution of the United States is declared that "All treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States,

shall be the supreme law of the land." By the treaty with Mexico California is annexed to this Republic, and the Constitution of the United States is extended over that Territory and is in full force throughout its limits. Congress, also, by several enactments subsequent to the ratification of the treaty, have distinctly recognized California as a part of the Union, and have extended over it in several important particulars the laws of the United States.

Under these circumstances the following instructions are issued by this Department:

First. All articles of the growth, produce, or manufacture of California, shipped therefrom at any time since the 30th of May last, are entitled to admission free of duty into all the ports of the United States.

Second. All articles of the growth, produce, or manufacture of the United States are entitled to admission free of duty into California, as are also all foreign goods which are exempt from duty by the laws of Congress, or on which goods the duties prescribed by those laws have been paid to any collector of the United States previous to their introduction into California.

Third. Although the Constitution of the United States extends to California, and Congress have recognized it by law as a part of the Union and legislated for it as such, yet it is not brought by law within the limits of any collection district, nor has Congress authorized the appointment of any officers to collect the revenue accruing on the import of foreign dutiable goods into that Territory. Under these circumstances, although this Department may be unable to collect the duties accruing on importations from foreign countries in California, yet, if foreign dutiable goods should be introduced there and shipped thence to any port or place of the United States, they will be subject to duty, as also to all the penalties prescribed by law when such importation is attempted without the payment of duties.

R. J. WALKER,
Secretary of the Treasury.

There has been considerable discussion in the last few months in regard to the authorship of the expression, "The constitution follows the flag." No living statesman can rightfully claim to be the author of this expression. John C. Calhoun, in the debate with Daniel Webster in the United States Senate on February 24, 1849, first used the expression in these words:

Then the simple question is, does the Constitution extend to the territories, or does it not extend to them? Why, the Constitution interprets itself. It pronounces itself to be the Supreme Law of the land.

Mr. WEBSTER: What land?

Mr. CALHOUN: The land. The territories of the United States are a part of the land. It is the Supreme law, not within the limits of the states of this union merely, but wherever our flag waves—wherever our authority goes, the Constitution in part goes, not all its provisions certainly, but all its suitable provisions.

To this Mr. Webster made the following reply:—

The Honorable Senator from South Carolina argues that the Constitution declares itself to be the law of the land, and that therefore it must extend over the territories. "The land," I take it, means the land over which the Constitution is established, or, in other words, it means the states united under the Constitution. But does not the gentleman see at once that that argument would prove a great deal too much. The Constitution no more says that the Constitution itself shall be the Supreme law of the land than it says that the laws of Congress shall be the supreme law of the land. It declares that the Constitution and the laws of Congress passed under it shall be the Supreme law of the land.

The Porto Rico Bill.

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES R. MANN,
OF ILLINOIS.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, April 11, 1900.

The House having under consideration the bill (H. R. 8245) temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, with Senate amendments—

Mr. MANN said:

Mr. SPEAKER: There has been a vast amount of agitation and misrepresentation in regard to this Porto Rico bill. Newspapers of all classes have assailed it with an indignation and fury seldom equaled in recent years. This has been particularly true in the great city of Chicago. There this measure has been attacked by the newspapers with a bitterness usually reserved for local Chicago affairs and Chicago men. It were easy for me to have been with the popular tide in my own city by siding with the press and opposing the bill. But I was one of the earnest believers in this legislation at the outset and have never faltered in my personal support of it. I have and shall favor it because I thoroughly believe it to be right. I express no doubt of the sincerity of those who have so denounced it, though I have never yet seen any argument against the bill which commended itself to my judgment, nor have I ever seen in any newspaper opposed to the measure a fair statement of what it provides.

HISTORY OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION.

Let us look into the history of the proposed legislation.

By the treaty of Paris between the United States and Spain the island of Porto Rico was ceded by Spain to this country. That treaty was ratified April 11, 1899. Prior to that time our Army had been in possession of the island for many months. After the ratification of the treaty the island continued to be governed through the military occupation of the United States.

The rates of duties imposed between Porto Rico and the United States remained as they were before the war with Spain began—that is, articles coming to this country from Porto Rico during our military occupation there have paid the regular Dingley tariff rates, and articles going from here to Porto Rico have paid the regular tariff rates established by the military commanders there, except in some cases where preference has been granted to articles imported from the United States.

The duties which have been collected in Porto Rico have been retained there for expenditure, and the duties which have been collected here on articles imported from Porto Rico have been retained here and covered into the general Treasury, except so far as affected by the law recently enacted by Congress.

POSITION OF PRESIDENT M'KINLEY.

Such was the situation when President McKinley prepared his message, which was sent to Congress at the opening of the session in December, in which he declared it to be our "plain duty" to provide by law for free trade between Porto Rico and the United States. We have used the term "free trade" in this country for many years to describe the doctrine of a tariff for revenue as distinguished from a tariff for protection to industries.

I have no doubt that was the idea of the President, the greatest living exponent of the protective principle, when he penned his message. He wished to do away with the Dingley protective tariff law as applied against Porto Rico. And he did not have in mind absolute free trade to the extent of raising no revenue on articles shipped between the United States and Porto Rico. I do not think, therefore, that President McKinley can fairly be accused of inconsistency in advocating the present proposed legislation, as he has heartily and openly done.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL.

The tariff provisions of this Porto Rico bill which have excited so much hysterical and unfavorable comment are short and easily understood, though I have never seen them stated in any of the newspapers denouncing the bill. It is provided that upon merchandise coming into the United States from Porto Rico, or coming into Porto Rico from the United States, there shall be collected 15 per cent of the amount of duties to be collected upon like articles of merchandise coming from foreign countries. This would make the duties to be collected about one-seventh of what they now are.

The bill provides that all food products and other articles now admitted free of duty into Porto Rico from the United States under orders of the Secretary of War shall continue to go in free. The bill further provides for the organization of a local civil government for the island of Porto Rico and that whenever the Porto Rican legislative assembly shall have put into operation a system of local taxation to meet the necessities of the government there, then all tariff duties between the United States and Porto Rico shall absolutely cease and that in no event shall duties be collected after March 1, 1902.

It is further provided that all of the duties and taxes collected in Porto Rico in pursuance of the proposed law, less the cost of collection, and the gross amount of all collections of duties and taxes in the United States upon articles coming from Porto Rico, shall be covered into the general fund of the Treasury, to be held as a separate fund, which is placed at the disposal of the President to be used for the government and benefit of Porto Rico until the civil government provided for by this legislation shall have been organized in Porto Rico, when all of such funds then unexpended shall be transferred to the local treasury of Porto Rico, and all future collections paid directly thereto.

Under this legislation no internal-revenue taxes will be collected in Porto Rico by the United States—that is, the National Government will not collect any revenue from the manufacture or sale of rum or beer or other spirituous or malt liquors, or even any of the war-revenue taxes.

The other numerous provisions of the act relate to the organization of a civil government in the island of Porto Rico. I do not propose now to discuss the character of the local government thus to be instituted. In my opinion, the provisions of this measure upon that subject are ideal. They give a broad latitude for local self-government, with sufficient restraints to prevent undue indebtedness and corruption and to insure stable, orderly, intelligent, and progressive government, and to inaugurate a system of liberal school education.

THE TARIFF IMPOSED IS IN THE INTEREST OF PORTO RICO.

Every line of this measure is distinctly favorable to the people of Porto Rico. No such liberal legislation was ever proposed before in the interest of a dependent Territory. Those persons who have denounced this law as a grievous burden imposed by us upon Porto Rico have been quite devoid of either facts or reasons to support their denunciations. Those who say that by this act we violate the promises made by General Miles in Porto Rico certainly can not have read either those promises or this bill, though I for one do not admit that a general commanding our army in a hostile country can by his proclamation settle the character of the government or laws to be granted by Congress to that country

if it comes under our control. That notion may be defended by Democrats, but it is quite too imperialistic to suit me.

There is to-day no government in Porto Rico except the purely military government. It becomes the duty of Congress to enact legislation for that island and to raise money for proper expenditure there in purely local matters. The objection does not lie to such legislation that it is taxation without representation, such as produced the war of the Revolution and caused the Declaration of Independence. The situations are entirely different. England was seeking to strike down the colonial governments already in existence, and override the charters previously granted, and tax the colonies to raise money for the English treasury and not to be expended by the local colonial governments.

Now, there is no local government in existence in Porto Rico. It is the duty of Congress to institute one and also to raise immediate revenue for use there. There is no other way to do it. Congress is the only legislative body which can act in the matter.

But it is charged that Congress has discriminated against Porto Rico. That charge is foolishly false. Foolishly so because as soon as the people read the law itself they will immediately see the falsity of the charge and turn against those who have attempted to excite their indignation by such a base and palpable untruth.

The people of the United States have been somewhat excited and alarmed because they have been persistently told by Democratic leaders and some Republican papers that, in addition to the other trials and tribulations of the people of Porto Rico, Congress was proposing to place new burdens upon them by exacting tariff duties. I honor the people for their feeling of indignation in this matter. They desired that liberal treatment and more than mere justice should be accorded to the Porto Ricans. And that is just what this bill in fact proposes. The indignation of the people has been misplaced.

It has become necessary to raise money to carry on the local affairs of that island. Manifestly there are but three ways of obtaining such funds:

First. Congress might have appropriated the money out of the National Treasury either as a gift or as a loan. That course would not have been a good precedent for our country or a good example for Porto Rico. How the Democratic leaders and followers all over the country would have charged that our new possessions were to be a great expense instead of commercial benefit if we had adopted such a method of providing money. How it would have been charged that the war-revenue taxes remained as burdens upon our people in order to let the peoples of the newly acquired territories go scot free from taxation.

Second. Congress could have borrowed money to spend in Porto Rico, to be paid out of the future revenues of that island. This was what the self-styled and so-called delegates from Porto Rico desired to have done. Such action by Congress would have been vicious. To put a burden of bonded debt upon a people without any form of consent upon their part is contrary to our theories of government and ought never to be done, if done at all, except in the most extreme and extraordinary situation.

Third. Congress could raise money by some method of taxation.

(*a*) A method of taxation on lands and personal property could have been inaugurated, such as the ordinary method of collecting State taxes in the several States. This plan, however, could have produced no actual revenue for a considerable period of time, and was unavailable to raise immediate revenue, for reasons which must be manifest to everyone.

(*b*) By a system of licenses and internal-revenue taxes, which could not easily have been put in force except by an organized local civil government, and which would have been very burdensome at this time to the people there.

(*c*) Or by the plan which has been adopted in this measure—that is, import-duty taxes. The indirect taxation method of raising governmental funds by import duties is the one generally recognized the world over as the best and least burdensome manner of raising money for governmental expenditure. It is the way in which the major share of the money for our National Government has always been raised.

In my opinion, Congress would have been justified while acting temporarily as the legislature for Porto Rico if it had provided that all the money to be expended for local affairs in that island should be raised by import duties levied on articles entering there from abroad. But we propose to be much more liberal. This measure gives to Porto Rico not only all the import duties collected at the ports of Porto Rico, but also all the duties collected in the United States on goods coming from there here without even deducting the cost of collection. Where in all history is there another such liberal treatment of a Territory? Nowhere. This great liberality has never been duplicated.

THE SUGAR AND TOBACCO TRUSTS.

But why should there have been objection to such liberal legislation by people of Porto Rico? The answer is easy. There has accumulated there considerable quantities of tobacco and raw sugar waiting to be sent to this country as the best market, but held back on account of the present high tariff in the expectation that the present duties would be much lowered or abolished altogether. Much of that sugar is now owned by the sugar trust; much of that tobacco is now owned by the tobacco trust. A few people own all the remainder of it. It is to the interest of these owners to have absolute free trade in order that they may not be compelled to pay any duty when those products are shipped here.

For that purpose they caused to be sent here from Porto Rico certain gentlemen who called themselves delegates and who demanded free trade. The interest of these men has been a purely selfish interest. They have labored in the interest of the sugar and tobacco trusts and other sugar and tobacco owners, and not in the interest of the island or people of Porto Rico. They have persistently misrepresented the situation and the proposed legislation, because that was their business here. It is true that many people to-day believe that it was the influence of the sugar and tobacco trusts which caused this tariff legislation to be brought in here in place of the free-trade bill.

The Democrats have persistently so insisted, and even the trusts themselves have been glad to encourage such belief. The trusts are perfectly willing to be cursed if they can escape the payment of the taxes. The idea that they prefer to pay as import tax on the raw material coming to them from Porto Rico instead of having it come in free is almost too silly and absurd to require a denial. But it is not true. The tariff provision is not in the interest of the trusts. Their only interest has been to have the tariff made as low as possible. They prefer free trade with Porto Rico.

CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS INVOLVED.

Mr. Speaker, most of the debate which has been had in this House upon this bill has been along the lines of the constitutional power of Congress to levy a tariff between Porto Rico and the United States. I do not propose to discuss that question. In a speech delivered by me on this floor on the 13th of February, 1899, I discussed that general question at considerable length.

I endeavored to show them, both by the history of our acquisition of new territory and the legislation in connection therewith, as well as by the opinions of the great jurists and statesmen, and also the Supreme Court, that in accordance with the terms of the Constitution the legal power of Congress over acquired territory not made into States was practically absolute and unlimited, and also that the provisions of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution, providing that—

All duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

And of section 9 of Article I, providing that—

No tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any State.

No preference shall be given by any regulation of commerce or revenue to the ports of one State over those of another; nor shall vessels bound to, or from, one State, be obliged to enter, clear, or pay duties in another—

did not in any manner control Congress in legislating for territory not yet admitted as a State into the Union. I do not think that the argument made by me at that time has been or can be successfully controverted. I do not propose to repeat it now. I was considering then my vote on the proposition to complete the acquisition of the Philippine Islands by paying to Spain the $20,000,000 provided by the treaty of peace. If I had not reached the conclusion which I then did I should not have been in favor of appropriating the money to complete that acquisition. I summed up my opinion at that time on our constitutional power in these words:

My position, Mr. Chairman, is that when the ratifications of the treaty shall have been exchanged and our country shall have acquired from Spain her title of sovereignty over the Philippine Islands we shall hold them as a common possession, province, colony, Territory, or whatever it may be called, belonging to the States which, in their confederate capacity, constitute the national Union. We may deal with and govern these new possessions as we please, unrestricted except by our intelligent ideas of humanity, civilization, liberty, and good government. We shall have the authority, if we wish, to sell the Philippines, because they have not become by the treaty a constituent part of our country.

We may exchange them if that is desirable. We may govern them with a government absolutely despotic in its character, or we may give to them such form of local self-government as will appeal to our best judgment, as will be in line with the history of our country, as will tend to educate the inhabitants of those islands for more complete government by themselves. The mere fact that we may have absolute and autocratic power is no reason against our taking the islands. Within its constitutional limits the power of Congress is already autocratic and despotic. Within their constitutional limits the powers of the different officers of our country are autocratic and despotic. We rely somewhat upon the good judgment of the men who are elected to office, and we also rely upon the right of the people, in their discretion, to correct an exercise of ill judgment by electing other and different officials.

I still adhere to that opinion. It was the opinion entertained by Jefferson and Monroe and Madison, by Chancellor Kent and Justice Story, by Daniel Webster and John Marshall, and by nearly all the statesmen and constitutional expounders of the early years of our Republic. I do not doubt that it will be sustained by the Supreme Court of the United States when the question is squarely presented before that court, as it can be under this proposed legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican contention is that Porto Rico and the Philippines have not become incorporated as a part of our Union and that Congress may control and legislate for them as may be desirable; that Congress may give to them limited self-government or complete local self-government or complete independence, as may seem for the best according to the developments in the future.

The Democratic contention is self-contradictory. The Democrats insist in one and the same breath, first, that Porto Rico and the Philippines are now part and parcel of our Union over which the jurisdiction of the Constitution has already extended, and second, that we ought to cease exercising control over the Philippines and grant to them independent government absolutely outside of our jurisdiction. The Republican view is the one in the interest both of our country and humanity. The Democratic views contradict themselves and have no precedent except in the doctrine of secession. If the Constitution be already extended over the Philippines, there is no way provided in the Constitution for withdrawing its full jurisdiction. But consistency is not a Democratic jewel.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is both constitutional and proper. It is more than just to Porto Rico. It is liberal to an extreme. I do not think it is so good now as it was when first reported in the House from the Ways and Means Committee. It has been trimmed some to meet the views of faltering members. But it will be a great blessing to the little island which it concerns. It marks another constructive era in the history of Republican legislation. The Republican party has never failed the people. It has always lightened the burdens of humanity by its enactments. It does now. As Republicans, we fully believe that we are doing what is right morally and constitutionally; and so believing, we shall act, leaving time to justify us, whether the present does or not.

We propose to deal fairly and liberally with those peoples who have come to us with our newly acquired territory. We propose to grant to them a broad latitude of self-government, giving to them every power which they are capable of properly exercising. We are not striking down but are building up self-government. We are extending the sphere and increasing the influence of liberty. We are standing by the precepts and examples of our forefathers. We are broadening the scope of human capacity.

We are not depriving a people of government or liberty. We are conferring both liberty and government upon a people. We have not become tyrants or oppressors, and we never will. We behold the greatness of our country and the greatness of its people, and we have no fear that it will breed tyrants and oppressors. We have faith in the people and in the destiny and future of the Republic.

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY.

The Democratic party ought to be treated as a common scold and ducked accordingly in the waters of oblivion. It is never happy except when engaged in bitter denunciation. It scolded about the civil war and scolded about Lincoln and his associates. It scolded about reconstruction and denounced General and President Grant without reserve.

For years it scolded about the protective tariff and denounced that great economic system as legalized robbery and oppression. On that issue it won the President and both Houses of Congress in 1892, and for the first time in a generation became responsible for the policies of our Government. But its leaders did not possess the genius of constructive statesmanship and at once commenced to engage in common scolding about each other, and the party, with the usual ingratitude of common scolds, turned with revengeful hate against those leaders whose frightful prophecies of the evils to result from Republican rule had never equaled the actual disaster and distress which their political success brought upon the country.

The real cost of Democratic success in 1892 can never be computed. It cost billions in money, and it cost hollow cheeks and wan faces, empty stomachs and cold firesides, happy hearts and warm clothing. It drove the rich to poverty and the poor to despair and often death. It was more expensive than famine and more destructive than plague.

At length, appalled by the ruin they had wrought and in helpless confusion over the panic they had brought, the Democrats turned in wild stampede from the tariff issue and, with unreasoning impulse, dashed toward the folly of 16 to 1. They regained their self-control only when they had settled themselves to scold about the gold standard and the damage caused and to be caused by our refusal to go on a cheap silver basis.

They grew red in the face and hoarse in the throat denouncing the era of falling prices and cheap goods caused by the demonetization of silver. They had nominated and elected Cleveland, knowing him to be a strong gold-standard and anti-silver advocate; but they now turned upon him with the fury of wild beasts to rend the idol before whom they had prostrated themselves in three national conventions. Out of the many common scolds in their midst they selected for their new leader the one best gifted by nature. They may preserve and follow him as leader so long as he can see only evil in the acts and legislation of the present and only dangers and pitfalls in the road on which we travel toward the future. If the time shall come when Bryan's heart shall swell with pride because of the prosperous greatness of our country, and he shall speak forth a word of praise for the contentment of the people, he will be cast overboard as leader and some other common scold selected for the position.

They gave our country the hard times, but they could not stop the warmth of the sun, the fertility of the soil, the richness of the mines, or the pluck of the people. They left us our hearts and our hands. They destroyed confidence, broke banks, ruined business, and pauperized labor, but they could not take our country away from us. Under a Republican Administration we have again become a happy and prosperous people; and now they tell us we propose to subvert the liberties of the people, and that we have become monstrous oppressors in Porto Rico and the Philippine Islands. Anti-imperialism is their cry. Liberty and freedom have suddenly become their watchwords.

They who would have broken the prosperity of this country by free trade are now shedding tears over the dangers of the Porto Ricans. They who would have destroyed honor and wealth and labor by silver coinage are now tearing their hair over the threatened tyranny over yonder. The Democratic party, which stamps under its feet the amendments to the Constitution, which deprives the colored people of the South of their legal right to vote, and which denies to them participation in self-government in the South, which looks with complacency and without punishment upon the lynching and horrible burning by mob violence of blacks in the South, so as to better keep them in a state of subdued subjection, now has the traditional idiocy and monumental hypocrisy to pose as the special champion of freedom and the right of the colored peoples of the Philippines to self-government, and to accuse President McKinley and the Republican party of treason to the fundamental principles of our Republic.

Why, sirs, it was the Republican party which carried our Government successfully through the civil war for liberty's sake; which freed the blacks in the South for liberty's sake; which upheld the payment of our national debts for honor's sake; which stamped out polygamy in Utah for decency's sake; which enacted tariff laws for prosperity's sake; which drove Spain out of Cuba for liberty's sake. What has the Democratic party done for liberty or country during all this time? Nothing but scold.

Have no fear of the attitude of the Republican party toward the Philippines or Porto Rico. They will never be oppressed by Republican leadership or a Republican Administration.

The islands are ours, and we shall keep them in the interest of civilization, trade, and liberty, notwithstanding the common scolding indulged in by the Demmies, the aunties, and the grannies. The Republic is not doomed. The sphere of its liberty is enlarging.

The Democrats seem to have lost faith in our people, but then that is reciprocated. The Republicans still have supreme faith in our country and in the honor, honesty, intelligence, and good motives of the people, and that, too, seems to be reciprocated. Poor old Democracy. Its past is without merit. Its future is without hope. Its leaders apologize for their followers, and its followers apologize for their leaders. Both apologies are appropriate.

Election of Senators by the People.

SPEECH

OF

HON. NICHOLAS MULLER,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, April 12, 1900.

The House having under consideration House joint resolution No. 28, proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing for the election of Senators of the United States—

Mr. MULLER said:

Mr. SPEAKER: The bill now before the House to amend the Constitution of our country is worthy of every consideration.

It is a sacred instrument and has served for many years the purpose of the greatest of all republics.

The veneration of the people for it is the greatest monument to our life and individual liberty.

Our forefathers saw the necessity for amendments, as is evidenced by Article V of the Constitution, and it is proposed by the majority report to follow this course in this emergency.

Your committee in charge of the bill, Mr. Speaker, unanimously agreed that a change should be made in the manner of electing United States Senators, and they are supported in their views by the people of more than thirty States in this great Union, both by petition and a direct vote of the people, and surely such a strong representation should be heeded by an American Congress.

Under the present arrangement the Senators are elected, not by

the people, but by the representatives in the legislatures of the different States.

Under the conditions existing at the time of the framing of the Constitution our forefathers undoubtedly were right as conditions then existed.

The proposition to elect Senators by the vote of the people is not new. It was urged at the time of the adoption of the Constitution itself by men prominent in the councils of the country.

The debate on the Federal Constitution shows that no serious objection was made against the right of the people to elect United States Senators.

It is only right, Mr. Speaker, that the House respond to the universal demand from almost every State for a change in this form of election of their representatives.

We are having many examples of the corrupt means and influences adopted by unscrupulous and ambitious men who desire to obtain seats in the United States Senate. What wrong can be committed by a direct appeal to the people? They are entirely capable of electing their Representatives in Congress, the municipal, State, judicial, and other officers; why not their Senators?

I have unbounded faith in the judgment of the people, and hail with delight the opportunity to place myself on record in favor of the election of United States Senators by the popular vote of the people.

The development of the people of the United States by the widespread education given them has removed all reason which may have existed at the time the Constitution was framed. This movement is in accordance with our institutions, our development, our democratic policy, and brings the only branch of the Legislature which has heretofore been separated from direct contact immediately in touch and directly responsible to the voters, and as such, in my opinion, it is an improvement and in accordance with the fundamental principles of the Democratic party.

Government for the Territory of Hawaii.

SPEECH
OF
HON. FRANCIS G. NEWLANDS,
OF NEVADA.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, April 6, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (S. 222) to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii—

Mr. NEWLANDS said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The purpose of the amendment which I have offered is to provide for a commissioner of labor in Hawaii, whose duty it shall be to present annual reports to the governor and legislature of Hawaii and to the Department of Labor in the United States as to the commercial, industrial, social, educational, and sanitary conditions of the laboring classes in Hawaii. This provision has been, at my request, drawn up by Mr. Carroll Wright, United States Commissioner of Labor, and is substantially as he drew it, with the exception that I have inserted a provision that these reports should be made to the governor and legislature of Hawaii as well as to the Department of Labor in the United States. I wish to say in this connection that the numerous amendments which I have offered to this bill have related entirely to the system of land tenure and labor employment there existing.

In my judgment the future of the Hawaiian Islands, as well as that of the other semitropical and tropical islands we have recently acquired, will depend not so much upon the form of their government as it will upon the economic conditions there existing. The form of the government may be perfect; the organic act which we provide for the government of Hawaii may conform with the most advanced ideas of free government; yet if the economic conditions there are such as to perpetuate an extensive system of land monopoly, the concentration of large areas of land in the hands of individuals and corporations, employing laborers as mere machines for the cultivation of the soil, we can not hope to develop there such citizenship as will be able to maintain the free institutions of a republic.

As I have previously stated, the population of the Hawaiian Islands consists of about 60,000 Asiatics, half Chinese and half Japanese; 40,000 Kanakas, the native people of Hawaii; 15,000 Portuguese, and about 8,000 other whites. It is fair to assume that as yet the Portuguese are not educated. Probably the most of them have been imported into these islands and are unfamiliar with the English language, so that we have a population of 23,000 white people as against 100,000 of Asiatics and natives, and of these 23,000 white people it is probable that not more than 8,000 are equal in intelligence and education to the average white citizen of the United States.

A few of these 8,000 whites are in the ownership and control of almost all the land in these islands. The main occupation there is agricultural, all the commerce being merely incidental to the great sugar interests of these islands. The sugar plantations are almost entirely owned by corporations, and the holdings run as high as five or ten thousand acres. Corporate control is the most convenient, effective, and economic method of managing sugar plantations. It secures cooperation of capital, and it enables capital to enter upon a comprehensive plan of improvement which contemplates, first, the acquisition of a large area of land; second, the construction of extensive irrigation works with which to irrigate it; third, the construction of a central sugar mill for the purpose of grinding the cane, and fourth, the construction of a radial railway connecting all parts of the plantation, by means of which the cane can be economically transported to the factory.

Upon these plantations are employed about 60,000 Asiatics, as well as a certain proportion of the Kanaka and Portuguese population. The tendency is to regard the Asiatic laborers as mere machines. Their food, their health, their sanitary conditions are looked after only with a view to maintaining their efficiency as machines. As to the Kanakas, they are a kindly people who have received a fair education, but who seem unable to withstand the contact of strong and vigorous races, and as a result the native race is gradually becoming extinct.

It is probable that these islands will support a population of a half million of people, and the development of the industries there will necessitate the increase of population by means of immigration from without. Chinese immigration is now prohibited by the United States laws, but other Asiatics, such as the Japanese, can enter, and they are crowding there in large numbers. Unless, therefore, we are content to allow the Japanese to gradually meet all the increasing requirements of these islands for laborers, we must devise some system by which the migration of citizens of the United States, white or black, or of the white people of other countries shall be promoted; and we can never expect to be able to successfully promote such migration if the laboring class is to be attached, as heretofore, in a semiservile capacity to the soil, without rights in it. The promotion, therefore, of small land holdings is absolutely essential to the promotion of a desirable immigration, and without the latter Hawaii will be republican in name only.

The task is a difficult one, I admit, but the more difficult it is the sooner we should enter upon it. We can not expect the class which has heretofore governed the islands, intelligent, public-spirited, and capable though it be, to work out the reforms that will be essential to the maintenance of republican institutions. They are the landed class. They are the beneficiaries of the system which now prevails there, a system which increases the dignity and wealth of the landowner and degrades the condition of the land laborer, a system which has given this class the wealth which it possesses. It can never be expected that the beneficiaries of an abuse will reform that abuse. This is too much to hope of human nature. The landowning class will control the political government of Hawaii, and any reform in the future must be compelled and forced by the United States Government through its control over Hawaii as a Territory of the United States.

It is urged that the sugar industry is such as to require large holdings and semiservile labor, and that the climate of Hawaii is unsuited to the labor of any other class than that now employed there, and that therefore reform is hopeless. My answer is that by admission of Hawaii to the commercial union of the United States large markets have been given to her sugar production, which have vastly increased its value, and that we will be recreant to our duty if we permit the entire benefits of this increase of the value of their sugar product to go to capital instead of being divided into some fair proportion between capital and labor. Are we to perpetuate a system which will raise the value of sugar lands from $50 an acre to a thousand, two thousand, and three thousand dollars an acre and say none of the benefits of this system shall go to the labor employed upon the land? The very foundation of the protective system of this country is that monopoly of American markets given to American products tends not so much to the advantage of capital as it does to the elevation of labor. If, then, our tariff on sugar gives to Hawaii a share in the monopoly of American markets, should we not see to it that this advantage accrues to the labor as well as to capital; the men employed to the soil as well as the men who own the soil?

As to the climate, the very fact that 15,000 Portuguese are now employed there indicates that it is adapted to the white races. The immigration of the Italians and Portuguese can be encouraged there rather than the immigration of Asiatics. The Italians and Portuguese in our Western country constitute a very valuable part of our community. They are soon assimilated. Their children are educated in our schools and become familiar with and attached to our institutions. Then, again, the climate is adapted to our negroes, who are now citizens of the United States, entitled to political rights; and then the overcrowded condition of Porto Rico offers an opportunity for the gradual transfer of thousands of people who are accustomed to a climate almost identical with that of Hawaii, and who have been trained in the very industries pursued in Hawaii. But the migration of the

inhabitants of Porto Rico and the whites and the negro population of the South and of the Italians and Portuguese can not be promoted if the large holdings of land are to be continued.

It is, perhaps, essential that these large holdings should be permitted for the purpose of development, that is to say, it may be a wise thing to permit a corporation to hold a large tract of land with a view to its development by irrigation works and the construction of a sugar factory and the construction of a railway system for transportation, but when this is accomplished the policy of the State should be to compel the partitioning of this area into convenient tracts, with water rights attached; the waterworks, the sugar factory, and the railroad to be charged with a public use and their rates regulated by law, either through a commissioner or the courts. Such enterprises are to-day conducted all through the arid West and in California. Large areas of land are taken up, irrigation works constructed, and when completed the lands are divided into small tracts of from 20 to 40 acres, with water rights attached, and the land sold to small holders whose rights to the water are protected by law. Such a system could be inaugurated in Hawaii, but it must be compulsory, for the profits of sugar production are so large there as to appeal to the selfishness of monopolies and trusts.

The question is, how can this be done without violently wrenching the business as now conducted? No one, of course, wishes to accomplish reform at the expense of a temporary industrial readjustment which will bring distress or loss to that community, and it is for this reason that I have urged throughout, in the consideration of this bill, amendments which would call the attention both of the governing body in Hawaii and the governing body here to the desired reforms, and which would result in the collection of accurate statistical information that would be a guide to future action both there and here. I have been as anxious that the intelligent thought of Hawaii should be stimulated to action upon this matter as well as our own, for the reason that I fear when this organic act is passed our attention will be so much absorbed in other questions of domestic and foreign relations that the Hawaiian Islands will drift from our consideration, and I wish to plant the seed of an agitation there which will make itself felt in local legislation, and, if necessary, in such a movement as will compel attention at the Capitol of the nation.

The tendency of human nature is to apply remedial legislation rather than to engage in preventive legislation. Whilst preventive legislation may be easier, yet indolence prompts us to wait till abuses cry aloud for a remedy. We are all more likely to take this view as to the questions now under consideration because we have never yet ourselves experienced the evils of land monopoly. We have here a population of 70,000,000 people in a country capable of sustaining 400,000,000. There has been as yet no congestion of population. Land has been the one thing of which we have had a superabundance; but this is not true of Hawaii, Porto Rico, or Luzon, and history tells us that the centralization of land ownership has been the fruitful cause of most disastrous wars and prolonged and violent agitations. We can rest assured that all the disturbances which history accredit to a system of land monopoly will be felt in Porto Rico, Hawaii, and Luzon when the advantages of our extended markets advance the value of the sugar lands in those islands to a point where they will arouse the greed of the trusts and syndicates. History teaches us that unless restrained by law these great monopolies will accommodate themselves to any system of degraded labor which will advance the profits of the land.

Turning for a moment from this general view of the subject, I wish to state that the amendments which I have offered were prepared upon the floor of the House whilst the bill was under consideration. I do not claim that they are as perfect as they might be. I have had no time to go into the details of this question, absorbed as I have been by the questions which have been before the Ways and Means Committee, of which I am a member; but my purpose has been to insert in this bill certain amendments which can be made the basis of thoughtful consideration by the conferees of the Senate and the House when this bill goes before them, and which can be there shaped in more scientific terms.

Now, what are the amendments which I have offered, both successful and unsuccessful?

First. In that provision of the organic act of Hawaii which provides for the organization of corporations by the legislature of Hawaii, I offered an amendment that no corporation, domestic or foreign, should in the future acquire and hold real estate in excess of 1,000 acres. That amendment was carried. I do not pretend that that amendment will reach the entire difficulty to which I have alluded. It will, however, go to the conferees and opportunity be given to shape it in such a way as will gradually and progressively diminish the evils of land monopoly. For instance, they might amend this by providing that corporations could acquire larger areas than 1,000 acres, and could develop irrigation works upon them, construct a factory, and build a railroad, but that when the entire enterprise was completed they should sell the lands so acquired in small holdings at the rate of not less than one-twentieth or one-tenth of the total every year; the factory, the irrigation works, and the railroad being held and retained by the corporation or its assignees as a public use, with charges regulated by law, so that the ownership of this public use could not be used in such a way as to oppress the land and transfer its value to the owners of the public use. They might also compel the gradual division and sale of existing holdings, or, if the conferees were indisposed to map out any definite system, they could provide the appointment of a commission whose duty it would be to inquire into the condition of land holdings in Hawaii and to report to Congress a method for gradually rectifying its abuses.

Another amendment which I offered was one defining the duties of the surveyor-general of Hawaii and providing that he should report annually to the Department of Labor of the United States and to the governor of Hawaii and the legislature the owners of all holdings not less than 100 acres in extent, by whom owned, the character of the cultivation, the number of laborers employed on each holding, their nationality, the wages paid, and such other information as the Department of Labor might prescribe. This amendment was adopted by the House. It simply provides for the statistical information which will enable the legislature of Hawaii and the Congress of the United States to act.

I also offered an amendment declaring it to be the purpose of the United States to promote the increase of white labor in Hawaii and to discourage the employment of Asiatics, and enacting that every corporation employing labor in Hawaii should, within one year, employ at least one-tenth of its laborers from citizens of the United States, citizens of the Territory of Hawaii, and other white persons, and that such corporations should increase the number of such laborers one-tenth annually, until at least three-fourths of their laborers should be citizens of the United States, citizens of the Territory of Hawaii, or other white persons. It was the purpose of this amendment to control the question of labor by reason of the unquestioned power of the State over corporations, for, as I have already stated, almost the entire agricultural business of these islands is done by corporations. It provided that gradually they should employ laborers other than Asiatics and spread the gradual increase of such labor over such a long period of time as would create no inconvenience to employers.

It opened up the entire labor employment of corporations to the Kanakas who are now there, the Portuguese and Italians who are now there, and other white persons who are now there, to white immigrants from any country who may land there in the future, and to citizens of the United States, which would include both whites and negroes, and which would also include the people of Porto Rico, from which overcrowded island it should be our policy to transfer a part of the congested labor. I regret to say that this amendment was lost, notwithstanding my statement that I presented it in order that it might form the basis of consideration and action by the conferees, who could enlarge it or contract it or modify it and whose judgment would finally be submitted to both the Senate and the House. It worked no injury whatever to the existing Asiatic labor there, for it must be recollected that the population of these islands must be steadily increased, and it is entirely probable that the Asiatic labor now employed there, and displaced by the gradual system which the amendment provides for, would be absorbed by new enterprises, such as rice plantations, etc., or in domestic labor, or would be glad to return to their homes with their accumulations, as most of them do. But unfortunately this amendment was defeated.

I also offered an amendment providing that there should be a commissioner of labor who should be appointed by the President of the United States and whose duties were identical with those of the various commissioners now provided for by the intelligent legislatures of the various States of the Union. It was made his duty to acquire and diffuse among the people of Hawaii useful information on the subject of labor, and especially upon its relation to capital, the hours of labor, the earnings of the laboring men and women, and the means to promote their social, intellectual, and moral prosperity. It was made his duty to make annual reports to the legislature of Hawaii and also to the United States Department of Labor. He was charged with the duty of investigating the causes and facts relating to all controversies and disputes between employer and employee and to report thereon both to the Hawaiian government and our own. He was to require such statements as might be prescribed by the United States Department of Labor from all the employers of labor. This provision, moderate yet full and ample and molded upon the best legislation in this country, was, to my great surprise, lost.

And now, Mr. Chairman, I have presented to the committee the amendment which has just been read regarding a commissioner of labor. It is not as full and complete as the one that I desired. It was drawn hastily by the Commissioner of Labor, with whom I communicated by telephone. I am inclined to think that he would have made it fuller in its details if I had had an opportunity of conversing with him, but I now submit the amendment as presenting the views of Mr. Wright, the Commissioner of Labor of the United States, and ask its adoption.

Porto Rico.

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANCIS M. GRIFFITH,

OF INDIANA.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, April 11, 1900,

On the bill (H. R. 8245) entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues for the relief of the island of Porto Rico, and for other purposes," and the Senate amendments thereto.

Mr. GRIFFITH said:

Mr. SPEAKER: Truth is direct and clear, it requires no subterfuges, no tortuous or obscure phraseology, and allows no evasions or inconsistencies. And inasmuch as the bill for the government of Porto Rico is not direct or clear, we may well affirm that it is disingenuous throughout and conceals in part and partly discloses a purpose at variance with the requirements of sincerity and justice.

And this is strongly emphasized by the extraordinary circumstances surrounding its origin; not merely extraordinary, but unprecedented in the history of our own Government or of any other. It is in its leading feature exactly the reverse of what the President in his message declared it ought to be—of what our plain duty demanded of us. It sets at naught, too, the urgent recommendation of the Secretary of War, who concurred with the President in his views of what plain duty enjoined. It annulled the report of the Ways and Means Committee setting forth a measure of far different design and scope. All was transformed almost with the suddenness of the lightning's stroke, and this bill, embodying the full opposite of what had been contemplated by both the executive and legislative departments, stalked into Congress demanding the utmost self-stultifying recognition and the most abject submission. And this has been yielded.

Not only so; when the astounding change was made in that mysterious manner the people exclaimed as with one voice against it. A former Republican President raised the cry of alarm. A prominent author who was a delegate in the last national Republican convention and strongly supported the present Chief Magistrate, reechoed the cry and sent out a circular letter to the Republican voters of his State, appealing to them against the proposed iniquity. Every Republican newspaper in Indiana, where these eminent protestants reside, was loud in condemnation. And in Illinois, two of the most radical organs of the Administration denounced it in the most energetic terms and predicted overwhelming disaster if the new policy were pursued. And everywhere was an answering response to the tocsin sounded at the centers of population and political influence. The people were aroused.

But all in vain. The Republican majority in Congress, goaded by the power which had overruled all their convictions of duty and seared their consciences as with a hot iron, determined to overrule the people whom they pretend to represent.

Not only so; but they further proceeded to silence their own scruples and, if possible, those of the people also, by inventing doctrinal absurdities which have never before been heard or thought of, and which have been devised by means of a perverse ingenuity quickened by the pressure of an overpowering emergency. The two chief perversions of reason in this matter are the absolute despotic supremacy of Congress and the inertness or passivity of the Constitution. Instead of Congress deriving its power from the Constitution, the Constitution is, as they say, dependent for its vitality upon the lordly will of Congress—a doctrine which, carried out to its full logical consequences, is utterly subversive of our boasted Republic. The success of this satanic sophistry may well fill every patriot with alarm for the perpetuity of our institutions.

What is the power behind the throne which has thus enslaved the hearts and consciences of the Executive and the Republican majority? We all know what it is; and we know how subservient that majority and its President are to the malign influence which has reduced them to the most abject servitude in all things. We know that power; and how unscrupulous and tyrannical it is—defying God and man in the insolence of its supreme selfishness.

Under these circumstances of origin we have a right to impeach the motive of this bill and believe that all its provisions were arranged to minister to the greed of this colossal and diabolic dictatorship, whose plastic hand has left its mark visibly impressed upon the framework and the finished work, for the "trail of the serpent is over it all."

The tortuous character of the bill is in part revealed by its sweeping grants of power. For example, after specifying the duties of the governor of Porto Rico, the bill adds this proviso:

Provided, That the President may, in his discretion, delegate and assign to him such executive duties and functions as may in pursuance with law be so delegated and assigned.

Now, who can tell what that means. It amounts to just this, so far as the verbiage is concerned: The President may delegate and assign such executive duties and functions as he may delegate and assign.

But such indefinite phrases, as a matter of fact, may be made to cover the most tyrannical acts of any President who is a slave of the domineering trusts, in whose interests evidently this bill has been devised. There is no usurpation which may not strike its roots into such unmeaning and unrestricted definition of power and authority.

We find in section 16 the grotesque provision that "all judicial process shall run in the name of the United States of America as the President of the United States," and all criminal or penal prosecutions in the local courts shall be conducted in the name and by the authority of "the people of Porto Rico," and all officials authorized by this act shall, before entering upon the duties of their respective offices, take an oath to support the Constitution of the United States and the laws of Porto Rico.

Will anyone explain the logical juxtaposition of the Constitution of the United States and the laws of Porto Rico in the oath of an official—say a governor appointed by the President and Senate of the United States—and of process in the name of the United States and the President, and prosecutions in the local courts in the name and by the authority of the people of Porto Rico?

We have been told, until the reiteration has become tiresome, and in fact disgusting, that Porto Rico is not a part of the United States, and this very bill affirms it in speaking of merchandise "going into Porto Rico from the United States or coming into the United States from Porto Rico," thus unmistakably making Porto Rico strictly a foreign country. And yet process must run exactly as if it were in the United States, as in truth we all know it is.

And so we have had ictus on ictus upon the proposition that Porto Ricans are not citizens of the United States, whereas they are not citizens of Spain or of any other country in the world. Consequently they have no standing—they have no "name or authority," and are no "people" in any proper sense of the word.

And yet this nameless rabble, as the arguments make them out to be, have in this sixteenth section a status, so that they have a name and authority and are a people.

O, consistency, where is thy blush?

Again, in section 17, the governor is given power to remit fines and forfeitures for offenses against the laws of the United States.

But the advocates of this measure have told us over and over again that neither the Constitution nor the laws of the United States can proprio vigore extend to any acquired territory until the masters of the Constitution expressly give their leave. And as this has not yet been done by this bill or any other, it follows that the Constitution and laws of the United States have not reached Porto Rico. So we are to exercise a government in a foreign land, and the governor of the island may respite offenses against the laws of the United States, although the laws of the United States are not there to be either obeyed or broken. And in like manner all officials are to swear that they will support the Constitution of the United States, although the Constitution is not there either to be supported or violated.

Was there ever such thimblerigging in legislation before? Now you see it, and now you do not.

It may be said that the act provides that the statutory laws of the United States shall extend to Porto Rico; but the language of the bill is not sufficient inasmuch as the Constitution has not been extended and the Constitution, being the source of power, is necessary to sustain the laws which have been passed by virtue of it.

A distinct intimation of the primary purpose of this bill is plainly seen in the extravagant expenditures directly provided for.

In the first place there is a superfluity of officers. They are far more numerous than in similar offices in other Territories and most of the States.

For example, compare the Porto Rico judicial system under this bill with South Carolina, of similar size.

In Porto Rico the supreme court consists of 5 judges; in South Carolina 3. In Porto Rico there are 5 judicial districts, with 15 judges; in South Carolina 8 circuits, with 8 judges. The inferior courts need not be mentioned.

In addition there is the district court of the United States, to be held outside of the United States in Porto Rico, whence appeals may be taken into the United States to be decided in the Supreme Court.

In Porto Rico the business of the courts will probably not be one-tenth of the judicial business of South Carolina.

It is not easy to discern what the district court of the United

States will find to do in that foreign land. As neither the laws nor Constitution can obtain a footing there except by an imperial mandate of Congress which has not been issued, the subjects falling within jurisdiction must be extremely scarce, even if the Porto Ricans, being noncitizens, are allowed access to its procedure.

Another significant index is found in the salaries to be paid the officials to be sent there. A most extraordinary liberality shines out conspicuously in this wonderful governmental scheme, inspired by the campaign feeders as a quid pro quo.

Here is the interesting schedule:

Governor	$4,000
Treasurer	5,000
Attorney-general	4,000
Auditor	4,000
Commissioner of the interior	4,000
Commissioner of education	3,000
Chief justice of supreme court	5,000
Associates of supreme court	18,000
Marshal of supreme court	3,000
United States district judge	5,000
United States district attorney	4,000
United States marshal	3,500
In all	62,000

Contrast this with the appropriation of 1899 for each of the Territories of New Mexico, Arizona, and Oklahoma:

Governor	$3,000
Judges, each	3,000
Secretary	1,800
Interpreter	500
In all	19,000

Thus the money goes in Porto Rico. Why these high salaries? Will not the incumbents of the offices be required to render an equivalent for the favors they have received to the movers of the present measure outside the two Houses of Congress?

Contrast the governor's salary with that of the governors of the States:

State.	Salary.	State.	Salary.
Alabama	$3,000	Nebraska	$2,500
Arkansas	3,000	Nevada	4,000
California	6,000	New Hampshire	2,000
Colorado	5,000	New Jersey	10,000
Connecticut	4,000	New York	10,000
Delaware	2,000	North Carolina	3,000
Florida	3,500	North Dakota	3,000
Georgia	3,000	Ohio	8,000
Idaho	3,000	Oregon	3,500
Illinois	6,000	Pennsylvania	10,000
Indiana	5,000	Rhode Island	3,000
Iowa	3,000	South Carolina	3,000
Kansas	3,000	South Dakota	2,500
Kentucky	6,500	Tennessee	4,000
Louisiana	4,000	Texas	4,000
Maine	2,000	Utah	2,000
Maryland	4,500	Vermont	1,500
Massachusetts	8,000	Virginia	5,000
Michigan	4,000	Washington	4,000
Mississippi	3,500	West Virginia	2,700
Missouri	5,000	Wisconsin	5,000
Montana	5,000	Wyoming	2,500

In all the list of States there are but five with as much salary, namely, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania.

And these are not equal because the governor of Porto Rico has besides a fine mansion free.

There are seven States which give their governors just half of what is allowed the governor of Porto Rico. And twenty-two give less than half of what he enjoys.

This is the way we are to pamper this governor outside the limits of the United States, whose chief function will undoubtedly be to fatten the trusts in turn, at the expense of the "people of Porto Rico."

One of the most remarkable illustrations of the workings of "benevolent assimilation" hitherto witnessed is the alertness with which the "people of Porto Rico" are to be saddled with the burden of paying these official salaries for the so-called "temporary government." The expenses of Territorial governments have hitherto been paid by the United States under direct appropriation laws enacted for the purpose. And so we will continue to do as to the rest of the Territories. But we are making an object lesson of Porto Rico: it must be treated differently from all others, and be made to confirm new, albeit absurd, principles to which we have taken a sudden fancy. And so we make the people there pay our bills. It may be a little hard on them at first, since they have been lately ruined in great degree by a hurricane, and their trade is badly broken down by the pungent application of the tariff since the cession; but then the Scripture says, "It is good for one to bear the yoke in his youth."

And so we will put the local burdens on them, and then enact, as you will see in our bill, that—

The salaries of all officers of Porto Rico, appointed, as herein provided, by the President, including deputies, assistants, and other help, shall also be paid out of revenues of Porto Rico, on the warrant of the auditor, countersigned by the governor.

And, contrary to the very fundamental principle of our Government—but then, what are the fundamental principles of our Government when they audaciously conflict with the interests or wishes of our rulers, the trusts?—we find that this bill is carefully framed to exclude all control of their finances used to pay the officials of the United States.

The control of the local treasury is in the hands of the auditor appointed by the President. He can issue his warrants at discretion, controlled, however, by the masters, and the countersigning is done by the governor, another Presidential appointee to represent the trusts.

There is not a single tax officer appointed or elected directly or indirectly by Porto Ricans—not one. They have no means whatever to control or influence the collection of their revenues, nor direct in any degree the disbursement thereof.

They can do nothing even in the way of legislation. They have no representation in Congress, and likewise they have virtually none in one house of the so-called legislature, the executive council, which is composed of the secretary, attorney-general, treasurer, auditor, commissioner of the interior, and commissioner of education—all Presidential appointees, and of necessity a majority of the council of 11, without a possibility that it should be otherwise. There are but 11; these 6 are always members; and of what avail is it that the minority, which can never become a majority, consists of native Porto Ricans? In effect, though not in form, it is merely an appointed council of 6 members.

And as to the other component part of the so-called legislature—the house of delegates—the qualified voters are left under not a registration law enacted by both houses but "under such regulations and restrictions as may be prescribed by the executive council—that is, by the six appointed officials, who in reality constitute that council.

And besides, in section 7 citizens of the United States residing in Porto Rico are made members of the body politic without regard to their intention of permanently remaining, and are so entitled to vote, which certainly opens the way to all kinds of adventurers and carpetbaggers.

Not only are the official salaries imposed for payment upon the people of Porto Rico, but it is also provided that all expenses and obligations contracted for the internal improvement or development of the island shall be paid by the treasurer of Porto Rico out of the revenues in his custody, except defenses, barracks, harbors, light-houses, and other works undertaken by the United States. There are no limitations and no guard against abuses in this direction. There are many ways by which public money may be expended by so-called improvements and development. The lordlings engaged in looting the island under the ample facilities afforded by this bill may have an easy plan of roads, bridges, etc., to their splendid mansions laid out at the public expense. The people are to be made responsible for "all expenses and obligations contracted," however they may have been incurred—perhaps for costly court-houses, etc., which are ever apt to furnish a fine field for first-class plundering anywhere.

The great wrong inflicted upon the Porto Ricans lies in taxing their products for two years.

If Porto Rico is a part of the United States, what right have we to make an exception of it, and levy taxes on it which we would not lay on Arizona, New Mexico, or other Territories? In the face of this act the pretense in section 14 that the laws not locally inapplicable are extended to Porto Rico is not only the veriest deception but a most monstrous travesty of justice and republican principles. All privileges of exemption or of any kind belong to the Porto Ricans as fully as any other people; they are our people; and if they are not, it is sheer folly to talk of extending to them the laws of the United States in the same force and effect. It is only to our domain that we can apply our laws justly, or really without usurpation. This bill is so self-contradictory that it annuls itself. Section 3 draws a broad distinction between Porto Rico and the United States, and hopelessly destroys the pretext in other sections that the laws are extended to Porto Rico. The bill is a bundle of absurdities and inconsistencies.

Had it been openly proposed to concoct a plan for looting the island and robbing all the people of their substance earned by honest toil for the benefit of the horde of speculators seeking whom they may devour, it could not have been more effectually framed to effect the end in view. Why can we not deal justly, if not kindly, with a people who have come under our jurisdiction with a free consent, who have never rebelled against us, and who welcomed us with open arms when our armies entered their territory as deliverers from an onerous bondage? Why should they find us more inexorable oppressors than those who formerly ruled them? Shall we plunder them: shall we let loose the flock of cormorants upon them which are directing their flight thither? Shall we force them to sigh for a return to their former condition as far more tolerable than our sordid tyranny? We should pause and reflect, and pursue only the ends of justice and kindness when we act.

Porto Rico.

SPEECH

OF

HON. ABRAHAM L. BRICK,

OF INDIANA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, April 11, 1900,

On the bill (H. R. 8245) entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues for the relief of the island of Porto Rico, and for other purposes," and the Senate amendments thereto.

Mr. BRICK said:

Mr. SPEAKER: After all the debate, constitutional and otherwise, had upon the subject of the Porto Rican tariff for the last sixty days, I would hardly have raised my voice in regard to it at this time but for the fact that persons have, upon the floor of the House, under the consideration of the Hawaiian civil government bill, asked the question—I suppose and hope, in good faith—why should we not treat Porto Rico the same as we are now proposing to treat Hawaii? Why not give Porto Rico free trade and the same civil government here and now as we do to Hawaii? And with equal consistency, and no better reason, that question might also mean, and probably does, why not apply the same legislative details, revenue system, and business measures to Alaska, Oklahoma, Arizona, New Mexico, Guam, Porto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippines? In catchy phrase and misleading speech they ask, why not treat them all alike? and have attempted to emphasize their utterance by malappropriate praise of the Hawaiian measure.

Whatever their motive may be, and however plain the answer is to us here in Congress, for the people's sake this deceiving proposition should not be allowed to pass unnoticed and unchallenged. And let me observe at the outset that people's desires very often incite the argument of their speech. I would expect the sugar trust, who are required to purchase about 80 per cent of the raw sugar material they use in making refined sugar from Porto Rico and other sugar-producing fields abroad, to say that any tariff on sugar, wherever laid, is unjust and an outrage. They must purchase raw sugar for refining purposes from other and sugar-producing lands. We can not supply the sugar required here in the United States in sufficient quantities; therefore, a tariff on raw sugar would have to be paid by the great sugar refineries. And so I am not surprised when I learned that Havemeyer was for free trade on Porto Rican sugar, and denounces the protective-tariff system as the mother of trusts.

The great tobacco combination of America must buy its filler from Cuba and Porto Rico and other countries. They can not get all and what they want in this country. Therefore, knowing human nature as I do, I was not struck with paralyzing astonishment when I noticed that they, among others equally interested, had declared that all revenue from tariff collected by the United States since we came into possession of the island of Porto Rico was unconstitutional, and had brought suit to recover about $1,800,000 collected in that way, and which, by recommendation of the President, Congress has turned over to the exclusive benefit of the Porto Ricans within the last few weeks.

Porto Rico raises no wheat, and she is looked upon as the legitimate and exclusive playground for the pork packers. So it occurs to me quite natural that the great wholesale flour producers and meat men should look upon any tariff between this country and Porto Rico for any purpose, even though it should all be given to the starving people there, as un-American in spirit and vicious in principle—all this solicitude on their part for the glory of God and suffering humanity in Porto Rico. I can easily see how the sugar and tobacco speculators, who have been holding their stock in expectation of free trade, to escape the payment of any tax—which means, at a very conservative estimate, $500,000 to them the minute the words "free trade" are written in the statute books—should behold with horror even this slight tariff, although it would go from them to feed the hungry laborer and to house the unsheltered child and wife of stricken Porto Rico.

Within the last two years the genius of American destiny has brought to us many bright, warm isles that gem the sunny seas, and with them new peoples, new problems, and added responsibilities. There are persons who believe, from one motive or another, that we should shift the burden, ignore duty, and cast aside to oceans of trouble these derelicts of human fortune.

Through party policy a large body of people are against what is termed "expansion." These persons are universally opposed to the Porto Rican tariff, because they are not in favor of holding Porto Rico at all; and whatever adds to the burden gives weight to the argument. They are against anything practical. They are against success, because they are against expansion, and opposed to anything and everything proposed by the Republican party, no matter what it is. They would throw obstructions in the path of progress, and this accounts for their opposition. It means political aggrandizement for them, as they believe, but the great, loyal, earnest mass of the people will be for what is right and reasonable. All they want to know is just why the apparent change occurred.

They hear all sorts of political noises; they have learned to think of free trade between us and our island possessions as the proper policy, and in the wonder of the doubt and the distraction of the noise they are waiting for a full and clear explanation of what the legislation really means, and why it has been proposed at this time. When they fully appreciate that, I am not afraid of the American people.

There has never been a time in the history of this country when men with ulterior motives could fool the American people to any considerable extent with demagogic lips of lying utterance. There has never been a great question submitted to the American people but what they have ultimately answered it correctly, and to the enduring honor and glory and prosperity of our country and our race. It is this very intelligence upon which the perpetuity of our institutions depend—a self-governing, self-controlling people. That person or party who stakes success upon the credulity of the people will surely fail. They always have; it is my prophecy they always will; and they ought to. I know of no greater insult than to be treated as a dupe. And no self-respecting, loyal American will ever attempt to treat the people in that way.

I can not believe the people are exercised over the mooted constitutional question as to the power of Congress to legislate on this subject. They have learned to expect that objection from the mouths of the Democratic party upon any proposed legislation they do not commend; and they never commend anything Republican, no matter how beneficent may be its design.

They have opposed every glorious achievement of the Republican party; they have never joined hands in a single act that bore its authorship, and I did not expect they would do so in the pending measure. Whenever they could find no other objection, they have uniformly fallen back upon the Constitution—unconstitutional—the Republican party never passed a constitutional law in its life. The interpretation of the Constitution has been the chiefest source of political differences since the formation of the Government.

Every progressive, glorious act of the United States has been declared by some party unconstitutional, one time and another, in the history of our country. The Louisiana purchase, which gave to us the Middle West and Northwest, and the Mississippi River and was the first great step in acquiring supremacy from gulf to lake and ocean to ocean, the grandest act of far-seeing statesmanship that illuminates the career of Thomas Jefferson—that was unconstitutional. The protective tariff, the corner stone of our industrial magnificence and the dignity of American labor, was unconstitutional. The greenback, which saved the financial honor of the Republic when its life hung in the balance, was unconstitutional. Every step the United States has taken in national stability and greatness has been un-American and unconstitutional in the mouths of carping critics and demagogues. In fact, every evolution of advancement in America has met the bitter, unyielding, vituperative objections of persons who appeared to block the way. Every new departure has been to them un-American.

It was un-American to purchase Louisiana. They clung to the blind belief that the Union was simply formed for the original States and that Territories could not and should not be acquired. All the arguments used against this Porto Rican bill and expansion were used then against Thomas Jefferson and the acquirement of the Middle South and West. Public jealousy was so aroused in those days that some of the States seriously threatened to secede should the purchase be consummated. But the wisdom of the people triumphed. Who would to-day unwrite that glorious page of American history? Certainly not Indiana, who formed a part of that great Western territory, the State from which I come, one of the brightest jewels in the American diadem.

The glory of our country, the test of our capacity for self-government, the strength of our institutions, all lie in our adaptability to new conditions, in the growth of our laws and institutions to new and novel exigencies. If it be un-American to meet the occasion with its needs and cares, then the most sacred principles that grace our national conscience were born and rocked in an un-American cradle. But that is not true. The proudest title of Americanism is an ever-marching civilization, prosperity, and power. That is the thing that makes an American respected wherever his name is mentioned in the wide, wide world.

That is what we are doing now. The American people are great because they are self-reliant; they are progressive because they are willing to add to their institutions as events and necessities require; they are successful because they are ingenious and practical; they have never met a burden they did not conquer; they have never taken a backward step, and they will not now.

There has never been such a word as "fail" in their bright lexicon, and they will not stop here to put it in.

No, Mr. Speaker, the people of America believe in expansion; they believe in writing American history, not in unwriting it; they believe in the manhood that bears its burdens and turns them into glory; they believe in themselves, and any person who stands in the way will fall, not the American people.

To those who would pervert the Constitution into a cave, a barrier, a corset to cabin, crib, and confine American endeavor, they will answer, "We know the American Constitution; it is a part of our conscience; it is the symbol of our sentiment, the symptom of our emotions; it was born in our hearts before it was written on paper. That paper Constitution is a lifeless writ; it lives and breathes and grows in the hearts of the American people; it was made to preserve, not to paralyze. We made it to foster our growth, not to swathe us in the shriveling cerements of a mummy."

The Constitution was made to bind together the original States into a nation, as dignified and powerful as any other nation on earth—a nation spelled with a big "N"—and at the same time preserve to the States of that paramount nation certain inalienable rights of local self-government. It was made for the States and the preservation of their rights agreed upon. As between the States and the National Government there were certain rights reserved in the States, certain powers given to the National Government. But as between the nation and other countries, as between the nation and its possessions, it was given and it possesses all the powers of a great, practical, self-preserving, coherent, free-acting world factor.

The time has come when we know that the vigor of the nation is essential to the security of liberty. We have learned by mistakes and sad experience that to weaken the national idea is to lessen the dignity and beneficence of our country; that a dangerous ambition most often lurks behind the mask of a pretended zeal for the right of the people and State rights; that all our hopes and fears and rights and liberties lie in the dignity, efficiency, and firmness of our National Government; that in all history republics have been overturned and the liberties of the people subverted by men who began their career by first paying obsequious court to the people—beginning demagogues and ending despots.

Without a patriotic sentiment of nationality the Union will not be safe as against itself, much less as against other countries; but with it it will be safe with an hundred States, and forever safe against the whole world. With that national spirit we have just emerged from a war of civilization, and as a part of the bequest of that civilization—not conquest—Porto Rico and the Philippines have come to us. No matter how you feel, there is now no honorable course but to take them. To set them adrift would be to blot the pages of American history and dishonor the name of the American people.

Why, Mr. Speaker, we must take care of them; take care of them in the spirit and conscience that invoked the American Constitution and which is its soul; take care of them in justice, honor, and generosity, each according to its wants, capacity, and condition. To some of our Territories we can give the fullest measure of self-government; to others we must give them the fullest measure of human rights, liberties, and always justice; but in justice to them, with the highest consideration for their welfare, we will lead them up to the fullest realization of American institutions and self-government. You need not fear for the Constitution. We will govern them with every generous impulse that flows from the liberty-loving, justice-dealing American heart, which was the mother of the Constitution.

There is no paper written to which I will go with the serenity of confidence that I will to the prompting of an overflowing heart. No constitution or law is stronger than the sentiment of the people. It is to the inspiration of the people to which I will turn as the sun of our national virtue, which holds our faces always toward the home, protecting and preserving all. It is the creed of American manhood that—

> He prayeth best who loveth best
> All things both great and small;
> For the dear God who loveth us,
> He made and loveth all.

It has been our practice as a practical, self-preserving people to withhold Territories until they have shown themselves fit to enter the sisterhood of States. All conditions to make them worthy of the dignities, immunities, and privileges of statehood were taken into consideration; and this was done, not to reserve from them rights and liberties, but to preserve the strength and force of the Union, as well as the privileges and rights of the citizens of the States.

We have not always treated each Territory alike. We do not now govern Alaska as we do New Mexico. This is not because we desire to discriminate, but because the climate, soil conditions, and population of Alaska make it impracticable to govern them with the same rules and regulations that we do some of the other Territories. The people of Alaska have no elections, they are allowed no legislature, the revenues are collected from them by a license system on mercantile pursuits—all this is different than in any other Territory the Government ever owned. They do not complain. The population, climate, and rugged territory make it impracticable to give them a legislature and provide them with elective self-government. It would burden and injure them rather than bless. There would be no way to raise revenues except by the license system. They do not complain, because they know it is the only reasonable way to do it.

What they want is a good governor and courts; with this they are satisfied. As time goes on apace, their growing wants will be provided for as they appear. Such is rational government.

We have Hawaii, and my committee has just provided for it a civil government. Under that bill we have gone further than in most other Territories, in giving them plenary powers of local self-control. We did this out of no mean spirit of partiality. It was the islands, the people, that prompted that most generous and kindly act—the Hawaiian bill.

The whole area of the islands is about the size of Connecticut, and perhaps with little Delaware added. They have had a government in some form for over sixty years. They have passed through all the stages of constitutional civilization. Like England and America, they have fought and forced their Bill of Rights. They have wrested from reluctant hands their Magna Charta. They have evolved through the whole gamut of human liberty, from kings to a constitutional monarchy, and through that to a republic. Over 80 per cent of the population can read and write. The native Hawaiian is a gentle, tractable, justice-loving, justice-dealing creature, whose most grievous fault is generosity. Of all the lands on earth, Hawaii is the place where locks are unknown and keys are the treasured relics of a novel curiosity.

There is no race problem there. The Kanaka is what is called a soft race. It amalgamates with the European into splendid manhood, and in the intermixture they are a fast fading people. They have the common-school system, hospitals, colleges, high schools. They have practically stamped out the hideous march of leprosy.

Mr. Speaker, to show their spirit, when we offered to put in our bill a provision in which the United States was to stand $50,000 for aid in the care of the leper settlement, their representatives here said, "No; this has been to us a labor of love; we have conquered it, and it will soon be a thing of the past. It has been our burden—our self-imposed duty—it is now our mission and our pride; let us finish it." Such are the people of Hawaii.

Over seventy-five years ago the sons of the Pilgrim Fathers went to Hawaii as missionaries. They made their language a science, and with devoted care gave them a grammar. They translated the Bible into Kanaka, and to-day the Hawaiian race is a Christian people, cheered by the Star of Bethlehem and governed by the common law. They had a constitution, which, with a few changes locally applicable, would have served well in America. They are imbued with pure Americanism; they draw their inspiration from the fountains of enthusiasm that flowed from Plymouth Rock. They are happy and prosperous; they have all revenues necessary for self-support, with a complete system of government in every essential branch, including the means and things for the collection of revenues.

They needed only our protection. All they asked was to be American and to be covered with the Stars and Stripes.

Why, Mr. Speaker, Hawaii was simply a long-lost child coming home. It is the least of our expansive difficulties. The atmosphere that surrounds the flag there is as pure and clear in the spirit of patriotism as the air in which it floats here. When the news of annexation reached them, church and school bells were rung, steam whistles blown, the bands played, the American ensign waved everywhere, and dwellings were decorated with flowers and colors, with sunshine and joy. The streets were thronged with people wild with excitement. It was the day longed for, prayed for, through so many years of anxious hope—and now it had come. And then when the flag was raised, the people gathered before the government building in subdued solemnity.

It was the same place which had viewed the uprising for Queen Emma, the proclamation crowning Kalakaua, the revolt of Liliuokalani against her brother, and, later on, her proclamation on ascending the throne. It had heard her harangue when she granted to the people a new constitution. It had heard the edict of the abrogation of the ancient monarchy, and the proclamation of the provisional protectorate of the United States. It had seen the sun decline—the lowering of the American flag by Blount, under Cleveland. Here, too, had been proclaimed the republic of Hawaii, and here now was seen its end. There were mingled tears of joy and regret as they slowly lowered the little republic's flag—the flag that had been raised by devoted hands and had been fraught with so many cares and dangers, so many hopes and fears; the flag that had meant so much to them in years gone by, now sinking to rise no more.

But in a burst of sunlight Old Glory rose, and then every Hawaiian tear contained a rainbow of American hope—and it was red, white, and blue.

All this tells you why we have intrusted Hawaii with full governmental powers. Do you need any other explanation? Does it not tell the story with simple pathos of what the Republican party in Congress is willing to do with its adopted children? Does it not refute with acts stronger than words the Democratic charge that we are dealing unjustly with Porto Rico?

And now, why do we not treat Porto Rico and the Philippines in the same way we have so gladly treated Hawaii? Why for the present raise revenues in Porto Rico by a small tariff? These are the questions the American people want to know; and when they do, I fully believe they will bless the hand that penned the act and cherish it as one of the proudest achievements of statesmanship that characterizes the Republican party.

Porto Rico has been presented to you with poetic exaggeration by persons who have opposed the tariff act. They would have you believe that Porto Rico is an Indiana, a Michigan, or an Illinois in education, intelligence, and the power to instantly grasp the problems of American institutions and the spirit of self-government.

But to get down to facts, and when I do so it will be to set down in charity the real truth for no other purpose than to accurately survey the field, so that we may better care for them. The island is not as large as Connecticut, yet it contains a million people, while Hawaii holds only about 108,000. The Porto Rican industries are almost entirely agricultural. They have many good people there who, in a few years of absorption, may catch the intuition of the American character.

By far the larger portion of them are the children of wild adventurers of all climes and races. Not over 10 or 12 per cent can read or write. Notice, I say read *or* write. Not 2 per cent can read or write or speak English. Nine hundred thousand are in absolute ignorance. General Davis reports that it would be impossible to found the jury system there; that the whole island would not furnish the right kind of men for juries, and to do so would be to inflict the grossest injustice upon the merchants and business men and, for that matter, the whole people of Porto Rico. There are no schoolhouses on the island, except perhaps one built by the United States during the last year. At least four-fifths of the people have absolutely no idea of political affairs, either of Spain or of this country.

Sugar, coffee, and tobacco are their principal industries. After the American officials had taken possession of the island and were rapidly converting it into a garden of happiness and prosperity a calamity occurred almost unequaled and unparalleled in the history of any country. The hurricane destroyed almost everything on the island except the ground which held them up. Not even the soil of the coffee plantations remained. In one day 800,000 people were left without occupation or support. The world will never know the heroic efforts of our President, acting through General Davis, in feeding and caring for these stricken people and in ameliorating one of the saddest tragedies of modern times.

We must have money; we must have it in large quantities immediately, and that fund must continue and grow for at least a period of two years before revenues by ordinary taxation could be raised.

Under ordinary circumstances it was thought we could have free trade between this country and Porto Rico—by that we did not intend to support the island by taxing our people at home; it is a rich and fertile land; it can and ought to support itself; it was supposed that we could do this by the system of internal revenue in vogue with Territories in some other instances—and so the President recommended it as his general policy. It was and is the intention to do that with Porto Rico when practicable. It is the purpose of the present act, as amended by the Senate, to give to Porto Rico control over her own revenue at the earliest possible moment. But the hurricane, the poverty, the desolation, and the destitution, the enormous initiatory expenditure for schools, homes, food, roads, the expenses for government, the rehabilitation of stricken industries, all these confronted the President and Congress when they got down to the details of actually meeting the conditions that existed at the time of the proposed legislation.

President McKinley had sent Henry K. Carroll as a special commissioner for the United States to Porto Rico, to be advised by him as to the welfare of the island. Mr. Carroll was a man in whom President McKinley had implicit confidence, both as to ability and integrity. I need not tell you, Mr. Speaker, that he was worthy of that confidence; no one has ever doubted it. He at first reported, among other things, that free trade between the two countries was desirable. He, in connection with General Davis, continued in their herculean and devoted efforts for the comfort and welfare of the Porto Ricans; and let me say right here that no people in the world have ever had kinder friends or wiser benefactors.

In December, when they had got down to practical details, and considering the lamentable condition of this hunger-cursed, storm-stricken island, Mr. Carroll reported as follows:

> According to the judgment of the Porto Ricans most competent to have an opinion * * * it would seem to be prudent not to revise the Porto Rican tariff so as to very greatly reduce the customs revenue, at least for the period ad interim.

General Davis recommended the same. Congress had the benefit of all this later and valuable information. The disinterested Porto Ricans themselves were satisfied with it. Our best judgment indorsed it. The path of duty and wisdom seemed so plain that the committee put forth the bill as a matter of common business, as hundreds of others are brought forth, without waiting or asking for a public message from the President or consulting the newspapers before they acted.

It was done to relieve the present condition, a temporary expedient, a tentative measure. It was conceived in kindness for the Porto Ricans and in justice to Americans. Every cent is given to them. It was the only way to raise revenues for the benefit of the island in its present condition. It was purely provisional and can not continue longer than two years, and by the provisions of the present bill it will not continue longer than the government of Porto Rico deems it advisable and necessary. The tax is paid indirectly, in exactly the manner the people of the United States raise revenue to support our Government. The money does not come from the poor and suffering; it will come out of the people who do business there, out of the profits of their trade, largely out of the great sugar and tobacco speculators and planters.

This whole bill is a careful attempt to deal wisely and well with the Porto Ricans until American genius and time and events assure us of their capability of self-government, and shall divine for us what is the best and most practicable way to make them happy. The man who pretends that he is the friend of the Porto Rican in opposing this measure is in reality their worst enemy. The Porto Ricans are happy and contented in the act. They say it would have been better to have kept it at 25 per cent of the Dingley rate rather than lower it to 15 per cent.

Despite the statement of some statesmen that when we returned the $2,000,000 of the Dingley tariff for their benefit, on the recommendation of President McKinley, we did away with the necessity of the tariff feature, this is not a fact—as is well known by the Porto Ricans, General Davis, and all those who know best as to the needs and requirements of that island during the next two years. Three million dollars a year will not be too much for their wants and necessities during the reconstructive period. Here you have a simple statement of how and why this legislation was brought about. This tells to you in the main why I intend to vote for the bill. These are the reasons of fixing the tariff in Porto Rico at this time.

When we come to the Philippines, different reasons will obtain. It may be that there we will want to impose a tariff in that country to prevent the open-door policy in the Orient from becoming a trapdoor for other countries to insidiously break down our protective tariff at home. In order to get our share of the oriental trade it appears that we will have to reciprocally open the door in the Philippines to all the other countries upon the same terms that we enter there. But unless we can protect ourselves at home from the goods of other countries that enter there, it will sound the death knell to our protective tariff. We can do this and do it to the prosperity and happiness of the islands and with justness to every American laborer and citizen.

I want expansion, as it is termed, because America has never yet shrinked from a duty or failed in a responsibility. I want it because I respect my country. But I do not approach it with fear and trembling for our laborers, farmers, and people at home. We will govern all these peoples with kindness and all the beneficent liberties that play around the Constitution. But we have the fullest powers of self-preservation, and I insist that always and forever we shall do it in justice to the people here at home.

The people of America know that President McKinley is the kindest, gentlest spirit of the Spanish war. They will know before this controversy has finally been disposed of that his name continues to be indissolubly linked with the fortunes of labor and the prosperity of the masses. No one can make the American people believe that William McKinley would knowingly oppress or do injustice to any man, whether he be Porto Rican or American.

I am going to vote for this bill because I am for expansion, because to be practical is to be just, because I believe this country of ours is a full-fledged nation with all the powers of progress and self-preservation, because it is wise and sagacious, just and generous.

Mr. Speaker, I desire consent to print as an appendix to my remarks the very able article written by Judge Taylor, of my State, upon this Porto Rican subject. I think his remarks should have the widest possible dissemination.

APPENDIX.

To the Editor of the Indianapolis Journal:

The matter of the Porto Rican tariff opens a question which ought not to be closed without deliberate consideration, and pending that consideration

the freest possible expression of opinion is in order and highly desirable. The constitutional question is the difficult one. Has Congress power under the Constitution to deal with the people of Porto Rico otherwise than as citizens of the United States? If not, it has no more power to impose a duty on Porto Rican sugar than on Louisiana sugar. There are decisions of the Supreme Court which are thought by some persons to support that view, but I think they do not when fairly construed.

The great purpose of the Constitution was to found a stable government on what was, in the nature of things, an uncertain and precarious foundation—a union of independent States. For that purpose it proposed a scheme previously unheard of in the world, consisting of two independent systems of government within the same territory and over the same people, with its attendant incidents of two citizenships and two allegiances—one of and to the State government and the other of and to the United States Government. It was to define and adjust these sovereignties, rights, duties, and relationships that the Constitution was necessary and was formed and adopted. The essence of the principle of combination thus established is that the States have all the powers of government not denied to them by the Constitution of the United States or their own constitutions, while the United States have no powers except those expressly or impliedly conferred on them by the United States Constitution. Ever since its adoption we have discussed and applied the Constitution almost exclusively to questions arising out of the relations between the United States and the States and their citizens, respectively, and in consequence have fallen into the habit of speaking generally of the United States Government as one of limited powers. So, without stopping to think closely about it, we assume that these limitations apply to our relations with Porto Rico as well as to those with our continental States and Territories, and hence that the people of the island were clothed immediately upon its cession to the United States with all the rights of citizens of the Republic, among which is the right under the Constitution to trade freely with all other citizens of the Republic.

POWERS OF GOVERNMENT.

I am persuaded that this is an error, and at the present moment a dangerous error. There was no necessity, when the Government of the United States was called into being, to put any limitation upon its powers as a nation among nations. There were the best of reasons for not doing so. It was entitled, as against all the world except its own citizens and the States to which they owed an allegiance as well as to it, to all the powers of sovereignty recognized by the usages of mankind as belonging to government. Those powers did not need to be conferred by a constitution. They vested by virtue of the institution of the Government unless expressly prohibited by a constitution. I know of no such prohibition. Among these large powers of government, always and everywhere recognized as inherent in sovereignty, is the power to acquire territory and to hold acquired territory on such terms and deal with it in such manner as the acquisitor shall deem best. I believe that power belongs to the United States in as unrestricted form as any other government in the world. This power is not only an inherent one, residing in the Government by virtue of its existence as a Government, but it exists in a case like the present as an implied power under the Constitution.

It is settled constitutional law in this country that Congress possesses not only the powers expressly conferred by the Constitution, but all other powers necessary to give effect to the powers expressly granted. A large and important share of the functions exercised by the Government to-day rests on implied powers. The power to make war carries with it, by implication, power to do all things necessary to make war effective and to secure its results in a manner advantageous to the country. Among the incidents of war is the conquest of territory. And to secure the results of war it may be necessary to keep the territory thus acquired away from the possession or control of the enemy. If in such a case our Government could take and keep such territory only on condition that it should become permanently a part of the United States and its inhabitants citizens of the United States, with all the rights of citizenship, the situation of the Government would be pitiable and contemptible. It seems to me that the power to make war conferred by the Constitution carries with it the power to take territory from the enemy and, when taken, to deal with it as shall be to our highest interest. We can annex it to the United States if we choose to, or we can hold it as a detached, outlying possession. We have all the powers in that respect which belong to England or any other nation.

The decisions commonly referred to in support of the view that the provisions of our Constitution extend immediately to all acquired territory were made with reference to persons and property in territory about which no question existed as to its place as part of the area of the United States. That fact has been assumed by the people and the Government in all its branches, and was assumed by the court. After Congress shall have declared that Porto Rico is part of the United States and subject to the Constitution and laws thereof, those decisions will be applicable to questions arising in regard to the rights of her citizens.

SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEM.

If these views are sound, the Porto Rican question is wholly one of wise policy. The power is ample to do whatever we think best for all interests concerned. In respect to our trade relations, the matter is so much more important to the Porto Ricans than to us that we can well afford to let their interests have paramount place in the discussion. Proceeding upon this theory, it does not seem to me that either the bill which has passed the House or the amendment pending in the Senate is the wisest measure practicable. It is always highly desirable to make tariff changes in a way to prevent private speculation so far as possible. There is good reason to believe that the exportable property in Porto Rico belongs now to American owners. Any reduction of the existing tariff will increase their profits without benefiting the Porto Ricans. We can prevent that result by continuing to collect the present duties on Porto Rican imports and expending the money in Porto Rico in the relief of distress and in the making of improvements necessary to the beginning of independent development and prosperity in that island.

The problem does not seem to me to be a difficult one if we approach it in the right way—if we do what we do as an act of plenary power. If we do it as a recognition of Porto Rico as an integral part of the territory of the United States and of its inhabitants as citizens of the United States, we shall make a precedent which may give us trouble hereafter. Similar questions will soon confront us with regard to the Philippine Islands, and probably with regard to Cuba. Where else we may meet them in the future we do not know. That we are entering upon new and larger relations with the world is certain, however much we may regret it. It is not a time to give away any of the just powers of our Government. Toward its own people the Government of the United States has only the powers conferred by the Constitution; toward all the rest of mankind it has all the powers that belong to civilized governments. In my opinion it will be a grave mistake to do any act in the Porto Rican business in derogation of those powers.

R. S. TAYLOR.

FORT WAYNE, IND., *March 19.*

Trade of Porto Rico.

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANK E. WILSON,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, April 11, 1900,

On the bill (H. R. 8245) entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues for the relief of the island of Porto Rico, and for other purposes," and the Senate amendments thereto.

Mr. WILSON of New York said:

Mr. SPEAKER: Congress, through this Porto Rican bill, will provide for local revenues with which to conduct the government of Porto Rico. This will reduce the expenditures of the United States Government. Great care has been taken in drafting the civil-government bill for Porto Rico to provide the most expensive government ever organized in any Territory of the United States, probably for the purpose of preventing these increased revenues from increasing the surplus. If the government of Porto Rico was economically administered, the revenues of the island would more than cover the cost of the government, and the balance would have to be turned into the United States Treasury. It has been a problem for many years with the Republican party how to retain high taxes and find sufficient channels of legitimate expenditure in which the proceeds of these taxes can be used.

The campaign of 1884 was fought very largely upon the issue of having a tremendous surplus locked up in the United States Treasury. This contributed largely to the defeat of the Republican party that year. The per capita expenditures of the Government at that time were $4.39. There was a surplus of considerably over one hundred millions for which the Government could not find channels for expenditure. At that time the Treasury of the United States was a Department of the Government maintained for the purpose of receiving and paying out the public moneys. The surplus continued to grow, and it was reduced by one hundred millions by taking that amount from the surplus fund and calling it a reserve. It still continued to grow, and the result was the pension act of 1890, which greatly increased the pension fund and created little objection, because the American people are sufficiently patriotic to approve of almost any expenditure which will benefit the American soldier. But they could not give enough of it to the old soldiers to wipe out the surplus. They wiped out the surplus finally by passing practically a prohibitive tariff.

The surplus then became a deficiency. Bonds were issued to correct this evil. When the war with Spain was declared, the Government anticipated very heavy expenditures and provided for a very large increase in receipts. The expenditures were not so great, and the receipts were even greater than anticipated. The result is that the Government is again faced with that troublesome surplus. Hence it is that when the Republican system of taxation is applied to Porto Rico, it is necessary to establish as expensive a government as possible in order that there will be no surplus. In reading over the bill one is impressed with the belief that so much government in so small and poor an island will render a surplus impossible. But by relieving the United States Government of a large expenditure, the surplus in the United States Treasury must be increased unless taxes are reduced. The cash balance in the Treasury on the 1st day of February was $292,490,973.30; the cash balance on the 1st day of March had increased $5,871,850.28. The surplus outside of the gold reserve, which was formerly counted as a surplus, is a little over $198,000,000.

The Government has just this much money which it does not know how to use. The per capita expenditures have been increased in every direction possible; and yet the problem of what to do with this surplus without decreasing taxation remains unsolved. The question has a very practical political aspect. The people know that the surplus means just that much money was taken from them which the Government did not need. The people resent paying more money into the United States Treasury than the Government can use. They find, in looking over the list of expenditures, that the war expenditures have not been materially decreased in any branch and in some have been increased. They know that in the nature of things these war expenses must decrease in the aggregate; and if the Government is now collecting more money than it can use, the surplus must increase unless the taxes decrease. From this practical side of the question comes forth some good to the American people. Having decreased the expenditures by the Porto Rican bill and not being desirous to have any more surplus to explain than they have now, the Republican leaders must be in a frame of mind to consider favorably a reduction of some of the war taxes.

BREWERS.

There are two of these taxes to which I wish to call especial attention. I hold in my hand a respectful petition from the brewers' associations of the United States, setting forth their claims for a reduction of tax in such a clear-cut, businesslike, patriotic, and modest way, that it seems to me no member on this floor can refuse to accede to their request.

I do not wish to enter into any discussion as to the merits or demerits of the business of manufacturing any kind of malt, vinous, or spirituous liquors. I have no quarrel with any man who believes in this industry or with any man who does not believe in it. The liquor business has two sides. To a certain extent it must be controlled under the police power, and I have no opposition to offer against proper police regulations. We are not here discussing a measure which has for its object or purpose any police regulation. The tax of $2 a barrel on beer was placed there purely as a revenue producer, and not in any sense as a regulation. We must therefore consider it as a revenue producer and not in the light of any opinions which may be held as to the desirability of increasing or decreasing the consumption of beer.

When the civil-war tax was placed upon beer it was placed at $1 per barrel. This amounted to a tax of about 8 per cent. The breweries of this country offered no protest at the imposition of this tax. There have been no petitions for its reduction, although the price of beer fell 60 per cent. When the present war-tax measure was before Congress the brewers contented themselves with a mere statement of their business and used no efforts to prevent the doubling up of the old war tax. They were willing to share whatever proportion of the war expenses Congress thought they ought to share. Now that the returns show too much money is being collected for the use of the Government, they, in a very respectful circular letter, ask that the extra tax of $1 per barrel be taken off beer. They show very clearly in their circular letter that there has been an unjust discrimination between malt, vinous, and spirituous liquors. From the standpoint of those who believe the liquor trade harmful in its tendencies the most extreme opinion would be that malt liquors were the least harmful of the three kinds; and yet malt liquors are the ones discriminated against in the present law. It would seem that the only reasonable explanation of this fact is that the brewers were not assiduous in presenting their claims to Congress while the manufacturers of vinous and spirituous liquors were active.

The present condition of the brewing business shows conclusively that it is absolutely necessary for that trade to have the relief asked for. The brewers of the United States are gradually building up a fine export trade. In 1890 they exported $654,408, while in 1899 they exported $1,888,124. The cost of manufacturing beer in the United States is much greater than in most other countries. The increase in exports is due to the superior quality of American beer, and under the old tax the American brewers took great pride in increasing this superiority of quality. The large breweries have led in this pride of quality, and the smaller ones have been compelled to follow in order to compete. The circular letter, signed by all of the brewers, states, and explains the reason why, this pride in quality must be abandoned if this tax is not removed.

They can not keep up this quality and compete with foreign beers. The margin of profit has become so small that this extra $1 per barrel constitutes the difference between success and failure in the brewing business. The smaller breweries have failed or sold out to the larger ones. The larger ones have only continued business on a losing basis, because they believed the tax was only temporary, and they could not afford to lose the trade already established, as they would do if they closed their establishments. Some of the independent smaller breweries have already decreased the quality of their product, rather than to fail. The American taste for beer has been educated so that they demand good beer. The result has been that the per capita consumption of malt liquors was less in 1899 than it was in 1896, while the per capita consumption of distilled spirits has increased from 1 gallon to 1.15 gallons. The per capita consumption of beer decreased about 10 per cent. It is not good governmental policy to increase the consumption of spirituous liquors by decreasing the consumption of malt liquors.

There is another consideration which, while it tends somewhat to bring this question under the police power, yet is in reality entirely separate from that question so far as beer is concerned. The tax upon spirituous liquors was not increased, and yet that tax costs the Government more money to collect and the business of manufacturing spirituous liquors costs more to guard and protect than any other business. The illicit competition in the spirituous-liquor business costs annually large sums of money to detect and destroy. It requires the Internal-Revenue Office to keep a list of agents of the Government who have been wounded or killed. It involves a constant warfare. No such condition presents itself as to the illicit manufacture of beer.

The breweries of the United States largely look after this matter themselves. The brewers paid, according to the reports of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, for the fiscal years 1898 and 1899, $108,159,979. One-half of this amount was the extra war tax. The total increase in internal-revenue taxes for these two years was $126,748,587. The brewers alone paid over 40 per cent of these increased taxes. They can not continue to bear these burdens and continue their business. This tax could be taken off and there would still be more revenue than is needed to pay the expenses of the Government. An act of justice can be done in removing this tax and at the same time reduce the surplus of which the people complain.

RETAIL DRUGGISTS.

There is another tax which does not amount to enough in the aggregate to interfere with the revenues of the country and yet which does amount to enough to seriously cripple a class of merchants who have never asked for special consideration at the hands of Congress. I refer to the stamp tax upon druggists' sundries and proprietary medicines. This is a tax which neither the manufacturer nor the consumer pays. Ordinarily the consumer ultimately pays the taxes. He would in this case if the tax was enough higher or enough lower. The tax is fixed at a figure which justifies the manufacturer in adding it to the price of his goods, which are sold by the gross. The retail druggist pays this increase of price. He therefore pays the tax. Ordinarily this tax would be added to the retail price of the article sold. But the customer knows exactly what the tax is and as it only amounts to a fraction of a cent, or at most to 1 or 2 cents, he naturally objects to having the price increased on account of so small an increase in the cost of the article.

A medicine which sold for 75 cents before the present law was passed still sells for 75 cents, but the retailer pays the amount of tax in addition to what he paid before. This entire tax, therefore, is paid by the retailer. It is a serious burden upon the retail drug trade. Its removal would not be felt by the Government. Its continuance is neither necessary nor desirable. I therefore ask, in the name of the brewers, who are not poor, but who will become so if this tax is continued, and in the name of the retail druggists, who are usually men of small capital, that the oppression which seemed necessary when the glory of the nation was at stake, be now taken from them, as the nation is safe and these onerous burdens are no longer required.

So serious a problem has the increasing surplus in the United States Treasury become that Congress is seeking new avenues of expenditure in order to get rid of the money which the Government does not need. One of these measures is the ship-subsidy bill, which gives subsidies to a few lines of established ships, such subsidies amounting to $9,000,000 per year. By the passage of the Porto Rican tariff bill an American steamship line, the Porto Rican and American Steamship Company, which owns four steel vessels which were built and are operated by American officers, has been so seriously crippled that it is scarcely able to keep its boats running. This Porto Rican measure is one which kills the trade between the United States and Porto Rico, and destroys this ocean commerce which would otherwise be profitable. And yet the party which passes this bill proposes to turn around and present $9,000,000 a year to men who are successfully engaged in navigating the sea. And what is this $9,000,000 to be paid for? It is not proposed to establish any new lines of vessels; it is not proposed to guarantee any increase of freight. The men who receive the $9,000,000 are to build some ships of their own with a portion of the money and keep the ships and the balance of the money. It is plainly and evidently simply a proposition to decrease the surplus in the United States Treasury by giving a part of it to private individuals.

While there is no constitutional limitation upon the authority of Congress to levy any amount of taxes in a constitutional way that it may see fit, yet it is a general governmental principle that taxes shall be levied only as required for governmental use. It is neither necessary nor desirable that the money of the people should be locked up in the United States Treasury. The people of the United States are very heavily taxed. Our complex system of government requires taxes for many purposes. The aggregate of the municipal, township, school, State, and Federal taxes run our per capita tax up to $16, as against $4.50 in England. Our people are more heavily taxed than in any other nation except Spain. The Federal taxes are not as high as in two or three other countries, but in those countries there are no State taxes.

Previous to the war tax, passed for the purpose of providing revenue for the war with Spain, this country was grievously taxed. But an emergency came, and in order to meet that emergency Congress placed additional taxes upon the people. There was little or no complaint. The American people are the most patriotic people in the world to-day. If the life of the Government was in danger and the citizens were called upon to give up everything they had in order to save the nation, a very large portion of them would willingly accede to that demand. They were told that it was an emergency, and it was all they cared to know. They

put their hands in their pockets and paid the taxes. It occasioned some surprise when they discovered that the telegraph companies, the express companies, and the banks compelled their patrons to pay all of the taxes and declined to share in the responsibilities of citizenship; but the people paid the taxes, and they had a pride in paying them. They felt that they were standing behind the men in the field, and they read the accounts of victories won with a sense of patriotic exultation.

The war was closed, the Americans had triumphed, and the American people rejoiced. The emergency was over. They read the reports of the Treasury Department, and they found that now the emergency was over the Government had more money than it knew what to do with. They said to themselves, "Uncle Sam is all right again; he does not need our money, and Congress will take off the emergency taxes." But to their astonishment the American people find that the surplus is increasing and the taxes are not decreasing. Instead of seeking how to relieve the people of these new and unusual burdens, the majority in Congress has devoted its deliberations to finding a means of retaining the burdens and discovering new and unusual methods of expenditure. The emergency tax is not being removed when the emergency is over.

The governor of the little island of Porto Rico must be installed with great pomp and ceremony. His inauguration will be more formal and imposing than that of the President of the United States. He is to receive a larger salary, including the use of the governor's mansion, than is to be paid to the governor of any State of the Union. They did not see how they could divide the Territory of Porto Rico into more than twelve districts and give the judges any work at all. This did not provide enough for inferior judicial officers. They therefore placed three judges upon each nisi prius bench. They also provided for a supreme court and United States courts. A most aristocratic government of the United States is that of Porto Rico. They seek to use a part of the funds to present them to a few shipping companies which are already wealthy. They sought to use a very large amount of the surplus in building a canal across the Nicaragua isthmus to be controlled by England. When its being controlled by England was objected to, they declined to build any canal. These are the ways in which this Congress has sought to dispose of the emergency-tax question. The bills introduced and favorably considered by the majority of this House which relate to this subject at all provide for the establishment of new lines of expenditure and not to the abolition of emergency revenue.

I believe that Congress in all good conscience is bound to keep taxes at as low a point as possible in order to provide for the legitimate expenses of an economically administered Government. I do not believe that it is right, morally or politically, to retain burdens which have become unnecessary. I do not believe it is right when we have a surplus in the Treasury to study how to increase the cost of administering the Government. I believe that this is a very dangerous thing to do. The people paid the last emergency tax willingly and cheerfully because they thought and were officially informed that it was a temporary emergency tax. If it is not removed, now that the emergency is passed, when the next emergency comes and taxes must again be increased the people will not be so patient or patriotic. If we deal fairly with the people now they will have confidence in us and trust in the wisdom of taxing measures in the future. But if we compel the people to pay these emergency taxes when there is no longer a necessity for them we will lose the confidence of the people and we will dim the patriotism which has been the most glorious characteristic of the American people since the birth of this Republic.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this Congress will relieve the Government of some necessary expenses in its outlying territories by providing systems of local revenue. Are the people to have the benefit of these reductions, or are they not? If they are, then I ask Congress to consider carefully the claims of the brewers and the retail druggists, because I know, from personal investigation, that these men can not well stand the additional burden imposed upon them by the war-revenue law. It is out of proportion to the burden imposed upon other classes of business, and in good equity taxes ought to be made as equal and uniform as it is possible to make them.

There may be other lines which impose hardship and where the taxes are no longer necessary; and if such is the case, those ought also to be relieved. It is certainly of the utmost importance that this war-revenue law be most carefully revised. It will be remembered that it was not only passed as an emergency tax, but the passage itself was a matter of emergency. We needed the money, or thought we did, and we needed it hastily. Compare the hearings in a tariff investigation with those upon the war-revenue bill. The hearings upon the latter measure were necessarily incomplete and hurried. Mistakes were to be expected, and mistakes occurred. We got more revenue than we wanted and more than we intended. The revenue produced has been greater than the estimates of the committee.

Some of the taxes have not appeared to be burdensome, others are ruining the men who pay them. From the operations of the law we can discover its errors much more clearly than they could be seen while the law was untried. The brewers themselves did not realize how fatal this tax would be to their business, or in self-defense they would have used their utmost efforts to prevent it being imposed. They were patriotic enough to be entirely willing to share their just proportion of the increased expenditures of the Government. The operation of the law has disclosed the fact that they are taxed out of all proportion to what they should justly be called upon for. The operation of the law has shown that it is practically not a tax at all, but a confiscation of their entire profits.

The druggists' tax was not fought very hard by anyone, because it was supposed that it would largely be paid by the consumers and so distributed that it would be burdensome to none. The experience of the past two years has shown that the tax is too large not to increase the wholesale price of goods and too small to increase the retail price. It is therefore borne by the retailers alone, who did not expect to pay it and who can not afford to pay it. There may be other articles where the operations of the bill have been different from what was intended. Even if Congress did not believe that the time had come for repealing this measure, there certainly should be no objection to a thorough and careful scrutiny of its provision in the light of experience, in order to detect and correct its manifest inequalities and burdensome exactions.

Mr. Speaker, I ask, now that the Republican party has provided for an increase in local revenues and a consequent decrease in national expenditures, it consider the question of relief for the poor taxpaying people before it takes up any questions of donating public funds to wealthy individuals.

APPENDIX.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.

GENTLEMEN: On behalf of the brewing industry of the United States, and in accordance with resolutions adopted at a general meeting of brewers held in the city of New York on the 7th day of December, 1898, the undersigned respectfully beg leave to submit to your honorable bodies the following reasons why the tax upon fermented liquors should be reduced to the former rate.

The attitude of the American brewers at the outbreak of the Spanish-American war, as reflected in their remonstrance addressed to every member of your honorable bodies, was that of patriotic citizens, fully aware of the extraordinary needs and requirements of the hour, perfectly willing to assist to the full extent of their ability in maintaining the honor of the nation, but equally confident that the lawmaking power would not and in justice and fairness could not possibly attempt to increase the tax upon their product unless all the available sources of internal revenue resorted to during the civil war should prove to be insufficient to produce the amount of money required for the successful prosecution of the war.

And even in that case an additional tax upon malt liquors was deemed impossible, because unjust and inequitable, except upon the assumption that the lawmaking power would also increase the tax upon distilled liquors, and impose taxes upon all other alcoholic beverages, so as to include domestic wines and ciders, which have never borne any part of the nation's fiscal burdens. These self-evident conclusions, although based upon the most obvious principles of justice and equity, and fortified by fiscal, economic, and moral considerations of the highest importance, were overbalanced not only by totally erroneous opinions as to the latent ability of the brewing industry to bear additional taxes, but also by the unwarranted belief that the doubling of the tax rate would necessarily double the amount of revenue from this source without materially increasing the expense of collection, and, what is more important, without creating any appreciable industrial disturbance or popular discontent. Guided by these considerations, your honorable bodies determined upon a fiscal measure which stands alone and without a parallel in the history of civilized countries, i. e., the doubling of the tax upon an article of consumption (already overtaxed) which constitutes one of the necessaries of life of a large proportion of the population.

While, as we have already intimated, this act might have been justifiable as an extreme war measure, adopted under stress of extraordinary circumstances and in view of complications imperatively demanding immediate action, it can not be successfully defended upon any rational ground in the face of the facts that scarcely one-third of the available revenue sources have been resorted to; that the tax upon distilled spirits has not been increased, and that domestic wines and ciders remain practically untaxed.

The following, obtained from official sources, clearly demonstrates the astonishingly inequitable and unfair adjustment of tax burdens:

During five months of the present fiscal year, from July 1, 1898, to November 30, 1898, the total receipts under the war-revenue act of 1898 amounted to $37,810,262.31, of which sum the extra tax upon malt liquors yielded $15,183,006.56, or over 67 per cent of the aggregate amount received from all other sources, and over 40 per cent of the entire war tax. The figures stand as follows, viz:

Extra tax upon fermented liquors	$15,183,006.56
War tax from all other sources	22,627,255.75
Total	37,810,262.31

Taking into consideration the aggregate receipts from all internal-revenue sources—new and old—we find an equally striking illustration of the inequality in the distribution of taxes. During the period before mentioned the receipts from all sources (new and old) were as follows:

Fermented liquors (old and new tax)	$31,000,734.73
All other sources (old and new tax)	85,128,848.37
Total	116,129,583.10

Hence the proportion of revenue derived from fermented liquors amounted to over 36 per cent of the total receipts from all other sources and to over 26 per cent of the entire receipts.

That the brewing industry of America, which had uncomplainingly and cheerfully borne and honestly paid a very high tax upon its product ever since the war of the rebellion, should now be made to pay 40 per cent of the entire sum raised under the new act for carrying on the Spanish-American war, while two-thirds of the nation's available revenue sources remain totally unproductive, the tax upon distilled spirits is continued at its ante-bellum rate and domestic wines are practically untaxed, is certainly an injustice which need not be emphasized. Nevertheless, it may not be amiss to compare the taxes raised for the maintenance of the Union during the civil war, which lasted four years, exacting enormous sacrifices of human blood and straining the nation's energy to its utmost, with the taxes raised for the prosecution of the shortest and least sanguinary war ever recorded in modern history.

In 1866, when the net expenditures of the Government amounted to $1,217,704,000, the internal revenue yielded $309,226,000, and of this latter sum the brewing industry paid—at the rate of $1 per barrel—but $5,115,000. The industry was then in a most flourishing condition, increasing its annual production at the rate of 1,000,000 barrels, and receiving an average price of $12 per barrel. In 1897, when the expenditures of the Government, including the estimated cost of the Spanish-American war, did not exceed one-half of the expenditures of the year 1866, the brewing industry paid—still at the rate of $1 per barrel—about $32,000,000 into the Federal Treasury. Competition had in the meantime reduced the selling price of a barrel of beer to $5, and the cost of labor had increased by at least 40 per cent.

To impose an additional tax of $1 per barrel upon a commodity already so seriously handicapped and overtaxed virtually amounts to an attempt (unwittingly made, of course) to destroy an industry which, from every conceivable point of view, it should be the duty of the lawmakers to protect. It was to have been foreseen that such must be the effect of this extra tax, and the reduced production, as shown by the official returns, clearly demonstrates it.

In 1866 the special revenue commission reported that the tax of $1 per barrel (sold at $12) exceeded the rate imposed by any European state, and was fully up to the revenue standard. This applies to present conditions far more forcibly than to the conditions of 1866. The additional war tax exceeds the revenue standard by more than half its legitimate proportion, and to that extent it exceeds the tax-bearing ability of the trade.

In no other civilized country are fermented liquors made to bear so large a proportion of the internal taxes as in our own, and in no other country is there greater need of encouraging the use of the milder stimulants by judicious fiscal laws—a policy which, first promulgated by Alexander Hamilton and adopted by the Congress of the United States in 1790, has consistently been adhered to up to the date of the imposition of this additional tax. A comparison of the taxes upon beer and upon distilled spirits in the United States and in Great Britain may be cited here in support of the foregoing assertion:

SPIRIT TAX PER GALLON.

United States	$1.10
Great Britain	2.43

BEER TAX.

$2 for 31 American gallons equal to 26⅓ imperial gallons.
$1.18 for 31 American gallons equal to $1.62 for 36 imperial gallons.

Reducing imperial gallons to American gallons, you will perceive that the English brewer pays $1.18 (less a rebate) upon the same quantity of beer for which the American brewer pays a tax of $2, less a similar allowance for loss by leakage, etc. The cost of labor is very much lower in Great Britain than in America, and like differences in cost of material, added to complete immunity from excessive local taxation, place the British brewer in an infinitely more favorable economic position than that occupied by his American fellow-manufacturer.* The British brewer's fiscal position as compared with that of the British distiller as a taxpayer is the very opposite of that of the American brewers; it is attributable to a fixed policy on the part of the British Government to encourage and popularize the use of fermented beverages by a discriminative tax rate in favor of these drinks.

It is asserted that a tax upon spirits exceeding the present rate can not be collected, i. e., that the taxpayers will evade it; defrauding the Government and yet exacting the tax from the people, as they have done whenever the rate was increased. Admitting, for the sake of argument, the correctness of this statement, we fail to recognize in it any valid reason why the brewers, noted—as innumerable official reports demonstrate—for their integrity as taxpayers, should be made the fiscal scapegoats for the sins of the distillers and compelled to pay an additional war tax which exceeds the revenue standard by 50 per cent and will inevitably cripple a most useful industry.

Excessive taxation nearly destroyed the British brewing industry in the past century. Its effect upon the drinking habits of the people and the prevalence of drunkenness are too well known to every student of history to require reiteration. The governments of other nations profited by their own and this English experience, and hence we find that in France, Belgium, Switzerland, and the Scandinavian countries beer is either very lightly taxed or not taxed at all. Our additional tax has already reduced the consumption very considerably, and can not but result in a still more rapid decrease in the production and consumption of beer. The loss thus occasioned will not only affect in a most disastrous measure and manner every one of the many trades dependent upon brewing, but will also jeopardize one of the main sources of Federal revenue and change for the worse the drinking habits of the people.

Differences of opinion may possibly exist, from the lawmaker's point of view, as to the tenableness of the moral and ethical considerations here alluded to; there can be no room, however, for argument as to the injustice of the tax to the brewer, the dealer, and the consumer (we mention the three, for all suffer in varying degrees under the new tax law); nor is there any doubt as to the actual effect of the tax as a revenue measure pure and simple, and as to its effect upon the consumption of fermented liquors. During the period of five months mentioned before (July 1 to November 30, 1898) the decrease in the consumption, as compared with the same period of the previous year, amounted to 1,250,000 barrels.

If this could happen within five months after the enactment of the new law, when every brewer naturally put forth his most strenuous efforts to hold his trade, in the vague hope that aid might come to him from some source, and that matters between himself, the Government, the dealer, and the consumer might satisfactorily regulate themselves, what must be the effect, particularly upon the smaller establishments, if this anomalous and intolerable state of affairs should continue for an indefinite period with no relief to be hoped for from any quarter? At the rate of decrease of which the figures quoted above may be regarded as a fair criterion, diminished production will in the very near future offset the aggregate increase of revenue derived from the double tax rate; the fiscal object of the increase of tax will then be frustrated, and the lawmakers will have accomplished nothing except the destruction of one-half of the brewing establishments and of all industries dependent upon them, thus impairing alike one of the most important of the nation's wealth-producing agencies and a productive source of revenue, which, on account of its stability, could hitherto be relied upon as almost the only sure and predeterminable quantity in the necessary estimates of Federal receipts.

The ratio of the decrease in the production of malt liquors as a direct result of the imposition of the additional tax is not, of course, uniformly the same throughout the country; nor is it possible to state with anything like mathematical accuracy in what proportion untaxed wines and ciders and lightly taxed ardent spirits have taken the place of the milder beverages thus forcibly driven out of the market under an unjust distribution of taxes. True, the revenue report for the period of five months repeatedly mentioned before (July 1 to November 30, 1898) show an increase of receipts from the spirit tax amounting to $1,116,000, in round numbers, as compared with the receipts for the same period of the preceding year; but these official reports can afford us no clue as to the consumption of untaxed wine and cider. Fortunately we are enabled to present local statistics of undisputed authenticity illustrating in what manner and to what extent untaxed wines and ciders drive out overtaxed malt liquors, to the detriment alike of the brewing industry and of the Federal Treasury.

These domestic wines, ordinarily containing three times as much alcohol as malt liquors, were sold by the measure and consequently did not yield any revenue whatever to the Government; on the other hand, the Federal Treasury lost the revenue tax upon 28,889 barrels of malt liquors by reason of the decrease in the production of malt liquors. Not only do these domestic wines produce no revenue, but they accelerate the decline of a tax-yielding industry.

At the present time it is difficult, almost impossible, to estimate the extent of injury already inflicted upon brewing and the allied trades; but this much is certain, that far from causing a minimum of industrial disturbance, as had been claimed, the additional tax has completely unsettled the industry, causing an astonishing proportion of insolvencies among the smaller producers, and strengthening the tendency toward consolidation and the creation of trusts to such a degree that in nearly every brewing center, the smallest not excepted, there is now pending a scheme of this character. Everything is in a state of transition; neither the producers, nor the retailers, nor, in fact, the consumers have succeeded in accommodating themselves to the new condition of things; everything is held in abeyance; sporadic and desultory efforts to regulate matters are quickly abandoned on account of the uncertainty of surrounding circumstances and the vague possibility that concerted action—such as the formation of trusts—may bring relief.

In the meantime the brewer, unwilling as yet to reduce the wages of his workmen, and equally loath to produce an inferior quality of beer, can find no way by which to recoup losses arising from diminished sales and an expense account based upon the former more favorable conditions. Sooner or later the exigencies of a desperate situation will compel him to resort to either or both of these expedients, and even then it is questionable whether the relief sought will be obtained. It is perfectly well understood in theory that the consumer must ultimately pay any excise tax, but when such a tax causes decrease of consumption, both the manufacturer and retailer must in one form or another bear a part of the loss. Doubtless, the consumer already pays part of the tax; for while the price of beer by the glass or measure has not been raised, the quantity given for the old price is smaller; nevertheless, the burden of the tax rests most heavily upon the manufacturer, who needs immense sums of ready money for the purchase of stamps, thus investing capital which for many weeks and even months remains practically dead, yielding no return and swelling his loss account, caused by delinquent debtors, to prodigious figures. The brewers lose enormous sums, as we have stated, because their operating expenses remain the same, while, on account of steadily decreasing sales, their profits grow less from day to day.

Besides this, for some reason or other, brewers do not succeed in collecting the whole amount of the tax; in many instances attempts to do so only resulted in augmented book accounts; in others, compromises had to be effected in order to hold trade. The pressure arising from competition naturally operates along the lines of least resistance, and hence, in this respect, too, the smaller establishments are the greatest sufferers, in spite of the fact that the larger producers—to their credit be it said—have sought and still seek to protect them. What the fate of the smaller establishments would be if the additional tax should be continued can easily be inferred from the fact that there are in all about 1,800 brewers in the United States, of which number 100 brew one-half of the entire quantity of malt liquors produced in our country, while the remaining 1,700 manufacturers produce the other half, averaging 10,000 barrels per brewery. If under such alluringly favorable conditions trusts and combinations upon a large scale have not yet been formed, it is because the assurances given both by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and of the Finance Committee of the Senate justified the hope that upon the termination of the Spanish-American war the additional tax would be remitted. We are fully aware that the extraordinary expenditures growing out of this war have not yet reached their limit; but we would respectfully submit that this is no reason why our industry should continue to bear an insufferable burden, while two-thirds of the legitimate and easily available revenue sources of our country do not pay, and for the past thirty-two years have not paid, a single dollar of internal revenue, while the tax upon distilled spirits remains unchanged and neither domestic wines (when sold in bulk or by the measure) nor native ciders pay any taxes whatever.

The additional tax of $1 per barrel upon malt liquors represents, as we have stated, 40 per cent of the aggregate receipts derived from all sources under the new revenue act. The whole tax of $2 per barrel represents 40 per cent of the price of our product. We hold that there is not even a semblance of a reasonable argument by which could be justified the imposition of such an enormous tax upon an article of general consumption—a beverage which forms an essential part of the daily diet of the great mass of the workingmen of this country, and which at the same time served great hygienic and moral purposes, inasmuch as its popularization has minimized the evils resulting from the former general use of ardent spirits.

The continuance of this double burden, imposed at a time when the market value of our product had dwindled to less than one-half of the price which prevailed when the old war tax was imposed, can not but result in the destruction of a large proportion of the brewing plants of this country. The enormous decrease in the consumption of malt liquors, which has taken place within five months after the imposition of the additional tax, and the present depressed condition of the trade may serve as a reliable gauge of the injury which the continuance of the tax will inflict upon the industry. The crippling of the brewing industry means not only the impairment of the most valuable source of revenue and of one of the more important wealth-producing factors; it also means the jeopardizing of the interests of agriculture, of innumerable allied trades, of the brewery workingmen, who now receive much higher wages than the average mechanic in any other branch of industry, and last, but not least, of the consumer who, when the process of crushing the weaker manufacturers and combining the larger producers into vast trusts shall have been accomplished under the operation of the inexorable

*The wages of brewery workmen are as follows: Foreman, $8.50 per week; engineman, $7.50; coopers, $8; laborers, $5 per week. The average price of ale per barrel is $8.75, and of porter, $7.50. The prices of materials are, as a rule, not as high as American prices. The beer dealers' license (wholesale) costs $16 and the retail beer sellers' license, $3.

economic conditions produced by this exorbitant tax, will ultimately be the sufferer in more than one way.

It is universally admitted that the gigantic strides with which, within the last forty years, the cause of true temperance has progressed toward its goal are almost exclusively attributable to the substitution of the mild fermented beverages for distilled spirits as the common drink of the people. This substitution, the aim and object of every civilized government of our time, would have been impossible without a broad discrimination in favor of fermented liquors in point of the relative proportion of taxes imposed upon the two kinds of drinks, and the determination to tax fermented drinks as lightly as possible.

In all Federal excise legislation, beginning with the first bill proposed by Alexander Hamilton, this policy found unequivocal and emphatic expression, and Congressional debates prove beyond a doubt that the master minds of our people were at all times its most ardent advocates. The recent excise act is not merely a departure from this policy, but a complete subversion of it; and the inevitable result will be a relapse into the deplorable condition of things which in past years had placed the American people in the foremost ranks of "hard-drinking nations."

In respetfully submitting the foregoing statement of facts upon which we base our petition for a reduction of the tax upon malt liquors to the former rate, we rely upon the justice of our claim no less firmly and confidently than upon that sense of fairness and equity which ordinarily guides the lawmakers of a great nation.

Respectfully submitted for the—

United States Brewers' Association, C. William Bergner, president; New York Lager Beer Brewers' Board of Trade, W. K. Clarkson, president; Ale Brewers' Association of New York and New Jersey, James M. Fuller, president; New York State Brewers and Maltsters' Association, C. G. Pankow, president; Ohio State Brewers' Association, Percy Andreae, president; Philadelphia Lager Beer Brewers' Association, C. W. Bergner, president; Boston Brewers' Association, Gottlieb F. Burkhardt, president; Brewers' Association of New Jersey, Gottfried Krueger, president; Brewers' Association of St. Louis and East St. Louis, Ellis Wainwright, president; Baltimore Brewers' Exchange, Joseph H. Straus, president; Buffalo Brewers' Association, Charles G. Pankow, president; Chicago Brewers' Association, Theodore Oehne, president; Cincinnati, Covington, and Newport Brewers' Association, Louis J. Hauck, president; Detroit Brewers' Association, Julius Stroh, president; Milwaukee Brewers' Association, Adam Gettleman, president; Rochester Brewers' Association, John C. Enders, president; San Francisco Brewers' Association, W. A. Frederick, president; Connecticut Brewers' Association, N. W. Kendall, president; Louisville Lager Beer Brewers' Association, J. F. Kellner, president; Pittsburg and Allegheny Brewers' Association, H. Frauenheim, president; Brewers' Association of New Orleans, La., August Schwedge, president; Cleveland Brewers' Association, W. F. Gehring, president; Albany and Rensselaer County Brewers' Association, N. B. Taylor, president; Colorado Brewers' Association, Frederick Neff, president; Ale and Lager Beer Association of Oneida County, N. Y., F. Fred. Ralph, president; Onondaga Brewers' Club, Syracuse, N. Y., George Zott, president; Toledo Brewers' Association, James Pilliod, president; Columbus Brewers' Association, Carl J. Hoster, president; The Indiana Brewers' Association, F. W. Cook, president.

Porto Rico.

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS H. TONGUE,

OF OREGON,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, April 11, 1900,

On the bill (H. R. 8245) entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues for the relief of the island of Porto Rico, and for other purposes," and the Senate amendments thereto—

Mr. TONGUE said:

Mr. SPEAKER: The policy of protecting American industries and American labor from foreign competition is not involved in the passage or defeat of this bill. When that fundamental doctrine of the Republicanism of Lincoln, as well as of McKinley, comes in question, I shall be found supporting it in the future as I have supported it in the past. The country abandoned it in 1894. The abandonment brought industrial paralysis, national and individual bankruptcy. It was restored in 1897, and the restoration brought revived industry, national and individual prosperity.

As a permanent national policy, I am in favor of free trade with Porto Rico. I am in favor of unrestricted commercial intercourse with the people of those islands as soon as such a policy is consistent with their welfare and their duty to the people of the United States. As soon as possible the people of Porto Rico should have the same commercial privileges and should perform the same commercial duties as the States and Territories that have hitherto composed the United States. There should be no discrimination and no favors. Their commercial privileges should go hand in hand with their commercial and economic duties.

There are no circumstances or conditions that would justify the imposition of any tariff upon any of the products of Porto Rico imported into the United States under the claim of protecting any of our own industries against such competition. Porto Rico can not now and will not at any time be able to send to the United States any products to an extent that will reduce in the slightest degree the price of any of the products of American industry. Her exports of sugar amount to about 50,000 tons annually. This is less than one-fourth the products of a single beet-sugar factory of the United States. We purchase from foreign nations annually 1,400,000 tons, and the consumption of sugar is constantly on the increase. The sugar and tobacco that Porto Rico can send to the United States are too utterly insignificant to affect the prices of these articles here.

Let us briefly examine the various provisions of the pending bill, so far as it deals with the imposition of duties. Under the present law the full duties required by the Dingley law to be collected upon foreign merchandise imported into the United States are collected upon like goods imported into the United States from Porto Rico, and similar duties are collected upon certain articles imported into Porto Rico from the United States. As soon as the present bill becomes a law all of these duties are removed at once, absolutely, upon all necessary food products going from the United States into Porto Rico. Eighty-five per cent of present duties are removed at once from all articles of commerce passing between Porto Rico and the United States either way. All other duties of every kind upon all goods passing between Porto Rico and the United States are to be removed absolutely in two years, and as much sooner as a legislature elected by the people of Porto Rico shall so decide.

The permanent policy, therefore, of this bill is unrestricted commercial intercourse between Porto Rico and the United States. The only interference with present absolute unrestricted commercial intercourse is the retention for a brief period of 15 per cent of the present duties upon a few articles, principally upon sugar and tobacco, coming from Porto Rico into the United States. This will cease, in any event, at the expiration of two years. The people of Porto Rico, under this bill, are given the absolute power to terminate it at any moment. This brief retention of these slight duties is the only portion of this bill that has been subjected to unusual and severe criticism. Why not absolute free trade? Why retain any duties upon any portion of its commerce?

I regret the conditions that make it necessary. But we are confronted with conditions with which, as practical men and practical legislators, having in view and at heart the best interests of the people of Porto Rico, we are required to deal and deal now. We are not called upon to legislate for one class of people alone, not simply for the rich planters whose domains number thousands of acres and whose annual products of sugar run up to thousands of tons. We are not required to legislate alone for the merchant, the trader, or the middleman. These classes of people, able to send to this Capitol interested representatives demanding legislation in their own interest, are not all of the people of Porto Rico. There is a vast mass, ignorant, poor, unable to comprehend our institutions or this proposed legislation, who have no knowledge even of its pendency, that we must also take into consideration in legislating for these islands.

When the people of Porto Rico receive the same commercial privileges accorded to the several States of the Union, they must be prepared to perform reciprocal duties. Let us see what those duties are. In every State of the Union we are enforcing our internal-revenue laws, including war taxes. We are collecting from the people of the United States under this law annually many million dollars, collected from every State of the Union, and are placing every dollar of that in the Federal Treasury. We are collecting at the several ports in every State in the Union import duties upon foreign merchandise, and every dollar of that is paid into the Federal Treasury. We are collecting in one form or another throughout the United States, in order to pay the expenses of the Federal Government, about $600,000,000 per annum.

In addition to that, the several States of the Union who are bearing their share of these burdens, contribute their share of these taxes, are raising within themselves by taxation upon their own citizens and upon their own property all the revenue needed to maintain and support their local, State, county, and municipal government, to support their schools, improve and repair their roads, maintain their courts of justice, preserve order, and care for their general welfare. In some instances these local taxes amount to 3 per cent or 4 per cent of the valuation of their property. When Porto Rico has full commercial privileges she should perform these duties. When the President advised that it was our "plain duty" to give Porto Rico free trade his recommendation implied that it was the "plain duty" of Porto Rico to submit to our internal-revenue laws, and that the money so collected, as well as that collected under our tariff, should be paid into the Treasury of the United States; that it was the "plain duty" equally of Porto Rico to raise by local taxation whatever more was needed to support local government, maintain order, support schools, improve and repair roads, maintain the courts, and carry on municipal government, organize and pay the police force,

preserve good order, and carry out sanitary regulations. The President certainly intended, and expected, that while it was the "plain duty" of the people of the United States to give to the people of Porto Rico the same commercial privileges as those enjoyed by the States and Territories of the Union, it was equally the "plain duty" of the latter to bear the same burdens and perform the same economic duties. Are the people of Porto Rico able, are they willing, are they ready to perform these "plain duties?"

Are they ready to perform a single one of them? Does anyone who criticises this bill advocate the performance by the people of Porto Rico of a single one of these "plain duties?" Why not? What justification or what reason? If there is no justification for the retention of this small duty, is there one justification why Porto Rico should not perform these duties? The bill, as introduced by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, like a similar one introduced in the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Ohio, while granting free trade to Porto Rico, extended the internal-revenue laws over the island, as over each State in the Union. While people have hysterically demanded to know why a portion of that bill was changed in a small way, in the retention of small duties, no one has demanded to know why the features of this bill in reference to internal-revenue taxes were changed.

It will be noticed that under the provisions of this bill Porto Rico is exempted from every form and provision of our internal-revenue laws, an exemption that applies to no other portion of the United States. It will be observed that the people of Porto Rico, under this bill, will be practically exempted from all forms of property taxation, an exemption, I believe, enjoyed by no other portion of the United States. It will be further observed that they are exempt from paying into the National Treasury any money collected as duties upon foreign goods, an exemption applying to no State or Territory of the Union. This policy was not contemplated by the President's recommendation, or in the bills introduced in either House in pursuance of such recommendation.

No one asked why this change. Vigorous attacks are made upon the retention of this small duty. No criticism whatever or question raised about granting to the people of Porto Rico exemption from all other forms of taxation. Has there been a single man opposing this bill at either end of the Capitol or the editor of a single newspaper who has proposed or who now proposes or even suggests that Porto Rico should perform a single one of these "plain duties" performed by every State in the Union or bear a single burden borne by other States of this Union? Have these gentlemen coming from Porto Rico, including those who, while residing there, never intended to become citizens, and who represent not the people of Porto Rico, but its wealth, its sugar, its tobacco, and its trade—have either of these gentlemen, while demanding every privilege of American citizenship, offered to bear a single burden or perform a single duty incident to such citizenship?

There has not been a single man opposing this bill or favoring it, in Congress or out of it, in Porto Rico or the United States, who has suggested in the remotest way that Porto Rico could now or should contribute a single dollar to the Federal Treasury toward defraying the expenses of the Federal Government, as do the citizens of every State and Territory of the Union. The utmost that has been offered by gentlemen claiming to represent Porto Rico, while demanding the total abolition of tariff duties, is that one-fourth of the amount of taxation prescribed by the internal-revenue laws of the United States might be collected, and the amount so collected turned over to the people of Porto Rico toward defraying the expenses of their government.

They demand exemption from every other form of direct or property taxation, a privilege enjoyed by no civilized people living, and we have conceded it. They have demanded substantial exemption from the internal-revenue laws of the United States, and we have conceded that. They have demanded to retain every dollar collected as duties upon foreign commerce, and we have conceded it. When this bill becomes a law, there never has been, there is not now, any portion of any civilized nation on earth so favored in taxation, so lightly taxed, as will be the people of Porto Rico. And yet we are accused of "oppressing Porto Rico." A more malicious slander, a more glaring falsehood, could not have been uttered. It is said that this bill is without precedent. We concede it. Never in all the history of our country has any portion of the United States, any State or Territory, been so favored, so lightly taxed, as will be the people of Porto Rico under this bill.

I have said that the enactment of this bill was intended to meet in a practical, humane way existing conditions that we were compelled to confront. They are conditions for which no one is responsible. They are conditions that probably will not arise at any other time, in any other way. What are they? What are the conditions that justify the imposing of this small amount of duty; that justify exempting the people of Porto Rico from duties and burdens that are borne by every citizen of the United States? What are the conditions that justify withdrawing the ordinary methods of supporting local government, retaining this small tariff, and applying all the money collected under that as well as from foreign commerce to defray the expenses of local government in Porto Rico? Let us examine them briefly.

In the first place, we have destroyed the government under which the people of Porto Rico have lived for centuries. To organize a new government, complete in all its branches, with the necessary machinery for the assessment of property and the collection of taxes, must necessarily be slow. Money is needed to pay governmental expenses while this machinery could be organized. While this is being done government in some form must be carried on, courts must be maintained, schools must be supported, roads must be repaired, order and peace must be preserved. All this requires money, and money for this purpose means taxation upon something, and paid by somebody. The machinery for the collection of the small taxation imposed by this bill is now in existence, fully organized, in running order, and to operate it in the collection of the taxes retained by this bill will cause no delay and add no additional expense. The method of collecting it is simple, inexpensive, efficient, and can be enforced now. This is one advantage that commends it, but this is not the only one.

The principal reason for the passage of this bill is that if local government existed, if the machinery necessary to assess property and collect taxes was in full operation, it is alleged by those in a condition to know best that taxation sufficient to pay the necessary expenses of local government, carry on schools, improve and repair roads, dispense justice, and preserve order could not be collected from the people of Porto Rico in their present condition. Does anyone opposing this bill sincerely believe otherwise? I know the gentleman from Maine, who was so hampered by the Constitution that he could see no way from keeping a convicted and confessed criminal from membership in this House, after admitting that it would take three or four million dollars for these purposes, stated: "It is conceded that by the ordinary methods of taxation this amount must be raised." Who concedes it? No one but the gentleman from Maine. What does General Davis, the governor of the island, with much better opportunities to observe, have to say on this subject?

But in August a calamity came upon the island the like of which it is impossible to cite an example. I believe there have been similar calamities, but they are fortunately unknown to the people of the United States. In one day two-thirds of all the current wealth was obliterated; it was wiped out in one day. Everyone knows that such a calamity can not occur without disarranging everything, commercial, industrial, and social.

The coffee lands suffered worst. These trees are planted on the hill and mountain slopes, and in many places the declivities are very abrupt. The gale tore up the trees, loosened the soil, and the deluge of water converted the earth into a semifluid.

Then followed landslides, and thousands of acres of coffee plantations slid down into the valley; trees, soil, rocks, and every vestige of culture are piled up in the bottom of the valleys. In such cases there is no restoration possible, for where there were smiling groves are now only bald rocks which were uncovered by the avalanches.

Where the soil was not disturbed the most of the coffee trees were either uprooted, broken off, or stripped of foliage and the immature berries. The larger trees of other varieties, which are habitually grown for shade to the coffee, were blown down, and their protection to the coffee trees is also gone; so where the trees are not wholly denuded, the protection of the berries from the sun's heat is absent, and the green fruit is blighted and spoiled.

It will take five years to reestablish these coffee vegas, and there will be necessarily years of want and industrial paralysis.

It seems to me that Porto Rico has got to realize in some way $5,000,000 a year from taxes at least. It ought to be much more than that, but at least $5,000,000 for municipal government and insular government, including public works and schools.

Five million dollars is two and a half times more than I can collect from taxes, to say nothing of the hurricane, and perhaps five times as much as I can collect now. To bridge over that means must come from somewhere, or this prostration will continue.

The municipal governments are many of them prostrate; the police can not be paid, the prisoners can not be fed, and the schools must be closed if not wholly supported from the insular treasury.

I quote the following from the testimony of General Davis before the Senate committee:

Judging from the capacity of the island to pay taxes, and on the basis of present tariff rates and the condition of their industries, I should say it would be imprudent to obtain more than a million and a half from all sources.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Suppose we should repeal the tariff so as to have free trade with the United States?

General DAVIS. That would cut it still more.

Mr. PETTIGREW. How much?

General DAVIS. It would cut it about in two.

Mr. NELSON. What does your plan contemplate in regard to customs and internal-revenue taxes? Are they to go into the general fund or be devoted exclusively to that country?

General DAVIS. It is, of course, immaterial where the money comes from, but they must have a large revenue to administer the affairs of the government. My suggestion is that all collections inure to the country; but I am looking to see the sources from which a revenue can be obtained. A general system of taxation to produce revenue enough to carry on the government would amount to confiscation.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Can you collect revenue enough to maintain the government?

General DAVIS. Not for two or three years on any basis.

Mr. NELSON (to General Davis). Have you any system of taxation akin to our internal-revenue taxation?

General DAVIS. Only on two articles. One, the liquor tax, of which I have spoken, of 3 cents a liter, and the other a tax on matches, the manufacture of matches.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you levy the tax readily, or with difficulty?

General DAVIS. With difficulty; no man pays his tax readily.

He further testified that the people dependent upon the coffee industry had been fed by the charity of the Government and $800,000 expended in their relief. He states further:

I have not felt it proper for me to discuss Congressional matters, filling, as I do, an executive position. I have expressed my views fully, however, on Porto Rico's needs; and I might say, if Congress should adopt free trade, the receipts of the custom-houses would naturally cease. One million five hundred thousand dollars has been collected during the fiscal year, and with free trade this will fall off. What, then, will run the island?

Although I have received no official advices regarding an appropriation, I understand through the newspapers that an appropriation was decided upon, and I infer that this appropriation will be spent on insular government expenses. If free trade is adopted, I can not see how the necessary funds for conducting the affairs of the island are to be raised by myself or those who succeed me.

Two million dollars are the present expenses, and this amount will be needed annually. There is only a small revenue incoming from stamps, liquors, tobacco, and mercantile licenses, and it is impossible to collect taxes because of the conditions.

The assessable value of the property of Porto Rico is said to be about $100,000,000. To raise the amount conceded by the gentleman from Maine to be necessary would require a tax of from 3 to 4 per cent of the valuation of this property. To attempt to collect this tax, in the opinion of General Davis, "would amount to confiscation." It is conceded that our complex internal-revenue laws are unsuited to present conditions of the people of that island. An attempt to enforce them all at once, without due preparation, under present conditions, would be difficult and oppressive and, in the opinion of some eminent gentleman, would produce riot.

These are the conditions in the island that confront us. We must deal with them as practical men. We must deal with them now. We should deal with these distressed people in the spirit of mercy, with due regard to their welfare, conceding them not only humane but generous treatment. How are we to solve these problems? They must be solved now. Those who favor this bill, and in whose views I sincerely concur, believe that the method prescribed by this bill will be the easiest, the least oppressive, and the most humane way temporarily to collect the revenue needed for the support of the local government of those islands. This duty will fall principally upon sugar and tobacco brought from the islands into the United States. These articles, of all others, are best able to bear a small share of taxation. General Davis, in his report, has stated that during the late storm "the sugar industry has suffered much less than others."

It must be remembered that in past years the sugar industry has borne many burdens under Spanish government from which it would be exempted under ours. Yet it has exported to and sold in the United States three-fourths of its output, paying full Dingley duties, and has yet prospered. During all this time, with a magnificent soil and climate, specially suited to that industry, superior to our own, it has paid but 30 cents per day for its labor. Its climate and the fertility of its soil will continue; cheap labor will continue. The taxation paid under this bill will be less than the taxation paid in direct taxes by the American sugar producer for the support of his local government. It is idle to say that this tax will be oppressive, that these people are unable to pay it. There is no tax that could by any possibility be levied in Porto Rico that would be so wholly upon wealth and the burdens of which would fall so much upon the shoulders most able to bear it as the small tariff retained by this bill. But if this bill is not right, why have we not something suggested in its place? How would its opponents meet existing conditions?

Revenue is necessary. How is it to be raised? The Democratic minority of the Ways and Means Committee, in a lengthy, carefully, and ably written report, propose absolutely nothing. Nearly the entire report is taken by an argument as to the unconstitutionality of this bill, and a very small portion of it by denouncing the bill as oppressive. There is some plausibility in the former position. The latter is absolutely without foundation. The gentleman from Nevada, who also prepared a special minority report, based his objection upon the unconstitutionality of the bill. It is singular that he himself wrote, approved, and voted for a resolution—passed two years ago and still in force—in reference to Hawaii, which is as follows:

Until legislation shall be enacted extending the United States customs laws and regulations to the Hawaiian Islands, the existing customs relations of the Hawaiian Islands with the United States and other countries shall remain unchanged.

This is still the law for Hawaii.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL], who prepared a separate minority report, bases his objection to this bill upon the following grounds:

The pending bill is, in my judgment, a well-considered measure from a fiscal standpoint, and is likely to produce a sufficient revenue. I am unable to give it my support, because it does not follow the rule of uniformity prescribed by the Constitution—a rule which, in my opinion, governs Congress in legislating for the Territories of the United States.

While objecting to the constitutionality of this bill, he voted for and supported the resolution which I have just quoted in reference to Hawaii. Just why and how it is unconstitutional to levy a tax of 15 per cent of the Dingley duties upon commerce with Porto Rico, but constitutional to levy a tax of 100 per cent of the Dingley duties upon commerce with Hawaii is something I am unable to comprehend. A distinguished Senator from Minnesota proposed that this tariff be omitted and that 15 per cent of the taxation prescribed by our internal-revenue laws, except the tax upon checks, drafts, and other commercial papers, be collected, and that applied to the government of the island. Such a bill would exempt wealth and tax poverty. The wealthy merchant who draws checks upon his banker for the payment of his daily expenses and purchases his imported wines and imported cigars would be exempted from such a tax.

Under such a system commercial transactions involving vast sums of money would escape taxation and its burdens be shifted upon simple medicines administered to the sick and dying. The taxgatherer would pass by the bank, pass by the palace of the sugar king, pass by the homes and business houses of the wealthy, and enter the chamber of the fever-stricken peon and the hovel of the lonely mother watching over the cradle of her dying child. The small manufacturer and dealer in cigars, out in some hut in a small village, would be driven out of business by the taxgatherer and his family to starvation, while Mr. Finlay, the sugar king, forty years a resident but not a citizen of Porto Rico, the man who is able to spend his time and his money in efforts to reduce this small duty upon his production, would revel in wealth and escape the taxgatherer.

Another remedy suggested has been that we should empower a commissioner to borrow money at 7 per cent interest per annum, mortgage the island, and turn it over to what our Populist friends delight to call the "minions of wealth," the "bloated bondholder." I submit that a government, like a private individual, should not borrow whenever it can pay its way. There are many interests in the island that can not bear taxation; we are exempting them. There are many people in the island requiring relief and charity, and we are bestowing both upon them. But this is no reason why we should not tax the people that can bear it, or that we should not collect taxes where they can be collected without injustice, without oppression, and without hardships to anyone. We ought not to mortgage the heritage of a coming generation in order to exempt the wealthy few of this.

THE PRESIDENT'S RECOMMENDATION.

But it is said that the President and members of his Cabinet have said that it was our "plain duty" to grant free trade to Porto Rico and that we are disregarding his recommendation. This is an exceedingly shallow subterfuge. When the President described our "plain duty," he anticipated that it would be the "plain duty" of Porto Rico to assume the corresponding financial burdens and perform the corresponding financial duties. He recommended free trade as a relief to the people of Porto Rico. The bills introduced in both Houses of Congress were in pursuance of this recommendation.

Only after more careful consideration into the conditions of the people of the island, and their interests more carefully examined and more thoroughly known, was it found that to enforce such a policy, instead of being merciful, would be cruel and impossible of enforcement against the people of Porto Rico in their present condition. It was found that internal-revenue taxes could not be collected as prescribed by our laws; that sufficient money could not be raised by local taxation without great oppression and, as stated by General Davis, without "actual confiscation." It was found these people could not perform the duties that were borne by the people of every State of the Union. Even the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LITTLEFIELD] says: "What Porto Rico wants is help, and help now."

Under these circumstances it was found that the President's recommendation did not go far enough toward the relief of this island. It was found that it would practically give no relief at all to the people who need it most. Industries that are entirely prostrated, with nothing to sell, could not be benefited by free trade. There is no tariff upon coffee, and yet it forms 75 per cent of the products of the island and is absolutely prostrated. What relief would it be to the coffee interest to give free trade in sugar and tobacco and then tax the devastated coffee plantations in order to support local government?

What relief would it give to the poor laborers, receiving 30 cents a day for two days in the week, with nothing to sell, to give free trade in sugar and tobacco, and then collect internal-revenue taxes upon the cigars that he smokes and the medicines he administers to his sick child? Something more than the President's recommendation was needed for these people, further relief than the President thought of recommending. We could not feed them

with one hand and tax them with the other. And so the gentlemen who had introduced bills in accordance with the President's recommendation found that if enacted into law they were impracticable, harsh, and cruel.

Now, with all due deference to the intelligence of these gentlemen, including the President of the United States, I do not believe that either of them, at the time the President made his recommendation or at the time these bills were introduced, thoroughly comprehended the wide-spreading distress in the island of Porto Rico. This was only fully realized when the effect of the bills which had been introduced began to be contemplated and when General Davis appeared before the committee and gave his testimony. Then these gentlemen were face to face with conditions that they for the first time fully realized and at last fully comprehended. Then it was found that giving free trade to Porto Rico would afford no relief to those who suffered most, were most needy, had nothing to sell, and who are in the greatest distress; that it would help only those who needed no help.

On the other hand, in the helpless condition of such a large portion of the people the enforcement of internal-revenue laws and the collection of property taxes would be extreme cruelty. It was from pity for their distressed condition and in an honest attempt to relieve as far as possible their distress that the bill was devised. It was in their interest that they were relieved from all local taxation and all internal-revenue laws, and this small duty imposed upon the wealth and trade and commerce of Porto Rico, and all the duties collected under it applied to the support of local government. This goes much further for the relief of the distressed people of those islands than the President or the members of his Cabinet had thought of going.

Accused of antagonizing the President? We have discharged practically all the "plain duties" enjoined upon us, while relieving Porto Rico from performing any of the "plain duties" the President must have expected her to perform. After the President in his generosity had pointed out the way of mercy, we have advanced beyond him as the greater need appeared, and he will doubtless gladly advance to our side. It is said this bill is without precedent. Yes; I grant it. The conditions of distress in Porto Rico are without precedent. The generosity of this bill toward the people in distress is without precedent. No government on earth ever treated any portion of its people with greater magnanimity than we are treating the people of Porto Rico. Not from the first acquisition of American territory has this Government at any time passed any legislation so extremely liberal and charitable to the people of any of its acquired territory.

THE TRUSTS OPPOSE THIS BILL.

But we are told the "trusts" and the "protected grafts" have forced the passage of this bill. It is said that the president of a distinguished college has stated if this tariff is adopted it can be said that the "trusts went down to Washington and grappled the Republican party by the throat and made it choke to their advantage." The gentleman who uttered this remark is either the most reckless descendant of Ananias or is in total ignorance of the subject he attempts to discuss. A more reckless and groundless falsehood could not have been uttered. Yet this charge is being repeated by those who ought to know better, who either do know better or who could know better with the slightest exertion to obtain the necessary information.

A peculiar coincidence is the fact that the newspapers of this city, which have for months been singing the daily praises of the millionaire Senator from Montana and denouncing those who attempted to convict, at last practically have convicted him of bribery, are the ones most loud in declaring that the "trusts" are interested in this bill. If the trusts wanted this bill they could adopt the same methods to secure the support of these newspapers that has doubtless been adopted by the Senator from Montana. What trusts want this bill? No attempt has been made to signify them. We are told the sugar interests and tobacco interests. What sugar interests and tobacco interests? The sugar growers and tobacco growers? Have these people organized a trust? If so, when, where, under the laws of what State, in what name? But these interests are opposing this bill because it is not protective and because the tariff is too low. But by reference to "sugar interests" and "tobacco interests" the intention is to induce the people to believe that the great corporations known as the sugar trusts and tobacco trusts are in favor of this bill.

The gentlemen who make these assertions know better. Neither of these trusts produce any of the raw material of either sugar or tobacco. Each buys its material in the crude form, transforms it to the finished product, and sells it in that form. They are interested in the cheap crude product and high price for the finished product. They have been constantly in favor of free raw material, the form in which they buy, and a high tariff upon the form in which they sell. These people buy cheap and sell dear. They are now for free trade in crude sugar and tobacco. There seems to be a singular confusion of ideas in reference to the interest of the producers of beet sugar and the sugar trust. They are natural business rivals.

The beet-sugar factories in almost every instance refine their own product. They both produce and refine sugar. Their ultimate business is to sell refined sugar. The sugar trust produces no raw sugar. Its entire business consists of purchasing the raw sugar, refining, and selling the refined article. As the beet-sugar industry will grow, the output increase, the beet-sugar factories sell more refined sugar, and the business of the sugar trust will decrease and grow less. Beet-sugar producers want a high tariff upon both raw and refined sugar in order to increase the price of both. The sugar trusts want free raw material, cheap raw sugar, but want a high tariff upon the refined product. The attitude of the sugar trust is pretty clearly outlined in the following interview of Mr. Havemeyer, the president of the trust, taken from the Chicago Tribune of a recent date:

> The sugar king, in discussing the whole situation, was plain and outspoken regarding the position of Porto Rico and the Philippines, and declared that there was no reason in the world why sugars should not be admitted free of duty from those countries. "I am much in favor of it," he said, "and I believe the time is not far off when they will be admitted free of duty. Why, both of those countries are part and parcel of the United States, and no matter what action Congress takes, I am confident the Supreme Court will hold that the products of those colonies are entitled to free entry here.
>
> "There is no more reason why a duty should be placed upon the products of Porto Rico than on stuff coming into New York from Long Island. There is only a wide ditch between the United States and Porto Rico. Well, if Porto Rican sugars are brought in free, it will not be long before some similar policy is adopted with reference to Cuban products."
>
> It is Cuban sugar the trust wants to be admitted free.

But I wish to ask a question of those who are so loud in clamoring for the defeat of this bill, for fear it might aid the sugar trust. I have called attention to the resolutions passed two years ago retaining the full Dingley tariff upon commerce between Hawaii and the United States.

Under treaties previously existing, the validity of which, of course, the Dingley law recognized, unrefined sugar was imported from Hawaii into the United States absolutely free of duty, while there was a tariff upon refined sugar. These provisions were clearly satisfactory to the sugar trust and plainly in accordance with their interests.

Early in the session of 1898 Mr. Dingley introduced in the House a bill, H. R. 11186, which was passed by unanimous consent, extending the revenue laws of the United States into Hawaii. Under this bill all customs duties between Hawaii and the United States were abolished, enacting absolute free trade. This removed the duties upon refined sugar.

The bill promptly went to the Senate, where it was buried, never saw the light of day, has never yet been passed, and to-day there is still the old duty upon the importation of refined sugar from Hawaii into the United States. Why do not these newspapers, these zealous public servants, who are so anxious to defeat this bill for fear it might benefit the sugar trust, have something to say in reference to the long delay of the bill removing duty from refined sugar in Hawaii? Those patriotic Senators who could not support this bill, where are they? What have they been doing during the past fifteen months? Why have they not passed that bill? Why has not the United States Senator who has had charge of that bill for fifteen months, who could not support this bill, urged the passage of that? Why is not this protection for the sugar trust removed, and why is there no public clamor against its continuance?

Why such a clamor all over the United States for free raw sugar, a cry in which the sugar trust joins, and a deathlike stillness in reference to free importation of refined sugar from Hawaii, a cry which the sugar trust desires and is anxious to still? Why so much clamor where the sugar trust desires clamor and will profit by clamor, and such deathlike, prolonged silence where the sugar trust wants silence and where their interests are subserved by silence?

This great trust desires to purchase the sugar of Porto Rico at the least possible price. It has also purchased substantially all of the product in the island. It bought it at the world's market price. Whether it comes into the United States free or pays full Dingley duties, it will be sold to the people of the United States at exactly the same price. Does anyone suppose that this trust is debauching Congress to induce it to pass a law that will force it to pay taxes? We must not forget that when these trusts wanted a law upon which a Democratic President stamped the words "perfidy" and "dishonor," they went to a Democratic Senate and a Democratic House of Representatives. We are now told that the statement that the sugar trust has bought the product of Porto Rico is not correct.

It has been repeatedly stated upon the floor of this House and upon the floor of the Senate that the sugar and tobacco trusts have bought substantially and now own the entire product of the island, except a small amount in the hands of a few wealthy planters and merchants. This has not been successfully contradicted or denied. They bought this while, as the law then stood, it required them to pay full Dingley duties when imported into

the United States. Whatever reduction of tariff is made will, for the present at least, inure to their benefit and for the benefit of the men who now own the crude material.

We are told, however, on the authority of Mr. Finlay, the British vice-consul at San Juan, who is a very wealthy sugar planter, described as possessing vast estates, that all the sugar and tobacco in the island "belongs to the planters themselves; that there is not much of it anyhow, as all but this year's crop was exported long ago." He further assures us that sugar has been imported into Porto Rico for local use. This gentleman proves too much. If there is no sugar in Porto Rico to be imported into the United States upon which duties could be collected, why these "tears?" Why complain about a tax that is levied upon nobody, reaches no property, imposes no burdens, and even collects no revenue?

Why has that gentleman remained so long in Washington, so bitterly antagonizing this bill? We are assured by one of the members of the Ways and Means Committee that this gentleman has been one of the most persistent lobbyists that has ever approached the portals of the Capitol. We are assured that according to this gentleman's own admission, should an absolute free-trade bill be passed he himself would be enabled to make $100,000. It can work no hardship to him, if he should be allowed to make $85,000, and the remaining $15,000 be contributed in the way of taxation toward supporting the government. But if this crop has been all sold, to whom has it been sold? Who was the purchaser? There can be but one answer to this question. There is but one purchaser in the United States on the Atlantic seaboard of unrefined sugar.

This is the great corporation of which Mr. Havemeyer is the head, and commonly called the sugar trust. But where is this sugar? In what warehouse? In Porto Rico or in bonded warehouses in the city of New York? In either place a large part of it has not yet paid duties. This fact we do know, that the last sugar crop of Porto Rico is not reported as sold in any of the commercial reports in reference to that island. Mr. DOLLIVER, a member of the Ways and Means Committee, who has had a full opportunity to investigate this question, has stated publicly upon the floor of the House, has made a statement that is contained in the RECORD, which points very clearly to the forces that are behind the opposition to this bill. I quote his language:

It is said that the sugar trust and the tobacco trust are behind this bill. That fact is, if we may believe the correspondent of the Associated Press, that two crops of sugar and tobacco are now on hand in Porto Rico awaiting shipment. There are 5,000,000 pounds of tobacco and the sugar crop of two years, not in the hands of the people of Porto Rico, but piled up by speculators in the warehouses of San Juan and other seaport cities of the island, now chargeable, if shipped to the United States, with full duties under the Dingley law, held there in bulk waiting for the profit that will accrue from free trade.

A gang of speculators, mostly Americans, have been hounding members of Congress for weeks. This syndicate of sugar and tobacco brokers are even now jostling one another in the corridors of this Capitol pleading, with sordid hypocrisy, for the people of Porto Rico. This bill does not suit them because it diverts from their pockets a portion of the profits which they had hoped to reap, puts it into the Treasury of the island of Porto Rico, and devotes it to the pressing necessities of that stricken and unfortunate people.

If these facts are not true, if this sugar is not in the warehouses of Porto Rico or in bonded warehouses in the United States, the people who have made such tremendous opposition to this bill would have been able to furnish the specific proof of the unreliability of these statements. The principal people, then, interested in the defeat of this bill and in the free admission of sugar into the United States is this great overshadowing trust, and not the sugar planters of Porto Rico. But if still in the hands of sugar planters, they are wealthy men, well able to pay this tax. General Davis describes them as follows:

The small proprietors are disappearing, for the capitalist so arranges his business in Porto Rico and nearly everywhere else as to force the small proprietors to sell their holdings. The tendency in the sugar business, as in all other requiring large aggregations of capital, is to combine or consolidate. While the population is steadily increasing, the number of small proprietors is steadily decreasing, as shown by statistics.

In producing coffee and tobacco the necessities or advantages of combination are not so urgent; but since sugar can not be produced at a profit without large concentrated investments, it is only through combines and trusts that the best commercial success will be attained. Should the development of the cane industry in Porto Rico approximate that achieved in Mauritius, Barbados, and Hawaii, the cane lands will be ultimately owned or practically controlled by these huge "central" proprietors. There will be a few thousand owners, managers, overseers, clerks, etc., and many hundreds of thousands of peon laborers, whose social and, if we may judge by numerous examples in other countries, industrial conditions will be the same as now, and without hope of improvement.

Nowhere in the world, save in the United States and Hawaii, is sugar now extensively produced on a basis of a wage rate for field and mill hands exceeding, say, 30 cents per diem, and in many tropical countries the rate is not above 20 cents.

Considering the world's enormous acreage suitable to cane cultivation and the teeming population available, it is probable, indeed almost certain, that, whatever be the price at which sugar may be sold, the peon will still remain in a state of serfdom and generation after generation, living in fief to a merchant monopoly, will be able to earn only the wherewithal to indulge in drink, debauchery, and vice.

The planter has been paid; the laborer has been paid. Neither can receive any further benefit nor be called upon to submit to any further burdens. So far as the present crop is concerned, with the exception of the very small number of wealthy men, they have absolutely no interest in this bill. Whether this tariff is maintained or not, the people of the United States will pay the same prices for refined sugar. Whatever tariff is removed will for the present benefit these trusts: whatever is retained will be paid by them. Whether duty is collected upon the next crop will depend entirely upon a legislature to be elected by the people of Porto Rico. Those who want relief from the law can apply to a Porto Rican legislature. But for the present, at least, the tariff collected under this bill will be paid by the sugar and tobacco trusts and a few men of wealth in Porto Rico who now own the entire product of the island.

Conclusive proof of this is furnished in the fact that a short time ago, when $2,000,000 in duties had been collected upon sugar and tobacco imported from the island of Porto Rico into the United States, it is known and admitted that $1,800,000 of that sum was paid by the great corporation known as the sugar trust of New York. Suits have been instituted in the United States courts to recover duties so paid, upon the ground that the exaction of such duties was illegal and unconstitutional. This great corporation is plaintiff in suits to recover $1,800,000.

The greatest friend of this sugar trust, the one who has introduced a measure providing it the greatest relief and conferring upon it the greatest benefit, is the Senator from the State of Arkansas, the chairman of the national Democratic committee. He some time ago introduced in the Senate of the United States an amendment to the bill, placing the duties above collected in the hands of the President, to be used in the government of Porto Rico, as follows:

[H. R. 9080. Fifty-sixth Congress, first session.]

In the Senate of the United States. March 15, 1900. Ordered to be printed.

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. JONES of Arkansas to the bill (H. R. 9080) appropriating, for the benefit and government of Porto Rico, revenues collected on importations therefrom since its evacuation by Spain, and revenues hereafter collected on such importations under existing law, viz: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That all duties collected to this date upon articles imported into the United States from Porto Rico since the 11th day of April, 1899, the date of the exchange of ratifications of the treaty of peace between Spain and the United States, be returned to the persons from whom they were collected, and from and after the passage of this act no duties shall be collected on articles coming from Porto Rico.

The object and purpose and effect of this amendment was plain. Instead of conferring upon the people of Porto Rico this vast sum of money to be used in the government of the island, it would have bestowed it as an actual gift to this great trust. When purchasing the sugar it was bought at the world's price and subject to the full Dingley duties. Even the Senator from Arkansas has been practically forced to admit that the money he sought thus to return would have gone into the pockets of the sugar trust. Attempting to explain this bill a short time ago he states that at the time he introduced it: "I had never looked to see who had paid these revenues nor where this money would go. I am not in the confidence of the sugar trust. They have not come to me to complain of that duty by which they paid $1,800,000. I did not know that such was the fact." The Senator makes no attempt to deny "that such was the fact" or that "they paid $1,800,000." "Where ignorance is bliss, 'tis folly to be wise."

These are the people above all others who want immediate free trade. These are the people and the only people, aided by a very few wealthy men in the island of Porto Rico, who have maintained a lobby at Washington to defeat this bill and secure immediate free trade. The issue involved in the passage of this bill is between the wealthy, the trusts and sugar kings, on the one hand and the distressed people of Porto Rico on the other. One of the issues involved in the bill is whether great corporate wealth, by adopting the methods lately resorted to to defeat this bill, corrupting the sources of information and deluding the public, will be able to avoid just and equitable taxation.

The only people who are interested in the passage of this bill are those who would otherwise pay the taxes to support the government in Porto Rico. This bill removes the burden of taxation from the shoulders of the poor and the needy, those who have suffered destruction of property and business by storm and flood, and places it upon the shoulders of the wealthy, where all taxation should be placed.

But it is claimed that this bill is in the interest of protected "grafts." Is there an intelligent person in the United States who believes for a moment that the imposing of 15 per cent of the Dingley duties upon 50,000 tons of sugar imported from Porto Rico would add the thousandth part of 1 per cent to the 2,000,000 tons annually sold and consumed in the United States? If so, I can not hope to inform him or convince him. What protected graft is clamoring for this bill? Oh, we are told that Mr. Oxnard favored it. Who is he?

I have not seen or heard of a member of either House, outside of the committees before whom he appeared and testified, who has seen or conversed with or knows him. It seems that he is interested in two small beet-sugar factories, the total product of which

is 18,000 tons of sugar per annum. He claims, I believe, to represent other sugar producers, but who want full Dingley duties from Porto Rico, the Philippine Islands, Hawaii, and from Cuba. To this claim the present bill is a defeat.

It is claimed, however, that while this bill is in itself not material it is to be proposed and urged as a precedent to satisfy "protected crafts" who will labor and work to keep out the products of Porto Rico. I think the most serious and by far the most honest opposition to this bill is based on this objection. It is largely founded upon an honest mistake. For this the Ways and Means Committee is not altogether free from blame. The first bill introduced came as a surprise, without adequate explanation. It was entitled "A bill to regulate the trade of Porto Rico, and for other purposes."

Upon its face, it was unlimited in duration. It was calculated to, and did, produce the impression upon the minds of many, including myself, that it was intended and designed to enter upon a permanent policy of placing a tariff upon the products of Porto Rico for the purpose of attempting to protect some American interests from this insignificant competition. When the conditions, however, of Porto Rico were explained, when the needs for providing temporary revenue for the island were set forth, when it was urged with some reason that a small tariff would be the easiest and most convenient way to raise such revenue, until normal conditions of the island could be restored, a different question was presented.

Believing that such a measure, if not the best that could be devised, was at least a reasonably good revenue measure, we asked that the bill be so changed that this purpose should be made manifest and apparent on its face; that everything that looked like even adopting a policy of protection against Porto Rico should be stricken from the bill; that it should be limited in operation to the present necessity of the island, and that there should be nothing remaining that could be construed as a precedent for entering upon a policy of protecting ourselves against ourselves and against the small producers of the island of Porto Rico. This demand was readily complied with. The title was changed and a preamble added to the bill, as follows:

An act temporarily to provide for the relief of the island of Porto Rico, and for other purposes.

Whereas the people of Porto Rico have been deprived of markets for a large portion of their products, and have lost property and crops by severe and unusual storms, whereby they are impoverished and are unable to pay internal revenue and direct taxes; and

Whereas temporary revenue is necessary for their schools, their roads, and their internal improvements, and the administration of their government: Now, therefore,

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, etc.

Then an additional section was added to the bill limiting its operation, which is as follows:

SEC. 5. This act shall be taken and held to be provisional in its purposes and intended to meet a pressing present need for revenue for the island of Porto Rico, and shall not continue in force after the 1st day of March, 1902.

These amendments were fundamental. They changed the entire character and scope of the bill. The charge so often brought against others, as well as myself, who opposed the first bill, but supported this, that we have changed our attitude, is not borne out by the facts.

The bill has been changed to conform to the attitude and position that we occupied then and do now. These amendments proclaim as distinctly as it is possible to proclaim that the settled policy of the Government of the United States toward Porto Rico, so far as a settled policy can be enacted by any law, is one of unrestricted commercial intercourse. That is the declared purpose of this bill, as it is the declared purpose of its supporters. It is set forth as distinctly as it can be set forth that the purpose of retaining this small tariff is one under special and peculiar circumstances and conditions, never likely to arise again, and to answer a present and pressing need.

But it is claimed that the bill is in conflict with the following provisions of the Constitution:

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Whether or not the term "United States" in that provision, as well as every section of the Constitution, meant the States forming the Government or the entire territory belonging to the Union has been a disputed question and will continue to be disputed until it is finally settled by the Supreme Court of the United States. Before the solemn decision of that august tribunal we shall all bow with profound respect. I shall not, however, enter upon a question which has been so ably discussed by men of ability, experience, and learning on both sides of this Chamber.

But from the time of Jefferson until now the legislative and executive departments of the Government have uniformly construed the Constitution in their dealings with the Territories of the United States in conformity with the principles upon which this bill is sustained. There has been at no time any government for any of the territory framed by any Congress of the United States that would be constitutional upon the construction of the Constitution contended for by those who oppose this bill. There is no government now in force in any of our Territories valid under their theory of constitutional construction. We are taxing Alaska without representation. We are taxing it in a way that we tax no other portion of the United States.

If this bill is a violation of the provisions of the Constitution, which I have cited, the taxation of Alaska is equally unconstitutional. Every provision suggested in the place of this bill for raising revenue in Porto Rico equally violates the foregoing provisions of the Constitution. If that applies to Porto Rico, we have no right to levy only a portion of the internal-revenue laws of the United States. We must levy them all in Porto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippine Islands. We would have no right to exempt them from any taxation borne by any of the people of the United States, and provide for the support of the government, either by loan or by direct appropriation from the Treasury. If this provision applies to Porto Rico, she must pay full internal taxation; the customs collected must be put into the Treasury of the United States, and she must support her local government by local taxation. The Republican party was founded upon a construction of the Constitution antagonistic to the attitude of those opposing this bill.

The Republican platform of 1856 declared:

Resolved, That the Constitution confers upon Congress sovereign power over the Territories of the United States for their government, and that in the exercise of this power it is both the right and the duty of Congress to prohibit in the Territories those twin relics of barbarism, polygamy and slavery.

The Republican platform of 1860 declared—

That the new dogma that the Constitution of its own force carries slavery into any or all of the Territories of the United States is a dangerous political heresy, at variance with the explicit provisions of that instrument itself, with contemporaneous exposition, and with legislative and judicial precedent; is revolutionary in its tendency, and subversive of the peace and harmony of the country.

This question of unconstitutionality of various measures has lost some of its terrors for me. A very large number of members of both Houses could see no constitutional way to accept Hawaii or annex the Philippine Islands or Porto Rico. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. LITTLEFIELD] could see no constitutional method of excluding from membership in this House one who is a convicted polygamist and living in open defiance of both the laws and public sentiment of this country.

Of the two gentlemen who drafted separate minority reports against this bill, one drafted and both supported a provision collecting full duties upon the commerce between the United States and Hawaii. The only Republican member of either the House or Senate now opposing this bill who voted against that resolution imposing full duties upon Hawaii is the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER]. But that gentleman opposed the acquisition of any territory, believing that we have no constitutional power to annex it.

Let me remark that every anti-expansionist, every opponent of the "Greater America," those who have bitterly opposed acquiring or retaining Porto Rico, the Philippine Islands, or Hawaii, have been leaders in declaiming against the constitutionality of this bill. Is it not fair to assume that the people who have inaugurated, supported, and defended the policy of acquiring and retaining our new territories can be trusted to honestly endeavor to give them good government? They are largely responsible for this new national policy. Whether it is to be a success or a failure, history will hold them responsible. Every instinct of their nature is to make it a success. The way to make it a success is to confer good government.

It is said that we are going to "establish tyranny" in the newly acquired territories, govern them without the Constitution, and grind them down with "cruel oppression." Singularly enough, some of those making this claim cite us to the success of England in governing her colonies, and urge us to follow her example. Do not these gentlemen know that in the government of her colonies the Parliament of England is restrained by no constitutional limitations of any kind whatever? The citadels of liberty are in the hearts of the people, not in its laws and constitutions.

If tyranny is to be maintained, it must be enacted by and with the consent of the American people; by a people in whom hatred of oppression and love of liberty have been intensified during centuries of struggle and sacrifice; by a people who poured out its best blood to strike the chains from the limbs of 4,000,000 slaves. These people can be trusted to administer just government to the people of our lately acquired territories, whether retrained by constitutional limitations or not. But no one questions that the Constitution adequately protects these people in the enjoyment of personal, civil, and religious liberty and the protection of life, person, and property.

It is said that public sentiment is against this bill. I admit it; but this is less true every day. No bill has been before Congress upon which the public possesses so little correct information.

No man has a higher regard for public opinion than I. None is more ready to yield it implicit obedience. The approval of our fellow-men, the respect of our neighbors and our friends, the indorsement and approval of the people whom we represent, constitute all the rewards of public life worth striving for. I would rather have the respect, friendship, and approval of the people with whom I live and whom I have the honor to represent than the wealth of a Rothschild.

The public opinion that has been aroused is not against the bill as finally passed by the House; least of all against the one as it passed the Senate. It is against the bill as originally introduced by the Ways and Means Committee into the House. When the present bill is understood, as it will be, it will, in my judgment, meet the approval of the people of the United States. Newspapers do not always, though in the main, voice the public sentiment. Hysteria does not always foreshadow mature public opinion. We have previously had to contend with hysterical outbursts during the present Administration.

When the President announced his declaration of war against Spain upon grounds well founded in international law and public justice, upon the ground that the Government of Spain in Cuba for a long series of years had been a menace and a constant danger to the peace, property, wealth, and lives of the American people, there was an outburst throughout the entire land of hysteria, denouncing the declaration as weak, nerveless, alleging that it should have been based upon the destruction of the *Maine* and founded upon revenge. This notwithstanding the fact that Spain disclaimed responsibility for that terrible disaster, offered to submit the question to the decision of any impartial tribunal, and abide by the full consequences.

It is now recognized by every sensible person in the United States that had the President yielded to this demand he would have rendered his country ridiculous in the eyes of the civilized nations of the earth, now and through all history. Hysteria did not prove in that instance to be mature public sentiment, though sustained largely by the class of newspapers who antagonize this bill. When a declaration of war was passed by the House and Senate, this same hysterical, emotional sentiment demanded that we must recognize the independence of the so-called Cuban republic, and go into the war with Spain as an ally and subject to the control of Gomez, and submit to his will and remain only during his pleasure. This hysteria entered the United States Senate and unbalanced the judgment of some of its oldest and ablest members.

It required firm and intelligent leadership in this House to restrain the emotions of its own members and resist its wild demand. The country now recognizes that the House, in resisting this apparent public sentiment, rendered the country a valuable service, and its conduct is approved by maturer public sentiment. History will repeat itself. Much of the criticism of this bill has been hysterical rather than reasonable. When hysteria subsides and this bill is examined by the American people, during their moments of sober judgment, they will approve its provisions. Does this statement that hysteria is dominant in demanding some of this legislation demand proof? It is at hand. This bill includes a provision for a local government for the people of Porto Rico, to which I reluctantly consent. Its passage has been procured by hysterical demands, in Porto Rico and in the United States, by a large portion of the press of the United States and by an apparent public sentiment.

Does any intelligent person claim that the members of this House know enough about the people of Porto Rico, or they about us, that we can form a government for them that they will understand, adapted to their conditions, and that will answer their needs? These people are alien to our race and language; they are foreign to and ignorant of our institutions; they are unpracticed in the art of self-government; they are uninformed, unlearned, and ignorant. Let me call attention to a description of them from a report of General Davis:

On the 25th day of July, 1899, an election was held in Adjuntas for municipal officers, and the registration was made in conformity to General Orders, No. 112.

The order imposed the following qualifications for electors: Men over 21 years old, able to read and write, or who were taxpayers of record, who had been actual residents of the island for at least two years and of the municipality for six months preceding the date of the election. The number who proved these qualifications before the board of registration was 906, out of a population, according to the census of 1897, of 18,506; that is, less than 5 per cent could vote under the conditions stated.

There was much public interest in this election, and it is believed that about all who were eligible were registered. This incident indicated that in the whole island there may be approximately 45,000 who could vote under the conditions of the order above referred to.

The class who can not fulfill these conditions, say 75 per cent of the males over 21 years of age, are usually in a state of abject poverty and ignorance, and are assumed to include one-fifth of the inhabitants.

They are of the class usually called peons. This word in Spanish America, under old laws, defined a person who owed service to his creditor until the debt was paid. While those laws are obsolete, the condition of these poor people remains much as before. So great is their poverty that they are always in debt to the proprietors or merchants. They live in huts made of sticks and poles covered with thatches of palm leaves. A family of a dozen may be huddled together in one room, often with only a dirt floor. They have little food worthy of the name and only the most scanty clothing, while children of less than 7 or 8 years of age are often entirely naked. A few may own a machete or a hoe, but more have no worldly possessions whatever. Their food is fruit, and if they are wage-earners, a little rice and codfish in addition.

They are without ambition and see no incentive to labor beyond the least that will provide the barest sustenance.

All over the island they can be seen to-day sitting beside their ruined huts, thinking naught of to-morrow, making no effort to repair and restore their cabins nor to replant for future food.

The remarks of Mr. James Anthony Froude, in his work on the English in the West Indies, apply with full force to these people:

"Morals in the technical sense they have none, but they can not be said to sin because they have no knowledge of law, and therefore they can commit no breach of the law. They are naked and not ashamed.

"There is evil, but there is not the demoralizing effect of evil. They sin, but they sin only as animals, without shame, because there is no sense of doing wrong. They eat the forbidden fruit, but it brings with it no knowledge of the difference between good and evil. * * * They are innocently happy in the unconsciousness of the obligations of morality. They eat, drink, sleep, and smoke, and do the least in the way of work they can. They have no ideas of duty, and therefore are not made uneasy by neglecting it."

Between the negro and the peon there is no visible difference. It is hard to believe that the pale, sallow, and often emaciated beings are the descendants of the conquistadores who carried the flag of Spain to nearly all of South America and to one-third of North America.

One family of industrious people, such as are found all over the United States, contributes more to the general prosperity and wealth of the country then ten families of these peons.

Would it not have been wiser to take time to learn something of their conditions, their needs, and their capacities? Would it not have been better to give them some opportunity to study our institutions and the form of government that we are about to give them? But a hysterical press has demanded that this bill must be passed now, by this Congress, at once, and so Congress is yielding to this demand. A bill for this government is passing this House without consideration of its principles, without full investigation by any of its committees, and the results of which no man can tell.

Let me consider this in connection with another portion of American domain. In Alaska are thousands of our own countrymen; they are of our own race, trained to self-government; no more intelligent men live upon any portion of the civilized earth. They are the soul of enterprise, full of energy; a large portion of them are men who graduated from the leading colleges and universities of this country. They are of the best we have. They are being governed now, as ever since we acquired that portion of our domain, without their consent. They are taxed without representation. They are demanding the right to have some share in their own government.

I join them in this demand. It is a just and equitable one and should be granted. For years their prayers have been unheeded. I have tried in vain to enlist Congress and a public sentiment in their behalf. The bill now pending for their relief has been sidetracked for this bill. The measure intended to grant them some relief now denies them representation upon the floors of Congress. These are our own people; people fighting for self-government; people capable of self-government; and yet the press, that in its hysterical cries is forcing us to grant self-government to a race and a people unfitted for it, ignorant of our language, our laws and institutions, has no word of sympathy for the people of Alaska, our own people, our own race and blood, whose rights and privileges have been for years denied. We are refusing them the very privileges that we are conferring upon an alien race in the island of Porto Rico.

Is this hysteria or sober sense? For two years longer than this bill will be in force the people of Hawaii, who came to us of their own volition long before we acquired Porto Rico, have been subject to full Dingley duties upon commerce between themselves and us. These burdens have been retained, in my judgment, without justification or excuse. We have attempted to urge upon the Senate to make other provisions, but in vain. The House long ago passed a bill removing these restrictions, but they have not yet been removed. Yet nowhere in the United States, not even on the Pacific coast, where our people are in close sympathy and trade relations with the people of Hawaii, has there been any cry for their relief or anyone to urge that the Senate should be expeditious in removing these duties. There has been no time for words of sympathy or justice to them. These newspapers could not spare for them the space in their columns, so taken were they with their comments upon this Porto Rican bill.

The issue presented by this bill is whether during a brief period, in order to raise the revenue needed for local government in Porto Rico, we are to tax the wealth of Porto Rico or its poverty; whether we are to remove the burdens of taxation from those who can best bear them and place them upon those whose property has been destroyed, whose industries have been ruined, and by storm and flood deprived of the means to purchase their daily bread; whether we are to attempt to collect the taxes to support the government of Porto Rico from those who are prosperous or from those who are dependent upon the Federal Government and its charity for the necessaries of life; whether we are to furnish them with food with one hand and remove it by the taxgatherer before their hunger is satisfied; whether we are to collect taxes from the half-starved mother before she can administer medicines to her sick, rather than from the full store of the occupants of the palaces of Porto Rico and New York.

There are no powerful interests supporting this bill. It benefits no people of wealth or influence. Every assertion to the contrary has been disproved over and over again. The Oxnards and Myricks do not want it, because every vestige of protection against Porto Rico has been removed. The only people who are to be benefited are the great masses of the people of the islands, whose present means of support have been destroyed, who are too helpless to utter a word in its favor, too poor to send a lobby for its support, and in most instances too ignorant to understand the nature of the contest being waged in their interest and for their relief. On the contrary, this bill is opposed by great wealth and political influence.

The sugar trust, the tobacco trust, the sugar kings of Porto Rico, who have amassed great wealth while living in Porto Rico and retaining foreign citizenship, have, by their agents, been in constant attendance upon this Congress, dogging the footsteps of its members, harassing the members of the committee, alternately cajoling and threatening them, have spared neither pains nor money to accomplish the defeat of this bill. Every public man, every newspaper, great and small, who opposed the acquisition of Hawaii, the acquisition of the Philippines and Porto Rico, opposes this bill.

Every newspaper in this city of whatever politics, whose columns have been daily filled with laudation of the millionaire Senator from Montana, and denunciations of those who have attempted to convict, and have practically succeeded in convicting him of bribery, oppose this bill; every newspaper, every public man who defended and supported the tariff policy that bankrupted this nation four years ago, and opposed the one adopted under which the land has become flourishing with prosperity, mistakenly supposing that their peculiar tenets were in some way endangered by this bill, have opposed its passage. There are many Republican Senators and Republican members of the House, whose temporary selfish interests would have been subserved by opposing it. Their names would have received great plaudits at home by the men who did not send them here.

The opposition to their reelection might have been less intense. In the scathing resolutions against this bill and its supporters that have been passed and will be passed by Democratic and Populist and fusion conventions their names would have been omitted. In every State of the Union they would have been praised as heroic and courageous statesmen by the enemies of the Republican party and its political principles. In every newspaper in the United States supporting Bryan and opposing annexation they would have been heralded as coming statesmen and their names inscribed beneath that of Bryan, Atkinson, MASON, and the latest acquisition to the Democratic party, the erratic WELLINGTON, of Maryland. They might even have enjoyed the exquisite pleasure of seeing their speeches and utterances against this bill circulated as campaign documents, in the interest of Bryan and the Chicago platform, by the Democratic national committee.

Under all these circumstances the fact that 96 per cent of the Republicans of this House have resisted all these temptations, withstood these promises of fame, the blandishments of wealth, and the threats of power, and have legislated in mercy, under the guidance of their conscience, according to their best judgment, for the welfare and protection of poverty and distress, is an exhibition of courageous statesmanship rarely excelled.

Trade of Porto Rico.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JACOB RUPPERT, JR.,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, April 11, 1900,

On the bill (H. R. 8245) temporarily to provide revenues for the relief of the island of Porto Rico, and for other purposes.

Mr. RUPPERT said:

Mr. SPEAKER: We have been privileged with many arguments pro and con concerning the right of Congress to impose legislation upon Porto Rico, which Congress could not, under the Constitution, impose upon any other Territory of the United States except those Territories which came to us through the provisions of the treaty of peace between the United States and the Kingdom of Spain. The lawyers of this body have argued both sides of this question with great ability, and no converts seem to have been made upon either side.

The theory that the Constitution controls wherever the United States, the Government of which was created by the Constitution, has jurisdiction has been most ably presented. Upon the other hand, the Republican lawyers have urged that the Constitution is limited in its operation, and the only really omnipotent power is the Congress which the Constitution created. Whether or not the created is greater than the creator, I will leave to the lawyers to argue.

I will leave for the lawyers the question as to whether the United States Constitution and the United States flag cooperate together and dwell in peace or whether at a certain point the flag and the Constitution become divorced, and in such cases whether it is an absolute divorce or only a limited separation. I leave this question for the lawyers of this body. I wish to speak as a business man and in behalf of the business men whom I represent. I do not care to discuss whether Judge Magoon was right when he said the Constitution did apply or when he said that it did not apply. I do not care to consider the merits of the opposite decisions of the learned chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

In New York the Secretary of War has been regarded as possessing some legal ability, and he decided that the Constitution did apply. The President of the United States has decided this question both ways. I think, therefore, that the most ardent supporter of this bill will at least admit that the question, from a purely legal standpoint, is a doubtful one. I do not think that any lawyer upon the Republican side will contend that his position is free from difficulties. I therefore pass by the consideration of the legal matters involved and present the case from a purely business standpoint.

The property we possess in Porto Rico, whatever the nature of that property may be, belongs to the people of the United States. It does not belong to any one man or to any set of men. The expenses incurred in the war which caused the annexation, or rather the transfer of the sovereignty, of Porto Rico to that of the United States were paid by taxes to which all of the people of the United States contributed in proportion. It is represented by all of the reports that we have had concerning the resources of Porto Rico that there are certain features of that island which will make it valuable property to the people of this country.

The benefits to be derived should be equally shared by the people of the United States. Those benefits bring with them corresponding obligations and duties. The President of the United States recognized the force of this observation when he stated that it was our plain duty to give free trade to the island of Porto Rico. At the time he wrote that message it was not a question of policy, but of conscience, with him. When, later, the voice of conscience became stilled, his policy changed. The reasons for that change have not been made public.

The question, then, to consider is a twofold one: How can we best distribute the benefits of our acquisition among the people of the United States, and how can we best discharge our duties toward the people of Porto Rico? In order to determine what is best for the people of the United States, it is necessary to consider briefly the nature of the benefits which are to be derived from trade with Porto Rico. Porto Rico is an agricultural country. Its products do not compete to any considerable extent with the products of the United States. Its sugar cane does compete with the cane of Louisiana.

But this competition is a very limited one. If every acre of land in the United States adapted to the raising of sugar cane was cultivated, and every pound of cane raised that nature will produce in this country, the supply would still fall far short of the domestic demand. Add the fields of Porto Rico to those of Louisiana and there would still be a deficiency in the home supply, although that deficiency would be materially decreased. Sugar is an article of universal consumption. Every man, woman, and child in the United States is directly interested and beneficially interested as a consumer in the increase of the domestic sugar crop.

As the supply would not equal the demand, the sugar crop of Porto Rico would not seriously conflict, if it would conflict at all, with the interests of the sugar grower in Louisiana. The other great product of Porto Rico is tobacco. Tobacco is raised in the United States. The crop of tobacco has steadily decreased in this country for several years past. The reason for this is that a large acreage of tobacco land is worn out and no longer produces in paying quantities.

It is a notorious fact among those people who are familiar with the tobacco trade that the acreage of bright leaf tobacco can not be increased in the United States. Nearly all of the Porto Rico tobacco is of a superior quality and does not compete at all with that produced in this country. We still import tobacco and cigars in large quantities. Every consumer of tobacco is directly interested in the increase of the home product.

The next great staple of Porto Rico is coffee. We have expended a very large sum of money in the aggregate trying to introduce the coffee plant into the United States. While there have been some partial successes, there has never been a paying crop of coffee raised in this country. Every consumer of coffee is directly interested in an American crop of that berry.

The people of Porto Rico manufacture practically nothing. They raise nothing which enters into competition with American products. They are customers for our manufactured goods, for our wheat, our corn, and our flour. They are customers for our coal and our iron. They are customers for what we produce and they are raisers of what we do not produce. They are an agricultural people, and yet they do not compete with us in any of our lines of agriculture.

The Republicans recognized that Porto Rico was an ideal country with which to have free trade; and James G. Blaine, when Secretary of State, chose Porto Rico as one of the first countries with which it was desirable to establish reciprocal free trade. And it is a fact known to every member of this House that during the three years of free-trade relations between the United States and Porto Rico sugar, coffee, and tobacco were purchased by the United States in large quantities, and in return the people of Porto Rico patronized our lines of agriculture and manufacture as they never did before and never have done since.

The Republicans were unanimous that the three years of free trade between the United States and Porto Rico were most prosperous years for both the United States and Porto Rico. So convinced are the Republicans that free trade with the West Indies would be advantageous to the United States that the very party which denies free trade to Porto Rico is endeavoring to establish it with other West Indian islands. I do not understand upon what sound business principle the idea can rest that it is to the best interests of this country to establish the blessings of reciprocal free trade with the islands of the West Indies owned by foreign nations and only deny them to the island which is our own.

The first reciprocity treaty which the United States ever consummated was under President Jackson, and established free trade with the British West Indies. This treaty was renewed by Secretary Blaine, and was heralded by him and the Republican party as a stroke of diplomatic triumph. A treaty with France is now being considered by the upper branch of Congress which establishes free trade with the French West Indies.

Every consumer of tobacco, sugar, or coffee is directly interested and would be benefited by free trade with Porto Rico. Every manufacturer, except three, and every workingman in every manufactory except those controlled by these three, and every farmer who raises live stock, wool, corn, or wheat, is directly to be benefited by free trade with Porto Rico. Three manufacturers would be injured by free trade with Porto Rico: The tobacco trust, the sugar trust, and the coffee trust. Establish free trade with Porto Rico and there will be competition in the manufacture of tobacco, refining of sugar, and the roasting of coffee.

Leave a tariff of 15 per cent upon these raw materials and these three manufacturers need fear no competition. The reason for this is plain. Under the rebate clause of the Dingley law goods imported for manufacture where the product is exported are entitled to a drawback of 99 per cent of the tariff paid. As these trusts control the export trade in these articles they would pay but 1 per cent of the 15 per cent, while any competitor would have to pay the whole duty. Any competitor would pay just one hundred times as much tariff as the sugar trust, the tobacco trust, or the coffee trust.

Mr. Speaker, who owns the island of Porto Rico? Do the people of the United States own the island, or do these three trusts own the island? If the treaty with Spain was between these trusts and Spain this bill is right. They should reap the benefits of it. If the treaty with Spain was made by the United States and not by the trusts, this bill is wrong. Now, let us consider briefly, and very briefly, as it is admitted in all of the public documents issued and all of the expressions from Republican leaders, what obligations rest upon the people of the United States under their relations with the people of Porto Rico.

Porto Rico had local self-government; and the inhabitants of Porto Rico were citizens of Spain, and entitled to the protection of the Government of Spain. Spain transferred her sovereignty to the United States. With that transfer of sovereignty passed the right of local self-government. If the citizens of Porto Rico did not become citizens of the United States, entitled to all of the constitutional privileges of such citizens, then without their consent they became deprived of all citizenship and were without a country. They were made outcasts from all nations without any fault of their own.

They welcomed the Government of the United States, believing that they had become a part of that Government. At the expiration of eighteen months they find that they have no citizenship; the United States courts have refused to take cognizance of appeals, and appeals have been perfected to the supreme court of Spain, which will probably refuse to take jurisdiction of them. It has been but a few days since men were goaded to death for criminal offenses. The act shocked the people of the United States, and they were even more shocked when they learned that the successful culmination of the war for humanity did not, in the opinion of the Executive of the United States, give him any power to be humane.

Nearly two years after Spain had transferred her sovereignty Spain was still the sovereign. This Spanish mode of execution could not be interfered with, and why? Because if the President of the United States had taken jurisdiction where the treaty gave him jurisdiction, it would have been an exercise of Executive authority under the Constitution, which would bring Porto Rico under the Constitution, and would deprive the trusts of the advantage which had been promised them.

Mr. Speaker, the American people thought, when they fought this war, that they were fighting it as a protest against Spanish atrocities on the Western Hemisphere. The American people, Mr. Speaker, have labored under the impression that they were victorious and that with the signing of the treaty of peace the atrocities ceased, and that the islands on the Caribbean were brought under the humane influences of the United States Government. That impression was shared by every Republican member of this House and by the President of these United States with his Cabinet until a few days ago.

Then the trusts notified the Republican party that the United States Government did not have jurisdiction over Porto Rico, but was only a conduit through which the jurisdiction over Porto Rico was to pass on its way from the Kingdom of Spain to the despotism of the trusts. The President learned, undoubtedly to his sorrow, and it must have been to his surprise, that he did not have the power to commute a Spanish sentence in Porto Rico or change a Spanish mode of punishment.

If this garroting was to have taken place before the trusts issued their mandate to the Republican party, the President of the United States, with his well-known humanity, would have interfered. But having adopted the position that Porto Rico was not a part of the United States, and the Presidential office being a constitutional one and its power only extending to the territory under the Constitution, he could not interfere. Our duty was to extend the blessings of liberty and freedom over the oppressed people of the island of Porto Rico. We would have performed that duty and never considered whether or not it was placed upon us by the Constitution if the trusts had not prevented.

With our plain duty in one direction and the fact, if it is a fact, that we are not compelled by the Constitution to perform our plain duty, and are certainly not compelled by that instrument to abstain from its performance in the other direction, the Congress of the United States refuses to do our plain duty because it holds that we are not compelled to do it. No Republican member of this body has pointed to a single provision of the Constitution which denies to us the right to do "our plain duty," and the only argument is that the Constitution leaves us as free moral agents to do right or not as we elect. True to its history, where it is free to do right or wrong, the Republican party considers this condition as a solemn mandate to do wrong.

The doctrine of humanity set forth in the declaration of war with Spain and carried out in our "benevolent assimilation" of the people of the Philippines, who are being benevolently assimilated into angels as rapidly as the uncertain weather of that archipelago will allow, we placed this robbery of the Porto Ricans upon the ground of "relief." They were rendered destitute by a hurricane, and their condition must be remedied. Their houses were blown away, and in order to alleviate their distress we must take the balance of their possessions by taxation.

Had they been prosperous, they would not have had to be taxed; but as they were shaken by the winds of adversity they must pay for an expensive and elaborate government. The principle of the bill rests upon a verse of the Scripture taken apart from its connection: "Unto him who hath shall be given, and unto him who hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath." This is the Republican doctrine of humanity.

This bill states that it is a bill for the purpose of providing revenues to conduct the government of the island of Porto Rico. There was collected in the ports of Porto Rico the sum of $2,000,000 in eighteen months. One-sixth of this only was collected upon the trade between the United States and Porto Rico; that sixth was $20,000 a month.

This bill provides for only one-fifteenth of that. Under this bill the difference between free trade with Porto Rico and the provisions of the bill is only $3,000 a month. It is estimated that the cost of the government will be $200,000 a month. If this bill were really for the purpose of raising revenue, it would provide much more revenue. It is for the purpose, and the purpose only, of preventing competition against the sugar, tobacco, and coffee trusts.

It is necessary to raise enough revenue for the economical administration of public affairs in Porto Rico. The Republicans have already provided that revenue for a year by donating $2,000,000 for that purpose out of the Treasury of the United States. The bill also provides for a local system of taxation based upon any principle that the local legislature may outline. In fact, there is no provision in the bill limiting the amount of taxes which may be raised in this way. The States and Territories of the United States have all deemed it necessary to make a constitutional limitation upon the power of taxation, but the authority vested in

the Porto Rico legislature under this measure is absolutely without limit.

There is a provision also that in case the taxes have not yet been collected, the Porto Rican officials can bond the island up to 7 per cent of the assessed valuation of the property of the island; and as they have absolute power to fix the assessments and there is no appeal from their decision in this respect, they can assess the property for seven times its value if they so desire and bond it for the full value of the property of the island.

There is no legislature in the United States given such absolute power to raise money. It is therefore seen that the Republicans knew very well how to raise funds for the administration of the government of Porto Rico without imposing any tariff upon the trade between Porto Rico and the United States. The Territories of New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Arizona did not have at the time of their organization a single dollar in revenue derived from customs.

There was no trouble whatever in making them self-supporting from the start by the usual system of taxation. Porto Rico has ports with a large foreign trade with other countries than the United States. Five-sixths of its customs revenue are derived from imports from other countries than the United States. It therefore had, independently of the question of free trade between Porto Rico and the United States, a very large source of revenue that was not possessed by any other Territory of the United States at the time of its organization.

Mr. Speaker, the business men of this country have spoken. The press of this country has spoken. The business men have not declared in favor of a tariff upon the trade between the United States and Porto Rico. The newspapers of the country have not so declared. The voice of the people has been heard, and that voice has demanded free trade between the United States and Porto Rico. It is claimed that the people of the United States and the press of the United States do not understand this question.

They understand this question precisely as the President of the United States, his Secretary of War, the Attorney-General, and the Republican members of this House understood it up to a few days ago. The opinion was then unanimous. It was not a partisan question; it was not a political question. Everybody knew that duty and policy both demanded that we should have free trade between the United States and Porto Rico. Suddenly, and without warning, a majority of the Republicans in Congress discovered that the entire world was wrong and that they alone were right. They had all been wrong, but suddenly some great light had broken in upon them.

I have listened in vain for any explanation or any attempted explanation of this sudden conversion. The people have not changed their minds, the newspapers have not changed their views, no new arguments are made, no new facts are discovered, but suddenly and without warning the Republican members of Congress act in direct opposition to the wishes of their constituents. If there had been any reasonable explanation, any legitimate inducement, any new fact or new conditions, it is certain that they would have been brought out during this debate.

But they have not been so brought out, and the business men of this country will demand of Congress some reasons for acting in direct opposition to the interests of the business community, and that reason must be much more clearly stated and definitely proved than it has been yet. The only argument which seems to have been brought to bear is that of the "party lash," and the hand that wields the whip is invisible. The whip can be seen plainly enough, but the business men want to know who has hold of the handle and why the Republican members of this House have been scourged into abandoning their principles and voting against the declared wishes of the President and his Cabinet.

Election of Senators by the People.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN A. McDOWELL,

OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, April 12, 1900.

The House having under consideration House joint resolution No. 28, proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing for the election of Senators of the United States—

Mr. McDOWELL said:

Mr. SPEAKER: The American people have a high regard for the Constitution of their country. They have abiding respect for and great confidence in the wisdom of the fathers who framed the greatest political instrument of all ages. How natural that an instrument which has served so well for more than a century the purposes of the best Republic of all ages should be regarded as sacred by the people. The almost universal veneration in which the Constitution is held by the people insures to a very great extent the perpetuity of the Republic.

The people do not suggest any change in the Constitution unless it be in the interest of better and purer government. The framers of the Constitution foresaw the probable necessity for amendments and made provision in the Constitution itself for amendments desired. Within ten years after the ratification of the Constitution eleven amendments were made to it.

In the Presidential election of 1800 the urgent necessity was shown for a change in the mode of electing President and Vice-President. In 1804 the twelfth amendment was ratified. From 1804 to 1865 it is well to note that not a single amendment to the Constitution was adopted. The thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments were the outcome of the civil war.

The proposition now under consideration is not a new one. The proposition to elect Senators by direct vote of the people was urged at the time of the adoption of the Constitution. The debates on the Federal Constitution in the Constitutional Convention do not show that any serious or valid objections were made against the right or the wisdom of the people to elect United States Senators. Mr. Madison and Mr. Mason, of Virginia, and Mr. Wilson, of Pennsylvania, all prominent men of the convention, advocated the election of Senators by a direct vote. They desired that the Republic should be created upon a solid and durable foundation. Mr. Madison expressed his idea in these words:

> The great fabric to be raised would be more stable and durable if it should rest on the solid foundation of the people themselves than if it should stand merely on the pillars of the legislatures.

Mr. Wilson said:

> If we are to establish a national government, that government ought to flow from the people at large. If one branch of it should be chosen by the legislatures and the other by the people, the two branches will rest on different grounds and dissension will naturally arise between them. I wish the Senators to be elected by the people, as well as the other branch.

The people of this country have for years been asking Congress to submit an amendment to the Constitution to allow them to elect Senators by a direct vote. The legislatures of the great States of Ohio, Pennsylvania, California, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Kentucky, Nebraska, and others, thirty-four in all, have expressed the sentiments of the people of these States by memorials and resolutions, praying Congress to pass a joint resolution providing for the amendment desired. This House has at different times passed a measure similar to the one proposed by the minority report. Such a measure passed this House in the Fifty-second Congress. Joint resolution No. 20, on the same subject, passed the Fifty-third Congress by a vote of 141 yeas and 50 nays. A like measure passed the Fifty-fifth Congress by a vote of 185 yeas and 11 nays. Notwithstanding that the House, on these different occasions, has acted in accord with the will of the people, the Senate has ignored the popular sentiment of the country.

But, Mr. Speaker, I believe that very recent experiences in the election of United States Senators—Senatorial deadlocks, scandals, and charges of bribery—should convince the members in the other branch of the American Congress that something should be done at once to avoid the repetition of these disgraceful experiences. At the beginning of this session of Congress there were four vacancies in the Senate, caused by deadlocks in the State legislatures. Investigations were instituted as to the right of two Senators-elect to hold their seats. These investigations were brought about by charges of irregularities and bribery.

Much valuable time of the legislatures is unprofitably used in fruitless attempts to elect Senators. It demoralizes the legislature, corrupts legislators, prevents necessary legislation, causes the people to have a less regard for our political systems and for public officials. What stronger evidence do we need for the necessity of a change in the mode of electing Senators than we have had in the last fifteen months in the various deadlocks and in the election of a Senator in Montana? One State after another is being disgraced in consequence of the prevailing method of electing Senators. Even my own State, the great State of Ohio, has felt the blighting influences of this pernicious method. I hesitate here to say how the good people of that State have been mortified over certain Senatorial elections.

Under the present mode time is not only wasted in the State legislatures, but time is wasted in the United States Senate in the investigations of elections and the validity of the appointments of Senators. In this session of Congress matters of general legislation have been set aside and postponed in the Senate in consequence of these investigations referred to. What the Senate may do is problematical. What the people want it to do is certain.

Give the people the privilege to elect Senators by a direct vote and the evils incident to the present method will be very largely, if not entirely, remedied. Legislatures will be free to enact laws for the people. State capitals will not continue to be the place where Senatorial seats are sold. [Applause.]

Let the people elect the Senators, and there will be decidedly fewer investigations in the Senate. More time can be had for

careful legislation. Fewer men will find seats in the Senate whose principal qualification under the present method is a long purse. The great corporate powers will not be able to place their own trusted attorneys and agents in the United States Senate to legislate for their special interests. Think of the number of attorneys for the great railroad companies and other gigantic combinations of wealth that have lately found their way into the United States Senate. Is it any wonder that the people are demanding the right to elect Senators by popular vote?

By the present method of electing corrupting influences are seen at work in the county primary elections. Through influences of political rings and machines persons are selected as candidates for the legislature on condition that they pledge themselves, if elected, to support a certain man for Senator. This is the chief purpose and motive of their candidacy. They frequently do not make known their intentions in this direction. They feel no burden of responsibility to represent their people in the matter. How can such persons be true representatives of the people on any matters? Submit the election of Senators to the people, and political bosses and rings will receive a severe blow. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, several of the Southern States have made commendable improvement on the mode of electing Senators. Their candidates for Senators go before the people at their primary elections. The candidate receiving a plurality of votes is the choice of his party. This is practically choosing Senators by a direct vote, although the legislatures ratify the choice of the people, or make the election in accordance with the requirements of the prevailing method. In these States there is a universal demand for the right of the people to elect. The method they now pursue does not result in deadlocks or produce great scandals.

Let Senators be elected by popular vote and there will always be a choice. We shall not have great States with half representation in the Senate, as we have to-day. State legislatures will not be so violently disturbed by bitter political contests. The Senate itself will be elevated in the estimation of the people; the Senators being chosen by the people, will have their confidence in a larger degree than they now have.

I shall support the proposition that comes from the minority of the committee. We want a uniformity in the method of electing Senators. The proposition recommended by the majority of the committee allows the people to elect whether they will choose Senators by the present method—through the legislatures—or by direct vote of the people. The proposition of the minority of the committee is to elect by direct vote. I believe that the States that have expressed a desire for a change of the method of electing Senators are all in favor of electing by a direct vote of the people.

I count it a happy privilege to cast my vote for the measure recommended by the minority of the committee. For one, I am willing to trust the people. It can not be maintained that legislatures select better men than would be elected by the people. He who is afraid to trust the people should not be trusted by them. Heretofore the Senate has stood in the way of this legislation. It may for a time refuse to adopt the pending joint resolution, but I believe it will be forced to yield to the pressure of public opinion in the end. [Applause.]

Rural Free Delivery.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN A. McDOWELL,

OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, April 24, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 10301) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901—

Mr. McDOWELL said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am opposed to the amendment striking out the word "experimental." I believe the rural free-delivery service is still in the experimental stage, and the Department is proceeding carefully and judiciously with the idea of giving it a fair trial. Furthermore, if this service is not to be regarded as experimental, the employees in the service would lawfully come under civil-service rules, and I doubt whether this House, after careful consideration, is ready to place rural free delivery under civil service.

In replying to some remarks made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. MADDOX], it is true that Ohio had, on December 1, 1899, 83 routes established. That is not too much for the great State of Ohio. We never get any more than we want, and we are always going to get all that we can. [Laughter.]

Now, I do not believe it is true that it has taken begging, as some gentlemen have said, to get these routes established. I have had nine routes established in my district, more than have been established in the State of Georgia, according to the statement of the gentleman [Mr. MADDOX]. I did not have to beg for them. We presented good petitions, containing more than 100 families, oftentimes supplying five or six hundred persons. Some of these routes did away with fourth-class post-offices and eliminated carriers, and the showing that is now made on these routes is very favorable. It demonstrates that the expense is very little, if any, more than the delivery of the mail to some communities by the star-route service.

Referring again to what the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. MADDOX] said, I do not think members need to feel that they are compelled to beg to secure this service. They should advise their constituents interested in trying to get rural free delivery to get up good petitions in thickly settled communities. Then personal attention to the matter on the part of the Congressman will secure the service. These matters are not secured without the asking.

Mr. MADDOX. If my friend from Ohio will allow me to interfere, I never charged that there was any trouble in getting one established in the State of Ohio. [Laughter.]

Mr. McDOWELL. It will be a cold day when Ohio fails to get what she so richly deserves. However, I do not think it would be difficult to get rural free delivery in Georgia. I believe the disposition of the Department is to be fair. But there is a good deal in the kind of petition that is presented and in the personal attention given to the matter by the Congressman.

Another thing, as suggested by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY], perhaps a great many of these petitions that members speak of have been filed within the last few months. It is true that applications made in Ohio many months ago have been investigated only within the last few weeks. I do not know of an application that has been filed since last summer that has yet been investigated. It takes time, and there is a very small force of special agents at work in investigating routes.

Mr. MADDOX. Well, that ought to be attended to.

Mr. McDOWELL. That is true, and perhaps with a larger appropriation we shall have a larger force of special agents. We know the appropriation made last year was exhausted when we met here in December, and the Department was not able to go on investigating routes where applications had been made. There are on file hundreds of applications which the special agents have not been able to get around to investigate. I have reasons to believe that the postal officials desire to be fair in the management of establishing this service. I had a letter not long ago in reply to an application in my own district, a letter from the special agent, and he said that there were other districts in the State that did not have but one or two routes established, and it was necessary for him to go there and investigate proposed routes and establish the service, where found feasible, before he could go to districts that already had quite a number of routes in operation. I take it that no one can reasonably object to this method of procedure.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we are to have an appropriation for this service this year more than five times as large as that of last year. This will enable the Department to have in operation probably about five thousand free-delivery routes. It will not be found practical or desirable for the present to have the same number of routes established in each State, the same number in each Congressional district, or the same number in each county. The interest of the people in the service (whether they desire it or do not desire it), the density or sparseness of population, and the condition of the public roads are determining factors in the extension of this service. In public-spirited communities the service, no doubt, will rapidly find its way.

Rural free delivery and good roads are inseparably connected. We must either have good roads as a condition for rural mail service or the coming and continuance of rural free delivery will bring good roads. It is difficult to say which of these will be the more beneficial to the people. The coming of either should be hailed with delight. [Applause.]

When this Government went into operation under the Constitution, in 1789, there were but seven post-offices in the United States. To-day our postal service stands unequaled by that of any other country in revenues, cost, efficiency, or in the appreciation of the public. Every decade has been marked with steps of advancement. Letter postage has been reduced from 25 cents to 2 cents. Villages that a few years ago received mail once a week now receive mail once or twice a day. But the inauguration of rural free mail service marks the most important step in postal progress that this country has seen in the last half century. [Applause.]

Rural free delivery is certain to be a great factor in the development of the rural communities. It will have a most marked effect upon the intellectual and material progress of these communities. Who can estimate the value to the farmer of receiving

daily papers at his door to give him news of current events and the daily market prices of products he has to sell or to buy? An accurate knowledge of market prices will often save him from being wronged by shrewd and tricky dealers. Give the farmer rural free delivery, and the time saved, which would be required to go after his mail, will be money in his pocket. He can well afford to take more newspapers and periodicals and write more letters. His home will become a school for the study of important public questions and great events.

Every community in which rural free delivery is established will be considered a more desirable locality in which to reside. There will be found better educational and social influences, more refinement and culture. Farm property, other things being equal, will be more valuable in such communities. In our country homes have been reared the brightest, the wisest, and the ablest men of the past and the present, and by giving to the rural regions the increased mail facilities afforded by rural free delivery the educational agencies of these homes will be further increased and the rural homes will continue to give to the professions, the trades, and the various vocations the strongest and best men and women. [Applause.]

I am glad to see members of this House so much disposed in favor of legislation to benefit the farming communities. There seems to have been a grand awakening on some of the subjects in which farmers have a vital interest. For years the agricultural population of this country has been asking for rural free delivery. Congress has been gradually increasing the mail facilities of the cities, giving them from two to nine free deliveries a day and establishing branch offices accessible to all. It is only fair and equitable that the farming interests should have a fair share of the modern facilities of our admirable postal system.

The farmers bear a very large part of the burden of taxation. They pay taxes as cheerfully as any other class of citizens. But it is an indisputable fact that farmers have not had equitable consideration in matters of general legislation.

It is time that Congress should cease to legislate continually and exclusively for other interests, and to ignore the interests of farmers, who are the very foundation of our social and commercial institutions and the bulwark of our Government.

It is gratifying that the Post-Office Department is able to make so favorable a showing of the successful operation of this service. On many routes the service is already self-supporting. In consequence of the establishment of this service the postal receipts have materially increased. We may reasonably expect continued favorable showings from the workings of this service.

Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of rural free delivery. I could cheerfully support even a larger appropriation than the bill under consideration carries. But I commend the committee in their generous response to the earnest and just appeals of the farmers of the country. [Applause.]

Late Representative Richard P. Bland.

REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. JONES,
OF VIRGINIA.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, April 7, 1900.

The House having under consideration the following resolutions:

"*Resolved*, That the business of the House be now suspended in order that suitable tribute may be made to the high character and eminent public services of the Hon. RICHARD PARKS BLAND, late a most distinguished member of the House of Representatives of the United States from the State of Missouri.

"*Resolved*, That as a mark of respect for the memory of the deceased the House, at the conclusion of these memorial exercises, shall stand adjourned.

"*Resolved*, That the Clerk of the House transmit a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased statesman, and inform the Senate of the action of this body"—

Mr. JONES of Virginia said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I met the distinguished Missourian, in whose honor these memorial exercises are held, for the first time at the opening of the Fifty-second Congress. That was the beginning of his tenth term as a Representative in Congress and my first.

For years Mr. BLAND had occupied a conspicuous position in national politics, and long before it was my good fortune to form his personal acquaintance he had attained high distinction as a patriot and a statesman, and had impressed his views on a great public question upon the legislation of his country.

He was born in the State of Kentucky, but was of a family which had settled in that region when it was a part of Virginia. Among the patriots whose names reflect luster upon the history of that Commonwealth are those of the Bland family of colonial and Revolutionary fame, and from that historic family was descended RICHARD PARKS BLAND, so that the strong conviction, inflexible purpose, indomitable courage, and intense patriotism which dominated his life and illustrated his long and splendid public career, may be said to have been his birthrights.

The House of Representatives of the Forty-fourth Congress, the second of which Mr. BLAND was a member, was the first since the year 1859 over which the Democratic party exercised control. In 1873 silver was denied free access to the mints, and the financial panic which so soon followed its demonetization swept the Democratic party into power at the ensuing Congressional elections. Mr. BLAND, in common with almost every member of his party in Congress, and with many of those of the opposition party, believed that the ills which had befallen his country resulted from this financial legislation, and he at once set himself resolutely to the task of righting what he regarded as a monstrous wrong inflicted upon the American people, and the proud distinction is his of having written the free-coinage measure which passed the House of Representatives by an overwhelming majority in December, 1877, just four years after his advent upon the national theater.

It was this legislative achievement which first brought Mr. BLAND into national prominence, and from that moment until the close of his useful life he was justly regarded as the foremost advocate of bimetallism in America.

It is true that this bill never became a law, but it made possible the passage of the compromise measure known as the Bland-Allison Act, by which the Treasury was authorized to purchase not less than $2,000,000 nor more than $4,000,000 worth of silver bullion monthly at the best rate obtainable, and to coin it into dollars for which certificates might be issued, the dollars to remain in the Treasury to meet their redemption upon presentation.

Under this act, which became a law on the 28th of February, 1878, by far the larger part of all the silver currency now in circulation was coined or issued, and it must be conceded to be the most beneficial measure of silver legislation in all the history of the United States. Whilst it is true that Mr. BLAND lived to witness, twelve years later, the repeal of this act, it is equally true that, however much the minds of some others may have undergone change upon this great monetary question, there was no abatement in his loyalty and devotion to the silver cause up to the last moment of his life.

When the national Democratic convention assembled in Chicago in 1896 Mr. BLAND was very generally regarded as the logical candidate for the Presidential nomination of his party. Indeed, it is not too much to say that but for the electrical effect of Mr. Bryan's matchless speech the great silver champion would have received the nomination. I recall with a feeling of pride that, as the chairman of the Virginia delegation in that memorable assemblage, I had the honor of announcing upon three successive ballots that the 24 votes of my State were cast for RICHARD PARKS BLAND, and it was not until it became apparent that he could not be nominated that he failed to receive those votes. The failure to realize his great ambition, if, indeed, he ever coveted that great distinction, to lead his party in the great contest in which the dominant issue was one with which his name was more prominently connected than that of any other living man, caused no diminution in his zeal for the Democratic cause and its chosen leaders. In the stupendous struggle which followed he bore a conspicuous part and contributed no small share in bringing about that great popular indorsement which the Democratic doctrine of the free coinage of silver received at the polls.

Although Mr. BLAND was profoundly interested in the monetary question, and devoted the best energies of his life in strenuous efforts to restore silver to its ancient place as a money metal, those efforts did not comprise the sum of his political creed or the measure of his legislative achievements. He was a Democrat in the truest and best sense of the word. He was thoroughly imbued with the fundamental principles of Democracy, and his belief in those principles was a part of his very life. He was not in politics for personal advantage, but because of a firm conviction that the advancement of the principles of Democracy would redound to the general welfare, and because he was profoundly interested in all those great public questions which, in his judgment, affected the well-being of society. He advocated the cause of silver not because he believed it would become popular, but rather because he was convinced it was a just cause. His mind was never occupied with devising shifts and turns for his own advancement. He despised with a righteous scorn the tricks and wiles of the small politician.

Mr. BLAND'S tastes were simple and his life was plain and unostentatious. He loved the simple virtues. In truth, he was one of nature's noblemen. His ability was great, his character stainless, his life pure; but his most marked characteristics, in my opinion, were his steadfastness of purpose and his modest courage. His Congressional career was distinguished rather by sincerity, earnestness, courage, and firm resolution than by any

extraordinary exhibition of genius. He was not eloquent, but he was forceful and convincing, and at times his speech was most impassioned.

In advocating what he believed to be just and right and in combating what he believed to be wrong he was unflinching, inexorable, and unyielding. The poet Lowell might well have had RICHARD PARKS BLAND in mind when he wrote of another:

To front a lie in arms and not to yield,
This shows, me thinks, God's plan
And measure of a stalwart man.

Memorial Address on the Late Representative Bland.

REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. ALLISON,
OF IOWA.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

Tuesday, April 10, 1900.

The Senate having under consideration the following resolutions, submitted by Mr. COCKRELL:

"*Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. RICHARD P. BLAND, late a Representative from the State of Missouri.

"*Resolved*, That the business of the Senate be now suspended in order that fitting tribute be paid to his memory.

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary be directed to communicate a copy of these resolutions to the House of Representatives and to the widow of the deceased."

Mr. ALLISON said:

Mr. PRESIDENT: Almost from the very beginning of his service in the House of Representatives it was my fortune to know Mr. BLAND well, and I fully appreciate the tributes paid to his memory by his friends and associates here.

The House of Representatives is a great forum in which to achieve distinction if a man has the opportunity to remain there, as Mr. BLAND had, for nearly a quarter of a century. I have sometimes thought that no man could so long remain in that body unless he had great qualities—first, the quality to endear himself to the popular heart of his local constituency, and next, to secure the confidence, respect, and esteem of his associates in the body in which he served. It is also necessary, however, that his environment politically should be of a friendly character.

Mr. BLAND'S term of service in the House of Representatives began on the 4th of March, 1873. We have now passed the 4th of March, 1900. Elected to the present Congress, if he were still living, he would have served here, with the exception named by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], for more than twenty-eight years. There is but one man now serving in the House of Representatives who was serving there during the first term of Mr. BLAND.

So that, without in detail speaking of the character and nature of his services in that body, it is a fitting eulogy upon him to say that during that long period he served uninterruptedly a single district in his State, and all the time enjoying their confidence and esteem. One can count on the fingers of his hands the men who from the beginning of the Government have served in the House of Representatives for so long a period. Therefore I am glad to say of him what so many before me have said—that he was an earnest, an honest, and modest man, but withal a man of highest ability.

He entered the House of Representatives at a time when many questions which had agitated the country, though not entirely settled, were practically disposed of. He entered that body at a time when not only in this country but in all the civilized countries of the world there were new agitations respecting the money question. Germany, with its hosts, had marched through the streets of Paris and secured from France an indemnity of a thousand million dollars and also two of her most valuable provinces. That success of Germany had a great political effect upon Europe, and it had a special effect upon the money situation of Europe. Therefore it was that in Europe the question of confining the money standard of Europe or of some of the great European nations to gold alone was agitated; and Germany, which had been for so many years a silver country, having the opportunity to use this enormous indemnity as a means, and a ready one, to change her money system from silver to gold, did so, without considering the effect such radical change would have upon the money standard of Europe and upon the exchanges in all the money markets of the world. At that time we were upon a paper basis, having neither gold nor silver in general circulation, though by law having nominally the double standard. The United States by law followed the action of Germany, hoping to soon be able to make our paper currency convertible into gold. This soon became a great economic question, not only in our country, but in the countries of Europe as well. Mr. BLAND early in his service in the House became a student of this question and a patient, honest, earnest student of all its important phases.

How far his mind was influenced by political surroundings it is as impossible for me to say as it would be to say how far the minds of others were influenced by political considerations in the discussions that followed for many years and which still continue in a degree. It is enough for me to say of Mr. BLAND now that I believe his advocacy of the free coinage of silver in our country, without the concurrence of other nations, was an earnest advocacy. He believed it could be accomplished without impairing the general credit of our country or without impairing either the rights of debtor or creditor. Whether that view was a wise one or an unwise one, I will not say. It is sufficient to say that Mr. BLAND became its earnest and principal advocate in the House of Representatives during the whole period of his service from 1876 to 1899.

I quite agree with those who have already said of him that he was the logical candidate of his party in 1896 for the Presidency; because it was to him more than to any other one man that the House of Representatives from Congress to Congress and from year to year was committed to that principle, which was incorporated in 1896 in the platform of the party to which he belonged. That fact was recognized, and I believe in every ballot, except the last, he received a larger number of votes than any other candidate in that convention.

Mr. BLAND at many times took rather pessimistic views of the situation of our country. He believed, and I have no doubt sincerely, that nothing but the free coinage of silver would restore prosperity and activity to our business, to our mechanical industries, and to our agriculture, and also thereby bring about remunerative compensation to labor. How far his views have been sustained by the history of the recent past I shall not now stop to consider.

Although devoted to the advocacy of free silver, the question which was nearest to him, Mr. BLAND was an efficient and faithful legislator, giving close and careful attention to every public question which came before the House of Representatives for consideration. He was influential there with all parties and especially with those who agreed with him on public questions, often carrying his party according to his views and wishes.

In his advocacy of a measure he was always serious and argumentative, and I know of no man in either House of Congress who made better arguments or a stronger presentation of the great questions he had at heart than did Mr. BLAND.

I think the death of Mr. BLAND is a great loss to the House of Representatives, in which he served so long and in which he was so influential, as I am sure it must be to the State of Missouri and to the entire country. Missouri has had many eminent and many faithful public servants, as she now has, but I think she has had very few more eminent or who will be more and better known in the history of the State than will RICHARD P. BLAND. He has left a memory of faithful public service, an inheritance and a record which will be of inestimable value to those who are nearest and dearest to him.

The Late Representative Richard P. Bland.

ADDRESSES AND RESOLUTIONS
SUBMITTED BY
HON. DAVID A. DE ARMOND,
OF MISSOURI,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday April 7, 1900,

On the following resolutions:

"*Resolved*, That the business of the House be now suspended in order that suitable tribute may be paid to the high character and eminent public services of the Hon. RICHARD PARKS BLAND, late a most distinguished member of the House of Representatives of the United States from the State of Missouri.

"*Resolved*, That as a mark of respect for the memory of the deceased the House, at the conclusion of these memorial exercises, shall stand adjourned.

"*Resolved*, That the Clerk of the House transmit a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased statesman, and inform the Senate of the action of this body."

Mr. DE ARMOND submitted the following addresses, etc., made at Mr. BLAND'S funeral, which were ordered to be printed in the RECORD:

The committee appointed by the citizens of Lebanon, upon the occasion of the death of R. P. BLAND, to draft appropriate resolutions, unanimously adopted the following expression of the common bereavement:

To the will of an overruling Providence which has removed from our midst our beloved and illustrious fellow-townsman, who for more than a generation was an honored and distinguished figure in the legislative chamber of the nation, we bow in sorrow and submission.

The citizens of Lebanon, with one common accord, upon the occasion of so great a public bereavement, desiring to honor the memory of the departed statesman, and sharing the grief of the State and the nation, as an expression of their regard and reverence for his public and private virtues and distinguished national career, do hereby

Resolved, That we profoundly and thoroughly appreciate the private worth and domestic virtues, as well as the public services, of our late fellow-citizen, RICHARD PARKS BLAND. That we point to him as an inspiring example of the possibilities of American citizenship—a man who, by the simplicity of his life and manners and his devotion to what he so earnesty championed as the people's cause, won the heart of a great people and rose from the condition of humble beginnings to the heights of honor and fame. And we feel that the memory of his character for integrity and unswerving fidelity to his convictions during all the vicissitudes of a long public career, and of his high endeavor and faithful, patriotic life, will ever be treasured as a priceless heritage by a people whom he so long and so devotedly served.

And be it further resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be presented to Mrs. Virginia E. Bland and family, with the assurance of profound sympathy in their deep personal affliction, and with the expression of the sincere condolence of this entire community.

J. P. NIXON,
W. I. WALLACE,
W. H. OWEN,
J. M. PERKINS,
H. W. CLARK,
Committee.

DEATH OF MISSOURI'S "GRAND OLD MAN"—THE FUNERAL SERVICES.

In all Lebanon's history no event has been the occasion of such universal sorrow and regret as the death of Missouri's great commoner, RICHARD PARKS BLAND. The great love and esteem in which he was held was evidenced by the immense number that gathered Saturday to do honor to the distinguished dead. From the surrounding country they came and from the neighboring towns, while from the country at large came the nation's greatest men to pay their last tribute to the departed statesman.

At 4 o'clock on Saturday afternoon were performed the last sad rites for the dead, and the solemn, impressive services were, in their simplicity, in keeping with the character of the man. The event was marked by a general suspension of public business, and on all sides were the signs of mourning. The business houses were heavily draped in black and white bunting, and conspicuous everywhere were pictures of Mr. BLAND, shrouded in funeral draperies.

The opera house, where the remains had lain in state for twenty-four hours, guarded by a detachment of Knights Templar of Lebanon Commandery, of which the deceased was a member, had been decorated under the supervision of Sergeant-at-Arms of the National House of Representatives B. F. Russell, of Steelville, Mo. The pillars were wrapped in black and white, while draperies of the bunting adorned the walls and gallery. On the stage were banked palms, ferns, and flowering plants, which formed a beautiful background for the somber catafalque. The white casket, with its silver trimmings, stood out in striking contrast with the somber black of the pall and bier, and on the lid was a silver plate bearing the simple inscription:

RICHARD PARKS BLAND,

Died June 15, 1899.

Grouped around the bier were the floral offerings. Among them were a pillar of roses and carnations, presented by the Bland Glee Club; a "Gates Ajar," from the Mitchell family; a bunch of lilies and roses, from Major Towles; a wreath, from Senator and Miss Cockrell; a bunch of carnations and roses, from the Lebanon Shakespeare Club; a bunch of roses, from the Bachelor Girls' Club. A bunch of exquisite wild roses and other flowers lent a touch of sweetness and beauty to the impressive scene.

At 4 o'clock entered the Masonic fraternities. Soon after came the Congressional delegation and the visiting friends for whom seats had been reserved. After the arrival of the family the doors were thrown open, and the house was soon filled to its utmost capacity.

Hon. J. W. Farris was master of ceremonies. The services opened with the song "Nearer, my God, to Thee," given by a selected choir composed of Misses Williamson, Aycock, Farris, Fisher, Wright, and Steinberg, Messrs. Wehe, Barrows, Manchester, and Billings. After the opening prayer and scripture reading by Rev. John Wilkinson, that beautiful song, "Rock of Ages," was rendered by the choir. The funeral oration was delivered by Rev. W. K. Collins, who took as the theme of his discourse the text from Hebrews ix, 27: "It is appointed unto men once to die."

Then followed the impressive Masonic services, Past Grand Commander Gillis conducting the the Knights Templar ritual, while J. W. Farris led the Masons in their solemn service for the dead. At the conclusion a prayer was offered by Rev. J. E. Alexander, and the beautiful, impressive service was ended.

The procession was very imposing. First in order came the Lebanon Cornet Band followed by Lebanon Commandery, Knights Templar, mounted and in full regalia. Next came the Congressional escort in carriages preceding the hearse and pallbearers, after whom came the family carriages, the Masonic lodge, Hobart's Military Band, of Springfield; St. John's Commandery, Knights Templar, of Springfield; then other visitors, and finally the general procession.

The procession formed on Jefferson avenue and proceeded north to Second street, west to Monroe avenue, then south to Commercial street, down which the funeral cortège slowly passed to the beautiful but mournful strains of the Dead March from Saul, played by the Lebanon Cornet Band. The pallbearers were F. S. Clark, B. F. Pasley, Joe McMillen, A. W. Bradshaw, E. M. Easley, Ed. S. Ivey, C. E. Joslyn, and Oliver Sharp.

At the cemetery Father J. F. Wood made brief but appropriate remarks, at the close of which the silent sleeper was left to his last long rest.

The following is the sermon from the text, "It is appointed unto men once to die" (Hebrews, ix, 27), preached by Rev. W. K. Collins:

This dark truth is written upon every page and into every paragraph of Nature's great volume, and yet, lest man in his folly and heedlessness might disregard it, our merciful Creator, who is always planning for our security, has seen fit to repeat it over and over in the great Book of Life.

How inexorable is death! "All that live must die, passing through nature to eternity." How solemn are the words—

Death enters and there's no defense;
His time there's none can tell;
He'll in a moment call thee hence
To heaven or down to hell.

How intrusive is Death! There is no age, nor hour, nor circumstance into which he will not intrude his presence. Life's chamber door can not be barred against him. He regards not the sacredness of infancy nor the innocence of childhood's glee, but obtrudes his dark presence—the voice of mirth is hushed and the rosy cheek is paled with his cold kiss. How pathetic the "May Queen" of Mr. Tennyson:

You must wake and call me early, call me early, mother dear;
To-morrow 'll be the happiest time of all the glad New-year;
Of all the glad New-year, mother, the maddest merriest day;
For I'm to be Queen o' the May, mother, I'm to be Queen o' the May.

Then Death insinuates his unwelcome presence, the cheek fades, the spirit is broken, and in languid voice we listen to the plaintive words:

If you're waking call me early, call me early, mother dear,
For I would see the sun rise upon the glad New-year.
It is the last New-year that I shall ever see,
Then you may lay me low i' the mould and think no more of me.

Man enters the broad field of industry and lays his plans for an abundant harvest, and just when his arduous toil is culminating in success, and in his pride he says, "I will build me larger barns wherein to store my goods," a startling voice from unseen lips, in deep, sepulchral tones, says: "Thou fool; this night shalt thy soul be required of thee."

A broken and melancholy dreamer saw in the dark night an ill-omened bird perched upon his chamber door, and to all his prayers and imprecations he received only the response, "Nevermore, nevermore."

And so there is an ill-omened spirit which haunts man night and day, waking or sleeping, in toil or sport, in sin or in righteousness, and keeps evermore repeating in his ear the melancholy warning:

"Vain man, thy fond pursuits forbear;
Repent; thy end is nigh.
Death at the farthest can't be far.
O think before thou die."

How dreadful is death! Into the presence of what an awful, unknown world of terrible possibilities it introduces us!

"To die, to sleep; to sleep, perchance to dream.
Ay; there's the rub; for in that sleep of death
What dreams may come when we have shuffled off this mortal coil,
Must give us pause."

The unpardoned man lives in dread apprehension of the issues of death. To him "the meanest and most loathed worldly life which age, ache, penury, and imprisonment can lay on nature is a paradise to what he fears of death."

It is the wisdom of life to prepare for death. The wisdom that came to us from out the depths of the unknown world and "spake as never man spake" said but little to us about the conditions of well-being in this life. He established no school of sociology; He founded no college of the arts and sciences; He planned no system of statecraft. He passed these by as matters of minor consequence, and the burden of His teaching was preparation for eternity: "Prepare to meet thy God." "Be ye also ready, for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of Man cometh."

A question of deep interest to us now and pertinent to this occasion is: How did Mr. BLAND regard the warnings of the Son of God? Had he considered the number of his days and applied his heart unto wisdom? Had he made his peace with God and laid up treasure in heaven?

A gentleman who has known Mr. BLAND intimately for years said to me that he believed him to be a Christian in all but name. If we are to decide the matter by the criterion which the Master laid down and assign him a place according to the "fruit" found clustering in his noble character, then he must have an exalted seat indeed.

We observe first the charming simplicity of the man. Mr. BLAND was unassuming, unostentatious. He loved not the pomp and display which pleases men of lighter weight. He was plain and simple, not given to heartless ceremony and cold conventionality. He exemplified in a marked degree that most beautiful humility which we are taught is the virtue most pleasing to the great Father.

He was a tribune of the people. The common people sought and greeted him, assured of friendly recognition and interest, and the children were at home in his presence.

HIS UNIMPEACHABLE HONESTY.

So true had he lived in all his dealings, private and official, that he had won from all the people the soubriquet, "Honest Dick," the highest compliment that can be given to anyone, for "an honest man is the noblest work of God."

He was honest in speech. He would not prevaricate nor use ambiguous terms. He stooped not to sophistry, nor did he "darken council by multitude of words." His nay was nay, and his yea was yea. In his manuscript there was nothing to be read between the lines.

He was honest in his opinions. He did not trim his sails to catch the breeze. He would not compromise himself with expediency and policy. He chose the plainest Anglo-Saxon words to express the honest convictions of a noble mind. And honesty of purpose imparts an unwonted power to discern and vigor to grasp the truth. And the convictions of an honest man are always current as pure gold.

He was honest in dealing with men and government. He lived during times when it was easy for one in his position to accumulate a fortune, yet he died poor. His idea of manhood would not permit him to—

"Crook the pregnant hinges of the knee
Where thrift might follow fawning."

Mr. Emerson says, "The State depends upon the veracity of men," and we, the people, may well beware of statesmen who are too thrifty.

Senator Colquitt, of Georgia, used to enjoy telling of an incident which happened to him at Hot Springs, Ark. A Westerner approached him and grasped his hand, saying, "I always love to shake hands with you old-fashioned Southern Senators, for you are as poor as church mice, and as honest as the noonday." Probably Mr BLAND was not as poor as a church mouse, but it is the verdict of all who knew him well that he was honest as the noonday.

HIS UNSWERVING COURAGE.

His greatness consisted not in a genius which discovered new inventions and proposed unheard-of theories, nor in a brilliance that illumined or dazzled, nor in an eloquence that secured the applause of the unthinking throng, but in some sterling quality or lionlike courage which made him stand with his very life in defense of some old-fashioned and fundamental principles.

And this is why the people loved and trusted him. The great principles upon which the strength of the citizen and the State depend are not, as some may suppose, numerous and difficult of discovery, but they are few and lie upon the surface. They are as old as the laws of God, as unalterable as the constitution of life, and as wholesome as the trundle-bed prayer which our mothers taught us. Hence, it is not more brilliant, not more astute statesmen that we need, but more like RICHARD P. BLAND, always found standing like a stone wall in defense of plain and well-known principles.

HIS UNFAILING BENEVOLENCE.

He entertained the most generous feelings toward men. Some one has said:

"I know some men who lay in wait
And get up soon and stay up late
To catch some fellow they can hate
For going with a faster gait."

These words do not apply to our friend here.

"He lived for those who loved him,
For those who knew him true;
For the heaven-bright above him,
And the good that he might do.

"For the cause that needed assistance,
For the wrongs that lacked resistance,
For the future in the distance,
And the good that he might do."

Behold, these are the fruits, rich and fragrant, clustering about the life that has just gone out; and in answer to the question, Did MR. BLAND heed the counsel of the Savior? I must refer you to a little poem by Leigh Hunt:

"Abou Ben Adhem (may his tribe increase!),
Awoke one night from a deep dream of peace,
And saw within the moonlight of his room,
Making it rich like a lily in bloom,
An angel writing in a book of gold.
Exceeding peace had made Ben Adhem bold,
And to the presence in the room he said:
'What writest thou?' The vision raised its head,
And with a look made all of sweet accord,
Answered, 'The names of those who love the Lord.

'And is mine one?' asked Abou. 'Nay, not so,'
Replied the angel. Abou spoke more low,
But cheerily still and said: 'I pray thee, then,
Write me as one who loves his fellow-men.'
The angel wrote and vanished. The next night
It came again with a great awakening light,
And showed the names of those whom love of God had blessed,
And lo! Ben Adhem's name led all the rest."

Mr. BLAND'S life was upon the altar of human want.

And is BLAND dead? Good BLAND! Honest BLAND! Wise BLAND! Great BLAND! Our BLAND! Did he die? Could not the pitiful tears of children, the deep, sweet love of a devoted wife, the constant prayer of a trusting constituency, the exigency of a nation, neither bribe, nor placate, nor importune the grim monster, Death, that he might pass him by? No; he died as other mortals, and we must lay him low beneath the lilies, where the mountain breeze will murmur a requiem over his grave, and soothe him into a slumber that shall never be broken.

No; he is not dead. By the Lord Jesus Christ I affirm he is not dead, but sleepeth.

Parallel with the dark sentence of death in the Bible is the declaration of life. There was One commissioned from Heaven to break the power of him who had the power of death. He declares, "I am come that they might have life;" "I am the resurrection, and the life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die."

The story of His wondrous triumph over man's mortal foe is finely told in the tearful hymn of Mr. Watts:

He dies! the friend of sinners dies!
Lo, Salem's daughters weep around;
A solemn darkness veils the skies,
A sudden trembling shakes the ground.

Come, saints, and drop a tear or two
For Him who groaned beneath your load;
He shed a thousand drops for you—
A thousand drops of richer blood.

Here's love and grief beyond degree:
The Lord of Glory dies for man!
But, lo, what sudden joys we see,
Jesus, the dead, revives again.

The rising God forsakes the tomb;
In vain the tomb forbids him rise;
Cherubic legions guard him home
And shout him welcome to the skies.

Say, "Live forever, wondrous King!
Born to redeem and strong to save;"
Then ask the monster, "Where's thy sting?
And where's thy victory, boasting grave?"

"There is no death, but angel forms
Walk o'er the earth with silent tread;
They bear our best loved things away,
And then we call them 'dead.'"

THE LION OF LEBANON.

[Extract from a speech delivered at Eldon, Mo., by T. O. Towles, of Jefferson City, Mo.]

FELLOW-CITIZENS AND FRIENDS: Less than a year ago, before an audience composed largely of persons who are now present in this hall, it was the privilege of the speaker to address the citizens then here assembled on the public and political questions of the day, and especially as to the wisdom and propriety of the reelection of Hon. R. P. BLAND to the Congress of the United States. Mr. BLAND was himself present and spoke briefly on the occasion, being then in feeble health. Only a few months have intervened, but the passing time hath wrought a cruel work, and our great leader and true friend has fallen in the midst of his life work for good government, equal rights and privileges for every individual, and the fullest liberty and freedom of each person consistent with the safety of all.

Let us pause to pay a tribute of respect and affection to the memory of R. P. BLAND, who for so many years and so ably represented this district in the House of Representatives of the United States. Mr. BLAND was a man of marked simplicity of character and habits of life. He was an upright man, and purity and truth dwelt in his heart. He was modest almost to diffidence, and wholly free from selfish ambition. Strong in all his convictions of the right, he was fixed and immovable in his purposes, and when occasion demanded could lead a forlorn hope, against a host of opponents, with the vigor of a Titan, and the courage that despiseth fear and that maketh martyrs. He was an earnest lover of his country, a Democrat in the noblest and truest sense of the word, a useful citizen, a firm and true friend, a devoted husband and father, and a "friend of human liberty throughout the world."

Mr. BLAND was first elected to Congress in 1872 from the former Fifth Congressional district of Missouri, taking his seat at the organization of the House of Representatives of the Forty-third Congress, in December, 1873. He was reelected continuously from that district, and from the Eleventh and Eighth districts, as subsequently changed by the legislature, to Congress from the Forty-fourth to the Fifty-third Congress, both inclusive. He was defeated by a few votes in the contest for the Fifty-fourth Congress, but was reelected to the Fifty-fifth and Fifty-sixth Congresses. He thus served continuously as a member of Congress for twenty-two years, and after a lapse of two years he again served a term of two more years, making in all twenty-four years of service, with a full term of two years upon which he was just entering at the time of his death.

In all these years of public service, beginning with President Grant's second term as President and ending under President McKinley's Administration in 1899, he took an active and leading part in all great public and political questions, and no word or sentiment he ever uttered or expressed in debate or argument, no vote he ever cast on any "call of the roll," was ever questioned or criticised by his constituents. No public man from this or any other State of the Union has left a nobler, purer, or more enduring record of faithful and useful service to his people.

His lifelong efforts and work in behalf of the free coinage of silver and its restoration to its constitutional place in the coinage of the United States are too well known to need any reference thereto; but if the record of all BLAND'S service in the cause of silver coinage was stricken from the archives and written history of Congressional proceedings, he would still have left, on other public questions, the longest, the most useful, and most honorable record of service of any man who ever served this State in the lower House of Congress.

He took an active part and did faithful, intelligent work on all tariff questions, and issues relating to internal revenue taxation; on currency legislation and bond issues by the General Government; on the the matter of the "Electoral Commission," which he opposed and voted against; on river improvement; on foreign relations, and on every grave question relating to our national affairs pending or discussed in the last quarter of a century of our history. He bitterly opposed the "force bill," the right of United States marshals to interfere with elections in the States, the presence or use of United States soldiers at polling places, and government by injunction of the United States courts.

On all party questions he was a typical Democrat, the ablest and most fearless advocate and champion of the people's rights and the untrammeled liberties of the individual citizen since the days of Jefferson and Andrew Jackson. The fact that there is to-day an organized, active, and purified Democratic party is due more to his fearless leadership, his untiring zeal, and his wise championship than to the work and efforts of any one man. At times he seemed to stand almost alone, as it were, upon the ramparts of militant Democracy, holding aloft its banner and struggling with heroic valor for the principles of the party, until he forced faltering leaders and wavering hosts to rally to his support.

The nomination of his party for the Presidency which so narrowly missed him, to my personal knowledge, he did not seek, and he honestly and earnestly advised against the use and presentation of his name for this highest office among men, when his party in his own State decided to make the trial and effort for him. He sought no other official honor than to represent this people and district in Congress, and his highest ambition was fully satisfied to serve this constituency faithfully and well.

In the calm light of coming years, when the student of that day and time reads and ponders over the records and the history of these times, measured by the test of fully developed truth and the fruition of experience and actual trial, the life work and public services of BLAND will rank him among the foremost statesmen of his day, and no one will contest his right to be called the "Great American Commoner."

He died on an early morning in June, at his home, and we buried his body under the oaks and elms in the midst of the people whom he loved so well. Surrounded by his family and his nearest friends, just as the dawn of a new day appeared in the eastern sky, the brave champion breathed his last, and his spirit passed to rest, not as sinks the evening star in the darkness and gloom of night, but like the morning star, which—

"Sinks to rest beneath the ocean's bed,
And ere anon repairs its drooping head
And flames with new spangled ore
In the forehead of the morning sky,"

giving up its own light only when the glowing sun, the king of day, floods the earth with radiance. A mighty man of our Israel has fallen. An high priest of our political faith has passed away, and a brave champion and leader of our people is taken from us. Peace to his ashes, rest to his soul, and honor to his memory.

Rural Free Delivery.

SPEECH
OF
HON. HENRY C. SMITH,
OF MICHIGAN,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, April 25, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 10301) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901—

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Rural free delivery, while called in the law experimental, has come to stay.

This tardy recognition of the rights and the intelligence of the farmers should not be curtailed, but should be extended.

The real object of the post-office ought to be quick and effective transmission of mail matter from addressor to addressee in the shortest possible time from posting to delivery.

The United States has never looked upon its Postal Department as an institution for taxing the people. It has always considered it as one for the general use and benefit of the people, and therefore as one which should not make a business of taxing them.

Accommodation to the public is the first consideration, and the means for paying for it the second.

We have never attached much importance to profit or loss on the

transaction. Such for many years, at least, has been our policy. And so long as service to the public and not profit is the supreme test it can not well be seen why the farmer, the representative of the largest and most important business of our land, the most extensive reader of any class, the most appreciative and best deserving, should not receive fair, adequate, and equitable mail facilities.

A brief comparison of our postal system with that of other countries will show the real situation.

In England, the United Kingdom, the postal system is conducted at a large profit. The same is true of France, and Germany reaps some profit. But in these countries the population is not scattered, and for this reason in a well-governed old country the post-office pays, while in a new one it does not pay.

This deficit is most conspicuous in countries of wide territory, scarcely peopled, like our country, Canada, and the Argentine Republic, in which countries there are annually large balances of expenses over receipts.

The cause of the principal part of the excessive expenditure, compared with the greater possible economy of an old country, is obvious. It lies in the distance letters and papers have to be carried during collection, transit, and delivery in the new country. For example, the United States has to carry a letter three times as far for the same money as does the United Kingdom.

Then, again, in the United Kingdom 51 letters per year to each inhabitant are posted; in Germany, 24; in France, 17; in the United States, 37.

We post twenty-eight newspapers to each inhabitant to seventeen in the United Kingdom. In France there are six times as many registered or insured letters as in the United Kingdom, which adds much to the profit.

Then, too, in the United States there is a post-office to every 986 inhabitants, which is not exceeded in any country in the world except Canada and Switzerland. So it will be readily seen that the deficit can not be all laid at the door of the Government.

The delivery of mail from house to house, direct to the people, has been of slow growth.

In France the only thing in the way of the traveling post-office is the courier conveyancer, who goes along in a second-class carriage provided with a box containing a bag to hang up on the umbrella rack and a list of places he has to deal with.

He takes in and gives out only ordinary letters and post cards and newspapers, of which the publishers have permission to utilize his services, making up his mails in gummed envelopes instead of bags.

This service is confined to the large cities. In Germany there is a complete delivery in Berlin and other large cities.

In England orders may be left and the carriers may call for mail and parcels of certain kind.

Now, one-third of the people of the United States have their mail brought direct to their doors, but this is in the cities and larger towns and villages, where the mail is delivered free from one to eight times a day.

It is much credit to our system, which costs $105,000,000 per year and handles 6,214,447 pieces of mail matter, distributed in every part of our broad domain, that but one error is made in the distribution of each 10,000 pieces of mail.

This is an era of marvelous progress and advancement. Every industry and every enterprise has written in unfading colors upon its banner the word "Forward." The farmer, slow to anger, has waited with patience and dignity the dawning of his day of relief, and at last he sees the bow of promise span his sky of hope.

Under President Harrison's Administration, in a time of supreme prosperity, a meager appropriation of $10,000 was made for rural free delivery of mail, merely as an experiment.

The authorities predicted that the service could not be made practicable. The experiment was made, and the test refuted the theory.

The appropriations have been steadily increased, until the Fifty-fifth Congress appropriated $300,000 for this service, and now rural free-delivery routes are in successful operation in forty of the States of the Union, operating from nearly 400 distributing points.

And this day we all rejoice with the farmers of the land that this bill appropriates one million and three-quarters for this much-needed and highly appreciated service, and which I believe will prove self-sustaining, if not profitable, in the most thickly populated farming communities.

It seems to me that there are many better reasons why the farmer should have his mail brought to his door than that this service should be accorded to any other citizen.

In the first place, he works more hours and has greater responsibility than any other man for the return his toil and care bring him.

I believe that it takes more skill, forethought, and real ability to successfully operate a farm than to successfully carry on any other business in which the equal amount of capital is invested.

And yet, while 77 per cent of the business men in other pursuits fail and are stranded on the rocks, the farmer never makes an assignment, he never does business through a receiver, but manfully meets his obligations 100 cents on the dollar. And this without much direct aid from tariff laws and in spite of high taxes, from which, with him, there is no escape.

He can not hide his farm from the tax assessor's vigilant eye, if he would. It lies right out in the light of day, where all can see it, and this is true of all of his property. The cattle on the hillside can not escape; all is taxed, and that to full value.

Let us give this honest man a fair opportunity in the contest for life and for property.

Again, he has much farther to go to get his mail at the post-office than does the man in the city, village, or town. He has no sidewalk upon which to travel, no lamp, gas, or electric light to guide his weary steps.

The farmer has more need for daily papers and market reports than do other business men. He is isolated, and no one is near of whom he can make inquiry. His meager business will not permit of his employing a broker or sales agent. He alone must manage the production, distribution, and sale of his products.

Must he go into the market place blind, to accept, unaided by market reports, the offer of the buyer wholly intent on making gain?

Honest himself, he has been wont to consider all mankind the same. But now he is thinking for himself, and should be given all reasonable assistance.

A larger proportion of the farmers take newspapers, periodicals, and other reading matter than do those of other classes; and they read them, too.

If the people in cities, villages, and towns took newspapers in the same proportion farmers do, what a business the newspaper enterprise would be.

The Government has not done anything for the farmer within my memory which meets with such universal approval as does this service.

In the district which I have the honor to represent the special agent's coming to establish a rural free delivery is greeted with open-handed welcome. The proposed routes are ablaze with banners and he is feasted as a king. If the routes now asked for in my district are all established, the greater proportion of the farmers will be supplied with daily mail.

The postmasters join in the petitions and help on the work, willing to throw up their offices for the common good—the greatest good to the greatest number.

Recently it was stated in the public press that the carriers were to receive more compensation for their work, and all will concede that their pay is not at all adequate. Four hundred dollars per year and he to furnish horse and rig—everything.

Still our people were so fearful that the routes established might be taken away or the prospect of having more dimmed, if the carriers were to receive more pay, that I was fairly flooded with remonstrances against the change, and many of the carriers signed the remonstrances.

The farmer knows a good thing when he gets it, and he proposes to cling to it.

The opinions expressed during this debate indicate an almost unanimous desire to increase this appropriation to $2,000,000, and I am quite certain this would now be done, except for the statement made by one gentleman, a member of the committee, that the Postmaster-General told him that not more than one and three-quarters of a million dollars could possibly be used at this time.

This feeling is, to say the least, most encouraging.

The only opposition encountered here is from the Representatives of the large cities.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] argues that the receipts from the post-office in Chicago are far in excess of the expense of that office.

A like argument has also been made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM]. And it was urged that the large cities yielded the principal part of the revenues of the Post-Office Department. These arguments were made in behalf of the pneumatic-tube service.

And the first-named gentleman made an eloquent, strong, and impassioned appeal that the latter service be extended to the stockyards in his city.

I want to inquire from whence came and whither go the letters and newspapers and the other mail matter which yield the large receipts of these offices?

I respectfully submit that this wonderful correspondence is not carried on among the citizens of Chicago, nor among the citizens of other large cities.

On the contrary, the large proportion of these letters go to and come from the rural districts, and from the smaller cities, villages, and towns throughout the country.

In my State, of late at least, I find that the people are reading the Chicago newspapers quite extensively. If these large cities were not fed and sustained by the country they would soon perish from the earth and cease to be known among men.

"God made the country, and man made the towns." From creation's dawn till now the honest farmer has been the pride and glory of the world. He is the best hope of this Republic.

He ought to be protected, and he ought to be fairly treated.

And I rejoice in the favorable sentiment toward this appropriation, and hope it will pass without a dissenting vote.

Rural Free Delivery.

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. ZENOR,

OF INDIANA.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, April 26, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 10301) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901—

Mr. ZENOR said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This discussion has taken wide range. While the bill under consideration is the regular annual Post-Office appropriation bill, and while such a bill is always one of more than ordinary interest, yet this one contains matters of the utmost importance, both to the Government and the great body of the people. This is not only true because of the fact that it carries a larger appropriation than any ever heretofore passed, but for the further reason that it more clearly indicates and recognizes the policy which it is hoped shall become the fixed and settled policy of the Government for all future time upon the subject of rural free delivery.

No question has of late years attracted more widespread public attention or excited more earnest and thoughtful consideration among the masses of our people than that of better facilities of mail distribution through the agency of an extension of rural free delivery. This is one of the subjects, Mr. Chairman, upon which I confess that I am an enthusiastic expansionist. For years past our policy has been one of great liberality in securing to the great mass of our people the benefits of cheap and inexpensive literature, and to afford to them the advantages of every improvement in our mail facilities. Postal rates have been reduced on all first-class mail matter.

A classification of the matter passing through the mails has been so arranged that newspapers, periodicals, pamphlets, prints, and reprints of books of a certain character have been admitted to and carried through the mails as second-class matter at the 1 cent a pound rate. This extremely low rate has stimulated the efforts and developed many large, enterprising, and reliable publishing houses and firms throughout the country to publish and circulate at exceedingly low prices many of the most valuable works on the subjects of science, literature, and art, and furnish them to the people at popular prices. Through this means inestimable blessings are brought home to the masses in the way of good, wholesome reading matter that otherwise would be beyond their reach.

Recognizing the fundamental truth that our institutions rest upon the common intelligence and the general dissemination of knowledge among the masses, every effort has been made to accomplish this patriotic purpose through the enactment of liberal postal laws. As an aid to this beneficent policy, supplementing it in the most effectual way possible, the Government has entered upon the experiment of "rural free delivery." I say experiment, Mr. Chairman, but in view of the fact that the Assistant Postmaster-General has in his last report said that this service has passed beyond the experimental stage, this word "experiment" perhaps should be omitted. This service has, in my judgment, been so successful and entirely satisfactory wherever and whenever given a fair test that it has become a permanent feature of our postal system.

It has met with such universal favor among the people and proven so beneficial in expediting mail delivery, as well as profitable in its tendencies to develop, improve, and build up good roads throughout the country, that it has become one of the most popular features of this public service. And while there are some provisions of this bill that do not command my approval, yet the bill in its general scope is cast along lines in harmony with the spirit of progress that has so distinctly marked our advance in the past, and with some few exceptions must commend itself to the sanction of this House and the country. I am, however, opposed to the provisions proposing to grant subsidies to certain railroads mentioned.

In this bill it is proposed to grant to trunk lines from New York and Washington to Atlanta and New Orleans $171,238.75, and to trunk lines from Kansas City, Mo., to Newton, Kans., $25,000. These subsidies are not asked for by the Department and are not regarded by the Postmaster-General or the Department as necessary to facilitate the mail deliveries upon or along these great lines of railroads.

So, Mr. Chairman, I do not understand why the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, whose chairman, Mr. LOUD, is so generally watchful and careful to protect the Government and people from unjust and unwise expenditures of the public moneys, allowed these items to be incorporated in this bill. If given the opportunity—and I trust such an opportunity will not be denied to any member of this House by any unjust rule—to vote separately upon these obnoxious provisions, I shall vote against these items.

There are some other provisions of the bill which, in my judgment, are open to just criticism; but, Mr. Chairman, the only special feature of this bill to which I desired more particularly to address myself is that of "rural free delivery." I represent a district that, while embracing several large cities and towns, may yet very properly be denominated a rural district. Many of the counties have entered upon the construction of systems of gravel and macadamized roads, and many miles of this kind of road have in some of the counties been completed and in operation and use for many years. In others the people are fully alive to these advantages, and while not as far advanced as their more enterprising neighbors, and may have been to some extent embarrassed by less favorable surroundings and natural conditions, yet they are rapidly taking advantage of the very liberal laws in force in my State to secure the establishment of a very high grade of public highways.

As it is now generally understood through the country that rural free delivery and these new and improved facilities in the mail service will only be extended to sections and localities where the condition of the public roads are such as to render such extension feasible, there is no doubt in my mind, when it is once known that this branch of our system of mail service has become a part of the permanent policy of the Government, that it will only be a few years until the popular demand for these additional mail facilities will stimulate such enterprise and energy among the people for better roads that every community will soon be in a condition to entitle them to the benefits of this service.

Mr. Chairman, good roads and rural free delivery are inseparably connected, and this fact must and will be readily recognized by every community, and thus, acting upon each other, will prove potential factors in generous and friendly rivalry in the development of their mutual interests. As pertinent to this discussion and appropriate to this occasion I wish to incorporate as a part of my remarks an address of Mr. Francis M. Dice, special agent in charge of the western division of rural free delivery, delivered at a meeting held by the citizens of Iowa, at Des Moines, October 6, 1899, in which he quotes from a speech delivered by the governor of my own State upon a similar subject and occasion. In the course of this address Mr. Dice said:

It is comparatively easy to present a multitude of reasons in favor of the universal construction of good roads.

There is no argument against it. This is one reform at least that has this advantage over all others: The argument is all on one side. Nobody is opposed to good roads. It is not a controversial question. The only practical inquiry is, "How to get good roads?"

There is but one answer to that question, and that is to build them. But like every other improvement it costs labor and money to do it. So the only real question after all is, How can the sum necessary to do this be obtained? As a very distinguished candidate for the Presidency once said about a very important national measure, this is largely a "local" question and about which there may be and there are wide differences of opinion. Into such discussion I will not enter, for no universal method could be adopted. The conditions being so very different in different sections and localities, whether the construction of good roads shall be by General Government or by State and local authority or by all three combined or in conjunction is perhaps the only question which admits of discussion. From such meetings as these the proper ways and means will yet be evolved to provide for the expense necessary for their construction, and by the proper authority and under the proper supervision.

Every farmer knows that bad roads often keep him from the markets when prices of grain are high, and thereby cost him a good profit. Every farmer knows how much time he has lost by traveling over bad roads. Every farmer knows how much larger a load his team would haul if the roads were hard and smooth. Every farmer knows what a considerable item in his annual expenses is the repair of wagons and harness whose strength and safety have been crippled by bad roads. Every farmer knows how much more it costs to keep four or five horses instead of two or three, as he might with equal service with good roads over which to haul his products. Every farmer knows that his farm would increase in value if by good highways it could be brought into ready communication with village or city. All these things farmers know, when they think about it, and they know that the sum of these pecuniary advantages in favor of good roads would vastly outweigh the cost of procuring them.

My birthplace and my home are in Indiana, and in this presence I am reminded that a great many Indianians, at an early day in the beginning of the settlement of this great State, came here as emigrants as to a new El Dorado, and by their thrift and intelligence have contributed very largely to the development of the natural resources of the State and the building up of its institutions.

We who still live there greatly rejoice to know how well Indiana sons have honored the mother State, wherever else they have gone, as well as in your State, for which they have furnished three United States Senators and many other worthy and honorable citizens.

When I spoke of being from Indiana, however, I had intended to do so only as preliminary to saying that our present governor, who has been all his mature life a practical farmer of the county in which I live, in an address delivered before the Indiana State Board of Agriculture, at Indianapolis, last winter, spoke, among other things, on the subject of "good roads and rural free delivery," and his remarks were so pertinent to the object of this convention, as I understand it, that I desire you to know his views upon the subject. He said:

"I desire to call attention for a brief while to another subject of vital moment not only to the farmers, but to all the people of our Commonwealth. Good roads are inseparably connected with progress. Like abundant harvests, they contribute to the good of all. The isolation of the country home is the farmer's greatest barrier. Bad roads enlarge this barrier. 'Iron sharpeneth iron, so a man sharpeneth the countenance of his friend.' This proverb reveals a truth found in everyday experience, that by friction of mind through frequent contact the intellect is quickened and the mind expanded. Conditions that tend to isolate should be removed as speedily as possible.

"Facilities for daily contact with the world's best thought and progress should be accelerated. The highest success socially, financially, and intellectually can not be attained until we have good thoroughfares. The restriction of marketing farm products to periods when the roads are passable prevents marketing to the best advantage, both as to time, cost, and price.

"I heard a farmer in southern Indiana say that $2,000 was lost to the farmers on hay alone on one road extending 8 miles from the market into the country. This loss, which was sustained in one year, was caused by impassable roads when prices were best. One year's loss on one crop would have paid for improving one-eighth of the distance. This illustrates the financial loss caused by bad roads.

"The farmer whose family is held in the thraldom of bad roads for a large part of the year is subjected to an ordeal that trammels progress, fetters social growth, and retards intellectual development. The farmer who lives on a mud road will be likely to have all his environments in harmony therewith. He sees the passer-by plodding his weary way through the heavy roads, and likewise moves in a sluggish manner; goes with muddy boots into his home; sits down with hat on; chews his tobacco, and spits in the fire. Such a farmer is apt to lose much of his pride and self-respect. His home has but little of brightness and good cheer, and his family are subjected to the necessity of staying at home or going out in a manner that humbles their pride, and, as a result, their dislike for the country is intensified.

"The farmer located on a good thoroughfare, who sees the fine turn-outs rapidly hurrying by, the occupants handsomely dressed people, is inspired by the scene, steps quicker, thinks faster, and keeps his home surroundings in harmony with what he sees. A sense of pride prompts him to greater efforts to have for his family a good conveyance, to provide about his barn good drives, free from mud, and to have about his home good brick or cement walks. His children go to school over good roads; his family goes to church, to lectures, to town; they are in touch with the world's progress. The need of combining small country schools, the demand for township high schools, will heighten the need of road improvements.

"Rural free delivery of mail, so much needed among our farmers, can never obtain except in localities possessing good thoroughfares, insuring rapid transit at all seasons of the year.

"The United States is the only country among all the countries that comprise the International Postal Union that fails to deliver the mail to the addressees. In thickly settled districts, where there are good roads, the conditions are ripe for the farmers to demand some consideration of fairness from the Post-Office Department. Hon. Perry S. Heath, First Assistant Postmaster-General, recommended and secured an appropriation of $150,000 for experimentation in rural free delivery of mail. I am amazed that objection should be made to the appropriation of this paltry sum for so wise and just a purpose. Mr. Heath informs me that a Senator from one of the Eastern States said to him, 'You have acted unwisely in this recommendation. You will have these farmers demanding a rural delivery of mail and causing a great deal of trouble.' I am astonished that an Eastern man should have the effrontery to speak slightingly of the rights of the men who are contributing so much to the nation's wealth and power.

"The people who produce the food and fiber that feed and clothe the world must not be overlooked in their just demands. The past year the farmers of the United States, after supplying home demands, sent abroad $856,000,000 worth of farm products. They bear a large part of the burden of taxation, and are justly entitled to some of the privileges accorded to others. Recently I was invited to go through the Southwestern Limited through mail train on the Pennsylvania Railroad. I found the clerks engaged for hours distributing two publications from Augusta, Me. I was informed by those mail clerks that in one day on one through train there were 115 sacks of this mail for the State of Texas alone. I was informed that this trashy stuff was handled by the Government at a loss of 7 cents a pound. These large sacks, filled with papers wrapped and packed by machinery, probably contained 100 pounds to the sack. The expense to the Government in one day, carrying mail to one State, would pay the expense of two rural routes for one year. Before this Eastern Senator again criticises the wise action of Mr. Heath, he should remember the farmers have some rights that even an Eastern Senator should respect.

"These Eastern cities should no longer be allowed to deluge our mails with thousands of tons of trashy stuff, destructive rather than constructive in its influence, thus costing the Government millions of dollars. These publications are not sent in good faith to bona fide subscribers, but to many unwilling subscribers, whose names are surreptitiously obtained. It would be far better if the amount thus unwisely expended were devoted to free rural routes. The result would be the farmers would take daily papers, and tens of thousands of our home daily newspapers, with all their elevating, refining, and educating influence, would find their way into rural homes. Of all men the farmer needs the daily paper. He is enabled thereby to keep in touch with the world's advance, to be posted on current events, and to understand daily markets. Nothing, in my judgment, gentlemen, will do more to hasten this desired end than good roads. The farmer's family must be kept in close touch and intercommunication with the world's thought and action, or they will migrate from the country to the already overcrowded cities."

I can not add to this comprehensive epitome of the advantages of good roads by one who speaks from years of experience and whose opinions are worthy of the highest consideration.

Mr. Chairman, wonderful progress has been made since the inauguration of this experiment. The first appropriation for this purpose made by Congress was for the year ending June 30, 1895, when an item of $10,000 was set apart to make some experimental tests. This was followed up by subsequent appropriations, as follows:

For year ending June 30—

1896	$30,000
1897	40,000
1898	50,000
1899	150,000
1900	300,000

And now in the present appropriation bill the very liberal sum of $1,750,000 is the amount appropriated for this specific purpose, an increase of $1,450,000 over the largest sum ever heretofore devoted to this service. The system in operation up to November 1, 1899, in the different States and Territories of the Union is shown in the following table.

On the 1st of November, 1899, rural free delivery was in successful operation from 383 distributing points, radiating over 40 States and 1 Territory, as follows:

Alabama	1	New Hampshire	5
Arkansas	1	New Jersey	7
Arizona	1	New York	24
California	14	North Carolina	1
Colorado	5	North Dakota	3
Connecticut	6	Ohio	49
Delaware	1	Oregon	3
Florida	4	Pennsylvania	15
Georgia	17	Rhode Island	5
Illinois	14	South Carolina	21
Indiana	44	South Dakota	2
Iowa	23	Tennessee	6
Kansas	2	Texas	2
Louisiana	1	Utah	1
Maine	7	Vermont	6
Maryland	10	Virginia	4
Massachusetts	11	Washington	1
Michigan	15	West Virginia	7
Minnesota	7	Wisconsin	15
Missouri	12		
Nebraska	3	Total	383

Between the beginning of the fiscal year July 1, 1899, and the 1st of November, 1899, when the additional appropriation of $150,000 granted for the extension of the rural free delivery service previously established, which became available on said 1st day of July and exhausted on said 1st day of November, 1899, new service was established, as follows:

State.	Number of routes.	Population served.	State.	Number of routes.	Population served.
California	5	4,100	New Jersey	1	565
Colorado	3	2,525	New York	11	8,535
Connecticut	2	1,700	Ohio	38	26,040
Delaware	1	1,000	Oregon	2	1,490
Illinois	12	8,580	Pennsylvania	14	11,216
Indiana	25	18,307	Rhode Island	5	3,530
Iowa	21	11,791	South Carolina	2	1,200
Kansas	16	12,882	South Dakota	1	580
Kentucky	4	3,000	Tennessee	4	2,400
Maine	3	1,500	Texas	2	1,435
Maryland	1	1,500	Utah	1	2,000
Massachusetts	3	1,850	Vermont	3	1,800
Michigan	13	10,725	West Virginia	1	750
Minnesota	10	5,410	Wisconsin	19	14,167
Missouri	9	4,528			
New Hampshire	11	14,025	Total	243	179,131

This list has been materially increased since.

It will thus be seen that up to November 1, 1899, rural free delivery had been extended to about 180,000 persons, at an annual cost of about 84 cents per capita. No account is taken in this estimate of the great increase of postal receipts (averaging from 50 to 75 per cent) which always follows the establishment of rural delivery, nor is any reduction made for the cost of fourth-class post-offices and star routes practically superseded by the new service, which have been or might be discontinued. There is ample and convincing proof of the success of this service to be found in the reports of the special agents appointed by the Post-Office Department to make investigation of this subject and of the experiments made.

There is strong proof also, Mr. Chairman, tending to show that, with prudent and economical administration, when once this branch of the service is reduced to a well-organized system and wisely extended as the public needs and improved local conditions may justify, it will be self-supporting. I am therefore heartily in favor of rural free delivery, and congratulate the committee in their generous response to the requirements of this branch of the public service and demands of the farmers of the country.

Post-Office Appropriation Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. HENRY H. BINGHAM,

OF PENNSYLVANIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, April 25, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 10301) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901—

Mr. BINGHAM said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The paragraph on page 15, commencing at line 22, down to and including line 4 on page 16, reads as follows:

For inland transportation by railroad routes, of which a sum not exceeding $40,000 may be employed to pay freight on postal cards, stamped envelopes, and stamped paper, and other supplies from the manufactories to the post-offices and depots of distribution, $33,870,000.

For railway post-office car service, $4,561,000.

There has been much misinformation scattered broadcast over the country in regard to the compensation paid to railroads for carrying the mail, and for the use of railway post-office car service. Some have contended that the mails should be paid for as freight; that the use of the postal cars is equivalent to the rent of a store-room, and other vagaries without limit have found exponents and advocates.

The postal service of the United States is unique in this, that it is the greatest postal system in the world in extent, in receipts, and expenditures, in perfection of dispatch and delivery, and in the accomplishment of the most excellent results with the least expenditure of money.

ITS EXTENT.

The population of the United States is distributed over 3,500,000 square miles of territory. Large cities—Boston, New York, Philadelphia, St. Louis, San Francisco, Augusta, Me., Chicago, Cincinnati, New Orleans, La., Minneapolis, Minn., Portland, Oreg.—suggest intervening distances of thousands of miles, and in all this vast area—sustaining 70,000,000 of busy people—the most excellent facilities for quick and frequent intercourse are afforded.

THE RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE AND PAY.

This service is in operation on 176,726 miles of road with a frequency that makes an annual travel of 287,591,269 miles, or an average of 1,627 miles for every mile of road, at a cost of 11.1 cents per mile of transportation. Twenty years ago the cost per mile was 10.88 cents, so that notwithstanding the postal revenues have increased 200 per cent, with a corresponding increase in weight of mails carried, this rate per mile of transportation has increased but a little over one-fifth of a cent a mile. The total tonnage in 1879 was 44,428,619 tons carried 1 mile, at 21½ cents per ton per mile. In 1898 the total tonnage had risen to 272,714,017 tons, while the cost had fallen to 12½ cents per ton per mile.

This is a marvelous showing, and could only have been brought about through a perfectly arranged system, as is provided in the act of March 3, 1873, under which the rate of compensation decreases as the volume of mail carried increases. Thus for 200 pounds per day the pay is $42.75 per mile per annum, and at the same rate for 5,000 pounds it would be $1,068.75 per mile; whereas the law fixes the pay at $171 per mile. Then 16,000 pounds additional must be carried to earn $171 per mile additional. This is the principle that has produced the low rate per mile for transportation, and is continuously operative in the same direction.

It has been formally published that the railroads receive an average of 40 cents per ton per mile for transporting the mail, and the suggestion coupled with it was that the rate should be reduced 25 per cent. Professor Adams and others ascertained that the average rate received by the railroads is 12½ cents per ton per mile, and now the suggestion that the pay be reduced 25 per cent is directed to the 12½ cents per ton per mile. In fact, 75 per cent of the whole weight of mails is carried now at less than 8 cents per ton per mile.

This 8 cents per ton per mile would be entirely too much for this mail transportation if it meant simply the transportation of tons of mail subject to the conditions under which freight is carried. But the conditions are so entirely different that no fair and competent critic would think for a moment of applying freight conditions and rates to the mail. This, because the mails are carried in frequent and broken shipments on passenger trains and in traveling post-offices, so that an average load of mail is from 4,000 to 5,000 pounds per full car.

On the other hand, 50,000 pounds is not a heavy load for a freight car, while the actual loading is often greater than 50,000 and reaches the limit at 100,000 pounds, and yet the weight of the postal car with its load and the weight of the freight car and its load are not far apart in total tonnage. Hence it is that a car of mail of 5,000 pounds, at 8 cents per ton, would earn but 20 cents per mile, while the freight car, with 50,000 pounds of fast freight, at 1½ cents per ton per mile, would earn 37½ cents per car per mile. This illustrates in few words the peculiar conditions under which the mails are carried.

The sliding scale of pay to railroads for carrying the mails is as follows:

(No. 2502.)

SCHEDULE OF RATES FOR RAILWAY MAIL TRANSPORTATION.

Average weight of mails per day carried over whole length of route.	Pay per mile per annum. Rates allowable under act of March 3, 1873.	Rates allowable under acts of July 12, 1876, and June 17, 1878.	Rates allowable to land-grant railroads, being 80 per cent of allowance to other railroads, under act of July 12, 1876.	Intermediate weight warranting allowance of $1 per mile under the custom of the Department, subject to acts of July 12, 1876, and June 17, 1878.
				Pounds.
200 pounds	$50.00	$42.75	$34.20	
200 to 500 pounds				12
500 pounds	75.00	64.12	51.30	
500 to 1,000 pounds				20
1,000 pounds	100.00	85.50	68.40	
1,000 to 1,500 pounds				20
1,500 pounds	125.00	106.87	85.50	
1,500 to 2,000 pounds				20
2,000 pounds	150.00	128.25	102.60	
2,000 to 3,500 pounds				60
3,500 pounds	175.00	149.62	119.70	
3,500 to 5,000 pounds				60
5,000 pounds	200.00	171.00	136.80	
For every additional 2,000 pounds	25.00	21.37	17.10	
Over 5,000 pounds				80

No allowance is made for weights not justifying the addition of $1.

Rates allowable per mile per annum for use of railway post-office cars when authorized.

Railway post-office cars—	
40 feet, per daily line	$25
45 feet, per daily line	30
50 feet, per daily line	40
55-60 feet, per daily line	50

To constitute a "line" of railway post-office cars between given points, sufficient railway post-office cars must be provided and run to make a trip daily each way between those points.

RAILWAY POST-OFFICE CARS.

I wish to call attention to the frequent statements on the floor of the House that the compensation allowed for the railway post-office cars is an improper expenditure of money and an abuse. I have observed that in most of these statements on the floor of the House the vital facts in regard to the payment for the use of the postal cars have not been presented. The statements give the rate per annum received by some road for a line of railway post-office cars. Even some who have attempted to discuss this question appear not to know the difference between "a single daily line of postal cars" and the number of cars that may be necessary to operate the line.

As a result of this confusion, one who has attempted to enlighten the public on this subject (claiming that on a certain line ten 60-foot postal cars earned $219,000 per annum) has found it necessary to issue a supplement saying that his former statement should be changed to "10 lines 60-foot post-office cars." He might have added that on the line receiving $219,000 per annum for postal cars about 30 full 60-foot postal cars are employed in operating the 10 lines, instead of 10 cars, as would have been generally understood from the original statement. The true analysis of the compensation for the use of railway post-office cars is this: For a line of 40-foot railway post-office cars each way daily (over a route, say, 150 miles in length) the pay would be $3,750 per annum; therefore to earn this sum these cars must be run 109,500 miles per annum, making the earnings per mile run 3.43 cents.

Now, as compared with passenger-car earnings I quote from testimony before the Senate committee on passenger-coach earnings as follows:

It is entirely possible for a passenger coach on the main line of our road to earn over $200,000 a year. It can make a trip twice over the road from Chicago to Burlington in a day, with fare $6. The cars are generally, on the first-class trains, crowded. They could contain 60. If they contained an average of 50 passengers, that would be $300 one way, or $600 a day, and over $219,000 a year. The car itself costs only about $5,000.

This would make the earnings $1.34 per car per mile run, and hence it is clear, from the great difference between the amount

paid for use of the postal car, with the pay for the limited weight of mail carried in it, and the earning capacity of a passenger coach, that the Government really enjoys an advantage in its transportation. Again, the earnings for passengers have been placed in the evidence before the Senate committee at 20 cents per ton per mile. On this basis the ascertained rate of 12½ cents per ton per mile for mail shows that the passenger rate is 60 per cent greater than the mail pay per ton. Illustrating this, I give in comparison actual passenger rates and mail earnings as follows:

From New York to Chicago:	
Mail per ton	$71.39
Passengers per ton (10 to ton), actual fare	200.00
From New York to St. Louis:	
Mail per ton	87.52
Passengers per ton (10 to ton)	242.50
From New York to New Orleans:	
Mail per ton	117.18
Passengers per ton (10 to ton)	340.00
From New York to San Francisco:	
Mail per ton	265.63
Passengers per ton (10 to ton)	817.50

Some statisticians have fixed the number of passengers per ton at 15; and if this number of passengers had been used in this computation, the earnings per ton for passengers would be 50 per cent greater in each instance; but the 10 passengers to the ton is a most conservative statement, and it is surely within the actual number of passengers per ton.

When I found the foregoing facts, I will frankly say that I was astonished; and while the gentlemen of the House who are members of the Postal Commission of course have this information, I am sure many members of this House, as well as myself, had no idea that passenger rates were so greatly in excess of the rates paid by the Government for carrying the mail. The mail and passenger service are performed on the same trains and are very closely allied. These lines cover the great mail routes, and the fact that the passengers pay 200 per cent per ton more than the Government pays per ton for its mail must go far to clear the atmosphere of all of the indefinite and baseless charges which have been made against the present rates of mail pay.

In this connection I would say that emphasis has been laid upon the rates paid by commutation passengers, and it has been claimed that this commutation passenger service is more closely allied to the mail service than any other form of traffic. The consensus of opinion, however, by those familiar with the two services is that they are not approximately alike, because in the commutation business the transportation is limited by its character to short hauls with cars filled to their full capacity, while the rates are so arranged as to produce adequate compensation for the work, the shortest hauls being charged the greatest rate.

By far the greatest number of commuters use the cars for the shorter distances and consequently pay the higher rates and the actual result of the commutation is about 1 cent per mile, but the average earnings per passenger on a road having a very large commutation business is 1.82 cents per mile.

The postal service is rendered under no such conditions, but is a continuous service made up of pouches going off and coming on the trains every few miles, with other peculiar requirements, which I will not take the time to state here. This subject of commutation service and rates has been very ably stated by Mr. C. Stuart Patterson in a speech before the National Board of Trade, in which he says:

> It can readily be seen that the conditions are such as to render any comparison inapplicable. In the first place, a commutation passenger rate is made, as a general rule, only for short distances; secondly, it is based upon the theory that by allowing to the commuter lower rates you will obtain full loads for passenger cars, and you will obtain, also, a large amount of incidental business in the payment of full passenger rates by noncommuting members of the family and by visitors, and in the incidental transportation of freight and packages for the commuter and his family; and it is based, also, upon the theory that a certain proportion of the transportation sold to the commuter will not be used, and that, therefore, the railroad will receive higher pay for that which is used.
>
> It is obvious that these conditions are in no sense applicable to the transportation of the mail. Assuming that a passenger car seats 60 people, and assuming a commutation rate of 1 cent per mile per passenger, that car would earn, if 60 passengers were carried at the commutation rate, 60 cents per mile run. If the car were only half loaded and 30 passengers were carried at the commutation rate, it would earn 30 cents per mile. Yet these rates are largely in excess of railway mail rates.

POSTAL CLERKS.

There is another feature of the postal service which is deserving of especial attention in estimating the value and character of the service rendered by railroads. It is the relation of the postal clerks to the subject of transportation. Mr. Bradley, Superintendent of Railway Mail Service, ascertained that the total mail tonnage is over 283,000,000 tons per annum. The report of the Postmaster-General for 1899, shows that the postal clerks travel over the railroads in the discharge of their duty in distributing the mail 358,743,151 miles per annum, and hence, on an average, a postal clerk travels a mile for every 1,600 pounds of mail moved 1 mile.

This indicates very clearly the extraordinary character of the mail service. Consider, for a moment, 16,000 pounds of express matter in a car, accompanied by 10 men, or 50,000 pounds of freight in a car, accompanied by 30 men, and the work of postal distribution in transit, with its vast army of clerks, will stand out as a peculiar and distinct service, and one of the highest value, with which no comparison can be made so far as any class of railroad freight traffic is concerned. The burden of perfecting the mail service of the country at almost every point is thrown upon the railroads.

This will appear by noting the last report of the General Superintendent of the Railway Mail Service, who describes the work of city distribution in railway post-offices by railway postal clerks. They handled 519,870,465 pieces of mail matter intended for city distribution. A far larger number of pieces were handled by city distributors sent out to meet incoming trains. This work, from this date on, is to be all thrown upon the Railway Mail Service. It will thus be seen that not only the ordinary distribution of mails in transit is performed on the cars, but the space and facilities which would be required in the city post-office are thrown upon the postal cars in which the separation for city delivery is performed.

The General Superintendent of Railway Mail Service states that the separation for city delivery is commenced hundreds of miles away from the city of destination, and he says the Department will be able to provide this improved service at a comparatively small increase of cost and without retarding the distribution of the regular mail received in railway post-offices. There can be no increase in rate of pay to railroads by reason of this separation, because this refinement of distribution does not increase the weight.

MINORITY REPORT.

The minority report on the pending bill is a remarkable public document. I really doubt if there is a single member of this committee who could explain and make clear the statistics given in that report.

As preliminary to some remarks on that report, I wish to insert in the RECORD the laws governing the rates of pay for the transportation on railroad routes.

LAWS RESPECTING PAY FOR THE TRANSPORTATION OF MAILS ON RAILROAD ROUTES.

[For the information of parties concerned, the sections and paragraphs hereto appended are transcribed from the Revised Statutes and from acts of Congress making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department.]

The Postmaster-General shall, in all cases, decide upon what trains and in what manner the mails shall be conveyed.—*Act of March 3, 1879*, section 3, 20 Stats., 358.

SEC. 3999. If the Postmaster-General is unable to contract for carrying the mail on any railway route at a compensation not exceeding the maximum rates herein provided, or for what he may deem a reasonable and fair compensation, he may separate the letter mail from the other mail, and contract, either with or without advertising, for carrying such letter mail by horse express or otherwise, at the greatest speed that can reasonably be obtained, and for carrying the other mail in wagons or otherwise, at a slower rate of speed.

SEC. 4000. Every railway company carrying the mail shall carry on any train which may run over its road, and without extra charge therefor, all mailable matter directed to be carried thereon, with the person in charge of the same.—*Act of March 3, 1873.*

SEC. 4002. The Postmaster-General is authorized and directed to readjust the compensation hereafter to be paid for the transportation of mails on railroad routes upon the conditions and at the rates hereinafter mentioned:

First. That the mails shall be conveyed with due frequency and speed; and that sufficient and suitable room, fixtures, and furniture, in a car or apartment properly lighted and warmed, shall be provided for route agents to accompany and distribute the mails.

Second. That the pay per mile per annum shall not exceed the following rates, namely: On routes carrying their whole length an average weight of mails per day of 200 pounds, $50; 500 pounds, $75; 1,000 pounds, $100; 1,500 pounds, $125; 2,000 pounds, $150; 3,500 pounds, $175; 5,000 pounds, $300, and $25 additional for every additional 2,000 pounds; the average weight to be ascertained, in every case, by the actual weighing of the mails for such a number of successive working days, not less than thirty, at such times after June 30, 1873, and not less frequently than once in every four years, and the result to be stated and verified in such form and manner as the Postmaster-General may direct.—*Act of March 3, 1873.*

ADDITIONAL PAY FOR RAILWAY POST-OFFICE CARS.

SEC. 4003. In case any railroad company now furnishing railway post-office cars shall refuse to provide such cars, such company shall not be entitled to any increase of compensation under the provisions of the next section.

SEC. 4004. Additional pay may be allowed for every line comprising a daily trip each way of railway post-office cars, at a rate not exceeding $25 per mile per annum for cars 40 feet in length, and $30 per mile per annum for 45-foot cars, and $40 per mile per annum for 50-foot cars, and $50 per annum for 55 to 60-foot cars.

NOTE.—This statute does not authorize a pro rata compensation to be paid for cars which are less than 40 feet in length.

And hereafter when any railroad company fail or refuse to provide railway post-office cars when required by the Post-Office Department, or shall fail or refuse to provide suitable safety heaters and safety lamps therefor, with such number of saws and axes to each car for use in case of accident as may be required by the Post-Office Department, said company shall have its pay reduced 10 per cent on the rates fixed in section 4002 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by act of July 12, 1876, entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1877, and for other purposes," and as further amended by the act of June 17, 1878, entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1879, and for other purposes."—*Act of March 1, 1881*, 21 Stats., 375.

That all cars or parts of cars used for the railway mail service shall be of such style, length, and character, and furnished in such manner as shall be required by the Postmaster-General, and shall be constructed, fitted up,

maintained, heated, and lighted by and at the expense of the railroad companies.—*Act of March 3, 1879*, section 4, 20 Stats., 358.

MAILS TO BE WEIGHED BY AGENTS OF THE DEPARTMENT.

* * * And out of the appropriation for inland mail transportation the Postmaster-General is authorized hereafter to pay the expenses of taking the weights of mails on railroad routes, as provided by the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the year ending June 30, 1874," approved March 3, 1873; and he is hereby directed to have the mails weighed as often as now provided by law by the employees of the Post-Office Department, and have the weights stated and verified to him by said employees under such instructions as he may consider just to the Post-Office Department and the railroad companies.—*Act of March 3, 1875.*

REDUCTION OF 10 PER CENT.

* * * *Provided*, That the Postmaster-General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to readjust the compensation to be paid from and after the 1st day of July, 1876, for transportation of mails on railroad routes by reducing the compensation of all railroad companies for the transportation of mails 10 per cent per annum from the rates fixed and allowed by the first section of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1874, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1873, for the transportation of mails on the basis of the average weight. * * *—*Act of July 12, 1876, section 1.*

ADDITIONAL REDUCTION OF 5 PER CENT.

And provided further, That the Postmaster-General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to readjust the compensation to be paid from and after the 1st day of July, 1878, for transportation of mails on railroad routes by reducing the compensation to all railroad companies for the transportation of mails 5 per cent per annum from the rates for the transportation of mails on the basis of the average weight fixed and allowed by the first section of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1877, and for other purposes," approved July 12, 1876.—*Act of June 17, 1878.*

ALLOWANCE ON LAND-GRANT ROADS.

SEC. 4001. All railway companies to which the United States have furnished aid, by grant of lands, right of way, or otherwise, shall carry the mail at such prices as Congress may by law provide; and until such price is fixed by law, the Postmaster-General may fix the rate of compensation.—*Act of March 3, 1873.*

That railroad companies whose railroad was constructed in whole or in part by a land grant made by Congress, on the condition that the mails should be transported over their road at such price as Congress should by law direct, shall receive only 80 per cent of the compensation authorized by this act.—*Act of July 12, 1876*, section 13.

PENALTY FOR REFUSAL TO CARRY MAILS ON FASTEST TRAINS.

* * * And if any railroad company shall fail or refuse to transport the mails, when required by the Post-Office Department, upon the fastest train or trains run upon said road, said company shall have its pay reduced 50 per cent of the amount provided by law.—*Act of March 3, 1885.*

This report expresses the opinion that the main cause of the deficiency in the revenues of the Post-Office Department is the cost of transportation allowed and paid to railroad companies on inland mails.

It speaks throughout of "contracts," and says the companies very properly secure the best terms they can from the Government to perform this service, and calls attention to "the excessive pay for the transportation of mails, not with the view of striking out this item of the appropriation bill, for that could not be properly done at this time under contract relations between the carriers and the Government."

The minority report is altogether in error in stating that contract relations exist between these carriers and the Government. This is not the fact. There are no time contract relations between the railroads and the Government guaranteeing future payments. There are not only no time contract relations, but Congress determines the rates to be paid in accordance with the laws above cited.

It seems strange that the minority committee, overlooking this vital fact, speak throughout their report of "contract relations" with railroads, and of the companies securing "the best terms they can from the Government."

The report says it costs 8 cents per pound to carry the mails. This 8 cents a pound proposition, by whomsoever made, has long since been exploded.

Professor Adams has ascertained that the average cost of carrying a ton of mail 1 mile is 12½ cents. Others have reached substantially the same result. This includes pay for postal cars. Therefore 1 pound is carried 2,000 miles for 12½ cents and 8 cents would carry it 1,280 miles.

The report says, incorrectly, that the average haul is 813 miles, which would make the cost a little over 5 cents per pound. But this is not the full extent of this 8 cents a pound inaccuracy.

The recent weighing of all mail matter, made by the Post-Office Department and published under date of February 21, 1900, enables any one of intelligence to demonstrate beyond any doubt or question that the average haul of mail does not very much exceed 400 miles. Therefore, with the rate per ton per mile fixed at 12½ cents, the amount paid to the railroads for carrying the mail is about 2½ cents per pound the average distance and not 8 cents. Hence the minority report is not only in error, but grossly wrong and misleading on this point in giving its sanction to the idea that an average of 8 cents per pound is paid to railroads for carrying the mails.

Then the report states that express companies pay the railroad companies 40 per cent of their earnings. Others, and among them Professor Adams, place the figure at 50 per cent of their earnings.

Without going into details, this vital fact in connection with express traffic must be kept in mind, viz: That the portion of the express business carried under conditions even approximately similar to conditions controlling in mail transportation, is that part covered by packages of 4 pounds and less in weight, as that is the limit of weight of mailable matter. Taking this class of traffic, it will be found that railroads receive very much more per ton per mile for the express than for the mail.

I call attention to the blind and misleading form in which other statements are presented in the minority report. For instance: "Fixed rate for haul of 200 pounds of mail, average distance a mile (365 days), $94.77." The impression upon reading this would be that for 200 pounds of mail daily over 1 mile of road the pay would be $94.77. In fact, the pay for 200 pounds daily in not less than 730 shipments per year, or 730 miles of transportation, would be $42.75 per mile of road per annum.

In the greater number of these cases the shipments would be 1,460 times a year and over per mile. With the 300,000 pounds per day illustration (and there is but one route, New York to Philadelphia, that carries that amount), the pay for weight would be $3,323.34 per mile per annum, and this mail would be carried in 29,940 shipments per annum, or 80 per day. This is altogether a different question from a mere transportation of tonnage.

The minority report gives what purports to be the annual revenue of a passenger car and the annual revenues of a mail car, but no intimation is given as to work performed—that is, the mileage run per annum—in each case, and without such information anyone can see that no comparison is possible.

The annual revenue from any car used for any purpose depends upon the number of miles the car is run. No comparison of any value whatever can be made without such data, and hence the minority report concerning car earnings, in plain words, means nothing, absolutely nothing.

Professor Adams has testified that the cost to the Government per ton for mail transportation has been reduced since 1879 39 per cent, while passenger rates have been decreased 21.4 per cent. It will thus be seen that there is a principle at work, an evolution of the law, reducing the cost of transporting the mails, and it must be clear to anyone that with this decrease continuing, so far as railroad transportation is concerned, a profit on postal business will soon be reached. The last report of the Postmaster-General shows that this result is near.

It is not necessary to go further into the details in connection with the errors of this minority report, but prominent among its mistakes I note especially:

A. The statement that 8 cents per pound is paid for carrying mails.

B. That the express companies carry the mails from Eastern cities to Chicago for 1 cent a pound.

C. Table bottom page 2. It defies the initiated to understand it.

D. Table bottom page 2. First footnote incorrect.

E. Table bottom page 2. Second footnote incorrect.

F. Details in the tables on pages 2 and 3 entirely unreliable.

G. The citation, page 4, as to cost and use of postal cars.

H. The assumption that the service is rendered under time contract relations between the Government and the carriers.

OUR SERVICE COMPARED WITH ENGLAND'S.

Mr. Chairman, there is beyond question much misunderstanding in the public mind in regard to relative economy in the conduct of our postal establishment as compared with the postal establishment of other nations.

It is true that the United States is far ahead of any other nation in the volume of its business, as shown by its expenditure of $101,000,000 and its receipts of $95,000,000 for 1899. The only nation approximating the United States in postal affairs is Great Britain. The United States covers a great area—3,500,000 square miles—and the distances the mails are to be carried for 70,000,000 people are within the following limits:

	Miles.
Vanceboro, Me., and Seattle, Wash.	3,902
Vanceboro, Me., and Key West, Fla.	2,136
Key West, Fla., and San Diego, Cal.	3,137
San Diego, Cal., and Seattle, Wash.	1,567
Boston, Mass., and San Francisco, Cal.	3,407
Washington, D. C., and San Francisco, Cal.	3,211
Savannah, Ga., and Los Angeles, Cal.	2,661

These immense distances, with the great intermediate centers of population of Buffalo, Pittsburg, Cincinnati, New Orleans, Minneapolis, St. Paul, Milwaukee, Chicago, and St. Louis indicate most forcibly the great length of haul necessary to the interchange of mails in this country. It is to be noted that the mails do not follow straight lines. A letter posted at Key West, Fla., for Port Townsend, Wash., crosses the country diagonally and travels about 3,987 miles. This subject of the great length of haul must be kept constantly in mind as a natural, reasonable, and controlling factor in the cost of transporting the mail in order to a correct and intelligent understanding of the conditions under which our postal system must be operated. Then, too, 8,460 postal clerks are required to make this great distribution in transit.

Turn now to Great Britain. The United Kingdom—England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales—comprises an area of about 121,000 square miles. The greatest distance that can be measured from Lands End, England, to Dunnet, Scotland, is less than 700 miles. But the point of greatest significance in a comparison between the postal systems of the United States and Great Britain is this: The postmaster-general of Great Britain in his annual reports has repeatedly stated that 85 per cent of the mail matter of the Kingdom is delivered in England and Wales, and 30 per cent of that in the London district. Now, the area of England and Wales is but 58,000 square miles (population about 26,000,000).

The longest haul out of London within this district (London to Carlisle) is not over 300 miles, 140 miles less than the distance from New York to Pittsburg. Bear in mind that the combined area of the States of Massachusetts and New York is 57,485 square miles (population about 8,000,000), and that notwithstanding the population of England and Wales is more than three times that of Massachusetts and New York, yet these two States yield a net postal revenue of over five and one-half million dollars, or a net revenue of 70 cents per capita.

At the same ratio England and Wales should show a profit of $18,200,000; but Great Britain shows no such profit. If 85 per cent of the postal business of the United States were transacted in Massachusetts and New York, the net revenue on the ratio furnished by the existing business in these two States would be about $22,000,000 per annum. Thus, when conditions as to length of haul and density of population are taken into account—and no reasonable or valuable conclusion is possible without doing so—it appears beyond cavil or question that the postal system of Great Britain is not superior to that of the United States from any point of view.

DEFICIENCY IN POSTAL REVENUE.

What I have just stated explains in part why the mail service in this country shows a deficiency, and why it is reasonable that it should do so. But aside from rates of postage charged and cost of transportation, there is another strong factor that constitutes a most serious obstacle to the economical conduct of the postal business, and that is the fact that a proportion equal to one-fifth of the paid mail matter handled yields no postage whatever to the Government. This is made clear by the recent weighing of all mails mailed in the United States, the results of which were published by the Post-Office Department February 21, 1900:

Paid mail matter mailed per annum:		
First-class	pounds..	94,888,341
Second-class	do....	394,417,505
Third and fourth class	do....	145,874,518
Total paid matter	do....	635,180,364
Total revenue June 30, 1899		$95,021,384.00
Revenue per pound	cents..	14.944
Free matter:		
Second-class	pounds..	32,750,550
Government	do....	96,132,692
Total	do....	128,883,242
If postage at average rate for paid matter were collected for this free matter, the result would be per annum		$19,260,311.68
The deficit June 30, 1899, was		6,610,776.75
Therefore, if postage were collected on this free matter, the result would be, instead of a deficiency, a surplus of		12,649,534.93

The weight of the equipment is not included in these figures.

It will thus be seen that the total amount of paid matter mailed per annum was 635,180,364 pounds, on which a total revenue of $95,021,384 was collected. This shows a revenue per pound of 14.944 cents. The total amount of free matter carried was 128,883,242 pounds. If this free matter had been subject to the same average rate of postage, there would have been collected from it the sum of $19,260,311.68.

I am able, therefore, to make good the statement made to the House April 26, when I said I would be able to prove that the deficiencies in the postal service are due to an entirely different cause from that claimed by those who oppose this measure.

The deficiency reported for June 30, 1899, was $6,610,776.75.

If the average rate of postage had been collected on this free matter, instead of a deficiency there would have resulted a surplus of $12,649,534.93.

ALLEGED FRAUDS IN WEIGHING.

The public press recently contained startling headlines of great frauds in weighing the mail. The interest of a member of the Post-Office Committee was aroused, and he addressed a letter to the Post-Office Department for information, and the answer is so instructive that, with his permission, I will give the correspondence:

POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER-GENERAL,
RAILWAY ADJUSTMENT DIVISION,
Washington, April 21, 1900.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of even date, which I will quote, as you desire specific replies:

Hon. W. S. SHALLENBERGER,
Second Assistant Postmaster-General, Washington, D. C.

SIR: It was some time since stated in the public press that there is on file in your office an affidavit of B. C. Fechtig to the effect that when he was employed as station agent on the Colorado Midland Railway he was directed to and did fraudulently aid in "padding" the mail on the said road.

I will thank you, if you have it on your files, for information concerning this matter, as follows:

First. The date of the affidavit.

Second. The name of the station at which B. C. Fechtig was employed at the time he says he committed the fraud.

Third. What was the date of the weighing in question?

Fourth. What was the number and termini of the Colorado Midland mail route on which the station at which Fechtig was employed was situated?

Fifth. What was the average weight of mails per day and pay per mile on that route prior to the weighing in which fraud is alleged, the same data for weighing when Fechtig was station agent, and the same data for weighings and adjustment since?

Sixth. Was it possible for Fechtig to have been concerned in padding the mails passing over the Colorado Midland Railway, the weight of which would not have been shown on the route on which he was located?

An early reply will oblige.

Very respectfully,

SMITH McPHERSON.

In reply, I have the honor to state—

1. An affidavit signed by B. C. Fechtig was filed in this office in November last. It appears to have been sworn to on the 2d day of November, 1899, but the date at the head of the affidavit is October 31, 1899.

2. The name of the station at which Mr. Fechtig states he was employed is Newcastle, Colo.

3. The date on which the weighing in question commenced was April 16, 1894.

4. Newcastle is on Colorado Midland route, No. 165039, the termini of which are Aspen Junction (n. o.) and Newcastle.

5. The average daily weight on this route for the term preceding the weight of 1894 was 528 pounds; for the term commencing July 1, 1894, 113 pounds, and for the term commencing July 1, 1898, 141 pounds. The pay per mile per annum for the term prior to 1894 was $64.98; for the term beginning July 1, 1894, $42.75, and for the term beginning July 1, 1898, $42.75.

6. As compensation for railroad mail service is based on the average daily weight, no weight not shown in the figures above given, could have affected the compensation on this route. Under the rules and instructions of the Department in relation to mail weighings, it would have been impossible for the mails in question to have passed over this route and not been reported, unless there was dereliction of duty on the part of some postal employee.

The weight claimed to have been sent was 2 sacks of 125 pounds each, or 250 pounds; this, it is claimed, was sent during the thirty-day weighing period. The average per day, as affecting the whole weighing, would have been 8¼ pounds. The Department allows, under the law, $42.75 per mile per annum for an average daily weight of not exceeding 200 pounds carried over the whole length of the route; hence it will be noted that even though the two sacks mentioned were carried during this weighing, they would not be enough, added to the 113 pounds daily average on the route, to bring it up to an amount which would have entitled the company to any additional compensation.

Very respectfully,

W. S. SHALLENBERGER,
Second Assistant Postmaster-General.

Hon. SMITH McPHERSON,
House of Representatives.

This correspondence shows that, so far as the Government's interests are involved, the alleged fraud, if actually perpetrated, had no effect whatever.

Trade of Porto Rico.

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. JONES,
OF VIRGINIA,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Wednesday, April 11, 1900.

The House having under consideration the bill (H. R. 8245) temporarily to provide revenues for the relief of the island of Porto Rico, and for other purposes, and the Senate amendments thereto—

Mr. JONES of Virginia said:

Mr. SPEAKER: The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] who has just taken his seat concluded his speech in support of the pending bill by asking us upon this side of the Chamber, with some attempt at dramatic effect, what we propose to do for Puerto Rico.

Speaking only for myself, but, as I believe, voicing the sentiment of every Democrat upon this floor, I answer the gentleman by saying that first of all I would prevent, had I the power to do so, the consummation of the cruel wrong which the advocates of this measure of oppression would perpetrate upon a helpless and inoffending people, to whom instead we promised the blessings of liberty and happiness.

I would not withhold from them, as this bill is designed to do, the guaranties of the American Constitution and the protection of the American flag. I would give to them a Territorial form of government, such as is enjoyed by every other American Territory, a system of local self-government certainly no less free and liberal than that which it is proposed shall be given to the people of the Hawaiian Islands in the measure which but recently passed this House. I would treat them as citizens of the United States and not as conquered subjects, possessing no rights which the President and the Congress of the United States are bound to respect. I would leave in their hands the power to protect themselves against the rapacious greed of those in whose interest, as I firmly believe, this measure of cruelty and perfidy has been cunningly and devilishly devised, a power of which this bill absolutely and unqualifiedly robs them. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Speaker, that the Republican leaders in this House should have selected this day, the anniversary of that upon which the ratifications of the treaty of peace were exchanged—a treaty by the terms of which the island of Puerto Rico became a part of the territory of the United States—to enact this measure of injustice and bad faith must be incomprehensible even to themselves. To me it appears the very irony of relentless fate, the refinement of a studied and shameless cruelty, that such an anniversary should have been chosen to mark the departure of the American Congress from those principles of liberty and justice which lie at the very foundation of our Republic. It was to be assumed, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Indiana would have devoted at least a part of his address to an exposition of the governmental features of this bill. That he has not done so is to my mind a confession that they are indefensible and that the least said about them the better.

During the discussion of the despotic rule under which this bill is being considered, a rule which limits all debate to three and a half hours, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] defended the action of the Committee on Rules, of which he is a distinguished member, upon the ground that the measure had been thoroughly discussed heretofore, and that there was therefore no good purpose to be served by permitting any extended debate now. How the gentleman could reconcile that statement with the notorious facts in the case I can not understand. The bill covers 28 pages, 22 of which relate to and purport to be a complete system of civil government for Puerto Rico. Not one line of the civil-government feature of this bill has ever been discussed or even read in this House.

Indeed, I venture the statement that not one in ten of its members have either read or in any other way acquired a knowledge of even the more important of the many governmental features of this measure. A bill providing a complete system of government for a million of people, containing features unknown to any Territorial form of government on earth, and for which the history of the world is to be searched in vain for a precedent, is to be rushed through this House under whip and spur, with no reasonable opportunity afforded for either an examination or a discussion of its provisions.

In the limited time at my command I can not be expected to attempt an analysis of the measure. Many of its features are so outrageous, so iniquitous, so undemocratic, and so un-American that when they become known and understood they can not but offend the moral sense and shock the conscience of the American people—a people who abhor injustice, despise hypocrisy, and contemn dishonesty.

The first amendment proposed by the Senate changes the name of the island to that of Porto Rico. For more than four centuries this island, "the pearl of the Antilles," has been called "Puerto Rico," and to that name its inhabitants are deeply and profoundly attached. Against this change they have earnestly protested, and yet, to the many other wrongs which they will be called upon to endure, should the bill pass this House, is to be added the humiliation of being deprived of their country's name—a name which they revere and love and which, in their estimation, is nothing less than sacred. Nor with them is it purely a question of sentiment. Puerto Rico is their historical name; their records, both church and state, bear that name.

Every deed and other muniment of title contains the name of Puerto Rico—a name that is now to be blotted out because, forsooth, some Republican politician, ignorant of its derivation and meaning, and insensible to the wishes and the feelings of those who are attached to it, has abitrarily and wickedly determined that it shall be so. President McKinley, after advising with the Board on Geographic Names, provided, by Executive order, that the name should be spelled Puerto Rico. Among the reasons for retaining the present name advanced by the Hon. Henry Gannett, president of the board, I am permitted to quote the following, taken from a letter recently addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs. Mr. Gannett says:

> Puerto Rico consists of two good Spanish words, meaning rich port. This form is the one originally given by the Spaniards more than four centuries ago, and consistently and uniformly followed by the people of the island to this day. It is their name—a name which they have the same right to expect other people will adopt and use as we have to expect that others will adopt and use the personal names we bear. It is the form universally used by Spanish-speaking people everywhere. Porto Rico is a corrupted form, the word "porto" finding no place in the Spanish language or dictionaries.

In a communication, also addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs, the representatives of Puerto Rico, lately in this city, urged in pathetic terms that no change should be made in the spelling of the name of their island home. They say that there does not even exist the pretext of changing the name to Americanize it, since porto is not an English but a Portuguese word.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that if the policies of imperialism and the demands of sordid greed, as set forth in this bill, are not to be resisted, we may at least leave to the people of Puerto Rico such consolation as they may find in the continued use of a name endeared to them by the history and traditions of more than four hundred years.

I come now, Mr. Speaker, to the discussion of some of the more practical provisions of this measure. In every essential particular the government which you are about to provide for Puerto Rico is a despotism. The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoints the governor. In like manner there is to be appointed a secretary, an attorney-general, a treasurer, an auditor, a commissioner of the interior, and a commissioner of education, who, together with five other persons, also to be appointed by the President, are to constitute an executive council, at least five of whom shall be native inhabitants of the island. The local legislative powers are vested in a legislative assembly, of which the executive council is to constitute the upper house.

The house of delegates is to consist of 35 members, to be elected biennially by the qualified voters. Only such persons shall be allowed to vote for delegates as have been residents of the island for one year and who possess the other educational or property qualifications prescribed by the military laws in force on the 1st day of March of this year, which qualifications shall be subject, mark you, "to such modifications and additional qualifications and such regulations and restrictions as to registration as may be prescribed by the executive council. In other words, the executive council, appointed by the President, may prescribe such additional qualifications for the elective franchise as may limit the exercise of the right of suffrage to a mere handful of the inhabitants of Puerto Rico, if, perchance, it shall so desire. This places it within the power of six, or a bare majority, of the members of the executive council, every one of whom is appointed by the President and may not even be residents of the island, to prescribe the qualifications of the voters, and thus dominate the election of the lower house of the legislative assembly, virtually making the executive council the lawmaking power of Puerto Rico.

And this, Mr. Speaker, is the free, local self-government which was solemnly promised the inhabitants of Puerto Rico! Was ever before such a travesty upon justice enacted by the American Congress? As a scheme for the despotic government of a subject colony it can not be improved upon. As a means to reward political favorites and to provide for broken-down Republican politicians there is nothing like unto it, either in the heavens above or the earth beneath.

The salaries, with one exception, are all to be paid by the poor Puerto Ricans. The governor is to receive $8,000 and perquisites; the secretary, $4,000; the attorney-general, $4,000; the treasurer, $5,000; the auditor, $4,000; the commissioner of education, $3,000; a chief justice of the supreme court, $5,000, and each of the four associate justices, $4,500; a marshal, $3,000; a United States district judge, $5,000; a United States district attorney, $4,000, and a United States district marshal, $3,500.

The President is also permitted, of course with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint three commissioners, two of whom may be nonresidents, at a salary of $5,000 each per annum, to revise the laws of Puerto Rico. All of these high and mighty officials are allowed "all necessary clerks and other assistants," the salaries of which are also to be paid out of the insular treasury. These salaries are far in excess of those paid in my own and many other of the Commonwealths of this Union, and in the aggregate constitute a sum sufficiently large to be a heavy burden upon the impoverished people of Puerto Rico.

Unlike every other Territory, including that of Hawaii, the Puerto Ricans are to have no Delegate to Congress. Instead, they will be permitted to send a commissioner to Washington to look after departmental work, who is to be paid by the United States $5,000 per annum. What his duties are to be the bill does not disclose. He is not even given the privilege of warming his heels in the cloakrooms of Congress. Hawaii, with one-tenth of the population of this island, is to send a Delegate to Congress, who, like all other Territorial Delegates, will have no vote, but will at least have the right to speak upon the floor of this House.

Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding Puerto Rico is to be treated as if it were not a part of the United States, and its inhabitants are hereafter to be known as "the people of Porto Rico," this bill provides that "all officials authorized by this act shall, before entering upon the duties of their respective offices, take an oath to support the Constitution of the United States and the laws of Porto Rico." The people of Puerto Rico are either citizens of the United States or they are aliens. This bill denies to them the right of citizenship, excludes them from the enjoyment of the protection of the Constitution of the United States, and yet requires their numerous and high-salaried officials to take an oath to support that Constitution!

The Constitution is the supreme law of the United States; inoperative, you Republicans tell us, in Puerto Rico, because Puerto Rico is not a part of the United States, and yet the officials of this island are required by this bill to be sworn to support it. They are to administer the laws of Puerto Rico and those of the United States not locally inapplicable exclusive of the Constitution, and

yet they must swear to support that Constitution. This measure is to constitute the organic law of Puerto Rico. The Constitution of the United States is by express intendment not to be operative there, and yet the officials in Puerto Rico are to swear to support it. Denied, as the Puerto Ricans are, the rights, privileges, and immunities guaranteed by the Constitution, refused its protection and its blessings, unable to obey its provisions and requirements because not a part of their organic law, they are yet required to swear to support it and every line of it. Was there ever such an impossible legislative requirement, such an anomalous monstrosity as this upon the statute books of any country beneath the skies?

There is just one other feature of this bill to which I desire to direct the attention of the House. Despotic as are its provisions throughout, flagrant as it is with injustice to a prostrate and helpless people, and bristling as it does with inconsistencies, if I were asked to name the feature most glaringly obnoxious and most repugnant to my own sense of justice, I would unhesitatingly say it was that which puts into the hands of a carpetbag executive council, with only the approval of a carpetbag governor, the power to grant and dispose of every franchise, right, privilege, and concession of a public or quasi-public nature in the island.

Mr. Speaker, I venture to affirm that no such dangerous and absolute power as this was ever before lodged in an irresponsible carpetbag government. If this bill becomes a law, this single provision is capable of being made to work the complete and well-nigh actual enslavement of practically every man, woman, and child in Puerto Rico. If such arbitrary and limitless power over the franchises of this island is given to an executive council, the majority of whose membership may not be, and will not be, residents of the island, sixty days will not elapse after the organization of the government here proposed before corporate wealth will practically own it. To-day there are no corporations in Puerto Rico. It will not be long after this bill becomes a law before organized capital will own everything of any value in sight, including the very soil. For months the representatives of great railroad, telegraph, and other corporations have been besieging Congress to grant them the most valuable concessions in this island.

I have reason to believe that syndicates are now being organized to buy up practically all the rich sugar, coffee, and tobacco lands. A large part of these lands are heavily mortgaged and greatly depreciated in value. In truth, they were laid waste by the hurricane of 1898, and their nominal owners will be the prey of the greedy speculators who are behind this obnoxious bill. I say behind this bill, because no sane man believes that such a provision as this crept into it by accident. It is the handiwork of a crafty and desperately wicked mind. It was conceived in greed and, if suffered to remain in the bill, will be mercilessly executed. In the Hawaiian act it is expressly provided that—

> The legislature shall not grant to any corporation, association, or individual any special or exclusive privilege, immunity, or franchise without the approval of Congress.

The legislature of Hawaii is not even permitted to grant private charters; and no corporation, domestic or foreign, can acquire or hold real estate in Hawaii in excess of 1,000 acres. Under the provisions of this bill the sugar trust may acquire every acre of sugar land and the American Tobacco Company every acre of tobacco land in the island of Puerto Rico, and force its inhabitants, under pain of starvation, to cultivate them at a daily wage of 10 cents.

Mr. Speaker, it is said that there are no serpents or other reptiles in Puerto Rico; but if this bill is passed in its present shape, it will not be many days before human vipers, more dangerous than the crawling snake, will infest its borders.

It can not be doubted but that the franchise clause in this bill was drafted to accomplish just what I have endeavored to demonstrate would inevitably follow its passage. Practically all the valuable lands of Hawaii have for years been owned by corporations—not so with Puerto Rico. And yet the Hawaiian Territorial act safe-guards its franchises, and protects its people, as far as they can now be protected, from the curse of land monoply. Is it because there is little left in Hawaii upon which corporate greed can feed and fatten that this Republican Congress has treated it so much more justly than it proposes to treat Puerto Rico? Perhaps, after all, this legislation is incited only by a desire to make the civil-government act of Puerto Rico serve as a precedent for that which is to follow for the Philippines. Although there are many valuable concessions to be disposed of in Puerto Rico, they are as nothing compared to those which exist in the Philippines. The syndicates, trusts, and monopolies are well aware of this, and it is this knowledge, born of cupidity, which has fastened upon the Republican party the deadly policy of imperialism. I know of no other way to account for the discrimination of the Republican party in its legislation for Hawaii.

There surely can be no question of race prejudice involved, for only one-fifth of the inhabitants of Hawaii are white, while seven-tenths of those of Puerto Rico belong to the Caucasian race.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one thing further I desire to say. You Republicans deny that the Constitution follows the flag. Your slogan is that "trade follows the flag." To this extent only have our recent experiences proven that to be true: The facts of history, recent history, at least, prove that the products of our distilleries and breweries follow the American flag wherever it goes. During the fiscal year of 1897 the entire exports of American distilled and malt liquors to Puerto Rico, Cuba, and the Philippines amounted to $31,076, whilst during the last calendar year the sum total was $1,446,979. If we have not carried to our new possessions the protection of the Constitution and the blessings of liberty, we have surely carried to them the curse of the saloon.

However I may differ from my Republican friends as to the Constitution following the flag, there is no room to doubt that whisky is following "Old Glory," and is following it with alarming rapidity and in alarming quantities. Not only is it following the flag, but it is doing its deadly work wherever the American soldier has planted it. When the American Army entered Manila, there were not more than one or two saloons in that city, and we have the testimony of no less a person than Prof. Jacob G. Schurman, president of the first Philippine Commission, to the effect that he had "never seen a Filipino drunkard." Now there are said to be about 500 liquor saloons in the city, and drunkenness is almost universal. This same distinguished American is authority for the statement that "the spectacle of Americans drunk awakens disgust in the Filipinos." On another occasion Professor Schurman, in a public address, quoted a native as saying:

> You have brought us the blessings of civilization, and you have lined our most beautiful street in Manila, Escolta, with 500 saloons.

Thus far the cost in money of subduing the Filipinos, in addition to the $20,000,000 paid to Spain for what she did not possess and could not deliver, has been at least a hundred million, and some 6,000 American soldiers have yielded up their lives in this useless and wicked warfare. Hundreds of others, driven to madness by the drink which followed the flag to Manila, fill asylums for the insane. The secular as well as the religious press of the country is vainly endeavoring to arouse a Republican Administration to a realizing sense of the enormity of the crime which it has so long permitted and still permits to exist in the Philippines. And this is the Christianity which we are told it is our mission to carry to the Filipino! Does any man question the accuracy of these statements? Have I in any way overdrawn the picture? Let me read you only two extracts from the testimony of the many who have spoken and written upon this subject—testimony that no one will dare to question.

Bishop Thoburn, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, said, after a visit to the Philippines:

> Every alternate place of business seems to be a liquor shop of some kind, and the soldier has temptation before his eyes whichever way he may turn. * * * Drunken soldiers meet me everywhere, and it is painful in the extreme to remember that many of them have come from Christian homes and that they have been thrust into the very jaws of temptation, from which only a strong man can be expected to escape.

And Army Secretary Peyton, sent to the Philippines by Bishop Doane, chairman of the Board of Domestic and Foreign Missions of the Protestant Episcopal Church, said, after a stay of six months:

> At the present time there is no chance for Protestant effort. It is practically useless to undertake to do anything there until the United States troops depart or reform. The United States has in and around Manila at this moment, or had when I left a few weeks ago, 45,000 drunkards, rakes, and gamblers. Of course, there are exceptions (but they are not worth mentioning). The statement is sufficiently accurate. When the American troops landed in Manila there was only a saloon or two in the whole place. To-day Manila is a hell hole. There are 400 or more saloons, typical places of the Western frontier or worse, and the saloons are more respectable than are many of the other places within the city which Americans have either planted or keep alive by their support.
>
> I am aware that it may be an ungracious thing to characterize American soldiers as drunkards, rakes, and gamblers. I can not help it; the sin is not mine. Nor is the sin wholly that of our troops. I mean there are a few mitigating circumstances. The men are far from home, and restraint is absent from them. They are in a hot climate and surrounded by temptations unknown in colder ones. They have fallen, and that lower than anything I ever imagined. Just before I came away from Manila I had a talk with Señor Publetti. He is almost the only Protestant native there. He was educated in Europe and is a most devout and intelligent man. He said to me: "So long as this army is here and it remains such an army as it is, there is not the shadow of a chance for Protestant effort." And I think Señor Publetti is right.

Mr. Speaker, I have endeavored to show what the imperialistic and commercial policy of the Republican party has cost in money, in blood, in ruined lives, and in shame. I ask, Is the game worth the candle? Every day we are receiving letters from enlisted soldiers in the Philippines entreating us to procure discharges for them in order that they may return to their homes. Would it not be better to bring them all back to their homes, and put a stop to this miserable business? The distillers and the brewers, the whisky trust and the beer trust, may find that they do not represent all the honor of this American Republic. Neither are they the exponents of all the patriotism. And that love of liberty

which exists in the great American heart, that hatred of vice which, I believe, still dominates this Christian nation, will some day—I pray God it may be in the near future—answer the question put by President McKinley as to who will pull down the flag in the Philippine Islands. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

I shall print as an appendix to my remarks a letter which I recently received from a constituent who takes a great interest in public questions. It will be found to be a most scholarly and thoughtful article, that will richly repay perusal. Its author, Mr. William Baird, of Essex County, Va., is a profound student of political history, and his opinions, the result of exhaustive research and mature thought, are entitled to more than ordinary weight. Mr. Baird treats of the general subject of constitutional government and of imperialism from the standpoint of a Jeffersonian Democrat. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

APPENDIX.

OCCUPACIA, VA., *March 22, 1900.*

MY DEAR MR. JONES: Your letter and speech have both been received. I read both letter and speech with much interest and pleasure, and am fully in sympathy with you on the constitutional question. The judicial decisions you cited in support of your contention were not familiar to me, and I was very glad to have my view thus strengthened and reenforced. The Puerto Rican tariff measure, bad in itself, is still worse as a precedent, a sort of entering wedge prepartory to further assumptions of power on the part of the Government. The truth is the Republican party and the Constitution can not flourish together.

A man can not possibly serve these two masters; he must choose between them. The party as a party—I do not now speak of individuals—stands, in a broad sense, for paternal—i. e., arbitrary—government. It is continually claiming and reaching out after fresh powers, and thus, by a process of gradual absorption, is weakening and sapping the reserved rights upon the maintenance of which the free constitutional system founded by our fathers absolutely depends. The powers thus unwarrantably assumed are, then, freely employed for the benefit of favored interests, which, in their turn, by campaign contribution, and, indeed, by every means, direct and indirect, which wealth, practically unlimited, can wield, support the party so favoring them, trusting for their reward to fresh assumptions of power by the Government to be used in like manner for their aggrandizement.

And so wealth fattens upon the gifts of power, and power increases by the aid of wealth, while every revolution of the wheel marks another advance on the road to imperialism. If not checked in some way, the result of this will be the virtual transformation of what was intended to be a Federal republican government of carefully defined and strictly limited powers into a practically imperial government, construing its powers according to its own pleasure, recognizing no really effective limitations upon them, and using them at the behest and for the benefit of a few special classes and interests. The old machinery may indeed be retained and the people permitted to amuse themselves with the names and forms to which they have been so long accustomed; but the spirit having departed, these will be really only the convenient instruments of absolutism. The student of history is mournfully familiar with this process. Those who desire to establish despotism among a people accustomed to free institutions will, if they are wise in their generation, carefully preserve the forms while in the very act of destroying the substance of liberty.

It is thus that they most certainly and easily, often with the acquiescence and even aid of the deluded masses, arrive at their end. It is here emphatically the first step that costs, and it should be watched and guarded against with that sleepless vigilance which our fathers have taught us is the price of liberty. Once concede that the Government enters the new acquisitions freed from all constitutional restraints and what is there to control or check it? Why may it not establish a church, erect an order of nobility, fetter the press, fill the land with bastiles, and the bastiles with prisoners, and "do all the other acts and things" which czars and sultans, themselves being judges, "may of right do?"

Even supposing that the power thus arbitrarily assumed should be, in the first instance, at all events, moderately and judicially exercised, what would this avail? Arbitrary power gently and wisely employed may for that very reason be of all kinds the most dangerous. It is thus that that watchful jealousy which is the best safeguard of freedom is lulled to sleep and that nations are soothed into a false security and then disarmed and manacled. Our fathers would not have trusted mortal man, not Washington himself, with such power, nor would he have accepted it, not because there was any risk that he would abuse it, but because the precedent would have been fatal to liberty, and because, even if secure of a succession of Washingtons, communities can only retain and develop the powers of governing themselves by manfully accepting and patiently discharging the tasks which it imposes. As has been well said, a paternal government and a childish people are correlatives; the one implies the other.

But, it may be urged, in dealing with a childish people, it is necessary that the Government should be paternal, in other words despotic, and this brings us face to face with the question: Is it wise for the United States voluntarily to assume the task of governing a people in a politically childish condition and likely to remain so for an indefinite period, such a people, in short, as those of the Philippine Islands? This is the question that presses now for decision. It covers the whole ground and may be considered as presenting the issue in its broadest aspect, for, if it is wise to undertake the permanent government of these islands, no good reason can be assigned why similar conquests and acquisitions should not be made over every race and in every quarter of the globe.

To enter upon a career like this involves a tremendous, a fearful responsibility, for in spite of the efforts so persistently put forth to find or make precedents for it in the past, it is in truth utterly unprecedented in American history, a new and strange departure in American politics. Unpromising as the task may well appear, its supporters would do better even to try to defend it upon its own merits rather than continue the vain and hopeless attempt to shelter themselves behind the great names of early history—above all, to evoke the authority of Jefferson in behalf of a policy against which Jefferson's whole life and teachings were one long and vehement protest.

Jefferson an imperialist, Jefferson in favor of the red-handed conquest and subjugation of a people struggling to retain their independence! Jefferson! But the naked absurdity of the proposition places it beyond the pale of rational discussion. To state is to refute it. No! Imperialists must seek other sanction for their creed and practice than that of the author of the Declaration of Independence, the zealous, devoted almost fanatical advocate of popular rights and struggling nationalties throughout the world. Nor will they find it in the scarcely less celebrated document emanating from the other of the two great schools of political thought which divided the country in its early history. The Farewell Address, which may fairly be taken as embodying in large measure, Hamilton's views as well as Washington's, condemns such a policy not less emphatically and more directly than the Declaration itself.

Unquestionably there has heretofore been expansion, wonderful expansion, an immense increase in area. But surely there is a very clear distinction between the peaceable acquisition of coterminous territory, highly conducive, if not absolutely indispensable, to the natural growth and healthy development of the country, either virtually unsettled, or settled by a race akin to and easily assimilable by our own, and the forcible seizure and subjugation of a country separated by thousands of miles from the nearest frontier of the United States and inhabited by an alien, hostile, and unassimilable people. There is here a question not of colonization, but of conquest and all that conquest implies. It is perfectly possible, no doubt, to conquer the Filipinos and to hold them permanently in subjection; but is it either just or expedient to do so? Is it "benevolent assimilation" or "criminal aggression?" We ought to be able to distinguish between the two, for it is only in official, not in ordinary English that these have lately become convertible terms.

At any rate, be it called what it may, to pursue such a policy effectively Americans must break with their historic past and trample upon their traditional priciples and ideals. What becomes of the deep-rooted American hostility to standing armies, and of the solemn and repeated warnings against them left by the early patriots and statesmen of all parties? To suppress resistance in every shape throughout the islands and then to hold down eight or ten millions of reluctant subjects, still more to defend a possession thus acquired and thus held against possible, not to say probable, attack—for the entrance upon this new line of policy will at once involve the United States in all the complications of European politics—will necessitate the indefinite maintenance of a large standing army. Militarism having come to stay, imperialism is next in order, looming large already upon the horizon of the future.

Nor will a single army suffice. In addition to that stationed in the Philippines there must always be maintained a large force at home ready to relieve or reenforce the army of occupation. Meanwhile officers of every grade, civil and military, as well as the soldiery, will be gradually growing more and more habituated to the rule, not of laws, but of men—in short, to government by the sword. It is a habit by no means difficult to form. The domineering instinct, the "lust of sway," is deeply imbued in our own nature. Burke has forcibly pointed out the effect it had in encouraging the oppressive conduct of the British Government toward America, and it is an appetite, moreover, that grows by indulgence, with no hope of check through repletion or satiety. Is there no possibility that such a force, largely increased from its original proportions by the necessity of being constantly in a state of preparation for war, in consequence of the new policy of encouraging instead of avoiding European entanglements, might be dangerous to liberty at home as well as abroad?

The founders of the Government would have said that there was not only a possibility but a probability, nay, almost a certainty, of this. Plausible pretexts would not be wanting. A labor strike of unusual dimensions, a race feud of unusual bitterness, a prolonged and dangerous riot, a hotly contested State election, any one of many events not unlikely to occur, might be held sufficient ground for the employment of United States troops "to restore order and protect life and property," not only without any demand but against the solemn protest of the State authorities. If resistance were attempted there would be thousands of soldiers, trained to the work of "suppressing insurrection" by the most summary methods abroad, ready at the beck of the Government to shoot down citizens of Pennsylvania or Illinois as promptly and ruthlessly as natives of the Philippines or other enslaved dependencies.

The precedent once established would be followed again and again, the sphere of the central government expanding and that of the State governments contracting constantly, until nothing was left of the original federal character of our institutions but the name, until "local self-government" became an antiquated tradition and the States were reduced to mere subordinate municipal corporations, useful only as instruments to carry out the will of the one supreme, unchecked authority, already fully accustomed to enforce unquestioning submission throughout the subject provinces of the empire. And thus, after the manner of all previous republics, would end the great American experiment, to the success of which Jefferson once fondly looked for the political regeneration of mankind. Once fairly enter upon this downward course and it is difficult to see what mortal power could avail to check it. The thirst for gold itself is not more consuming and resistless than that for dominion when it takes full possession of the public mind.

At what precise period in the evolution of this strange hybrid, this piece of political composite, this monster of a government—republic at home, empire abroad—the baser element of its dual nature would gain complete ascendency it might be rash to predict, but that it would finally gain it we are warranted by all experience in anticipating. The oft-quoted example of Great Britain is not a case in point; the conditions, so far from being identical, or even similar, are widely different. Indeed, whatever the external resemblance, the agreement in forms and detail, in origin and structure, the two Governments—those of Great Britain and the United States—are as wide asunder as the poles, and in nothing do they differ more essentially than in the very point under consideration. Nor are the circumstances of the two countries less dissimilar. From her insular position and limited area, impossible to increase by coterminous annexation, the acquisition of foreign and distant territory, in spite of its great and manifest disadvantages, might have seemed to British statesmen a necessary condition of Britain's greatness, but the most ravenous land hunger could hardly desire, the most gorgeous dreams of territorial ambition could hardly picture, a goodlier heritage than that which nature herself has bestowed upon the United States.

In all this I have heretofore been considering only the consequences of holding the Philippines as a vassal dependency, for the reasons that forbid their admission as a State or States into the Union are so manifest that it seems superfluous to point them out. Surely by this time every sane man in the United States must have had enough of mongrelism, of the attempt to incorporate and assimilate alien and inferior races. The result has assuredly not so far been sufficiently favorable to encourage further experiments in the same direction, and it is hardly to be presumed that any man not a candidate for a lunatic asylum would have the hardihood to suggest further complicating the situation by adding millions of Asiatics to the millions of African voters we already have, to assist in governing us, to hold in their hands the balance of power, and perhaps, at critical moments, to decide the most momentous political questions. Yet if the Philippines are to be admitted to statehood, all this must follow, unless, indeed, we should carry the process of "benevolent assimilation" so far as to exterminate the present inhabitants and, by rendering a populous country a desert, should open it to American colonization. These things may come in time, but as yet the spirit of imperialism is hardly full grown; it must wait for a season ere it is ripe for such achievements.

But are we, it may be asked, to make such a sacrifice as this, to renounce

our conquest, to set free our subject people? In order to avoid the evils which stare us in the face there are few sacrifices which it would not be wise to make, but there is in truth no sacrifice involved. So far from strengthening in a military sense, the retention of the Philippines would serve merely to weaken us. On this continent the United States can be made practically unassailable and may laugh to scorn the threats or efforts of any enemy on the globe, but the permanent possession of the Philippines would invite attack and at the same time furnish a highly vulnerable point upon which to direct it. To defend our own shores is one thing; to secure a lately subjugated and half or wholly hostile province, at a distance of 7,000 miles, is quite another.

I do not say that it can not be done, but it is obvious that to make it secure would require immense armaments, naval and military, and entail enormous expenditure, and proportionally heavy taxation, while the possibility of foreign wars would be incalculably increased. As these facts can hardly be controverted, it is alleged as a counterbalancing advantage that the country will reap great commercial advantages from this policy. "Trade follows the flag" we are told. Never was there a greater fallacy. Trade follows the interest of the traders; it goes where the best goods can be had for the lowest price and is governed by practical, not by sentimental, considerations. The colonial experience of the continental powers of Europe is sufficient to refute this doctrine.

No; trade will not follow the flag unless it would have flowed naturally in that channel with or without the flag, or unless it is intended to use bayonets or bullets as instruments of commerce, and to force recalcitrant nations to buy and sell in one exclusive market, whether they will or not. Nay; we need not go so far as Europe to see this demonstrated; the rapidity with which American products are superceding all others by purely voluntary action of other countries is amply sufficient.

"The open door" is what is wanted, and this can much better be obtained without aggressive war and forcible annexation. Tariffs and wars hinder, they do not promote trade. So, then, when Americans have abandoned their principles, bartered their birthright, and betrayed their most sacred trust, they will not even receive for it the wretched reward by which they have been tempted. The 30 pieces of silver soiled and blood stained will elude their grasp.

Very sincerely, your friend,

WM. BAIRD.

Hon. WM. A. JONES, *Washington, D. C.*

The Operation of the New Financial Law to May 1, 1900.

SPEECH

OF

HON. MARRIOTT BROSIUS,

OF PENNSYLVANIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, May 3, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 11212) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes—

Mr. BROSIUS said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I embrace this occasion to lay before the House some facts showing the operation of the new financial law during the month and a half of its existence. It will be gratifying, I am sure, to every member and to the country to know how successfully the law is working out the results which were anticipated in its passage. It has more than met the most sanguine expectations of its friends, and disappointed every adverse suggestion of its enemies.

REFUNDING PROVISIONS.

The refunding provisions of the law are working out an achievement in finance without a parallel in the history of the world. The statement I submit is official, and shows the amount of bonds of each kind exchanged since the law went into operation, March 14, to the 1st day of May, 1900, together with the saving in interest, the premium paid, and the net saving. This is the statement.

	Amount refunded.	Saving in interest.	Premium paid.	Net saving.
Threes of 1908	$60,980,200	$5,080,415	$3,465,587	$1,614,828
Fours of 1907	158,791,700	22,998,909	18,522,306	4,476,663
Fives of 1904	40,239,850	4,619,841	4,046,878	572,963
Total	260,020,750	32,699,225	26,034,771	6,664,454

The "net saving" shown by this statement represents the difference between the amount of interest the Government will pay upon the bonds refunded to the date of their respective maturities and the amount of interest the Government would have been obliged to pay had not the bonds above described been thus refunded.

It will be observed that the total amount of bonds exchanged is $260,020,750. The Treasurer has already made full settlement for bonds amounting to $259,051,950, and of the premiums paid and to be paid, $26,034,771. The Treasurer has already paid $25,923,732, leaving unpaid only about $110,000. Of the $260,020,750 bonds exchanged $48,508,000 were from institutions or private persons other than national banks.

The Secretary of the Treasury assures me that the Department has been able to promptly exchange all bonds offered for that purpose; but the permanent 2 per cent bonds are not yet ready for delivery, owing to the pressure of work in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, growing out of the demand for national-bank plates and new national-bank currency. Temporary bonds, however, have been issued in accordance with the plan laid down in the circulars of the Department.

LEGAL-TENDER REDEMPTION.

The operation of legal-tender redemption under the provisions of the law exhibits a highly satisfactory condition of public confidence in our Government paper, and is a happy omen for the success of that branch of our monetary system in the future. The Secretary of the Treasury informs me that the amount of United States notes redeemed in gold out of the reserve fund since the new law went into operation is $5,133,289. As these redemptions occurred from day to day the reserve fund was replenished from the general fund, as the law provides.

It may be noted in passing that the redemption of United States notes would not have amounted to anything like the sum named but for the fact that under the provisions of the law currency certificates are no longer available as reserve money, and several millions of those certificates were turned in for United States notes which were converted into gold certificates.

The amount of Treasury notes canceled during the same period is $4,361,000. The amount of standard silver dollars and subsidiary silver coined during the period are, respectively, $5,792,377 and $1,192,320.45.

I will print at the end of this statement, with the consent of the House, a circular of the Treasury Department containing instructions in accordance with which the exchange of bonds under the provisions of the law has proceeded, as well as a statement showing the profit on national-bank-note circulation issued on the new bonds, and also a statement exhibiting the present worth of the outstanding bonds upon a 2½ per cent basis daily during the months of April and May, 1900.

BANKING AND CURRENCY PROVISIONS.

I submit now a statement from official sources showing by States the number of approved applications for authority to organize national banks, the number of banks organized, and the amount of bonds deposited by them since March 14 to May 1, 1900. This statement shows the number and amount of capital of banks proposed to be organized with capital of less than $50,000 and of $50,000 and over. The same division is made in connection with banks organized.

Following this I will print a statement showing the total number of applications, informal and formal, for authority to organize national banks, arranged to show by States the number of original organizations and those proposed to be converted or reorganized.

Applications approved for the organization of national banks, and national banks organized, from March 14 to April 30, inclusive.

State.	Approved applications to organize national banks.				National banks organized.				Bonds, deposited.
	No.	Capital $50,000.	No.	Capital $50,000 and over.	No.	Capital $50,000.	No.	Capital $50,000 and over.	
Maine	2	$50,000							
New Hampshire	1	25,000					1	$100,000	$25,000
Vermont			1	$100,000					
Connecticut	1	25,000	1	50,000	1	$25,000			10,000
New York	8	210,000	6	710,000	3	85,000	2	300,000	175,000
New Jersey	4	100,000	3	150,000					
Pennsylvania	19	475,000	9	570,000	3	75,000	2	150,000	67,000
Delaware	1	25,000							
Maryland	2	50,000	1	100,000					
Virginia	5	125,000	1	50,000	1	25,000	1	50,000	59,000
West Virginia	3	80,000	1	50,000	1	30,000	1	50,000	22,500
North Carolina	3	75,000							
South Carolina							1	60,000	20,000
Georgia	1	25,000	2	400,000					
Alabama			1	50,000					
Louisiana	1	25,000							
Texas	14	375,000	3	200,000	2	55,000	2	110,000	50,000
Arkansas			2	100,000					
Kentucky	3	75,000	21	1,745,000	1	25,000	11	1,645,000	210,000
Ohio	9	230,000	1	150,000	1	25,000			7,000
Indiana	6	150,000	3	200,000	2	70,000	2	100,000	60,000
Illinois	12	335,000	2	200,000	6	170,000	1	100,000	158,750
Michigan	4	110,000							
Wisconsin	1	25,000	2	100,000					
Minnesota	14	350,000	3	150,000	1	25,000			10,000
Iowa	20	540,000	2	150,000	2	60,000			22,500
Missouri	1	25,000							
North Dakota	10	250,000	1	50,000					
South Dakota	3	75,000							
Nebraska	17	440,000			4	100,000			45,250
Kansas	7	190,000	1	50,000	1	25,000	1	50,000	60,000
Montana	1	25,000							
Wyoming	2	50,000					1	50,000	25,000
Colorado	2	60,000					1	150,000	40,000
Oklahoma	11	275,000			1	25,000			6,300
Indian Territory	5	125,000			2	60,000	1	50,000	31,250
Washington	1	25,000							
Oregon	2	50,000							
Total	198	4,075,000	48	5,305,000	32	880,000	18	2,965,000	1,104,550

Statement of preliminary applications on file with the Comptroller of the Currency to organize national banks, showing (1) the number of primary organizations proposed with capital of less than $50,000 and with capital of $50,000 or over, and (2) the number of conversions similarly classified April 30, 1900.

State.	Primary.		Conversions.	
	Capital less than $50,000.	Capital $50,000 and over.	Capital less than $50,000.	Capital $50,000 and over.
Maine	3		1	
New Hampshire	3	1		1
Vermont	1		1	1
Massachusetts	5			1
Connecticut	4	2		
New York	26	3	14	5
New Jersey	10	3	3	2
Pennsylvania	73	17	3	2
Delaware	3			
Maryland	6		3	3
Virginia	12	2	4	
West Virginia	4	2	7	3
North Carolina	2		4	
South Carolina	2		1	1
Georgia	6	1	7	2
Florida	1			1
Alabama	8	2		
Mississippi	1			1
Louisiana	4		2	1
Texas	36	4	17	1
Arkansas	3	2	3	
Kentucky	6	3	16	5
Tennessee	3	1	4	
Ohio	29	4	16	2
Indiana	17	5	10	3
Illinois	20	3	17	3
Michigan	4		7	2
Wisconsin	8	2	7	1
Minnesota	13	4	26	3
Iowa	33	4	34	2
Missouri	7	2	13	
North Dakota	5		15	1
South Dakota	1		10	
Nebraska	11		23	1
Kansas	12		19	
Montana	3			
Wyoming	7	1	2	
Colorado	4	2	2	2
New Mexico	1			1
Oklahoma	11		14	1
Indian Territory	10	2	5	1
Washington	3	1	6	
Oregon			3	
California	6		1	2
Idaho	2	1		
Nevada	1			
Arizona			2	
Total	434	74	327	55
Aggregate of applications				890

I am advised by the Comptroller that on March 14 the bonds on deposit to secure circulation aggregated $244,611,570, while on April 30 the amount was $268,405,240, an increase during the period of $23,793,670. The total amount on the latter date includes new twos to the amount of $202,783,650. This shows how large an amount of the new bonds exchanged for old ones is availed of to secure bank circulation.

The bond-secured circulation on March 14, 1900, amounted to $216,374,794, and on April 30, 1900, to $246,067,162, an increase during the period of $29,692,368. It will be observed that this increase in circulation exceeds by about $6,000,000 the increase of bonds deposited during the period, showing that a portion of the increase is due to circulation taken out on bonds already deposited under the provisions of law authorizing circulation to the par of bonds deposited.

As an indication of the amount of currency the national banks may issue in the near future, as gathered from their expressed intention, I will print with my remarks some interesting figures tabulated from the answers of 3,000 national banks to inquiries addressed to them by William C. Cornwell, president of the City National Bank of Buffalo, N. Y., a few weeks ago. The questions asked were as follows:

How much new circulation do you think you will take out soon?
How much, say, within a year?
How much have you out now?
What is the capital of your bank?
Is circulation in your locality easily kept out, or is it returned quickly for redemption?

Mr. Cornwell condensed the results as follows:

Immediate increase in circulation		$69,065,049
Additional within a year		20,583,146
Total increase in circulation within a year		89,648,195
We have also received replies from a large number indicating intention to increase when bonds go lower, amount		22,140,663
Total		111,788,858
Circulation easily kept out	per cent..	88.44
Returned quickly	do....	11.56

These figures do not include whatever new circulation may come from new banks applying for national charters. Up to a recent date applications were as follows:

Capital $25,000 and less than $50,000—349 banks, with total capital	$8,930,000
Capital $50,000 and over—84 banks, with total capital	6,010,000

It is estimated by the Chicago Banker (as to the $25,000 banks) on a basis of some applications being denied and others falling a little below their full capital in taking out circulation, that increase of circulation from this source could safely be put at 7,000,000
And for the larger banks at 3,000,000

Making further increase in circulation	10,000,000
Grand total	121,788,800

Table of William C. Cornwell.

State or Territory.	Capital.	Amount in circulation.	Increase immediately.	Additional increase within a year.	Amount possible to increase over and above amount out, and increases noted.	Waiting for lower bond market.	How kept out.	
							Easily.	Quickly returned
							Per cent.	*Per cent.*
Alabama	$2,100,000.00	$372,350.00	$304,700.00	$45,000.00	$373,950.00	$75,000.00	100	
Arizona	400,000.00	157,250.00	5,000.00		237,250.00	25,000.00	50	50
Arkansas	1,070,000.00	227,500.00	31,250.00	8,900.00	802,330.00		75	25
California	6,875,000.00	1,648,510.00	811,880.00	1,026,150.00	3,382,460.00	100,000.00	67	33
Colorado	3,362,000.00	1,370,325.00	216,925.00	75,250.00	1,699,500.00		75	25
Connecticut	19,457,070.00	8,020,750.00	1,661,100.00	495,000.00	8,908,200.00	135,000.00	94	6
Delaware	2,113,975.00	784,250.00	67,250.00	34,500.00	1,227,975.00	169,000.00	92	8
District of Columbia	2,802,000.00	900,400.00	275,000.00		1,030,600.00		43	57
Florida	1,000,000.00	363,250.00	151,750.00	75,000.00	412,000.00	87,500.00	100	
Georgia	3,456,000.00	1,046,800.00	929,000.00	167,500.00	1,312,700.00	37,500.00	77	23
Idaho	450,000.00	134,000.00	43,000.00	13,750.00	258,650.00		100	
Illinois	31,998,000.00	7,809,715.00	5,492,[illegible]4.00	571,000.00	18,147,650.00	340,000.00	95	5
Indiana	12,162,000.00	2,434,335.00	1,437,578.00	1,381,125.00	4,893,962.00	455,000.00	94	6
Indian Territory	600,000.00	148,950.00	81,000.00	87,500.00	303,550.00		100	
Iowa	11,140,000.00	4,191,785.00	1,517,775.00	523,850.00	4,469,590.00	327,000.00	99	1
Kansas	5,410,100.00	2,140,977.00	1,026,375.00	595,500.00	3,344,747.00	144,000.00	92	8
Kentucky	9,455,900.00	4,934,620.00	1,862,080.00	175,000.00	2,834,200.00	557,500.00	86	14
Louisiana	2,200,000.00	716,[illegible]00.00	440,250.00	200,000.00	796,250.00		100	
Maine	9,055,000.00	4,049,825.00	667,525.00	238,000.00	3,999,650.00	150,100.00	90	10
Maryland	12,497,400.00	4,932,420.00	970,030.00	311,000.00	6,307,450.00	730,000.00	85	15
Massachusetts	68,640,000.00	17,173,935.00	3,496,700.00	551,700.00	44,301,575.00	4,327,500.00	89	11
Michigan	9,780,000.00	3,730,450.00	859,250.00	208,750.00	5,127,550.00	77,500.00	100	
Minnesota	10,300,000.00	2,047,230.00	1,246,600.00	117,760.00	6,888,910.00	987,000.00	98	2
Mississippi	980,000.00	395,100.00	343,850.00	155,[illegible]50.00	116,050.00		91	9
Missouri	15,810,000.00	6,449,875.00	2,770,425.00	1,480,950.00	5,187,500.00	77,500.00	84	16
Montana	1,950,000.00	485,500.00	261,250.00	27,500.00	1,115,750.00		100	
Nebraska	8,595,000.00	2,493,650.00	1,021,360.00	546,125.00	4,454,810.00	316,500.00	95	5
Nevada	82,000.00	18,450.00	2,050.00		61,500.00			
New Hampshire	4,275,000.00	3,008,190.00	100,000.00		521,250.00	80,000.00	98	2
New Jersey	12,745,000.00	5,129,197.00	1,479,025.00	280,500.00	5,909,152.00	1,000,000.00	78	22
New Mexico	600,000.00	378,750.00	170,000.00	51,250.00			100	
New York	63,264,440.00	27,478,215.00	8,803,025.00	737,830.00	32,475,770.00	750,490.00	89	11
North Carolina	2,651,000.00	832,915.00	463,835.00	180,000.00	1,074,750.00		88	12
North Dakota	1,175,000.00	321,775.00	67,600.00		798,125.00		93	7
Ohio	39,333,000.00	14,723,495.00	3,582,650.00	2,047,450.00	18,703,655.00	1,146,500.00	93	7
Oklahoma	350,000.00	103,750.00	134,500.00		111,750.00		100	
Oregon	2,020,000.00	791,250.00	87,000.00	1,250.00	1,136,470.00		76	24
Pennsylvania	60,376,720.00	26,009,920.00	7,012,780.00	1,847,000.00	24,756,280.00	3,325,700.00	90	10

Table of William C. Cornwell—Continued.

State or Territory.	Capital.	Amount in circulation.	Increase immediately.	Additional increase within a year.	Amount possible to increase over and above amount out, and increases noted.	Waiting for lower bond market.	How kept out. Easily.	How kept out. Quickly returned
							Per cent.	*Per cent.*
Rhode Island	$10,195,259.00	$3,359,250.00	$322,500.00		$5,906,750.00	$400,000.00	84	16
South Carolina	1,798,000.00	892,025.00	467,100.00	$147,500.00	292,625.00		78	22
South Dakota	1,100,000.00	441,547.00	74,000.00	12,500.00	696,453.00	175,000.00	86	14
Tennessee	6,610,000.00	1,883,090.00	765,125.00	280,000.00	3,691,065.00	1,067,500.00	97	3
Texas	15,360,000.00	4,474,705.00	1,548,430.00	540,550.00	8,641,335.00	370,000.00	89	11
Utah	1,509,000.00	671,810.00	143,750.00		684,440.00		72	28
Vermont	5,310,000.00	2,606,100.00	606,650.00	255,000.00	1,752,250.00	200,000.00	86	14
Virginia	3,916,000.00	2,220,700.00	654,300.00	14,000.00	802,000.00		84	16
Washington	2,926,000.00	717,350.00	435,800.00		1,722,350.00	141,750.00	91	9
West Virginia	3,071,000.00	1,360,710.00	468,990.00	226,450.00	1,014,850.00	244,100.00	86	14
Wisconsin	7,862,000.00	2,422,900.00	626,530.00	372,250.00	4,035,480.00	415,550.00	93	7
Wyoming	690,000.00	157,320.00	111,930.00	87,500.00	333,250.00		100	
Miscellaneous	4,470,000.00	1,104,925.00	583,775.00	287,500.00	2,513,400.00		100	
Total of banks heard from	510,419,855.00	181,028,841.00	57,506,286.00	17,138,340.00	250,378,759.00	18,435,190.00	88.44	11.56
20.1 per cent added for banks not heard from			11,558,763.00	3,444,806.00		3,705,473.00		
Total	510,419,855.00	181,028,841.00	69,065,049.00	20,583,146.00	250,378,759.00	22,140,663.00	88.44	11.56

[Department Circular No. 29.]

Circular to holders of United States 5 per cent bonds of the act of January 14, 1875, 4 per cent consols of 1907, acts of July 14, 1870, and January 20, 1871, and 3 per cent bonds of 1908, act of June 13, 1898.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., March 14, 1900.

The attention of the owners of United States registered and coupon bonds of the 5 per cent loan of 1904, act of January 14, 1875, the 4 per cent consols of 1907, acts of July 14, 1870, and January 20, 1871, and the 3 per cent loan of 1908, act of June 13, 1898, is invited to the provisions of section 11 of an act entitled "An act to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, to refund the public debt, and for other purposes," approved March 14, 1900, as follows:

"SEC. 11. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to receive, at the Treasury, any of the outstanding bonds of the United States bearing interest at 5 per cent per annum, payable February 1, 1904, and any bonds of the United States bearing interest at 4 per cent per annum, payable July 1, 1907, and any bonds of the United States bearing interest at 3 per cent per annum, payable August 1, 1908, and to issue in exchange therefor an equal amount of coupon or registered bonds of the United States in such form as he may prescribe, in denominations of $50 or any multiple thereof, bearing interest at the rate of 2 per cent per annum, payable quarterly, such bonds to be payable at the pleasure of the United States after thirty years from the date of their issue, and said bonds to be payable, principal and interest, in gold coin of the present standard value, and to be exempt from the payment of all taxes or duties of the United States, as well as from taxation in any form by or under State, municipal, or local authority: *Provided*, That such outstanding bonds may be received in exchange at a valuation not greater than their present worth, to yield an income of 2½ per cent per annum; and in consideration of the reduction of interest effected, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to pay to the holders of the outstanding bonds surrendered for exchange, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, a sum not greater than the difference between their present worth, computed as aforesaid, and their par value, and the payments to be made hereunder shall be held to be payments on account of the sinking fund created by section 3694 of the Revised Statutes: *And provided further*, That the 2 per cent bonds to be issued under the provisions of this act shall be issued at not less than par, and they shall be numbered consecutively in the order of their issue, and when payment is made the last numbers issued shall be first paid, and this order shall be followed until all the bonds are paid, and whenever any of the outstanding bonds are called for payment interest thereon shall cease three months after such call." * * *

Under the provisions of this law the Department will be prepared to receive on and after this date, until further notice, any of the bonds issued under the acts above mentioned, and as early as practicable thereafter will issue in exchange therefor a like amount of United States registered or coupon bonds bearing interest at the rate of 2 per cent per annum, as provided by the act approved March 14, 1900.

To effect the exchange the outstanding bonds should be surrendered to the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the terms of this circular; they will be accepted for that purpose in the order of the surrender of them to him, and new bonds bearing interest at the rate of 2 per cent per annum will be issued in the same order in lieu thereof. A letter of transmittal should accompany each package of bonds for exchange, setting forth the purpose for which they are forwarded and giving the address to which the new bonds and checks for the interest thereon shall be sent.

Bonds, held by the Treasurer of the United States in trust for a national bank, may be surrendered by letter addressed to the Secretary of the Treasury, accompanied with the Treasurer's receipt representing the bonds, together with a resolution of the board of directors of the bank, authorizing the Treasurer to assign the bonds.

The priority of issue of the new bonds will be determined by the date of the receipt by the Secretary of the Treasury of the outstanding bonds or the papers representing the same, provided that the bonds or papers are in proper condition for such surrender, as set forth hereafter in this circular. If any correction is required, the priority of the bonds to be issued will take date from the receipt and acceptance of corrected bonds or papers at this office.

Any registered bonds forwarded should be assigned to the Secretary of the Treasury for exchange into 2 per cent bonds. The assignment should be dated and witnessed by one of the officers named in the note which is printed on the back of each bond. Where a new bond is desired in the name of anyone but the payee of the old bond, the old bond should be assigned to the "Secretary of the Treasury for exchange into 2 per cent bonds for account of ——" (here insert the name of the person in whose favor the bond is to be issued).

Registered bonds inscribed in the name of an institution, forwarded for exchange, must be accompanied by a resolution of the board of directors of the institution, authorizing their assignment to the Secretary of the Treasury for such exchange. The resolution must bear the seal of the institution, or, if the institution have no seal, there must be furnished with the resolution an affidavit setting forth that fact.

Upon acceptance of any bonds for exchange under the conditions of this circular the present worth of the surrendered bonds to yield an income of 2½ per cent per annum will be calculated as of the date of their acceptance, except as provided in the next paragraph, and the sum representing the difference between the present worth of said bonds and their par value will be paid to the owner thereof in due course by a check drawn in his favor by the Treasurer of the United States. The settlement will include payment by the Department of accrued interest on the old bonds to the date of their acceptance for exchange and a charge against the owner for accrued interest on the new bonds from the date of their issue to said date of acceptance. Bonds surrendered upon which interest has been prepaid need not be accompanied by a deposit to cover such prepaid interest, as the Department will deduct at the time of the settlement any amount which may be due on account of unmatured interest which had been prepaid.

The new bonds will be dated April 1, 1900; therefore all outstanding bonds surrendered for exchange and accepted for that purpose prior to that date will bear interest to April 1, when interest on the new bonds will begin; and the present worth of such surrendered bonds will be calculated as of the said April 1. The new bonds will be issued in denominations as follows: Coupon, $50, $100, $500, $1,000; registered, $50, $100, $500, $1,000, $5,000, $10,000, $50,000.

All bonds forwarded for exchange will be regarded as the property of the person, firm, or institution in whose favor the new bonds are to be issued, and in each case the check in settlement of the "present worth," etc., above referred to will be drawn in favor of such person, firm, or institution; but if the agent forwarding the bonds shall desire and so request, the bonds and the check may be forwarded to such agent's address for delivery to the owner.

Packages containing bonds for surrender, or papers representing bonds held by the Treasurer of the United States in trust for a national bank, should be addressed to the Secretary of the Treasury, Division of Loans and Currency, Washington, D. C., and be plainly marked "bonds (or papers) for exchange."

Blank forms of application for the exchanges herein authorized and blank resolutions for use by institutions have been prepared by the Department, and may be obtained on application to the Secretary of the Treasury.

In exercise of the discretion given to the Secretary of the Treasury under section 11 of the act, he reserves the right to suspend the exchange of bonds above contemplated, whenever, in his opinion, the interests of the Government may be best served thereby. The Secretary of the Treasury also reserves the right to change the terms of exchange above set forth, either by requiring a bonus or premium upon the 2 per cent bonds or by requiring the holders of bonds outstanding to surrender the same in exchange for the new bonds at a rate to yield income of more than 2½ per cent per annum.

L. J. GAGE, *Secretary.*

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., March 14, 1900.

Referring to the circular of information just published relative to the exchange of certain classes of outstanding bonds for the new 2 per cent bonds authorized by section 11 of the act of March 14, 1900, the following statement is made for the information and guidance of national banks and others desiring to avail themselves of the provisions of said act with a view to using the new bonds as a basis for circulation.

By the expression "present worth to yield an income of 2½ per cent per annum" is meant such a price as would yield to the investor a return of his money at the maturity of the bond, with interest on the sum invested by him at the rate of 2½ per cent per annum, realized in quarterly payments.

A bank exchanging its present bonds on April 1, 1900, will receive the following as the present worth of the bonds described: For a $10,000 bond of 1908, $568.51 cash, and accrued interest to April 1; for a $10,000 bond of 1907, $1,167.65 cash, and accrued interest to April 1; for a $10,000 bond of 1904, $1,007.51 cash, and accrued interest to April 1, and a new $10,000 2 per cent thirty-year bond in each case. In other words, the value of the outstanding bonds upon a 2½ per cent basis on April 1, 1900, is—

Threes of 1908	$105.6851
Fours of 1907	111.6765
Fives of 1904	110.0751

If the bonds are purchased at a price above these figures, it will be equivalent to paying a premium for the new twos.

If, upon April 1, 1900, a bank can purchase outstanding bonds at these prices, the profit on national bank-note circulation will be as follows:

Capital invested		$100,000.00
Par value of bonds purchased		100,000.00
Circulation		100,000.00
Receipts:		
Interest on circulation, 4 per cent	$4,000.00	
Interest on bonds deposited	2,000.00	
Gross receipts		6,000.00
Deductions:		
Tax	500.00	
Expenses	62.50	
Total deductions		562.50

Net receipts	$5,437.50
Interest on capital invested, 4 per cent	4,000.00
Profit on circulation: Amount	1,437.50
Per cent	1.437

In this computation money is assumed to be worth 4 per cent per annum. The profit, however, will be the same, whatever the rate per cent assumed.

If the bonds are purchased or had been previously purchased at prices lower than these, the profit to the banks will be greater. If the bank has to pay more than these prices for the bonds to be exchanged, the profit on circulation will be less than that indicated.

If, upon April 1, 1900, the bonds were purchased—

Threes of 1908 at	$110.6851
Fours of 1907 at	116.6765
Fives of 1904 at	115.0751

Which would be equivalent to paying 105 for the twos, the profit upon circulation will be as follows:

Capital invested		$105,000.00
Par value of bonds purchased		100,000.00
Circulation		100,000.00
Receipts:		
Interest on circulation 4 per cent	$4,000.00	
Interest on bonds deposited	2,000.00	
Gross receipts		6,000.00
Deductions:		
Tax	500.00	
Expenses	62.50	
Sinking fund to liquidate premium	86.94	
Total deductions		649.44
Net receipts		5,350.56
Interest on capital invested, 4 per cent		4,200.00
Profit on circulation: Amount		1,150.56
Per cent		1.096

Money is assumed to be worth 4 per cent per annum. If a higher rate per cent is assumed, the profit on circulation will be a trifle smaller than that indicated above.

If, upon April 1, 1900, the bonds were purchased—

Threes of 1908 at	$111.6851
Fours of 1907 at	117.6765
Fives of 1904 at	116.0751

Which would be equivalent to paying 106 for the twos, the profit on circulation will be as follows:

Capital invested		$106,000.00
Par value of bonds purchased		100,000.00
Circulation		100,000.00
Receipts—		
Interest on circulation, 4 per cent	$4,000.00	
Interest on bonds deposited	2,000.00	
Gross receipts		6,000.00
Deductions—		
Tax	$500.00	
Expenses	62.50	
Sinking fund to liquidate premium	104.33	
Total deductions		666.83
Net receipts		5,333.17
Interest on capital invested, 4 per cent		4,240.00
Profit on circulation— Amount		1,093.17
Per cent		1.031

Money is assumed to be worth 4 per cent per annum. If a higher rate per cent is assumed, the profit on circulation will be a trifle smaller than that indicated above.

The "present worth" of the outstanding bonds upon a 2½ per cent basis during the months of April and May, 1900, is as follows:

1900.	Threes of 1908.	Fours of 1907.	Fives of 1904.
April 1	$105.6851	$111.6765	$110.0751
2	105.6833	111.6724	110.0690
3	105.6816	111.6684	110.0610
4	105.6799	111.6643	110.0539
5	105.6781	111.6602	110.0468
6	105.6764	111.6561	110.0398
7	105.6746	111.6521	110.0327
8	105.6729	111.6480	110.0256
9	105.6711	111.6439	110.0185
April 10	105.6694	111.6398	110.0115
11	105.6677	111.6358	110.0044
12	105.6659	111.6317	109.9973
13	105.6642	111.6276	109.9903
14	105.6624	111.6235	109.9832
15	105.6607	111.6194	109.9761
16	105.6589	111.6154	109.9690
17	105.6572	111.6113	109.9620
18	105.6555	111.6072	109.9549
19	105.6537	111.6031	109.9478
20	105.6520	111.5991	109.9407
21	105.6502	111.5950	109.9337
22	105.6485	111.5909	109.9266
23	105.6467	111.5868	109.9195
24	105.6450	111.5827	109.9124
25	105.6433	111.5787	109.9053
26	105.6415	111.5746	109.8983
27	105.6397	111.5705	109.8912
28	105.6380	111.5664	109.8841
29	105.6363	111.5623	109.8770
30	105.6345	111.5583	109.8699
May 1	105.633762	111.554167	109.862862
2	105.631073	111.550084	109.858010
3	105.628384	111.546001	109.849159
4	105.627694	111.541919	109.842307
5	105.626005	111.537836	109.835456
6	105.624316	111.533753	109.828604
7	105.622626	111.529669	109.821750
8	105.620930	111.525585	109.814896
9	105.619247	111.521502	109.808042
10	105.617557	111.517418	109.801188
11	105.615867	111.513334	109.794334
12	105.614177	111.509249	109.787478
13	105.612487	111.505164	109.780622
14	105.610796	111.501079	109.773767
15	105.609103	111.496994	109.766911
16	105.607416	111.492909	109.760055
17	105.605725	111.488822	109.753197
18	105.604035	111.484736	109.746340
19	105.602344	111.480649	109.739482
20	105.600654	111.476563	109.732625
21	105.598963	111.472476	109.725767
22	105.597272	111.468388	109.718907
23	105.595581	111.464300	109.712047
24	105.593889	111.460213	109.705187
25	105.592198	111.456125	109.698327
26	105.590507	111.452037	109.691467
27	105.588815	111.447948	109.684605
28	105.587123	111.443859	109.677743
29	105.585432	111.439771	109.670881
30	105.583740	111.435682	109.664019
31	105.582048	111.431593	109.657157

NOTE.—The foregoing tables are furnished by the Government Actuary.

The attention of persons desiring to effect the exchange of the three classes of bonds in question for the new 2 per cent bonds is especially invited to the importance of having all registered bonds properly assigned and all resolutions and applications properly prepared.

National banks now owning bonds lodged with the Treasurer of the United States as security for circulation will please take note that in every case the Department will require a resolution of the proper form authorizing the exchange of their bonds for the new 2 per cent bonds, and will also require the surrender of the duplicate receipts representing such bonds which were issued by the Treasurer of the United States.

National banks now owning bonds lodged with the Treasurer of the United States as security for public deposits will be required to furnish the resolution above referred to and surrender the duplicate receipts, and, in case the bonds now held are 5 percents of 1904 or 4 percents of 1907, there will also be required a certificate of deposit of an assistant treasurer of the United States showing a transfer of funds to the Treasurer of the United States of an amount equal to 5 per cent of the face value of such 4 per cent or 5 per cent bonds.

Institutions owning registered bonds inscribed in their name will please observe the requirement that the resolution authorizing their surrender for exchange must be certified to by a different officer from the one authorized in the resolution to execute the assignment.

Upon receipt of bonds, or papers representing bonds, to be exchanged for the new 2 percents, and upon their acceptance, the Department will issue an acknowledgment bearing the facsimile signature of the Assistant Secretary. This acknowledgment will not be negotiable, but pending the preparation and issue of the bonds, a process which may require two months or more, the Department will issue a temporary bond, which, in the case of bonds desired as security for circulation or deposits, will be lodged with the Treasurer of the United States.

In all other cases the temporary bond will be lodged with the Register of the Treasury. The Department will allow one transfer of these temporary bonds lodged with the Register, and the bonds issued on account of such transfer will retain the date and the priority rights of the original, but such bonds so issued will not be again transferred. In due time the permanent bond will be substituted in its place and will be delivered to the owner, after which the usual rights of transfer attached to all registered bonds of the United States will be recognized by the Department.

When the Register of the Treasury issues the temporary bonds he will mail a notice to the owner thereof, giving the denominations and the numbers. If the owner desires to avail himself of the privilege to make the one transfer above mentioned, he may give power of attorney to some one in the city of Washington to make the assignment for him. This power of attorney, accompanied by a letter giving the names and addresses of the payees of the new bonds, will be all that will be necessary to effect the transfer.

F. A. VANDERLIP,
Assistant Secretary.

Naval Appropriation Bill.

SPEECH
OF
HON. LAIRD H. BARBER,
OF PENNSYLVANIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, April 16, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 10450) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes—

Mr. BARBER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: As to the naval vessels authorized by this act, as well as those authorized by previous acts but not yet completed, the members of this House almost without exception are of the opinion that they are absolutely essential to our national safety and that they should be completed with all possible speed. We

well know that Manila and Santiago were decisive in the late conflict, and we anticipate that naval battles are likely to be equally decisive in coming conflicts, which we hope may be long deferred.

Party and political considerations should be entirely eliminated from the discussion of this question, and it should be considered from a business point of view. So far as I can learn, differences that have divided the committee who have made the report here are purely questions of dollars and cents, and that the question of building an armor plant is one of monetary expediency, for I can not conceive of any reason why the Government should undertake the manufacture of armor plate rather than any other commodity needed unless it be to overcome what is alleged on the part of these gentlemen to be a monopoly.

Now, in answer to that in general terms, I might say this: That these gentlemen have repeatedly said to the committee, and it is in print, that they would be glad to be relieved of their responsibilities in this matter and would be glad to have the Government take their plant at an appraised valuation in order that they might have the funds there locked up for their commercial business, which yields a very much larger percentage, without the constant annoyance and risk attendant upon this appropriation and having their business constantly questioned and their motives as well.

In the limited time allotted to me this evening I shall simply, without going into any other details, take up some of the points in the minority report and the insinuations there thrown out in relation to the business of these armor manufacturers. And I might say, in starting, that one of these plants is situated in the district I represent and that I have no other motive than that of seeing that justice and fair dealing prevail; and I am glad to recognize the courtesy shown me in this matter. I feel that I simply perform my duty in presenting the claims of the district I represent.

One of the first things that attracted my attention in the report of the minority was this:

> It seems to be pretty generally understood the armor-plate factories will not furnish Krupp armor for less than $545 per ton, but exactly where this information comes from we are unable to state, for there was no testimony before the committee on the subject.

It seems to me that is an unfair innuendo as to the relations existing between these armor-plate factories and the Government. Who makes the contract? The contract is let by the Department, the recognized officers of the Government, and it would seem very natural, therefore, that the correspondence and the offers on the part of these armor-plate men should come through these well-recognized channels. The committee had before them the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury and the testimony of Admiral O'Neil in relation to the price asked for armor plate. In a letter from the Bethlehem Iron Company, dated February 3, 1899, printed on page 32 of the letter from the Secretary of the Navy, it is stated:

> The lowest price we are willing to accept for Krupp armor is $545 per ton. We base this price on an average royalty we will be obliged to pay of $45 per ton and on the fact that, so far as our experience goes, the additional cost of manufacturing Krupp armor over the cost of manufacturing Harvey armor will not be less than $100 per ton.

Now, there is a letter, a business proposition, made to the Department, and it seems to me that it is hardly fair to say that they are unable to state where this information comes from. There is a letter from the Carnegie Company, dated about the same time and printed in the letter from the Secretary of the Navy, saying that $545 is the minimum they could accept for this type of armor. There is no secret about it, and why the insinuation in relation to the source of the information in regard to the price asked for armor plate should have been thrown out I am unable to state.

Mr. DAYTON. Will it interrupt my friend——

Mr. BARBER. Not at all.

Mr. DAYTON. To suggest right in connection with that that the Department spent a year in trying to secure this armor at a less price.

Mr. BARBER. Yes.

Mr. DAYTON. And they did not succeed in doing it.

Mr. BARBER. This is the result of negotiations with those parties.

Mr. KITCHIN. I believe when they endeavored to secure it at a less price it was at a specific less price of $300.

Mr. DAYTON. They advertised for a large quantity of armor plate under the terms of the limitation in the appropriation bill, at $300, but they also gathered information for a year, as Admiral O'Neil has stated, to see whether or not they could get it at any less price than $545 a ton, and Admiral O'Neil's investigations extended to Europe to ascertain whether it was obtained at a less price there, and he reports that no nation in the world is able to get it at that low price.

Mr. KITCHIN. But as a matter of fact the advertisement for that was at $300 a ton, at which price the Navy Department were trying to get it, and it was absolutely useless to talk about any other price.

Mr. DAYTON. He investigated the price at which it could be obtained by any nation in the world.

Mr. KITCHIN. It was useless for the manufacturers to offer $400 or any other sum, because the Government only offered $300 a ton.

Mr. BARBER. And it was conceded that the price of $300 was so small that there was no possibility of manufacturing it at that price.

Mr. KITCHIN. And therefore the men would not bid on it.

Mr. BARBER. Because they could not.

Mr. DAYTON. And at the same time they refused to furnish it for less than $545 a ton.

Mr. KITCHIN. I do not know about that.

Mr. RIDGELY. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. BARBER. Yes.

Mr. RIDGELY. Was it not brought out in evidence—sworn to—that this old Harvey plate was manufactured and sold to foreign nations at about $250 a ton?

Mr. BARBER. That has been gone over so often by older members here that I think it is scarcely necessary for me to say anything about it. I am a comparatively new member here, and I take it the gentleman is an old member, and so it hardly seems to me worth while to take up the time of the committee to review the reasons which have been fully stated why that one small contract was let at that figure.

Mr. RIDGELY. I am not asking for that, but I want to ask another question, prompted by these proofs that the Government has been overcharged in the past.

Mr. BARBER. The gentleman well knows that immediately after that particular contract was made for which they received about $250 a ton, for the purpose of introducing their armor in that country, they then received $520 per ton for the next contract——

Mr. CUMMINGS. Five hundred and twenty-seven dollars.

Mr. BARBER. For the next contract immediately succeeding that. It was a business venture upon which they embarked for the purpose of obtaining a start with that government.

Mr. DAYTON. And it was only for a very small quantity.

Mr. BARBER. Only for a very small quantity; and as soon as that particular contract had been finished they received $527 per ton for the next contract, and the result is that that nation is paying to these same contractors to-day more than they are asking our own Government.

Mr. RIDGELY. One further point. Was it not proven also that the cost of making the armor was less than $200 a ton?

Mr. DAYTON. No.

Mr. BARBER. No.

Mr. RIDGELY. Proven by expert testimony.

Mr. BARBER. No; because the Rohrer board and everyone who examined the question, including Secretary Herbert, as the result of that investigation found that the labor and material alone cost within a dollar or two of $200, without any allowance for royalty or the nickel which the Government furnished, or for other items which raised the cost far beyond $200 at that time.

Mr. RIDGELY. Now, one other question and I am done. Does not the fact that these prices are held up so high to all of the nations of the world and the fact that there are so few manufactures of this particular kind of armor plate, do not those two facts suggest to the gentleman that possibly there is a combine or trust between the factories, and that therefore the Government ought to control the matter by manufacturing armor for itself?

Mr. BARBER. That does not suggest anything of the kind to me. Whether there is or is not a combination, I have no personal information beyond any other member of Congress.

Mr. RIDGELY. Is it not very suggestive?

Mr. BARBER. It does not seem to me so, for this reason: That these very men who have now invested $4,000,000 in these plants have said repeatedly to the Government that they would be glad to get rid of their plants, that they would be glad to have the Government take their plants at what is found to be a fair valuation by arbitration, and let them use their money in their private enterprises. I quote the exact language of one of these companies:

> We shall be delighted if the Government will let us out of the armor business. We can use the capital in several lines of our business to better advantage.

Mr. RIDGELY. Are they saying so now?

Mr. BARBER. They are saying so to-day. They do not say that in the letter to the Secretary; but here is what Mr. Schwab says in his testimony, which is given in Secretary Herbert's report, which I have here. He said this to Secretary Herbert, in 1897, and has repeated this same statement, so that it is the same to-day:

> If the Government now desires to undertake the manufacture of armor for itself, we shall only be too happy to sell our plant to it at cost. It is in splendid order, and we refer you to your experts as to whether it is not far more efficient now than when new, as we have continually made improvements upon it.
>
> The plant can remain where it is, and we will undertake to furnish the steel in the ingot at a price to be fixed by three arbitrators; or, we will remove the plant and erect it any point designated by the Government; also erect the additional plant for the making of the steel. We will superintend all this and start the works, and continue to operate them until they produce armor successfully; and for all this we will only ask the Government to pay the actual cost.

We undertake also to teach the Government officials how to make such armor as we are now supplying you, which, as you know, holds the world's record.

Having gone into this business primarily to help the Government when it could not obtain armor, we submit to you and to Congress that we have some claim upon the Government to take our plant at cost, and we hope this proposition will meet with favor.

We make about 150,000 tons of finished steel per month, and the two or three hundred tons of armor we make per month demand greater attention and give more trouble than all the 150,000 tons. We shall be delighted if the Government will let us out of the armor business. We can use the capital in several lines of our business to better advantage.

Mr. DAYTON. Let me suggest to my friend right there that they entered upon this business at the urgent request of the Govment itself.

Mr. BARBER. He says so here; and to-day this same company now tell me that they are manufacturing 3,000,000 tons of steel per year as against 2,000 tons for the Government, and that they would be delighted if they could be relieved of the responsibility.

[Here the hammer fell].

Rural Free Delivery.

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE W CROMER,

OF INDIANA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, April 26, 1900,

On the bill (H. R. 10001) making appropriations for the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901.

Mr. CROMER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The appropriation of $1,750,000 which this bill carries for the continuation of the experimental rural free-delivery service not only commands my vote but my earnest advocacy and support.

As a member of the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads I was willing to make the amount appropriated larger than that proposed in the bill, if the Department had asked it. I, however, appreciate the cautious prudence by which its recommendations for the extension of this service have been guided and am content to wait.

About $900,000 of the amount which this bill carries, I am informed, will be required to continue existing service through the fiscal year 1900–1901, leaving $850,000 available for putting in new service during the year. If this should be found insufficient to meet the expectations of the people, I am in favor of giving more. It all, or nearly all, comes back to us, Mr. Chairman, in one way or another, either in the saving of cost of small post-offices and the star routes discontinued, or in the increase of revenue resulting from the increase of matter mailed because of the enhanced facilities for distribution and collection afforded by rural free delivery. Frequently both these causes operate together and make a rural free-delivery route a source of profit from the start instead of an added expense to the General Government.

It is not possible at the present time to strike an accurate balance sheet to show these facts, because the accounts are carried under different divisions of the Post-Office Department; but the results, wherever we have been able to test them, show that rural free delivery costs very little more than fourth-class post-offices, fed by star routes, and gives an incomparably better service. We do not yet know to what length this great experiment will lead us. I for one am willing to follow it wherever it goes; and if, when the Fifty-sixth Congress meets in final session next December, a request should be made for more money to carry on this service for the fiscal year which expires June 30, 1901, I will vote for it with a full conviction that no money appropriated by the Congress of the United States has been or can be more beneficially expended than that devoted to rural free delivery.

Its development has been as surprising as that of the "little cloud" predicted by the Prophet Elijah, as recorded in the "First Book of Kings," which rose "out of the sea, like a man's hand." King Ahab, we are told, had to send up his servant seven times before he could see that cloud in any shape; but when the rain from that cloud descended, it was heavy enough to stop the king's chariots.

This has been pretty much our experience with rural free delivery. Official reports of the Post-Office Department (which this House has ordered reprinted for general information) narrate the history of the rural free-delivery movement in this concise form:

It was condemned by the House Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads of the Fifty-third Congress (Hon. John S. Henderson, of North Carolina, chairman) as a scheme impossible of execution, which "would require an appropriation of at least $30,000,000 to inaugurate it."

Postmaster-General William S. Bissell, in his report for 1893, concurred in the opinion of First Assistant Postmaster-General Frank H. Jones, that "the Department would not be warranted in burdening the people with such a great expense."

In his annual report for 1894 Postmaster-General Bissell declined to expend the small appropriation of $10,000 made by Congress to test the feasibility of the scheme, stating that "the proposed plan of rural free delivery, if adopted, would result in an additional cost to the people of about $20,000,000 for the first year," and that he did not believe the people were yet ready to involve themselves in such a large expenditure for the purpose.

When Congress increased the appropriation for a test to $20,000 in 1895 Postmaster-General William L. Wilson adopted the views of his predecessor, Mr. Bissell, and of the House Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, that the plan of establishing rural free delivery was wholly impracticable. He added that he had assumed control of the Department too late in the fiscal year to take any action under the appropriation, but should Congress see fit to make it available for the current year, he would put the experiment ordered to the test by the best methods he could devise.

Congress made $40,000 available, and in 1896 Postmaster-General Wilson, with many expressed misgivings, put the service to the test.

You know the result. I think I am justified in saying that the prompt response of the people was something which the officials of the Post-Office Department, as then constituted, neither expected nor desired. I know that in my own State of Indiana two locations were selected for the experiment which were, perhaps, above all others, least adapted to give immediate beneficial results. One of the initial rural routes in Indiana was so unsuitable that it had to be abandoned because every piece of mail delivered cost four times the postage received upon it. Yet from that same distributing point, after the rural free-delivery service passed into the friendly hands which now control it, a new service was started on improved lines, which within six months proved self-sustaining, and I am informed that urgent petitions have since been presented to the Department for an extension of rural delivery from this same point. I can supplement this experience by facts which have come under my own observation.

Before I had the honor of representing the Eighth Indiana district in Congress I went over three or four rural free-delivery routes in one of the counties now forming part of my Congressional district in company with the special agent of the Post-Office Department detailed for the investigation. We found at one point an organized opposition to the service on the part of some of the country storekeepers, who feared all sorts of injury to their business if the country people had their mails delivered by rural free delivery instead of their being compelled to come to the village to receive them. We persuaded these people to give the service a trial. Inside of six months they were not only satisfied with the service, but asked for more.

In a recent magazine article Hon. Perry S. Heath, of Indiana, First Assistant Postmaster-General, has discussed the broad national aspects of rural free delivery so pointedly and well, and his statements so accurately express my own views on the subject, that I ask to incorporate this article as part of my remarks. Speaking of his own strong personal interest in the rural free-delivery service (which he has done so much to foster and encourage), Mr. Heath says:

In the three years since the experiment was placed under my charge by President McKinley, and my immediate chief, the Postmaster-General, it has sprung from childhood to mature growth as rapidly as the mangrove trees do under the manipulation of East Indian jugglers.

Already the correspondence which the Department receives in regard to rural free delivery exceeds in bulk and diversity that of any other branch of the Post-Office service, and it increases day by day. The people are moving in the matter. The growth comes up from the subsoil. It is not an orchid, nurtured in the heated air of a conservatory, but a sturdy plant, raised on the American farm, and fruitful beyond the expectations of its most ardent cultivators. Congress and the Post-Office Department are simply following the lead of the people and are endeavoring to carry out their behests.

There seems to be an impression among a very few persons in Congress and elsewhere that rural free delivery is a kind of fancy or luxurious service. Those who thus raise objection to the free delivery of mail in rural communities forget that for a third of a century the farmers of our country have submitted without a murmur to taxation for the purpose of maintaining free delivery in the large cities, for which taxation they received no direct benefit. The people in the agricultural districts never complained that the city folks were given a service which could not be extended to them. They paid their taxes, sawed wood, and said nothing. That is, they said nothing until the idea was brought home to them that all other countries gave their farmers a proportionate share of postal benefits, while the United States, the pioneer in so many fields of advancement, alone lagged behind among the great nations that had entered into the Universal Postal Union at Vienna (which was adopted at our instance and was signed in compliment to the United States on the 4th of July, 1891) by failing to give full effect to the international obligation then entered into of delivering mails at the residences of the addressees. Finding now, as our farmers do, that by reason of increasing density of population and improved roads they can be brought within the humanizing influences of the postal service at less cost per capita than the people of the smaller cities, to whom free delivery has been accorded by law, is it to be wondered at that they ask their just share of postal benefits?

The item of cost is almost the only tangible basis of opposition at this time to the universal free delivery of the mails. I do not take into consideration the selfish and personal interests of a few postmasters who only desire the retention of their offices.

When the question of expense was under discussion before a committee of Congress some time ago, a member of the committee who was then much opposed to the service (but who has since changed his mind) observed that this was a measure of extravagance which would finally lead the Government into the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars. When I asked why, he answered, because the vast area of our country was such that the possibilities of rural free delivery were beyond comprehension and could not even be approximated. Then I inquired why this same argument had not led him to ask a repeal of the law extending free delivery to cities, inasmuch

as that law made it mandatory to give free delivery to every city of 10,000 inhabitants or $10,000 gross annual postal receipts. I suggested that there was no knowing to what extent of extravagance this expenditure might lead, with the enormous growth of our country. This was something he had not thought about. A further statement made in the course of the discussion, that the cost of delivering a piece of mail to a farmer on a rural-delivery route was less than half the cost per capita of initiating urban free delivery in the smaller cities was received by some members of the committee with expressions of surprise and incredulity. The discredit placed on the statement disappeared when figures demonstrated the fact. This is a point which is not generally known or understood.

Rural free delivery is not a costly, fanciful service. Within the short time it has been in operation it has given better results in increased postal receipts and in economies effected over the colonial service it supersedes than has been achieved in the same length of time in any small city where, by operation of law, free delivery has been established. It is susceptible of much greater development than it has yet had.

I believe that rural free delivery might be established over the entire country in each of the States north of the Ohio River and east of the Mississippi and that the cost would be less than that of the present service and the receipts much larger. This question has been put to the test in Carroll County, Md., with results which have exceeded the most sanguine expectations. The territory selected was not an ideal one for the experiment. It presented no especial advantages, either in the condition of the roads, the density of the population, or their appreciation of the new service offered them. It was a fair average test, and it has succeeded.

Having said this much of the practicability of the service, let me touch upon the more alluring topic of the benefits it will confer upon the people of the whole country. These are almost beyond description.

To begin with, what a boon it will be to have the isolation of rural life eliminated and town and country brought into closest touch. We may confidently expect that the tide of population which now sets steadily from the country into the overpopulated cities will in a brief period be reversed, and the free air and wholesome avocations of country life, relieved of their desolate monotony, will become as attractive to the children of the slums as the varieties of city life now are to the offspring of the farmer.

This generation has witnessed the marvelous commercial and industrial advantages which have followed the building of great trunk lines from ocean to ocean. Think how much greater will be the blessings brought close to the homes of the people when good, free, agricultural roads, passable under all stress of weather and at all seasons of the year, shall stretch from one end of the country to the other.

The old toll turnpike is doomed. It exists only in a few States and is even there regarded as obsolete. Rural free delivery will eventually impel the construction of free macadamized agricultural roads all over the United States, so that a man, if he chooses, can ride or drive from Boston to Omaha, or from Detroit to New Orleans. We are working in harmony with good-roads conventions everywhere to secure proper roads for the rural carriers to travel over. Great results have already been achieved in this respect, and more may be expected. On one route alone the farmers expended $3,000 for the improvement of roads as a prerequisite to the establishment of rural free delivery. The increased demands for the extension of the rural service places the Department in a position where it can insist, in future, that good roads shall be a prerequisite to any order for the establishment of rural free delivery. This course has practically been determined upon. If we are to have free good roads wherever we have rural free delivery, and this service should be extended in the future as rapidly as it has been during the present year, what a splendid prospect is opened up!

The direct advantages conferred on the immediate recipients of rural free delivery are as obvious as the general benefits received by the country at large. Farm lands enhance in value by being made more accessible. Crops bring better prices, because the growers can get their daily market reports and learn just exactly what their produce is worth. Daily papers and the numerous excellent and wholesome magazines now published bring a liberal education within reach of the farmers' children at little cost. The wife can do her shopping at the country store through the medium of the rural carrier without leaving her house. The goodman has no excuse for laying off half a day and wasting time and money at the village grocery on the pretext of seeing if there is any mail awaiting him. Relatives at a distance can write often with assurance of prompt delivery of their letters and early replies.

As the rural service progresses, it is taking on symmetry and uniformity. When it started, boxes were put up by the patrons in most irregular fashion. Drainage pipes, tomato cans, soap boxes, and all other kinds of unworthy receptacles were set out for the reception of the United States mails. Now boxes characterized by neatness and security are the rule and not the exception. I am strongly of the opinion that the Government should supply a regular rural letter box and rent it for a small fixed annual charge to each patron. This development of the service may come in a short time.

Few of the original carriers have yet adopted any uniform. Regulation uniforms and special conveyances will soon become frequent adjuncts of the service.

The rapid changes and improvements already made in the service during the short period of its existence encourage the hope that its future growth and development will be even more remarkable than its past.

I quite concur in these hopeful anticipations, and in my own State I can point to the facts which back them up. Wherever the service has been started in an appreciative community, it grows and spreads. And let me say that in recent years rural free delivery has never been established in Indiana except in an appreciative community. It is hard to find any others. In my own Congressional district, which comprises 7 counties, 30 applications, earnestly indorsed by the people and complying with the preliminary requests of the Department, have been transmitted to me and filed, and 15 services, with 18 carriers, have been started.

In the course of this debate one gentleman, the distinguished Representative from the Seventh Georgia district [Mr. MADDOX], complained that there had been unfair discrimination shown in the establishment of the service, and that his district in particular had been neglected. I thought at the time that the gentleman was probably misinformed as to the facts, and on inquiry of the Department I ascertained that from the thirteen counties composing the Seventh Congressional district of Georgia only three petitions for the establishment of rural free delivery had been presented, and that two of them were in course of investigation.

I am satisfied, Mr. Chairman, that there has been no improper preference shown to any State or district in the carrying out of this great experiment of rural free delivery. The States which have received the lion's share of the service have been those that have been the first to ask for it and the most persistent in pressing their requests, presented with accompanying maps and information, as suggested by the Department. South Carolina, in proportion to its population, has fared better than Indiana, Ohio, or New York. Iowa and Michigan are in a fair way to outstrip Pennsylvania and New Jersey.

The First Assistant Postmaster-General, in the article I have quoted, speaks of the close connection between the rural free-delivery service and that greatly to be desired boon, the construction and maintenance of good roads. There have been some inquiries addressed on this subject to the postmasters of my own State, as well as to others where rural free delivery has been started, as to whether the establishment of this service had directly or indirectly caused an improvement in the country roads traversed. These are some of the replies received from Indiana:

Lafayette, Tippecanoe County.—Yes; very materially.
New Richmond, Montgomery County.—Indirectly; yes.
Noblesville, Hamilton County.—Yes.
Warsaw, Kosciusko County.—It has directly caused improvement of roads.
Parker, Randolph County.—Some improvement; but the roads were in good condition before the service was asked for.
Selma, Delaware County.—There has been a great improvement in our roads, and the indications are that there will be more work put on them this summer than ever before. Everybody wants the service extended to him.
Lebanon, Boone County.—Yes; $2,680 was spent on one strip, 2 miles long, in order to obtain rural delivery. The farmers have since built another 2 miles on the line. Other roads are being improved in anticipation of additional routes.
Newcastle, Henry County.—Yes; very materially.
Richmond, Wayne County.—Yes; though our roads were good before the establishment of these routes.
Hope, Bartholomew County.—Roads have been improved greatly.
Delphi, Carroll County.—Yes.
Crawfordsville, Montgomery County.—Yes.
Darlington, Montgomery County.—Yes; it has caused the construction of an iron bridge across a creek which was impassable at times, and the graveling of 1 mile of road, so that the entire route is now graveled and in good repair.

Mr. Chairman, we can not stop the wheels of progress, nor do we desire to do so. We can not, even if we would, go back to the condition of things when President John Quincy Adams proudly congratulated Congress on the fact that of the 7,000 post-offices then in existence, all of them were reached by the mails at least once a week and some of them as often as once a day.

The postal service must grow with the country, and rural free delivery is, in my judgment, its latest, greatest, and best development.

The Agricultural Bill.

SPEECH
OF
HON. GILBERT N. HAUGEN,
OF IOWA,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Monday, April 9, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 10638) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901—

Mr. HAUGEN said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have no desire to impose upon the good nature of this House. However, it is natural that I should have an interest in this bill, inasmuch as I come from the greatest agricultural district in the United States—the garden spot of the great and grand State of Iowa; a State which has given homes to two and one-quarter millions of the most prosperous, industrious, intelligent, patriotic, and law-abiding people on earth, embracing within her borders 55,000 square miles, or 35,000,000 acres, of the most productive soil ever fertilized by God's sunlight and rain; a State, according to her census of 1895, with land and improvements valued at $1,088,066,008; a State where 398,577 families are engaged in farming, and who give to the wealth of the world upward of $400,000,000 annually, and who are daily adding to the comfort and happiness of their homes; a State, as shown by the census of 1890, where there are 141,389 farms free from mortgage indebtedness, while but 104,072 farms are mortgaged, and that at only $88,553,000, which is less than 9 per cent of the value of all her lands, which has a total mortgage indebtedness of only $138,085,720, or less than 5 per cent of the value of all her property; and I might add, a State with a lower percentage of illiteracy than any in the Union except one.

I do not come here as a pessimist. I thank God I am an optomist, and I am not here pleading for poverty or for class legislation; but I feel that I have a right to advocate the interests of our agricultural districts.

Now that the money question has been so earnestly and eloquently discussed, and we have listened to you for days, weeks, and months, with so much patience, debating nearly every conceivable subject, the Committee on Agriculture has been given the right of way for to-day, and, through the courtesy of our worthy chairman, I have been accorded the privilege and honor of occupying a portion of this time, and in so doing I wish to devote at least a part of my remarks to the subject under consideration.

THE SCOPE OF AGRICULTURE IN THE UNITED STATES.

We find in the system of large land holdings and the system of subletting of these holdings to many tenants that there are 12,690,150 heads of families engaged in agriculture in the United States. Of this vast number 6,066,417 families own their own land, farm their own premises as best they see fit; and as a result of their good judgment, pluck, and energy we find there are 4,369,527 farms totally free from mortgage indebtedness, while there are 1,696,890 who have yet to complete payment on their lands. There are 6,623,735 of our farmers who are tenants, but we must remember that even this vast army is on the way to prosperity, and the good and thrifty tenant soon acquires sufficient means to purchase a farm of his own.

These industrious tillers of the soil now furnish 150,000,000 bushels of wheat and 200,000,000 bushels of corn for export, whereas in years past we were compelled to import the same commodities. In the United States we produce two-thirds of the cotton crop of the entire world. We do not as a people go on foot, for we had, according to the last census, 12,550,000 horses; for a part of our food and clothing we rely upon 38,000,000 sheep; that we may have our hams, bacon, and lard we depend upon 35,000,000 hogs; and that we have our own milk, cream, and make our own butter is fully demonstrated by the fact that we have 33,600,000 cows.

WHAT OUR FARMERS DEMAND.

Upon the subject of butter these 12,000,000 farmers are now demanding some national legislation, legislation that is in my opinion worthy of earnest and favorable consideration at the hands of this Congress; and I have no doubt but what their bill (H. R. 3717) known as the Grout bill will receive such consideration when the time comes for action. At least, it should receive the support of every member who really has the dairy interests at heart and who is here as their representative, notwithstanding the strong opposition made by the meat combines under the pretense that such legislation would ruin the cotton industry of the South and the ranchmen of the West.

I expect to have an opportunity to speak upon this subject at a later day, and will not now further take up your time.

THE SUGAR-BEET INDUSTRY.

There is another subject to which I wish to call your attention, that of the sugar-beet industry. A few days ago the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee called our attention to the fact that we are annually importing 1,500,000 tons of sugar. Now that it is demonstrated beyond doubt that we have the climate and soil, and nobody denies but we have the skill, capital, and enterprise, it occurs to me that some encouraging legislation along this line would greatly aid in promoting this new industry.

When we stop to consider that we are annually importing 150,000 carloads of sugar, of 10 tons each, or 6,000 train loads of twenty-five cars, a train reaching from the Speaker's desk to his home in Iowa, and that we are annually paying foreign countries in actual cash an amount exceeding the commercial value of the total output of all the silver mines of the world, or the total output of all the gold and silver mines in the United States for 1898, for this single product, sugar, it is at once apparent that this is an important industry to us. And had it not been for the uncertainty of legislation as to our newly acquired territories, and legislation touching directly upon this question, I should have offered an amendment to this bill that would, in my opinion, have encouraged the sugar-beet industry of this country.

But realizing that a desperate effort is being made on the part of the sugar and tobacco trusts to defeat all legislation along this line; and in view of the fact of their partial success in defeating legislation heretofore, and the present influence these combinations seem to have on legislation and the country at large—under these conditions, in my opinion, it would be a great mistake to now encourage an industry which seems destined to be legislated out of existence at an early date.

However, since considerable time and money has been spent by the Government experimenting in growing sugar beets in the United States, there can be no objection to calling attention to the importance of such legislation, as well as the importance of such an industry.

Upon investigation it appears, as a result of the able efforts on the part of our worthy and efficient Secretary of Agriculture, that there are 30 sugar-beet factories in operation in this country, manufacturing at the rate of 100,000 tons of sugar annually. These factories pay farmers about $5,000,000 every year for sugar beet. As sugar has an almost unlimited home market, there is yet room for at least 300 factories with a capacity of 400 tons per day of sugar beets, to supply the 1,500,000 tons of sugar which we yearly import. The establishment of this industry to this extent would give employment to at least 100,000 laborers on the farm at about $300 for from four to six months' work, or two times the total number of men employed in all of the gold and silver mines of the United States.

The cost of seed, cultivation, and marketing of an acre of sugar beets is estimated at $36 to $45 per acre. Labor costs about $37 per acre, and the seed $3 per acre, or an average cost of $40 per acre. It will take 750,000 acres, with an average yield of 16 tons per acre, to supply the 12,000,000 tons of sugar beet required. This gives to the laborers on the farm—counting seed as labor—the handsome sum of $40,000,000.

Next comes the landowner for his share. The beet sells for from $4 to $5 per ton, or an average price of $4.50, and the yield is from 10 to 22 tons per acre, or an average yield of 16 tons, which equals $72 per acre. Deduct the $40 for labor, and we have $32 for land rent and fertilizing, or the net sum of $24,000,000.

Then comes the manufacturer. It is estimated that 300 factories are needed, at a cost of $350,000 each, or a total cost of $105,000,000.

What will the manufacturer realize out of his investment? He must purchase 12,000,000 tons of beets, at $4.50; total	$54,000,000
He employs 50,000 men, and here again the laborer receives a handsome sum of	10,000,000
It is estimated that the fuel, coke, limestone, and incidental expenses will amount to about	16,000,000
He is entitled, we will say, to 10 per cent on his investment of $105,000,000 for deterioration of plant, repairs, insurance, etc., or	10,500,000
A total of	90,500,000
He disposes of his 1,500,000 tons of sugar at 4 cents per pound; total	120,000,000
Deduct total expenditures	90,500,000
And we have a balance of	29,500,000

with which to pay dividends, or 28 per cent on his investment.

In view of these facts, does it not seem that this is a subject which is entitled to favorable and early consideration? It is entitled to encouragement in the way of a protective tariff rather than the free trade advocated in the interests of Havemeyer and his associates, which would be sure to give a deathblow to this profitable industry.

Rather than to pay foreign countries $320,000 every working day of the year we had better legislate so as to pay this money to our own laborers and farmers. In so doing we would not only legislate in the interest of the farmer and laborer, but we would legislate in the interest of every American citizen, be he banker, lawyer, business man, physician, laborer, farmer, or manufacturer. All go hand in hand. Nobody will deny but that the prosperity of our people depends largely upon the prosperity of the tiller of the soil and that our interests are in common. When we place $100,000,000 annually into the hands of the American people we add that much to our purchasing power, and we all share in its benefits.

THE PORTO RICAN TARIFF BILL.

This suggests to me the importance of a subject which has been under consideration by this House for some time and upon which many able and eloquent speeches have been delivered.

No objection is raised to the 58,000 tons of Porto Rican sugar coming into the United States free of duty, on the ground that this small amount would materially affect the sugar market in this country, but we do protest against establishing a precedent for the Territories which will have to be legislated upon by us later.

The same argument used for free trade with Porto Rico will be used as to the other Territories. Your claim is that Porto Rico is entitled to free trade and the same privileges we have under the Constitution. Now, if this argument holds good as to Porto Rico, it will hold good as to the Philippines, Hawaii, and Cuba—if in time she should become a part of the United States, which now seems more than likely.

Cuba alone can produce enough sugar to supply the United States, and so can Hawaii and the Philippines; and I have no doubt when we come to legislate for these islands that every free-trade Democrat and every free-trade Republican will be here advocating his free-trade theory as earnestly and eloquently as ever and that we will again be told by our friends across the Hall that we are absolutely helpless and have no power to legislate or to protect ourselves under the Constitution.

Nobody will contend that our farmers and laborers can compete

with the farmers and laborers in the newly acquired Territories, where wages average from 5 to 30 cents per day, while we pay from one to two dollars per day. I believe it is safe to say that the price paid labor in the United States is fifteen or twenty times higher than wages paid in the Philippine Islands and Porto Rico and four times higher than in Cuba. And besides they have the advantages in soil and climate.

Free trade with Porto Rico means free trade with the Philippine Islands; free trade with Porto Rico means free trade with Hawaii and Cuba. Free trade with these islands means death to the sugar and tobacco industries of this country and every other industry that comes into competition with the industries of these islands. It is driving the nail into the coffin of the cigar industry of this country, an industry with $100,000,000 invested, employing 125,000 people, paying them $60,000,000 in wages, consuming $50,000,000 worth of tobacco, producing $150,000,000 worth of cigars annually—saying nothing about the tropical fruits, vegetables, etc.

In my opinion this will be the result of your earnest labors should you succeed; and I feel that the time of my Democratic friends on the other side of this Chamber might have been better occupied than playing into the hands and following the dictates of Havemeyer and his associates, who are so numerous in and about Washington. You are now glorifying in your prospects; but time will tell whether the sugar trusts will dictate legislation or whether the memorials of our farmers and laborers will be heeded. It is a simple business proposition.

The question is whether we are to follow the dictates of the few against the wishes of the many or whether we are to accede to the wishes of our farmers and laborers. In view of these facts, do you wonder that our farmers were holding mass meetings all over this vast country, protesting against this unreasonable and injurious measure?

Let me read to you a memorial sent to Congress by the farmers of America:

I have supported protection for other interests, now I want them to support protection for the farmer. If fruits, sugar, tobacco, vegetables, etc., are to be admitted free from Porto Rico, Cuba, and the Philippines, then admit free manufactures from England and Europe. If duties on the products I have to sell are reduced 12 to 15 per cent by "reciprocity," then make a like reduction on the manufactures I have to buy. So long as there is protection I want my share of it, especially on those things upon which a duty will really protect. Don't subject me to free-trade conditions and expect me to vote protection for the other fellow.

Much has been said as to the hardships imposed upon the poor, suffering Porto Ricans by this 15 per cent tariff of the Dingley rate. Let us see what hardships are imposed by this bill. The bill provides:

SEC. 3. That on and after the passage of this act all merchandise coming into the United States from Porto Rico and coming into Porto Rico from the United States shall be entered at the several ports of entry upon payment of 15 per cent of the duties which are required to be levied, collected, and paid upon like articles of merchandise imported from foreign countries; and whenever the legislative assembly of Porto Rico shall have enacted and put into operation a system of local taxation to meet the necessities of the government of Porto Rico by this act established, and shall by resolution duly passed so notify the President, he shall make proclamation thereof, and thereupon all tariff duties on merchandise and articles going into Porto Rico from the United States or coming into the United States from Porto Rico shall cease, and from and after such date all such merchandise and articles shall be entered at the several ports of entry free of duty; and in no event shall any duties be collected after the 1st day of March, 1902, on merchandise and articles going into Porto Rico from the United States or coming into the United States from Porto Rico.

SEC. 4. That the duties and taxes collected in Porto Rico in pursuance of this act, less the cost of collecting the same, and the gross amount of all collections of duties and taxes in the United States upon articles of merchandise coming from Porto Rico, shall not be covered into the general fund of the Treasury, but shall be held as a separate fund, and shall be placed at the disposal of the President to be used for the government and benefit of Porto Rico until the government of Porto Rico herein provided for shall have been organized, when all moneys theretofore collected under the provisions hereof, then unexpended, shall be transferred to the local treasury of Porto Rico, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall designate the several ports and subports of entry in Porto Rico and shall make such rules and regulations and appoint such agents as may be necessary to collect the duties and taxes authorized to be levied, collected, and paid in Porto Rico by the provisions of this act, and he shall fix the compensation and provide for the payment thereof of all such officers, agents, and assistants as he may find it necessary to employ to carry out the provisions hereof: *Provided, however*, That as soon as a civil government for Porto Rico shall have been organized in accordance with the provisions of this act and notice thereof shall have been given to the President he shall make proclamation thereof, and thereafter all collections of duties and taxes in Porto Rico under the provisions of this act shall be paid into the treasury of Porto Rico, to be expended as required by law for the government and benefit thereof instead of being paid into the Treasury of the United States.

Is it a hardship when we say to these people, "You are now paying $1.60 per hundred on sugar exported by you into the United States; we will now give you a discount of 85 per cent, and all that you will be compelled to pay is 24 cents per hundred; every dollar collected as duty on merchandise coming into the United States from Porto Rico and going into Porto Rico from the United States will be placed in the hands of our President for your benefit; and in addition to this we will give you the $2,000,000 heretofore collected under the Dingley bill?" No, it is not a hardship, and the argument that we are imposing upon the people of Porto Rico is all bosh.

Upon this subject let me say to you, if you are the friends of the Porto Ricans I submit to you that you should have at least been in favor of a proposition to donate them the $2,000,000 which has recently been done by the friends of this bill. It is not in good taste for you gentlemen to appear before the country as philanthropists and friends of the Porto Ricans when you have voted against this proposition to donate the $2,000,000, and are endeavoring to defeat this bill, knowing well that if it is defeated the Porto Ricans will be compelled to pay the 100 per cent of the Dingley rate instead of the 15 per cent provided for in this bill.

This bill is a temporary measure. Whenever the legislative assembly of Porto Rico shall decide upon and put into operation a system of local taxation to meet the necessities of that government, and they notify the President to that effect, all tariff duties on merchandise, both imported and exported, shall cease, and in no event shall duties be collected after the 1st day of March, 1902.

The gentlemen on the other side of this House claim that we are placed in an unfortunate condition; absolutely powerless to protect ourselves under the Constitution; and that when the flag was raised in these islands the Constitution jumped over there also, and that within the twinkling of an eye the Tagals, the Malays, the Negritos, and all the numerous savages and tribes who inhabit those islands were placed upon a level with the citizens of the United States—people who can not read or write (except a small percentage) and people who never heard of the United States given the same privileges, the same laws, and the same liberties as we ourselves have.

I am not a constitutional lawyer; nevertheless I have a high respect for the profession; but there are some things about the Constitution that need no constitutional lawyer to interpret. When I read Article IV, section 3, "that Congress shall have the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting territories and property belonging to the United States," viewing this from a layman's standpoint, it would seem that the Constitution is a constitution for the States and not for the Territories, except as it may be extended over these Territories by legislation; that these Territories, as all other Territories have done, must look to Congress for legislation, and that they are the property of the United States, and not a part of the United States or members of the Federal States.

The constitutionality of this measure has been ably and fully discussed by our able leaders on both sides of this Chamber, and I have no desire to impose further upon your good nature. I am inclined to believe as did our greatest constitutional lawyers and statesmen, such as Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Daniel Webster, Stephen A. Douglas, Thomas Benton, and others, and I feel safe in following their footsteps.

If we are powerless under the Constitution to legislate respecting these islands, and can not protect ourselves, then the sooner we know this the better, for we will soon be called upon to legislate for the Philippines and other islands.

The Democracy has thrown every possible obstacle in the way of the passage of this Porto Rican tariff bill, and could they accomplish its defeat they would have an opportunity to assert that a precedent had been established and must be applied to the Philippines and Hawaii or any other territory not contiguous to the United States with which we may subsequently have to deal. But this is not all. You would have contended, and justly, too, that the Republican party had been the cause of bringing the cheap labor of the Tropics into direct competition with our laboring men and farmers. Is it to be wondered at that the Democracy made such a desperate fight for the political opportunities just mentioned?

I feel justified in supporting this bill not only because I am unwilling that the prosperous, intelligent, and hard-working farmers and laborers of my State be placed on the same level with the cheap and savage labor of the Orient, but because I believe that our right to deal with these islands as seems best for our welfare and their welfare should be asserted at once; also because I believe that the 15 per cent of the Dingley tariff rate will bring no hardships with it, but, on the contrary, will bring a much-needed relief until such customs, laws, and internal-revenue system can be inaugurated as are adapted to their conditions and wants.

I am not surprised at the Democratic opposition to this bill, or any other bill, for that matter. They must have something upon which to make their campaign this fall. I really feel sorry for them. The tariff is a thing of the past; their free-silver theory has been thwarted by the enactment of a Republican measure which places us upon a sound financial basis, and they have practically abandoned that issue; they are trying to find refuge under the blanket of imperialism and military despotism, but the wisdom, skill, and tact with which our noble President is handling this is not in the least encouraging to them.

PRESIDENT M'KINLEY—PROSPERITY.

Our country is prosperous; our people are at work; our exports are increasing in large proportions, and our imports are decreasing. What more could we ask?

In 1896 President McKinley said:

What we want is a sound money and a chance to earn it.

In this we were all agreed; and the voters of this magnificent country decided by a large majority to give Mr. McKinley and the Republican party an opportunity to carry this maxim into effect.

Something over three years have passed; the country has been lifted out of chaos, stagnation, and financial depression and placed into an era of prosperity the like of which has never before been written on the pages of history; and the confidence intrusted in the President by the people has not been betrayed. This confidence has been fulfilled, and for proof of this we need but turn to our national ledger and glance at the business entries.

The business for the fiscal year ending in 1899 tells a most eloquent story of prosperity. We sold foreign nations $1,227,443,425 worth of American products, and in return bought only $696,077,388, or a balance of trade in our favor of $531,366,037. For the fiscal year ending 1898 we sold foreign nations $1,231,329,950, and in return bought only $616,205,159, a balance of trade in our favor amounting to the enormous sum of $615,000,000, or a total for the two years of $1,145,000,000.

Compare this with the last two years of Cleveland's Administration under the tariff act of 1894. We then exported more than we imported only $278,000,000; and in the last two years of the McKinley Administration, and under the Dingley law, we have exported more than we have imported, as above stated, $1,145,000,000, a gain of $878,000,000 under the tariff of 1896, as compared with the tariff of 1894. This gain has been large, constant, steady.

We have not only been fortunately prosperous, but we have been fortunate in war; and this good fortune is largely due to the wisdom, diplomacy, and stalwartness of our honored President.

William McKinley since taking his seat as our Chief Magistrate has used great care and judgment, and has held the reins of the Government with a firm and steady hand from the moment he took control. He has acted wisely and humanely in the past; and if we retain him as our Chief Executive, we have the assurance that the honor, integrity, and glory of America will be maintained and that the inevitable rights, life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness, which we now enjoy will be extended to the oppressed and downtrodden people of the West Indies and the Philippines.

We will have the fullest assurance that the grand and beautiful flag of America, now floating with its protecting folds over land and sea, will not be hauled down in shame and dishonor and that the fearless blood and matchless valor of our heroes, both living and dead, will not have been offered in vain on the sacred altar of our country and humanity.

Freedom is that for which our forefathers fought. The unity of our nation is what Lincoln, Grant, and Garfield stood for, and William McKinley stands for all that a true, patriotic American citizen can possibly ask for, namely, peace, prosperity, honor, and integrity, with no cry of the masses against the classes and no cry of the classes against the masses, advocating that an honest day's labor should be paid for with an honest dollar. [Loud applause.]

Rural Mail Delivery.

I want to see the day when the isolation inseparable from farm life will be illuminated at least once each day by the postman, bringing the humblest home in touch, through the press and the post, with all other homes in our broad land. Let there be one hour each day that shall lift the thought of each humble home above its sordid surroundings into contact with the better, nobler thought and aspiration of the nation.

SPEECH

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM STOKES,

OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, April 9, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 10538) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901—

Mr. STOKES said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I avail myself of this opportunity to submit some observations and conclusions upon the subject of free delivery of mail in rural districts.

I shall take as my text the bill which I introduced in the Fifty-fifth Congress, known as H. R. 11602, which I ask the Clerk to read as part of my remarks.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11602) to extend free delivery of mail along star routes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all contracts for carrying mail on star routes made after the passage of this act shall include the deposit in the proper boxes placed on the line of the routes for this purpose, without charge to the addressees, any mail matter that may be intrusted to the carrier for such distribution by any postmaster on the route.

SEC. 2. That it shall also be the duty of the said carriers so contracting, in addition to the duties imposed by section 687 of the postal laws, to take up such mail matter as may be deposited in said mail boxes and deposit same for mailing at the next post-office on his route without additional compensation.

SEC. 3. That it shall be the duty of each postmaster, upon a written order from any person living on or near an established star route which comes within the provisions of section 1 of this act, to deliver to the proper mail carrier for that route any mail matter, with instructions as to the proper mail box at which said mail matter shall be deposited.

SEC. 4. That any person desiring his mail deposited along the line of any star route within the terms of section 1 of this act shall erect a box, as convenient as practicable on the roadside, and file with the nearest postmaster on each side of the box a request in writing for the delivery of his mail to the proper carrier for deposit in said mail box.

SEC. 5. That all mail boxes along such star routes shall be numbered consecutively, beginning from the initial point of the star route.

SEC. 6. That with a view to bringing the mail thus deposited ultimately under the protection of the general postal laws until received by the addressee or his agent, the Postmaster-General is hereby authorized to invite submission of plans and devices for special boxes, with duplicate keys for the use of carriers and addressees, respectively.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, that bill was introduced January 14, 1899, and was reintroduced by me on December 7 of the current Congress as H. R. 2565. It is the same bill which a gentleman on the other side of the Chamber did me the compliment to reintroduce on February 7 of this year.

HOW IT WILL WORK.

The merit of this measure, Mr. Chairman, must be apparent as soon as it is understood. The proposition is to utilize an established network of star-route service for the purpose of extending free delivery of mail in such a way as not to materially embarrass the carrying of the mail under existing contracts and yet secure to a very large proportion of the rural people immense advantages at insignificant cost.

WHAT ARE STAR ROUTES?

It will be understood, of course, that star routes are routes through the rural districts, radiating from railroad points into sections more or less remote from railroad lines. Along these star routes mail is now carried in closed pouches from the initial post-office to the other outlying offices by private conveyance. The Post-Office Department of the Government is now maintaining 22,482 of these routes, which are let by contract every four years to the lowest responsible bidder, after wide advertisement.

THEY COVER THE COUNTRY.

The large number of these routes and their distribution at once suggests what is a fact, that they cover fairly well the entire rural districts of our country; and the method of giving out the contracts for the service insures cheapness, and, as a matter of fact, it is the cheapest carrying service in the world outside of the coolie chair service of India perhaps; and, I regret to say, is almost as discreditable, so far as appearances go, as it is cheap. But that is another story.

FREE TO THE PEOPLE.

My bill proposes to impose upon the contractors who undertake the carrying of the mail from one post-office to another along these 22,482 star routes the additional duty of delivering mail in boxes erected along the routes by persons living on or adjacent thereto. It also requires that the said contractors shall take up and mail at the next post-office on the route any mail that may be left in said boxes.

And this additional service the contractors are required to perform without charge to the people served.

PAID BY THE GOVERNMENT.

They are to include this service in their estimates and base their bids upon the whole service required, and of course it is paid by the Government like all Government contracts.

The people living on or adjacent to these routes are required to erect the boxes at their own expense and then direct the postmaster at the proper office to send out their mail to be deposited in the proper box.

I can not do better at this point, Mr. Chairman, as a means of conveying to the House a clear conception of the plan in its entirety, than to quote one of several very lucid and forceful editorials of the News and Courier, of Charleston, S. C., a few days after the introduction of the bill.

It is but justice to state here that the editor of that paper was one of the first to take up the proposition and has done incalculable service in pressing it through his columns:

FREE MAIL DELIVERY ON STAR ROUTES.

The bill introduced in Congress by Representative STOKES, of South Carolina, "to extend free delivery of mail along star routes" impresses us as being a wholly practicable and very desirable measure.

As explained yesterday, the bill provides, in substance, that mail boxes be placed on the roadside along the "star" routes, or country routes, and shall

be numbered consecutively. Persons living near the route and desiring to have their mail deposited in these boxes will have only to leave with the postmaster at each end of the route a written request for the delivery of their mail to the carrier, designating the number of the box in which it is to be deposited, and thereupon it becomes the duty of the carrier to deposit it, without charge, and so every person living on or near the star route would get his mail every time the carrier passed without expense or loss of time in going to the terminal post-office.

Some necessary details are added, but this bare sketch of the scheme will suffice, we are sure, to commend it to the hearty support of the rural constituents of every Congressman. Whatever objections, if any, may be offered to it by the postal authorities or others will be promptly and effectually overridden, we are sure, by the very large number of persons interested in its early adoption. It is in practical operation already for the benefit of a few persons living on or near such routes, and it should be put into operation for the benefit of all of them. The wonder is that so simple and desirable a plan for the wide extension of mail facilities to out-of-the-way places was not devised and adopted long ago. The people concerned in its operation can be safely trusted, we think, to take care of the boxes and to bring to sharp account those who may undertake to meddle with them. The Government will need but few detectives for that service.

Mr. STOKES believes, with reason, that the system would be inexpensive, and would soon prove to be self-sustaining. "For the present the people who get this service would have to furnish their own boxes, but the bill contemplates that ultimately they would be furnished by the Government, if the service justifies it." The right plan would appear to be to have the Government furnish them at cost to the several persons served by each box, so as to insure the popular interest in the due preservation and protection of the depositories. A simple iron box made to exclude rain, fitted with a safe lock and keys enough for each person or family served, would not cost much, would cost that little but once in years, and the cost, whatever it might be, would constitute no considerable tax on the persons served. The great majority would gladly pay very much more for such service.

On the whole, we repeat that Mr. STOKES's scheme is an admirable and unobjectionable one, and it is bound to be a popular one when its merits become generally known. We believe that he will have little difficulty in having it promptly adopted by Congress, and that when it is adopted it is certain to become firmly established and to lead to the still further development of the service which he predicts for it, amounting practically to "a general system of rural free delivery."

SOME HISTORY.

As will be observed, the sixth section of my bill contemplates bringing all the rural mail boxes provided for in the bill ultimately under the protection of the United States statutes. I had not proceeded far, however, in the discussion of the merits of the scheme with the experts of the Post-Office Department before I discovered that this just but unessential feature would arouse, or have a tendency to arouse, opposition to a scheme which was considered, in all other respects, not only unobjectionable but highly meritorious. While the sixth section was essentially just in the abstract, it opened up possibilities of new and largely increased burdens upon an already overburdened bureau—that of post-office inspection and mail depredations. The fear seemed to exist in some quarters that rural mail boxes in secluded or isolated sections of the country would invite depredations by the wanton or the vicious, and thus greatly increase the burden upon this arm of the public service with a class of cases where the chances of detection and punishment would be small.

THE LINE OF LEAST RESISTANCE.

Being unwilling to jeopardize the whole scheme by insisting upon a nonessential feature, I introduced on January 25, 1899, another bill, which was identical with the bill read by the Clerk save that the objectionable section was omitted. This bill I submitted formally to the Post-Office Department for examination and suggestion.

INDORSED BY THE DEPARTMENT.

In response, I received within three days the following letter from the ever alert and progressive gentleman who presides over and directs this branch of the postal service, General Shallenberger. I ask the Clerk to read, as a part of my remarks, his letter.

The Clerk read as follows:

POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER-GENERAL,
Washington, January 28, 1899.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 26th instant, asking me for an expression of opinion in regard to bill H. R. 11602, introduced by you in the House on January 14, 1899, entitled "A bill to extend free delivery of mail along star routes," and in reply to state that the object of the bill has my entire approval and recommendation. I would, however, suggest several changes therein, so that the bill as changed would read as follows:

"That all contracts for carrying mail on star routes made after the passage of this act shall include the deposit in the proper boxes placed on the line of the routes for this purpose, without charge to the addressees, of any mail matter that may be intrusted to the carrier for such distribution by any postmaster on the route.

"SEC. 2. That it shall also be the duty of said carrier, in addition to the duties imposed by section 3993 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, to take up such mail matter properly prepaid by stamps as he shall find in said mail boxes and deposit the same for mailing at the next post-office at which he arrives on his route without additional compensation.

"SEC. 3. That any person desiring his mail deposited along the line of any star route within the terms of section 1 of this act shall erect a box as convenient as practicable on the roadside, and file with the postmaster at the post-office at which his mail is addressed, which shall be one of the two post-offices on the route on either side and next to the box, a request in writing for the delivery of his mail to the proper carrier for deposit in said mail box.

"SEC. 4. That it shall be the duty of the postmaster at every such post-office, upon a written order from any person living on or near an established star route which comes within the provision of section 1 of this act, to deliver to the proper mail carrier for that route any mail matter, except registered mail, with instructions as to the proper mail box at which said mail matter shall be deposited; but no mail matter so delivered to a carrier for deposit shall be carried past another post-office on the route before being deposited in a box.

"SEC. 5. That all mail boxes along such star routes shall be numbered or marked as may be directed by the Postmaster-General.

"SEC. 6. That the Postmaster-General may prescribe regulations for the proper performance of service under this act."

I think it is entirely feasible to combine a system of box deliveries and collections in connection with the existing star routes, now numbering about 22,000, in such manner as to largely increase the mail accommodation to people residing in rural districts without detriment to the star service or without a large increase in the cost thereof. We know that it is the practice now on many star routes for the carriers to take the mail and deposit it in boxes along the line of the routes, but in the absence of legislation it rests entirely with the pleasure of the carriers whether they will give the people this accommodation or not. It also puts it in the power of a carrier to discriminate against some people while accommodating others on the same route. The proposed law would give equal accommodation to all people living on or near the line of star routes.

I do not think it would largely increase the cost, because the distance traveled by the carriers would not be increased at all. It would require a little more time, of course, for the carriers to stop and deposit the mail or collect it from the boxes, and in some cases it would require more intelligent carriers than are now employed, as all carriers must be able to read addresses on the mail matter taken by them outside of the bags to be placed in the proper boxes. It is also possible that in those cases where carriers are now charging the people along the line of route a fee for delivering their mail into boxes that there would be a tendency to slightly increase the price under the contract if the law prohibited the charging of such fees; but as these star-route contracts are let after having been widely advertised, and as there is much competition in bidding for them, I think that the increase in cost would be but slight compared with the additional facilities rendered to the public.

If it should be found impracticable to get this bill acted upon in both the House and Senate during the present session of Congress, I suggest that practically the same object could be accomplished by introducing an amendment to the Post-Office appropriation bill, now pending in the Senate committee, to the following effect:

"*Provided*, That the Postmaster-General, in making contracts for the transportation of the mail on star routes, is authorized to prescribe such regulations as will require the contractors to deliver mail into and collect mail from boxes located along the line of such routes; such boxes to be erected and maintained at the expense of persons living on or near such routes who may desire to have their mail so carried."

Very respectfully,

W. S. SHALLENBERGER,
Second Assistant Postmaster-General.

Hon. J. W. STOKES, *House of Representatives.*

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, the changes suggested, it will be observed, are purely verbal, and do not affect the principle of my bill.

THE STRENUOUS HOURS.

Although thus cordially indorsed by the Department, and favorably considered by many members of the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, it seemed impossible in the closing weeks of an expiring Congress to get independent consideration in the House, even if reported by the committee, and so I adopted the suggestion of the Department. Then through the earnest and efficient efforts of my colleague in the other end of this building, Senator TILLMAN, the amendment was placed on the Post-Office appropriation bill, but by a clerical error it went out in conference.

WHAT IT WILL COST.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, the probable cost of any public enterprise should always be an important consideration. But it is not and should not be the first or the controlling consideration. Whenever it is determined definitely that the country needs any particular thing, it is entitled to the best of that thing; when it is definitely determined that the country needs a certain number of battle ships, the dominant consideration is the best ships.

THE BEST THE CHEAPEST.

There may be disputes about the need and about the number; but once the need and the number are determined, considerations of economy and of every other kind impel to get the best; and the people are always ready to pay the bills, provided they are sure they are getting the best.

And so in the postal facilities, what the country needs and what it wants is the best possible facilities for the transaction of business through the mails, and there will be no kicking about paying for it, if the country is convinced that it is actually getting the best and getting what it is paying for. What it wants is service, and it is willing to pay for efficient service. Still the inquiry, what it will cost, is pertinent and proper; and it is incumbent upon the proponent to answer in a rational way.

NOT WITHOUT DATA.

Fortunately, we are not entirely without data of the most significant character. The effort to fix the scheme in the Post-Office appropriation bill last year having miscarried through a concatenation of incidents frequently attendant upon the closing hours of an expiring Congress, I suggested to the Second Assistant Postmaster-General the propriety of making an experiment of the scheme in those States whose quadrennium will expire July next, and which were to be relet for four years in the then coming fall (1900).

A TENTATIVE APPLICATION.

After mature deliberation from all aspects, it was determined to put the provisions of the bill into operation tentatively in limited areas of the section to be let anew in the following fall. My own State—South Carolina—was selected for the experiment, and the results so far attained fully vindicate the wisdom and

the progressive spirit of the Department. Accordingly, the instructions for the bidding on star-route contracts within South Carolina, in addition to the usual requirements, were as follows:

Mail carriers to deposit mail in boxes along the routes.

In addition to proposals for carrying the mails on the routes and subject to the conditions hereinbefore set forth, proposals will also be received for carrying the mails on the same routes in the State of South Carolina, subject to the same conditions, and also subject to further requirements, as follows:

Any person living on or near any star route herein described who desires his mail deposited in a box on the line of the route by the carrier on said route may provide and erect a suitable box on the roadside, located in such manner as to be reached as conveniently as practicable by the carrier, and such person shall file with the postmaster at the post-office to which his mail is addressed (which shall be one of the two post-offices on the route on either side of and next to the box) a request in writing for the delivery of his mail to the carrier on the route for deposit in said mail box, at the risk of the addressee.

It shall be the duty of the postmaster at every such post-office, upon a written order from any person living on or near the star route, to deliver to the proper mail carrier for that route any mail matter, except registered mail, with instructions as to the proper mail box at which said mail matter shall be deposited; but no mail matter so delivered to a carrier for deposit shall be carried past another post-office on the route before being deposited in a mail box.

The carrier on the star route will be required to receive from any postmaster on the route any mail matter that may be intrusted to him outside of the usual mail bag, and shall carry such mail matter to and deposit it in the proper boxes placed on the line of the route for this purpose, such service by the carrier to be without charge to the addressees.

The mail carriers must be able to read and write the English language and be of sufficient intelligence to properly handle and deposit the mail for boxes along the routes.

Proposal blanks for service in South Carolina will be furnished in such form that bidders may submit proposals on one blank for the two classes of service, viz: (1) For carrying the mails between post-offices only (or to and from other routes), without being required to deposit any in boxes along the line of route; and (2) for carrying the mails between post-offices (or to and from other routes), including the depositing of mail in boxes along the line of route.

As will be understood, this left the Department free to accept whichever bid seemed most advantageous to the service. The opening of these bids in December last was watched with keen interest by all who realized their significance in the premises. When the totals for the State of South Carolina were footed up and comparison made of the footings, with and without the free-delivery feature, it was found that the additional expense of delivering the mails free along all the star routes in the State of South Carolina—some 372 in number, covering a very large proportion of the population of the State—was only about $6,600, or only about one-third cent per mile traveled. The exact figures were:

For pouch service and free delivery along the 372 routes in South Carolina	$62,844
For pouch service only along the same routes	56,183
Net increase for the free-delivery feature	6,661

It will be seen that this makes less than 12 per cent, or about one-third cent per mile traveled, as the difference in the cost of service due to the free-delivery feature. Now, there are in the United States, as already stated, 22,482 star routes, covering 269,482 miles, and costing last year $5,114,943.83½.

The cost of the service per mile of length, therefore, was $18.98. The cost per mile traveled was only 3.87 cents.

APPLYING FIGURES TO FACTS.

Now, apply the data derived from the South Carolina experiment to these facts and figures, and what do we get? The cost of inaugurating the free-delivery feature upon the star routes in South Carolina, as already seen, was only 12 per cent additional, and as the conditions in that State are not exceptional or abnormal it is fair to assume the results obtained there as average results. At least the relation of the pouch service only and the same service with free-delivery feature is not abnormal.

Computing 12 per cent on the cost of the entire star-route system—namely, $5,114,943.83½—we have $613,793.25 as the probable net cost of extending free mail delivery to the residents on and adjacent to the 22,482 star routes in the United States.

Or, taking the other basis of computation, at the rate of one-third cent per mile traveled, the rate of increased cost in South Carolina, we would have as the net cost only $440,229. In other words, the mails can be delivered free along all the star routes in the United States at a net additional cost of not to exceed $613,793.25 per annum. Now, it has been estimated that the star-route delivery (as the star routes now exist) would serve in the neighborhood of half the rural residents. But assume that they serve only one-third—though I believe the other estimate is nearer the truth—and what do we get? Three times $613,793.25 would be $1,841,379.75 as the total net additional cost of rural free delivery by the method proposed in my bill. It is scarcely worth while, I take it, to point out that the star routes could be multiplied almost indefinitely to meet the requirements of such service. Doubtless some supplementary service would be necessary to meet special conditions in limited areas, but in the aggregate the cost for these would be relatively small. Upon the facts and figures demonstrated, it seems highly probable that rural free delivery may be had practically through the star-route method—supplemented in limited areas, as stated, where the star route might not be applicable—at a net additional cost of not to exceed $2,000,000 for the whole United States. In no other part of the service can such vast values be bought for so trifling a sum relatively. In view of all that rural free delivery means to the 40,000,000 farmers and rural residents of our country, who will rise in his place here and oppose this pitiful sum for their benefit? Whether we take this or the other as a basis of our estimate, compared with the service rendered to the rural population of the United States, the cost is trifling and not to be considered for a moment. It is the cheapest mail-delivery service in the world.

A COMPARISON.

Now, let us glance for a moment at the cost of the proposed service in contrast with that of other branches of free-delivery service.

Marvelous as the figures appear, as marshaled above, it is only when comparison is made with rural-free delivery proper and city delivery that its full significance is comprehended.

The showing so far made is no less surprising than it is gratifying, as will be more fully appreciated when it is understood that the net cost of rural free delivery proper is about 5 cents per mile traveled. Or, adopting another basis of comparison, the cost of rural free-delivery service, so far as it has been tried, is about 84 cents per capita of rural residents served.

SOME ESTIMATES.

There are, of course, no definite data bearing upon the number of people who will be served under this star-route experiment in South Carolina; and even if there were, such basis would be useful only in comparison with rural routes in South Carolina where the density of the population and length of routes and other conditions are similar. But assuming that the average star route in the sections covered by the rural delivery service would serve only one-half as many people, the ratio of cost per capita of people served would be as two-thirds of a cent is to 5 cents, or as 2 is to 15. That is to say, the cost per capita of people served free by the star-route delivery proposed in my bill would be less than one-seventh as great as the cost per capita of people served free by the rural delivery proper. Or, translating this into cents, if the cost of rural delivery proper be 84 cents per capita of the people served, as estimated by Mr. Heath, then under the state of facts and relations assumed the cost per capita of people served under the method proposed in my bill would be 11¼ cents—a comparison highly favorable to the star-route method, surely, wherever it can be applied.

COMPARED WITH CITY DELIVERIES.

As compared with the cost of city delivery the showing for star-route service is even better.

The cost of free delivery in the smaller cities is very near to $2.80 per capita, so that a comparative table of cost would stand thus:

FREE DELIVERY.

Cost per capita by—	
Smaller cities	$2.80
Rural delivery	.84
Star-route delivery	.11¼

A sufficiently striking comparison, surely, upon the face of the figures. But when we take into account all that free delivery of mail means in the country as compared with its meaning in the towns, the difference becomes well-nigh incalculable.

In the town it means the saving of a few minutes' walk, at the outside, to the near-by post-office. In the country it means the saving of several hours with man and beast—a ride of 6 to 10 miles, perhaps; and then the mail to be had, forsooth, only on certain days of the week. And this is not all that free delivery of mail means in the country, incalculable as this seems.

In his last annual report our able and efficient First Assistant Postmaster-General, Perry S. Heath, after a careful survey of the results of rural delivery, so far as ascertained, thus sums up the material, tangible significance of the service:

The facts hereinafter set forth, with some elaboration of detail which the importance of the subject seems to me to warrant, will, I think, demonstrate—

That the free delivery of mails in rural communities can be widely extended with great benefit to the people and with little cost to the revenue.

That whenever the system has been judiciously inaugurated, with a sincere purpose to make it a success, it has been followed by these beneficial results:

I. Increased postal receipts. More letters are written and received. More newspapers and magazines are subscribed for. So marked is this advancement that quite a number of rural routes already pay for themselves by the additional business they bring.

II. Enhancement of the value of farm lands reached by rural free delivery. This increase of value has been estimated at as high as $5 per acre in some States. A moderate estimate is from $2 to $3 per acre.

III. A general improvement of the condition of the roads traversed by the rural carrier. In the Western States especially the construction of good roads has been a prerequisite to the establishment of rural free-delivery service. In one county in Indiana a special agent reports that the farmers incurred an expense of over $2,600 to grade and gravel a road in order to obtain rural free delivery.

IV. Better prices obtained for farm products, the producers being brought into daily touch with the state of the markets, and thus being enabled to take advantage of information heretofore unattainable.

V. To these material advantages may be added the educational benefits conferred by relieving the monotony of farm life through ready access to wholesome literature, and the keeping of all rural residents, the young people as well as their elders, fully informed as to the stirring events of the day. The moral value of these civilizing influences can not be too highly rated.

While these comments were addressed specifically to one kind of rural free delivery of mail, it must be apparent to everyone that they are equally applicable to all phases of the service.

INCREASE OF REVENUE.

In neither case above considered does the increase of postal revenues, which usually follows increased facilities, enter into the estimate. I have taken no account of that, but analogy would justify us in expecting the comparison from that aspect to be quite as favorable to the star-route delivery. We know by actual statistics that in the smaller class of cities referred to above the increase of postal revenues traceable to the institution of free delivery is not large, owing to the relative smallness of the additional service. In the rural-delivery service, however, the increase of postal receipts directly traceable to the institution of the service ranges from 50 to 75 per cent. This enormous rate of increase is due, no doubt, to the relatively enormous increase of facility carried.

There is no reason to suppose that under conditions so nearly analogous the star route free-delivery service as proposed in my bill, and as actually operating in South Carolina, will not show an equal increase in the postal revenues. On the contrary, there is every reason to expect an equally marked increase following each extension of free delivery by means of star routes.

COUNT THE CREDITS.

And when the proper entries are made upon the credit side of the free-delivery account in each branch of the service, the net cost of the service as proposed in my bill will be reduced at least pari passu with the cost of rural delivery service proper; and both these phases of rural delivery will more than hold their own in comparison with the cost of city free delivery.

FALSE PROPHETS.

Mr. Chairman, some years ago, when I was advocating larger appropriations and fair treatment for rural free delivery, the opponents of the proposition confidently, not to say rashly, asserted that a general system of rural free delivery would cost $40,000,000 a year to begin with and would ultimately bankrupt the Government. At that time, with the meager statistical information at hand, it was difficult to refute these assertions.

Postmaster-General Wilson, I think it was, predicted that it would cost $20,000,000 to inaugurate the system, and he refused outright to expend the small amount Congress appropriated.

How stands the case to-day? What do the figures teach—and that, too, when the system is in its infancy, hardly yet thoroughly patronized by those whom it is intended to benefit?

In the light of the experiment in South Carolina, as applied to the country at large, we can arrive at some approximation to the cost; and every dollar of this cost could be saved out of the excessive amounts now paid to railroads for carrying mail. Let it not be forgotten, too, that this is based upon the crude results of an infant experiment. We have every reason to expect that, like all other branches of the service, better and cheaper methods will be invented.

It is natural and rational to expect that as the system unfolds, better methods will be evolved. But facts so far demonstrate how utterly worthless and unreliable were the assertions of those prophets of evil two years ago. The system is here to stay!

In one form or another the farmers of the country are to have their just proportion of the benefits which the money of the country is annually expended to purchase for free-mail delivery, and don't you forget it, Mr. Objector. Let no man deceive himself about this. We are not going to be frightened from our proposition of equal benefits as well as equal burdens for the farmers and rural residents of our country.

NO CONFLICT WITH OTHER SERVICE.

Mr. Chairman, in such comparisons as I have instituted for the purpose of establishing my plan in the confidence of the House, I wish it understood that I am not disparaging free delivery in cities or underrating the other forms of rural delivery. On the contrary, I have sought, in season and out of season, at all times, to extend both systems and to equalize as far as practicable the benefits which a given amount of money to be expended each year will buy. On this my record is clear; but lest some caviler arise in the future, I appeal to the record here. Two years ago I made the fight to double the appropriation for experimental rural free delivery which gave us $300,000, and for the first time in our history put the experiment on a fair basis. On that occasion I said in part:

FAIR PLAY FOR RURAL DELIVERY.

At the proper time I shall move to amend the bill along these lines, and I shall ask that the item for rural free delivery be increased from $150,000 to $300,000

If rural free delivery is here as an experiment, I want it treated fairly, and less than $300,000 can not establish a fair test. When the experiment of free delivery in the cities was begun in 1863, it was begun in some sixty-six cities, at an expenditure of $317,063 the first year. The result of the experiment justified the expense in that case. The amount expended has steadily grown from year to year, until it now reaches the fabulous sum of thirteen million a year.

Last year only $50,000 was used in an experiment, so-called, in rural free delivery. The results, as set forth in detail in the report of the Postmaster-General, show that in most cases the receipts so increased as to pay for the service. The interest of the rural population has promptly responded to the increased facilities, and the postal receipts have reflected this interest. And this is precisely the same result that has attended every increased facility to the use of the mails.

And again, in the same speech:

NOT AN EXPERIMENT.

But it is no longer experimental, this rural free-delivery system. It has been in successful operation in Great Britain, France, Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Switzerland for generations; and the meager tests provided last year in twenty-nine States demonstrate its success here.

Whether it is an experiment, however, or not, Mr. Chairman, I insist that some sort of proportion should be observed in the distribution of the benefits which accrue from the expenditure of thirteen millions of public money upon this service. If thirteen million is the figure that we can afford to pay for such service, then I want it distributed so that the benefit it will buy shall be proportionately distributed among the small towns as well as the big ones, among the rural districts as well as the smaller towns.

There can be no defense of any proposition to increase the appropriation for free-delivery service as at present restricted, so long as thousands of rural districts have not even a post-office anywhere within 3 miles of them.

In the same speech I had this to say with reference to the free delivery in towns:

"EQUAL RIGHTS TO ALL."

Mr. Chairman, I want to see the arbitrary and wholly artificial limitations upon the free-delivery service removed. I want to see free deliveries everywhere limited to three times per day as a maximum, and then extend the benefits to all towns and thickly settled rural communities once a day at least. For thinly settled portions three, or even less, times per week might be allowable.

On the same occasion, arguing for the equality of benefit as well as equality of burden, I said:

WHY?

When my people want mail, it involves sending from 1 to 6 miles. In the majority of cases it requires several hours with man and horse, and along the star routes mail can be had only on certain days in the week. In the New York City districts, or any other large city districts, the mail is carried to every man's door from three to seven and even nine times per day. Now, it is quite probable that a free-delivery system in the larger cities facilitates the handling of the mail, and in a general way the whole system reflects the benefit in any part. But there is absolutely no just reason why citizens at one end of the commercial line should have their mail thrown into their laps free of cost seven and even nine times a day, whether they want it or not, while those at the other end of the line must travel 6 miles at their own cost to get mail, and even then can not get it except on certain days. This bill proposes practically a bonus of $13,000,000 to 627 cities at the expense of all the smaller towns and rural districts of the country. It makes no provision at all for free delivery in towns of less than 10,000 inhabitants, while the 40,000,000 rural residents are dismissed with the pitiful sum of $150,000.

CITIES DO NOT PAY IT

Ah, but they say, these 627 cities pay for the service they get. I deny it. They had just as well say that the cash box in a large department store pays for all the service in the store. It would be just as rational for New York City, or any other port of entry, to claim that it pays the customs receipts of the port. The postal receipts, like the customs receipts in New York, for instance, do not arise independently of other offices in the system. They are not an inherent attribute of that city which collects them. They are the resultant of reciprocal relationship with every other office in the system. This is too plain for argument.

Mr. Chairman, I was in favor of the fullest provision for rural delivery then. I am for it now, and shall stand for the largest appropriation for that purpose that can be used to advantage. I think the regular budget for postal service should carry at least one and three-quarter million dollars, and I know no branch of the public service where such expenditure would be more wisely made or the benefits more appreciated.

Mr. Chairman, I am for every extension of mail facilities that reason and experience approve. I am especially in favor of every reasonable extension to rural residents. I want to live to see the day when the isolation inseparable from farm life will be illuminated at least once each day by the visit of the postman, bringing each home in touch, through the press and the post, with all other homes in our broad land. Let there be one hour each day that shall lift the thought of each humble home above its sordid surroundings and bring it into contact with the better, nobler thought and aspiration of the nation. I confidently expect to see these plans well advanced toward realization before I close my Congressional career; and if I can be instrumental in bringing about that glad consummation I shall feel that my service here has not been fruitless.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, it may not be improper to state that this bill has been strongly indorsed by almost every agricultural journal in the country, and by many of the leading daily papers. I have also had innumerable letters from prominent citizens in every section commending its terms and urging its passage. There are indorsements in great number from clubs and associations and farmers' alliances. The publication of all these would be burdensome, involving as they do much of repetition. I will content myself with referring them to the committee in charge of the bill, and print only a part of the press notices selected from the large number that have come to my desk.

Very many more papers have published the bill and the comments of the Department, or of other papers, on the same. It is but due these papers and individuals to state here that they have done a valuable service.

APPENDIX.

[From the Turf, Farm, and Home, Waterville, Me.]

FREE RURAL DELIVERY.

Congress now has under consideration a bill for the free delivery of mail in the rural districts. Representative STOKES is entitled to much credit for the part that he has borne in forwarding this bill. Through his efforts he has been able to obtain from the Post-Office Department a letter indorsing the plan, and the whole matter is of so much interest to all parts of rural New England that we reproduce the letter for the information of our readers.

[From the New York Commercial.]

FREE DELIVERY IN RURAL SECTIONS.

Representative STOKES has introduced a bill for the extension of the rural free delivery by compelling star-route carriers to deliver mail along their routes. It also provides that persons living along such routes may erect boxes, and on application to the nearest postmaster may have their mail deposited in the boxes without additional charge, and the person serving the route must also collect mail deposited in the boxes for the post-office The Postmaster-General is authorized to receive plans and devices for special boxes with duplicate keys for the carrier and the addressee.

[From the Christian Neighbor, Columbia, S. C.]

RURAL FREE MAIL DELIVERY.

The experiment of "free mail delivery" in the country has been so satisfactory that the system is to be extended in South Carolina. Its introduction and enlargement speak much for the well-directed influence of Congressman J. WILLIAM STOKES, of this State, who has worked vigorously and unceasingly for its adoption.

[From the Pacific Rural Press.]

A movement is being made by Congressman J. W. STOKES, of South Carolina, to require carriers of star mail routes to deliver and collect mail of parties living on or near the line of their routes. The Post-Office Department favors it and says the increased cost would be slight compared with the additional facilities rendered to the public. All it seems to need is a demand on the part of the people, and all interested should see to it that Congressman STOKES's measure does not fail for lack of popular support. Write him that you desire it.

[From the Farmers' Call, Quincy, Ill.]

This will not only be beneficial as a means of stamp revenue to the Government, but will also be beneficial in an educational way, a good deal of correspondence schooling being done through the mails.

[From the Times and Democrat, Orangeburg, S. C.]

FREE MAIL DELIVERY.

Congressman STOKES reintroduced in the House last week his bill to extend the free delivery of mail along star routes. This measure is one in which Mr. STOKES has been much interested for a number of years, and is a question to which he has given much study and attention. The measure is drawn carefully, and if put into law would be a great blessing and convenience to the people of the country districts, who would be saved from the necessity of traveling, in many instances, a long distance to the nearest post-office for their mail. The bill was introduced in the last House, but was never reported from the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

[From the Sumter Herald.]

Congressman STOKES deserves much commendation for the energy and zeal which he has put into his work for the rural free delivery of the mails. We are now in a fair way to reap the result of his labors on behalf of the people, but only partially. Such a great movement is susceptible of almost endless extension as its advantages are seen and as population increases.

[From the Baptist Courier, Greenville, S. C.]

FREE MAIL DELIVERY.

Free mail delivery in country districts will soon be given a fair and extensive trial. It has been tried already in some places and has given great satisfaction. Several routes in this State have been formed, and the system will be fairly tested. Congressman J. W. STOKES, of this State, has been greatly interested in securing this rural free delivery of the mail, and he is to be congratulated on his untiring and successful efforts. It will be a great convenience to the people, and we hope it will be found helpful and successful that the system may be brought into general operation.

[From the Nebraska Farmer.]

CONGRESSMAN STOKES'S BILL.

The bill is a good one. It should become a law. Farmers everywhere should be heartily in favor of it. We urge every reader to write Congressman STOKES and also the Congressman from his district in favor of the bill. Do this at once. Nothing can be done now to secure action at the present session of Congress, but if you delay writing you may forget it; and if you write again next winter, all the better.

Rural free mail delivery should be extended more than along star routes; but half a loaf is better than no bread, and when Congressman STOKES's bill becomes a law we can go to work for another extension of rural free mail delivery.

[Advance comment of the Southern Farm Magazine for May upon Congressman STOKES's bill for improved mail facilities in country districts.]

This seems to be an excellent measure. Observant persons traveling through sparsely settled regions in the South have noticed here and there in a fence corner or in the crotch of a tree little boxes for mail. The letters deposited in them in many cases depend for their delivery upon the honesty of good-hearted passers-by. The boxes are an expression of a want hard to be appreciated by dwellers in cities who have their mail delivered promptly two or three times a day. The mail brings one in close touch with the outside world and with all that is going on there. The lack of such communication is one of the drawbacks upon country life, and if Congressman STOKES can succeed in carrying through his measure he will be a benefactor of farmers not only in the South but in the whole country.

[From the Journal of Agriculture, St. Louis, Mo.]

RURAL MAIL DELIVERY.

Representatives STOKES is urging a bill in Congress which, if it becomes a law, he thinks will be of "more benefit to the residents in rural districts than any measure passed since Rowland Hill inaugurated the penny post." The Second Assistant Postmaster has examined the bill as introduced by Mr. STOKES, and, with some suggested changes, it now reads as follows:

* * * * * * *

[From the Item, Sumter, S. C.]

Congressman STOKES has proved a working member, and has already accomplished a great deal for his constituents. The establishment of free delivery of mail along all star routes in the State is his most important achievement; but it is such things as securing mail boxes for this city that benefit the people directly and make them feel that they have a Congressman who does more than draw his salary. Congressman STOKES is a worker, and he has done more real good for his district than many others who make more speeches and cut a bigger figure as talkers in Congress.

[From the Southern Planter, Richmond, Va.]

The other reform we ask to be supported is that in favor of the extension of free delivery of mail along star routes. This reform has the support of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General, and should be urged on by every resident in the country. If farmers will let their Representatives and Senators hear from them, both these reforms can be accomplished almost at once.

[From the Times and Democrat.]

Congressman STOKES deserves the thanks of all for his admirable plan of rural mail delivery. It will prove a great convenience to those living a distance from a post-office.

The people living on the line of the rural mail delivery route which has been established in this county are very much pleased with its working so far. They say it is a great convenience.

If Congressman STOKES's plan of rural mail delivery becomes general, which is almost certain, he will have conferred a great blessing on millions who will never have the pleasure of seeing their benefactor.

[From the Cotton Plant.]

FREE MAIL DELIVERY ON STAR ROUTES.

The admirable proposition of Congressman STOKES in regard to the free delivery of mail on star routes is in a fair way of practical accomplishment. Senator TILLMAN has lent his aid to the movement, and when the Post-Office appropriation bill was under consideration in the Senate a few days ago he moved to insert the following amendment as an additional proviso:

"*Provided further*, That the Postmaster-General, in making contracts for the transportation of the mail on star routes, is authorized to prescribe such regulations as will require the contractors to deliver mail into and collect mail from boxes located along the routes, such boxes to be erected and maintained at the expense and risk of persons living on or near such routes who may desire to have their mail so carried."

[From the Summerville News.]

THERE BE CONGRESSMEN AND CONGRESSMEN.

We have in Congress, and have had for many years, a Representative who at all times looks after the welfare of his district and at the same time is fully alive to the great questions of the day. His efforts to obtain a rural postal delivery, his speeches in behalf of liberty in the Philippines, on the government of Hawaii, on the trade of Porto Rico, and, more recently, in condemning the Loud postal bill—styled by James Lewis Cowles "a bill in behalf of the express companies and against the public weal," a most excellent title, by the way—have made the name of Congressman J. WILLIAM STOKES well and favorably known throughout the whole country and proved him to be a man of broad and liberal views, a ripe scholar, to read whose addresses is a pleasure, and a man who is to be reckoned with in any matter affecting the interests of his State or country.

The career of Dr. STOKES in the Congress of the United States reflects great credit upon the people of South Carolina and particularly upon the people of this district. Would that we had more like him. More power to ye, Doctor.

[From the Farmer's Call, Quincy, Ill.]

FREE MAIL DELIVERY ALONG STAR ROUTES.

We most heartily approve of the bill. It is what we have advocated for years as a step preliminary to daily free delivery of mail to all persons in farming territory. We believe that when our readers have read the bill, that they, too, will approve of it. If so, we strongly urge them to write at once, stating that they approve of the bill, to Hon. J. W. STOKES, M. C., Washington, D. C.; Hon. EUGENE F. LOUD, M. C., Washington, D. C., and to the Congressman from their district and the United States Senators from their States.

[From the American Agriculturist.]

The success of free delivery of mails in the rural districts has been so great that the Post-Office appropriation bill for the coming year provides $300,000 for extending this free-delivery service in country districts. This is double the amount allowed last year, but what a pittance it is compared to the necessities of the case. Congress spends millions on the Navy and other things of questionable benefit, quite overlooking these concerns of such direct importance to our own people. One great trouble is that the railroads and the express companies are rather opposed to improvement in the rural mail service. We believe that $10,000,000 a year spent in more frequent mails and free delivery and collection in country districts would within two years be more than reimbursed by the increased receipts due to the enlarged use of the mails that would follow such facilities. If you want the mail collected and distributed to the people served by your rural post-office, write your Congressman at Washington, and he will tell you just how to get it.

[From the Press and Standard.]

Congressman STOKES, of South Carolina, is untiring and enthusiastic in his systematic efforts to equalize and extend the benefits of our postal system. He is now busily at work preparing a bill providing that free delivery of mails be extended to towns under 3,000 population. As the law now stands, free delivery is allowed only to towns with 10,000 population. The bill is finding much favor here and is likely to pass. He is also pressing before the committee the necessity of a further extension of the rural free delivery, and to that end is asking that the $300,000 already appropriated under the law be supplemented by an additional appropriation of $150,000, making the total appropriation this year $450,000. Third Assistant Postmaster-General Perry S. Heath is loud in his praise of the system, and this fact, together with Congressman STOKES's aggressive fight, will give the proposition much weight in the House when it comes up. Free delivery is no longer an experiment; it is an actual necessity in our postal system.

[From the Patriot, Orangeburg, S. C.]

STRONG POINT SCORED.

Representative STOKES scored a strong point in the interest of his constituents a day or two ago, when he succeeded in placing on the Post-Office appropriation bill an amendment which goes a long way toward his star-route free-delivery scheme. Finding that it would be difficult to get through a separate measure on any subject this session, if done at all in time to benefit South Carolina, Mr. STOKES placed it as a rider on the appropriation bill. As contracts for star routes in South Carolina are due to be renewed next fall, and as these contracts are for four years, it is very important that the law be passed in some form prior to the giving out of these contracts.

While Representative STOKES's district will get a large slice of the benefits from this legislation, it is more than a local matter. It will reach the rural communities all over South Carolina and over all the States. It is a measure that is national in its sweep, covering something like 22,000 star routes and the millions of rural residents served by them. Under this system, where applicable, the rural districts have a fair proportion of the benefits of the postal system, fairer than ever before.

[From the Watchman and Southron.]

Congressman STOKES has proved a working member and has already accomplished a great deal for his constituents. The establishment of free delivery of mail along all star routes in the State is his most important achievement, but it is such things as securing mail boxes for this city that benefit the people directly and make them feel that they have a Congressman who does more than draw a salary. Congressman STOKES is a worker, and he has done more real good for his district than many others who make more speeches and cut a bigger figure as talkers in Congress.

[From the Farmer's Voice, Chicago, Ill.]

EXTENDING FREE RURAL MAIL DELIVERY.

J. W. STOKES, a member of Congress from the Seventh district of South Carolina, has introduced a measure into Congress which is calculated greatly to extend the blessings of free rural mail delivery without adding largely to the expense for the service. He proposes to have all established star routes take on the work of free delivery and collection of mail as now is done in the case of the regular rural free-delivery service; and as the star routes cover a very large territory, the results will be enjoyed by many thousands of those who need this service very much and to whom it will be indeed a pleasure and of great value. We are pleased to note that the Post-Office Department has given its unqualified sanction to the object of Mr. STOKES's bill, and while the Second Assistant Postmaster-General suggests certain modifications tending to make the measure harmonious to existing laws, his approval of the plan in general is most cordial.

In this connection it is interesting to note that free rural mail delivery is becoming very popular among members of Congress. Where two or three years ago it required an effort to secure an appropriation of $300,000 with which to test the plan, now ample means are being afforded for the purpose of extending the service. The other day the committee of the House on Post-Offices and Post-Roads reported a bill calling for $1,750,000 to be expended in the work during the coming year, when the estimate of the Department called for only $1,500,000; and the larger sum, it is believed, will be voted by the House.

Farmers everywhere should aid in all measures intended to extend the service. Mr. STOKES's measure seems to have real merit, and we trust that our readers will show their appreciation by heartily supporting him in the work of securing its adoption.

[From The State, Columbia, S. C.]

As will be seen in a Washington dispatch to-day, South Carolina is to be made the experimental field for free postal delivery on star routes. To Congressman STOKES is due the credit for persuading the Post-Office Department to put that system in operation on all star routes in this State. If it proves a success here, the other States will, of course, require the same facilities, and 22,000 free delivery country routes, exclusive of those where special provision has been made for "free rural delivery." In the latter case special men are employed, and the expense to the Department is considerably increased; but in the delivery on star routes it is contemplated that the carriers now employed on those routes shall deliver mail through their districts. They are expected to include this extra labor in their bids, and, according to our Washington advices, the bids from this State are satisfactory to the Department, the extra expense being but slight. The results will be watched with interest. It should be a boon to the reading countryman.

[From the Southern Cultivator, Atlanta, Ga.]

THE STOKES BILL FOR FREE MAIL DELIVERY.

We are pleased to call attention to the efforts of Representative J. WILLIAM STOKES to have free-mail delivery along "star routes."

The press and people should assist Mr. STOKES in this effort in every way possible. Bring to bear upon your immediate Representative in Congress such influence as you may have, so as to secure his support for this well-timed measure.

The rapid delivery of mails is demanded by the progress of this active age in which we live.

The people demand and desire to keep posted on public affairs.

We must not forget that the voters are the rulers of this country. Hence their rights should be respected and their demands granted.

This Stokes bill is a step forward. Congress should give it a trial.

[From the South Carolina Teachers' Journal.]

Congressman J. WILLIAM STOKES deserves the unqualified indorsement of all South Carolina for his invaluable services in behalf of free rural delivery for this State. On and after July 1 everyone living on a star route will have his mail delivered at his home if he will only provide a suitable box for the receiving of the same. The teachers should use their influence with children and patrons to take advantage of this great opportunity, the full advantages of which can not be appreciated without a trial. We hail the innovation with delight, and see in it an important factor for the improvement of our country schools.

[From the Rural New Yorker.]

RURAL MAIL.

Among the bills introduced into Congress at this session is one by Congressman STOKES to extend the free delivery of mail along the star routes. It provides that hereafter all contracts for carrying mail on such routes must include the deposit in the proper boxes, placed along the line for this purpose, of any mail matter that may be given to the carrier by the postmaster. The carrier is also obliged to take up such stamped mail matter as he shall find in the said mail box. Provision is made for those who desire to have mail delivered or taken in this way, so that they may put up a local mail box, and such boxes are to be protected. This is a good bill, and we hope it will pass. Many so-called star routes run through the country sections where these boxes would prove very useful indeed. For example, in many sections the mail carrier drives from the railroad station back into the country several miles to the town center or cross roads, where the post-office is located. If the farmers could put up boxes along the road and have their mail delivered to them in this way, it would certainly prove a great convenience and help.

[From the Indiana Farmer, Indianapolis.]

AN IMPORTANT POSTAL BILL.

Hon. J. W. STOKES, H. R., has introduced a bill in Congress that a large majority of our readers will favor when they learn its provisions. Its purpose is to combine a system of box deliveries and collections in connection with the existing star routes, now numbering about 22,000, in such manner as to largely increase the mail accommodation to people residing in rural districts without detriment to the star service or without a large increase in the cost thereof. It is the practice now on many star routes for the carriers to take the mail and deposit it in boxes along the line of the routes, but in the absence of legislation it rests entirely with the pleasure of the carriers whether they will give the people this accommodation or not. This bill makes it the duty of carrier to receive and deliver mail at boxes prepared for the purpose, receiving extra pay therefor from the Department. All readers interested should write their Congressmen, urging them to support the bill when it is brought up for action.

[From the Yorkville Enquirer.]

A SPLENDID SERVICE.

The information that the Post-Office Department has not entirely abandoned the project of delivering mail in boxes along star routes without expense to patrons will no doubt be received with a great deal of pleasure by a great many people. Further than the statement published elsewhere we are not prepared to say anything definite on the subject just at this time. The readers of the Enquirer remember very well the splendid fight that Dr. STOKES and others made for the necessary appropriation during the last Congress. In our opinion it was the best and most intelligent fight that Southern Representatives have been able to put up in recent years. It was not, it will be remembered, a pretended fight "for buncombe," but a real fight, which all but overwhelmed the cold-blooded Senate committee, which would have agreed to the appropriation had it not been for the enforced absence of one favorable member.

But it seems that Dr. STOKES was not satisfied with that. He has managed to persuade Postmaster-General Smith to take an unusual step on his own responsibility and call for bids for the necessary service, even without express authority from Congress. It does not necessarily follow that this free-delivery system is yet to be adopted. That will depend largely on the result of the bidding; but the chances of success are good. However, whether contracts are let as indicated or not, Dr. STOKES has performed good service for the State, and in the name of a large number of people in this section we take it upon ourselves to return to him especial thanks.

[From the Field and Farm, Denver, Colo.]

Field and Farm is in favor of a bill now before Congress, introduced by Representative STOKES, to extend the rural delivery of mail along star routes without additional expense to the people. It will not largely increase the cost to the Government, because the distance traveled by the carriers would not be increased at all. It would require a little more time, of course, for the carriers to stop and deposit mail or collect it from the boxes, and in some cases it would require more intelligent carriers than are now employed, as all carriers must be able to read addresses on the mail matter taken by them outside of the bags to be placed in the proper boxes. It is also possible that in those cases where carriers are now charging the people along the line of route a fee for delivering their mail into boxes there would be a tendency to slightly increase the price under the contract if the law prohibited the charging of such fees; but as these star-route contracts are let after having been widely advertised, and as there is much competition in bidding for them, the increase in cost would be but slight compared with the additional facilities rendered to the public.

[From the Farmers' Home Journal, Louisville, Ky.]

RURAL DELIVERY.

Hon. J. W. STOKES, Representative from South Carolina, is earnestly advocating a bill in Congress providing for free delivery of mail matter in the country. This is a measure which every farmer should be interested in. In cities we have our mail delivered in our offices. While farmers may not get as much mail as some city people, they are entitled to receive what they do get as cheaply, as promptly, and as conveniently as the people who live in the cities and towns. It is frequently of as much or more importance to the farmer or stock raiser to get his mail promptly as it is for the city merchant. In these days farmers who have anything to sell should get their letters and their market reports promptly. Under the present system, if they live 6 or 8 miles from the post-office, they must either do without their mail for several days or probably neglect important work to go after it. Farmers pay the same postage on their mail that city people do. Then is it not right that they should have the same benefits? We hope many of our readers will write to their Congressmen in Washington and urge them to support this bill. The farmers of the United States can compel its passage if they will demand it.

[From the Nashville American.]

THE STOKES FREE-DELIVERY BILL.

The bill providing for the free delivery of mail along star routes introduced into the House by Congressman J. WILLIAM STOKES, of South Carolina, deserves favorable consideration.

The bill makes it the duty of mail carriers on star routes to deliver free of charge to the persons addressed any mail intrusted to the care of the carriers by postmasters. It also requires that carriers must take up and place in the post-office mail given them by persons along the route.

The only requirement of the persons who wish to take advantage of the act is to put up boxes in a convenient place and to give the postmaster instructions as to the proper mail box at which they desire their mail deposited.

The Second Assistant Postmaster-General, Mr. Shallenberger, warmly indorses the bill, and in Mr. STOKES' own State, South Carolina, the Post-Office Department has tried the experiment of advertising for contracts, with and without provisions that contractors should deliver the mail free along their routes wherever farmers should erect boxes, and the difference in the cost for the improved service for the entire State was found to be only $3,000.

The passage of the bill would be a boon to every farmer in the country. It would bring them in closer touch with the outer world and its affairs, and would be a benefit all around. The only objection raised to its passage—that it would interfere with the pleasure farmers take in going after the mail—is too puerile to warrant attention.

[From the Beaufort Gazette.]

Congressman J. WILLIAM STOKES has been working on his star-route free-delivery scheme during the session of Congress just closed, and has gained many converts to his bill. He will present it in the Congress to meet in December, and hopes to have it passed. The bill will be found elsewhere in this issue, and is of great interest to those who live on star routes. There are a number of such routes in this county—for instance, that between Hardeeville and Bluffton.

The Postal Guide says: "The term 'star routes' includes all mail routes under contract other than railroad, steamboat, and mail messenger routes." The object of the bill is to compel the mail carriers to deposit mail along their routes in boxes which are to be placed on the road for that purpose, and to gather up mail in such boxes. This would be to hundreds of thousands of people in the country an inestimable benefit, by relieving them of many miles of travel to and from the nearest post-office, and would be practically no additional expense to the Government, as the system would only be in operation along routes which are already established.

There are 22,000 such routes in the United States, and there is no estimating how far-reaching the benefits will be.

Congressman STOKES has worked hard in behalf of his bill and deserves the commendation of his constituents.

His bill should become a law at the next meeting of Congress.

[From the Southern Presbyterian.]

RURAL FREE DELIVERY.

On July 1, 1900, the State of South Carolina will begin to enjoy free delivery of mails in rural districts. Through the efforts of Congressman J. W. STOKES, this State has been selected as the field in which the new plan of rural free delivery will be tested on a large scale. Each mail rider on the star route will be required to deliver mail to boxes along the route traveled. The residents along the route are expected to erect the boxes, and it is hoped that they will universally put up nice boxes, that a good impression may be made upon the inspector when he comes around. This may lead to the continuance of the service beyond the limits of first contracts and to its extension to other States.

In South Carolina there are 373 star routes, along which there should be erected as many as 50,000 boxes. These boxes should be ready for the reception of mail by the 1st day of July, 1900. In order to secure the free delivery it is only necessary that persons living on or adjacent to any star route should erect the necessary boxes and ask their postmasters to send out their mail by the carrier for deposit in their boxes. Congressman STOKES is the originator of the plan, and hence South Carolina, on his recommendation, has been selected in which to make a test of the system. He is, therefore, very anxious that it should succeed, and that the people should show their appreciation of the added convenience by promptly availing themselves of it and by erecting neat, attractive boxes for their mail.

[From the Kosciusko (Miss.) Herald.]

FREE MAIL DELIVERY ON STAR ROUTES.

Hon. J. WILLIAM STOKES, member of Congress from South Carolina, has introduced and is urging the passage of a bill to secure the free delivery of mail matter in the country along star routes. The Second Assistant Postmaster-General, in commending Mr. STOKES's bill, says he regards a system to combine box delivery and collections entirely feasible and thinks the present cost would not be greatly increased. The rural populace, or, as we are more familiarly sometimes called, "hill billies," get few of the comforts and conveniences that the people's money pays for, their more favored urban brethren usually appropriating every "hand out" the Government dispenses. The advantage of such provisions are too apparent to need rehearsing here. Its inestimable convenience can be seen at a glance.

[From the Farmers' Review, Chicago.]

FREE DELIVERY ON STAR ROUTES.

Representative STOKES is credited with the introduction of one of the most practical bills for the extension of free rural delivery of mail that has been offered during the present session of Congress. It provides for free delivery along star routes, which could be done with very little additional cost to the Government. W. S. Shallenberger, Second Assistant Postmaster-General, has expressed his approval of the measure and has suggested important changes which would make it provide for the erection of boxes along the route to be numbered or designated according to directions issued by the Postmaster-General; also, that all persons wishing to have their mail collected and delivered by star-route carriers should file an application with their nearest postmaster, and erect a suitable box at some convenient point along the route; that upon receipt of such application it shall be the duty of the postmaster to deliver all mail addressed to such parties to the carrier except registered mail; and that it shall be the duty of the carrier to collect and deposit such mail in the proper boxes, free of any additional charge, all mail so collected and properly stamped to be deposited for mailing at the next post-office on the route.

[From the Dorchester Eagle.]

Perhaps there has never been a Representative in Congress from South Carolina who has done anything or caused any legislation that is so appreciatively felt by the masses of the people of the State as Dr. J. W. STOKES did in the rural delivery of the mails to the country people. People who live in the country are as much entitled to the immediate delivery of their mail as those who live in cities and towns.

The rural delivery has passed the experimental stage, and from the report of that department of the Post-Office Department having the service in charge the results are highly encouraging. Not only are officers in charge of the service pleased with the operations of the service, but the patrons all over the country are congratulating the service, and feel that a long existing want has been supplied; and with the additional delivery along star routes (routes carried through the country by private conveyance) the service will cover the greater part of the territory, and the majority of Uncle Sam's citizens will get their mail at least every other day.

As for the delivery from this point there is no complaint that we hear of except from those who do not favor the politics of the promoter of the project; but we stand ready to admire and commend any legislation, either national or State, that casts on our community and its citizens any favor or even its God-given rights, let the promoter be who he may, Democrat or Republican. If the legislation helps us, we are thankful for it, and are proud when we are able to send to the Congress of the United States men who know the people's wants and delight in doing them.

[From the Lexington Dispatch.]

STAR ROUTE FREE-DELIVERY BILL.

Under its terms all future contracts for carrying mail on star routes will include this increased service. The star-route contractor will have this in mind when he puts in his bid. The additional service will be slight, and the additional cost to the Government correspondingly slight, but the benefit to the people will be great, very great. Carriers as a general thing deliver mail now along the line of their route by private contract for $1 or less per annum to each family served. It is confidently expected, however, that, instead of such a service as is provided in this bill being a charge upon the Government, it would be a source of revenue. That has been the history of all increases of mail facilities in the past. The increased cost of the service has invariably been offset by the increased revenue incident to better facilities.

Mr. STOKES referred to the well-known result of reducing letter postage from 3 to 2 cents. Those who had not studied such matters carefully confidently predicted an enormous deficit. The event proved just the reverse. The same state of facts was found after the inauguration of free delivery in cities; the increased revenue more than paid the increased cost of the service. This bill of Mr. STOKES provides that mail boxes shall be placed along the star routes on the roadside, and, for convenience, numbered consecutively from the initial point of the route. Those desiring their mail deposited in these boxes will leave with the nearest postmaster on each side of them a written request for the delivery of their mail to the carrier; thereupon it becomes the duty of the carrier to deposit said mail in the box without charge to the addressee.

Thus every person living on or near a star route would get his mail every time the carrier passed without expense or loss of time in going to the post-office. It is easy to see that by multiplication of star routes, radiating from the several railroad offices, a very cheap and effective free-delivery system could be realized, one that there is every reason to expect would become at once self-sustaining.

For the present the people who get this service would have to furnish their own boxes, but the bill contemplates that ultimately these shall be furnished by the Government if the service justifies it. The cost in large numbers would be small to the Government; but that is what is being done in many of the city districts, and I am in this asking only that the country residents be fed out of the same spoon that the Government uses to dish out benefits to our city cousins.

Mr. STOKES does not offer this bill as a substitute for the free rural delivery with which he has been prominently identified in the past, but as a supplemental proposition, a sort of transition stage.

A general system of rural free delivery is bound to come in the evolution of our postal system. It may be in the form already inaugurated here and there throughout the United States, or it may be through some modification of this star-route system, or it may be through a system of postal wagons radiating from the several railroad offices. But whatever may be its final form as approved by experiment, it will be a permanent system and will be self-sustaining.

[From the Charleston News and Courier.]

STOKES ROUTES FOR STAR ROUTES.

A dispatch from Washington notes that for the first time in the history of the country "the experiment is being made for the free delivery of mail along star routes, and South Carolina has been selected as the scene of the experiment, in recognition of the efforts of Representative STOKES, the originator of the system, to have it adopted."

The post-office authorities, it is added, express much satisfaction in view of the results so far of the bidding for the institution of the system, "which fully verify the claim of Mr. STOKES in the House and in the Department a year ago that the system could be put into operation at little if any increased cost," and it is "only a question of a short time when the system will be extended to all the 22,000 routes in the United States." We gave Mr. STOKES full credit last year for his admirable suggestion and his effective work in having it put into practice, and need not repeat here what we then said. The dispatch covers very well all that could be said on this point when it states that "if Mr. STOKES never does anything else in Congress the establishment of the new system entitles him to the gratitude of the rural population, not only in South Carolina, but throughout the nation."

This is not saying too much. A "star route" is a route through an out-of the-way country district which is not favored by railroad or other improved transportation facilities and whose inhabitants must send to one or the other of the post-offices at the ends of the route for their mail. This necessity imposes much waste of time and many inconveniences on people living at a considerable distance from the terminal offices, even though they should live on or very near the line of the route itself, but their condition has been regarded as hopeless of remedy heretofore. The system originated by Congressman STOKES affords the largest practicable measure of relief that could be devised short of having mail matter delivered at every door in the country by special messengers. It permits the people living along and near the routes to set up private boxes suitable for the reception of their mails and requires the carriers to distribute the mails in these wayside depositories. The rest is a matter of detail.

The certain operation of the new system for the great convenience, profit, and general advantage of small rural communities and of isolated residents in the country is too manifest to require explanation or statement. It is a simple but far-reaching improvement on the conduct of the rural mail service, and its beneficiaries, who will be numbered by the hundred thousand, have good reason to thank its inventor for it.

[From the Augusta Chronicle.]

THE RURAL FREE DELIVERY.

The rural free delivery has not had much exploitation down our way yet, but more fortunate sections have given it full trial, and it has given great satisfaction. Macon was about to have the system introduced in its neighboring rural territory, but a dispute arose as to whether the carriers should be white or black, and the matter was dropped by the Post-Office Department. In an interview on the rural free delivery, First Assistant Postmaster-General Perry Heath says:

"It now radiates from 250 offices in 30 different States, some of these distributing points having as many as seven or eight rural routes, each extending 20 miles or more into the adjacent agricultural districts. With this widely diversified service the records of the Department show no protests against its continuance, except from saloon keepers, village postmasters whose offices have been abolished or their emoluments curtailed, or other persons who believe their personal interests would suffer from the extension of postal facilities to their neighbors. The community at large is enthusiastic in its approval.

"The service is for the people, and there is no desire to impose it on them against their wishes. Wherever it has been introduced the people have been enthusiastic over the advantages offered, and in general when a proposition has been made to discontinue the service have offered to defray from their own pockets the cost of their increased facilities rather than lose them. Applications on file asking for the extension of the service are so numerous that the appropriation made by Congress for the purpose is insufficient to meet the demands. In response to inquiry sent out last fall by the Department at Washington 263 replies were received from persons affected by rural delivery in thirty-three States, and 259 were favorable."

It is not unusual, where the sacrifice is proposed in a new field, for objection to be made by village storekeepers who fear that delivering mail at their homes will prevent country people from coming to town as often as they are accustomed to do, and that in consequence they will lose trade, but actual experiment proves this apprehension to be unfounded, as second thoughts would also do. Few people come to town simply to ask if there is any mail. When they have no other purpose in view they manage to send a messenger. When they have the other purpose in view the delivery of the mail at their homes will not prevent them from coming to town. Free mail delivery does not lessen the need for groceries and household goods.

[From the Atlanta Constitution.]

THE RURAL MAIL DELIVERY.

We are glad to observe that the matter of rural delivery has been taken up very actively by Congressman STOKES, of South Carolina, who has introduced a measure in the House to extend free delivery of mail along the star routes. Under the provisions of the Stokes bill, any person desiring his mail deposited along the line of any star route shall erect a box as convenient to the roadside as practicable and file with the nearest postmaster on each side of the box a request in writing for the delivery of his mail to the proper carrier for deposit in the mail box.

Such is the measure, at once brief and simple, by means of which it is intended to establish free rural delivery. The Constitution hopes the bill will pass. If our readers in the agricultural districts will write to their Representatives in Congress and urge them to support the measure, there will be small difficulty in urging its passage. Congressman LIVINGSTON needs no urging. He has been actively in favor of free rural delivery ever since he has been in Congress. Nor do we suppose that any other Georgia Congressman needs to be urged; but it will do no harm for business men and farmers

in the country districts to give their Representatives a hint that the measure is a very necessary one.

It is our boast that under our laws all citizens are equal. You will hear orators declaiming of equality under the law, and yet while people in the country have to travel miles to the nearest post-office to get their mail the postal authorities are engaged in erecting a costly pneumatic system in the city of New York in order to save fifteen or twenty minutes in the delivery of mail. It is true that a community in the nature of things will enjoy larger and more complete postal facilities than a remote and scattered settlement, but we are speaking now of equality under the law and the rights of individuals.

But this difference is most clearly recognized in the demand for free rural delivery. The people are not asking for pneumatic tubes nor for any device that will place additional burdens on the taxpayers. The Stokes bill simply calls for a system of cheap boxes to be affixed to trees or posts along the post roads covered by the star-route system. These carriers have to go along these routes anyhow, and it will hardly be any trouble for them to deposit mail and take up that which they find. When the bill becomes a law star-route bidders will be put on notice by its terms of this addition to their duties as contractors, and they will take care of themselves in the matter of compensation.

The history of every increase of mail facilities in this country since its establishment shows that their increased cost is invariably offset by increased revenue. This is the history of the reduction of letter postage from 3 to 2 cents. It was freely predicted that it would result in an enormous deficit; the result, however, was an increase of revenue. When free city delivery was established, the same prediction was made, but the revenue has steadily increased. It was never intended, in the first place, that our postal system should be a money-making business. It was established for the benefit of the people, and not to pay revenue into the Treasury.

[From the Pacific Rural Press.]

A NEW FORM OF RURAL MAIL DELIVERY.

Representative STOKES has introduced in Congress "A bill to extend free delivery of mail along star routes." Under its terms all future contracts for carrying mail on star routes will include this increased service.

The star-route contractor will have this in mind when he puts in his bid. The additional service will be slight, and the additional cost to the Government correspondingly slight, but the benefit to the people will be very great. Carriers as a general thing deliver mail now along the line of their route by private contract for $1 or less per annum for each family served. Of course, taking it in gross for everybody, it could be done for less still than for a few. It is confidently expected, however, that instead of such service as is provided in this bill being a charge upon the Government, it would be a source of revenue. That has been the history of all increases of mail facilities in the past. The increased cost of the service has invariably been more than offset by the increased revenue incident to better facilities.

Mr. STOKES has referred to the well-known result of reducing letter postage from 3 cents to 2 cents. Those who had not studied such matters carefully predicted an enormous deficit. The event proved just the reverse. The same state of facts was found after the inauguration of the free delivery for cities, the increased revenue more than repaid the increased cost of the service.

This bill of Mr. STOKES provides that mail boxes be placed along the star routes, on the roadside, and, for convenience, numbered consecutively from the initial point of the route. Those desiring their mail deposited in these boxes will leave with the nearest postmaster on each side of them a written request for the delivery of their mail to the carrier, designating the number of the box in which it is to be deposited, and thereupon it becomes the duty of the carrier to deposit said mail in the box without charge to the addressee.

Thus every person living on or near a star route would get his mail every time the carrier passed, without expense or loss of time in going to the post-office.

"It is easy to see," said Mr. STOKES, "that by multiplication of the star routes radiating from the several railroad offices a very cheap and effective free-delivery system could be realized—one that there is every reason to expect would become at once self-sustaining. For the present the people who get this service would have to furnish their own boxes, but the bill contemplates that ultimately these shall be furnished by the Government if the service justifies it. The cost in large numbers would be small to the Government, but that is what is being done in many of the city districts, and I am in this asking only that the country residents be fed out of the same spoon that the Government uses to dip out benefits to our city cousins."

Mr. STOKES does not offer this bill as a substitute for the free rural delivery, with which he has been prominently identified in the past, but as a supplemental proposition—a sort of transition stage—but, as he puts it: "A general system of rural free delivery is bound to come in the evolution of our postal system. It may be in the form already inaugurated here and there throughout the United States, or it may be through some modification of this star-route system, or it may be through a system of postal wagons radiating from the several railroad offices. But whatever may be its final form as approved by experiment, it will be a permanent system and will be self-sustaining."

This will not only be beneficial as a means of stamp revenue to the Government, but will also be beneficial in an educational way—a good deal of correspondence schooling being done through the mails.

Nicaragua Canal.

SPEECH

OF

HON. STEPHEN M. SPARKMAN,

OF FLORIDA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, May 1, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 2538) to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans—

Mr. SPARKMAN said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: In favor, as I am, of legislation looking to the construction of a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, and feeling it incumbent upon me to vote for the measure, I nevertheless regret that its consideration could not have been postponed until the short session of this Congress, in December next.

At present we have no sufficient data upon which to predicate intelligent action, but by that time the commission provided for in the last river and harbor act will doubtless have made its report, and we will then have more definite information to guide us than if we proceed now to the consideration of the bill. At present we know very little definitely as to the cost of the canal, or as to the most feasible and best route for it—two things we ought to know before any bill of this kind should become a law.

The commission referred to was created for the purpose of determining these questions. It was organized, as I have just stated, under certain provisions in the river and harbor act passed by the last Congress, which are as follows:

SEC. 3. That the President of the United States of America be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered to make full and complete investigation of the Isthmus of Panama with a view to the construction of a canal by the United States across the same to connect the Atlantic and Pacific oceans; that the President is authorized to make investigation of any and all practicable routes for a canal across said Isthmus of Panama, and particularly to investigate the two routes known respectively as the Nicaraguan route and the Panama route, with a view to determining the most practicable and feasible route for such canal, together with the proximate and probable cost of constructing a canal at each of two or more of said routes: And the President is further authorized to investigate and ascertain what rights, privileges, and franchises, if any, may be held and owned by any corporations, associations, or individuals, and what work, if any, has been done by such corporations, associations, or individuals in the construction of a canal at either or any of said routes, and particularly at the so-called Nicaraguan and Panama routes, respectively; and likewise to ascertain the cost of purchasing all of the rights, privileges, and franchises held and owned by any such corporations, associations, and individuals in any and all of such routes, particularly the said Nicaraguan route and the said Panama route; and likewise to ascertain the probable or proximate cost of constructing a suitable harbor at each of the termini of said canal, with the probable annual cost of maintenance of said harbors, respectively. And generally the President is authorized to make such full and complete investigation as to determine the most feasible and practicable route across said Isthmus for a canal, together with the cost of constructing the same and placing the same under the control, management, and ownership of the United States.

SEC. 4. To enable the President to make the investigations and ascertainments herein provided for, he is hereby authorized to employ in said service any of the engineers of the United States Army at his discretion, and likewise to employ any engineers in civil life, at his discretion, and any other persons necessary to make such investigation, and to fix the compensation of any and all of such engineers and other persons.

SEC. 5. For the purpose of defraying the expenses necessary to be incurred in making the investigations herein provided for, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be disbursed by order of the President.

SEC. 6. That the President is hereby requested to report to Congress the results of such investigations, together with his recommendations in the premises.

From these provisions it will be seen that the President was not only to make investigation as to the cost, but also as to the route; nor was he confined to any particular route, but was directed to investigate the Nicaragua and Panama routes, as well as all others, with a view to determining the most feasible and practicable route for the canal.

Now, the commission through which the President is causing this investigation to be made has been engaged for months in obtaining this very information. Its members have been to Central America for the purpose of examining all the routes across the Isthmus, particularly the two referred to, and to-day have corps of engineers making surveys in order to determine the best and most feasible location, as well as the cost of the proposed canal; all of which will doubtless be completed and report made to Congress by the beginning of the short session in December.

Would it not, then, Mr. Chairman, be better for Congress to await this report? It certainly would appear so to a practical mind, for this investigation will doubtless give us information which we ought to have, information more or less essential to the building of the canal, and without which we, as well as the President, who is to put the law into effect, will be acting largely in the dark.

Can anyone on this floor tell to a certainty within fifty or one hundred millions of dollars what the canal will cost? If so, he knows more than the engineers who have been examining the proposed routes, because they differ widely as to the cost, while they are not united by any means as to the route to be taken. Thirty millions say some, one hundred and fifty millions declare others, while by yet others the cost is placed all the way between these figures, the mean of computation being probably about $120,000,000. Some, again, think the Nicaragua route preferable, others the Panama, while yet other intelligent engineers think they have found or can find routes differing from both these across this great barrier which nature has thrown between the two oceans.

No wonder, sir, that these divergent views should be found in reference to this canal. In the first place, no sufficient and exhaustive survey has ever been made of these different routes. Especially is this true of the Nicaragua route.

Admiral Walker, when before the River and Harbor Committee in February of last year, stated substantially that while his investigations and those of others to which he had access were such as to satisfy him what the approximate cost would be, that yet he was not entirely satisfied, and thought further examination should

be made; neither could he state positively that the Nicaragua route was the most feasible, though he thought it was. And it was no doubt this lack of definite and positive information as to the cost of the canal and as to which was the best route that caused the committee on conference to insert the provisions just quoted in the last river and harbor bill.

Then, again, sir, it is an undertaking over which the best engineering skill has hesitated long and pondered much; so many problems to solve, so many difficulties to override. The canal has to be constructed in a tropical clime, malarial and sickly, where the white race never thrives, and under conditions the most trying and expensive.

Vast elevations are to be overcome; torrential streams are to be diverted and utilized; storms and floods are to be controlled, and their waters stored for future use; vast harbors, if the Nicaragua route is to be adopted, are to be constructed and maintained where none exist to-day, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific a great canal is to be dug through stone, and rock, and gravel, deep enough and wide enough to accommodate the commerce and the navies of the world for all time to come.

To aid in overcoming these difficulties, to furnish correct data as to the cost, and to obtain the best location for the canal, are the purposes of the commission now investigating this project, and I fear we can not act intelligibly until we have had the information and data which it can and will give us if we await its action.

But, sir, there is another consideration which should suggest delay or an amendment to this bill. A right of way, together with very important franchises and privileges, is necessary before we can proceed with the construction of this canal. This will cost money, or its equivalent, in the shape of concessions from this Government. A right of way, it is said, 5 or 6 miles wide, from Greytown to Brito, except where Lake Nicaragua is to be utilized, and even there a strip of land of considerable width around the lake, will be necessary. Arrangements for policing the territory thus acquired and the defense of the canal will have to be made, together with the acquisition of other valuable rights, all of which, as a matter of business, should be obtained before the canal is finally located. And yet this bill not only instructs the President to proceed at once and acquire the right of way, but, which is not at all businesslike, fixes the location of the canal.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what will be the result? Why, of course none other than to raise the price of the privileges for which we may wish to negotiate. Would a business man proceed in this way? What would be thought of one who, desiring to purchase a piece of property, and who, before acquiring the right to occupy the same, should enter into a building contract for the construction of a costly building thereon? No man guided by sound business principles, it seems to me, would do this; and yet that is just the position in which this bill will place the Government if it should become a law before these valuable rights have been obtained. We will have to pay for them at best; and if we do not agree upon the price before this bill becomes a law, we will have to pay much more for what we get when we come to deal with the country or countries through whose territory we may wish to construct the canal.

The Nicaraguan Government has already had a taste of our generosity in this matter. Away back in 1884 a foolish treaty was negotiated between this country and Nicaragua, by which we agreed to furnish all the money and build the canal, together with everything pertaining thereto, to give to Nicaragua one-third of the net proceeds and lend her the sum of $4,000,000 besides. Yet under this treaty we were to obtain a right of way only about one-half as wide as subsequent investigation has shown to be necessary.

Now, the two Governments of Costa Rica and Nicaragua are not likely, at least in the preliminary stages of negotiation, to demand less than would have been given the latter if the Frelinghuysen treaty had been adopted and enforced. I do not think, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that any particular route should be adopted until after sufficient and satisfactory arrangements have been made with the Governments through whose territory the canal is to be constructed. The Panama route and canal can no doubt be had if we wish it; but in any event none of the countries through whose territory the canal may run should know in advance of the proper treaty arrangements what route we wish to adopt.

I am not behind the scenes and do not know, Mr. Chairman, what the leaders of the majority in Congress intend to do with this bill, whether or no it is intended that it should become a law at this session, but rumor has it that the bill is to be halted at the threshold of the Senate, and there held up until the commission appointed by the President shall have made its report. But if it is intended that the bill should pass and become a law at this session, then it should be amended here or in the Senate so as to authorize the President to deal not only with Nicaragua and Costa Rica, but also with the Government of Colombia, and, in fact, with any or all of the Central American countries and to obtain options from them for the site of a canal.

All of these countries would be willing to bid for the canal, as it would be a great acquisition to that country through whose territory it may pass; and if we go at it in the right way, there is no doubt but that we can obtain all the concession necessary on very reasonable terms. I therefore propose at the proper time, if no one else does so, to offer an amendment to the bill embodying the provisions just suggested. Perhaps it would be better if the President were directed absolutely to do nothing whatever until the report of the commission now investigating the subject of an isthmian canal is made.

Understand me, Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to do anything to trammel the President, but on the contrary to put him in a position where he would at least have an equal chance in negotiating with these governments when he shall come to deal with them for the privileges and franchises we are compelled to have in the construction, maintenance, and use of this great waterway.

I have now, Mr. Chairman, gone over the objections to immediate action on this bill, but I do not wish to be understood as saying that they present an insuperable barrier to its passage by the House. On the contrary, I for one feel it my duty to vote for the bill, even though it should be finally presented in its present shape with only the proposed committee amendments. I, however, would like much to see the bill amended as before stated, and trust it may be done; but it would be better, in my judgment, that the bill should pass; certainly with the amendments suggested, if it is possible to have them made, or even without them, if they can not be adopted.

In the first place, the people whom I have the honor in part to represent on this floor feel a great interest in the canal. The State of Florida lies nearer the point where the canal would be located than any other in the United States, and the early connection of the two oceans by such a waterway is of vital importance to them. Already her great harbors from Pensacola to Key West on the Gulf, and from Fernandina to Miami on the Atlantic, stimulated by the changed conditions in the Southern seas, and the rapid improvement in the matter of foreign and coastwise trade, are assuming greater commercial activity and importance than ever before in their history, and their commerce will be increased tenfold; yea, probably one hundredfold, by the completion of this canal. The same is likewise true of all the Gulf harbors.

The productions of the South, the Middle States, and the West, or the greater part of them, will find their way through these ports to the Pacific and to the East by way of this canal as our trade increases, as it will increase with the Orient, whether the flag shall go there or not, whether the Philippines shall remain a part of this country or shall exist under an independent form of government. Then, too, it will afford a passageway for our Navy from ocean to ocean. And when the clouds of war shall gather, as gather they will in the future, as in the past, no battle ship freighted perchance with the honor and glory of our Republic, will have to sail through 15,000 miles of sea to strike a blow for the flag of our Union, as the *Oregon* did in the recent war with Spain.

Viewed, then, alike from the standpoint of business, of commerce, of national pride, and of patriotism, this canal should be constructed at the earliest practicable moment, and it is this consideration, Mr. Chairman, that makes the people of this country almost a unit in favor of its early completion.

In the next place, this bill provides for Government ownership. Now, I am opposed, Mr. Chairman, to private ownership of this great waterway, except as a last resort, and not even then unless its construction and maintenance are under the protection and control of the American Government.

We can not permit any other nation to own this canal, or to control it if in private hands. It should be open to the commerce of the world, under proper conditions, it is true, but this Government should either own or control it. We want no entangling alliances with other nations in this any more than in other matters. The Monroe doctrine should apply here as elsewhere. We say to the nations of the earth that they shall not extend their political power in either of the American continents where it does not exist to-day, which, with the reciprocal or cognate proposition not to interfere in the affairs of the Old World, is the Monroe doctrine, and carried to its legitimate conclusion would place the isthmian canal under our control, and make of it in international law what it will be in fact—an American waterway.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in this connection, I want to say something about the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. It has been urged that it stands in our way, and must be abrogated before we can proceed with the construction of the canal by the Nicaragua route, if, indeed, we can, under its provisions, construct any canal across the isthmus connecting the two American continents. Now, while I would like to see the treaty abrogated by mutual agreement between the two nations, if it were practicable, I do not agree to the proposition that it is now of any binding force upon this Government. I believe, with the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as is set forth in its very comprehensive

report on this bill, prepared by the distinguished chairman of that committee, Mr. HEPBURN, that this treaty no longer exists. It was made with reference to a condition of things which obtained a half century ago, and was never intended to meet, nor is it possible that it should meet, conditions as they exist to-day. It is a dead letter, and should not stand for a moment in the way of the construction of this canal.

This work, while for the use of the world, is to be an American canal. It will be an extremely important strategical waterway, greatly affecting our national interest, both from a commercial and naval point of view, and we propose to own and control it. No other country in the world should or will have anything to say about it, and we will take all necessary steps to protect it against external as well as internal violence. No other nation should be permitted to go into partnership with us in its protection or defense, its construction or control.

But it may be said, indeed it has been said, that the Suez Canal is entirely neutral and rests for its protection upon the plighted faith of the combined powers of the world to protect it. This is true, however, only in theory, for England, as is usual, holds more than the balance of power. Where is the northern entrance to that canal? Geographically on the southern shore of the Mediterranean Sea; not so, however, in point of fact, for in order for ships to reach the Mediterranean or that canal from the Atlantic they are compelled to pass through a narrow waterway, known as the Straits of Gibraltar, made not by English capital or by the hand of man, but by nature's forces, severing in twain the continents of Europe and Africa. Over this channel England ever stands guard. From behind the strongest fortification in the world she controls every inch of this waterway, and tells the nations of the earth who may or who may not pass. In time of peace all may use the Suez Canal, but when war comes between England and any other nation or nations, she closes the Straits of Gibraltar, and consequently the canal, to her enemies, as we ought to be able to do, and as we will do with the American Canal; and neither the Clayton-Bulwer treaty or any other consideration shall or will stand in the way.

Before England talks to us about the absolute neutralization of this canal, to be built by American money on the American continent, before she undertakes to conjure up the ghost of the dead Clayton-Bulwer treaty to frighten us from protecting the canal by fortifications or otherwise, let her destroy her own fortifications and dismantle her cannon at Gibraltar, which, standing as they do now, would prevent us from going through the Suez Canal if we were at war with that great power.

Then, again, this bill proposes to do something, and that is one of its merits which appeals strongly to me. The day of dilly-dallying will have passed if this bill becomes a law. It may cost a little more to purchase the right of way and the concessions necessary to build, maintain, and protect the canal, but if the provisions of this bill are carried out the canal will be built, and that is what the American people want. If to-day it were left to a vote of the American people to say whether we should begin at once and without unnecessary delay the construction of this canal, we all know what the result would be; and although I should like to see the bill amended in the particulars mentioned, yet if it is not done I should still feel it my duty to vote for the measure as it stands with the committee amendments alone.

This is the first time this proposition has ever come before Congress in a tangible shape, and to defeat it now would be to give it a blow from which it might never recover. The people want the canal, and their representatives are on this floor. Let it not, then, be said that this great national project was slaughtered in the house of its friends. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, a few words with reference to the benefits to be derived from this canal and I am done. It has been stated that the canal will not pay the cost of construction; that ships will not use it to any great extent, and that commerce will avoid it. This idea, in my judgment, is an erroneous one. True, we have only one great work of the kind with which to make comparison. That is the Suez Canal.

There are, of course, other extensive and important canals in the world, such as the Kaiser Wilhelm Canal, between the North and Baltic seas; the Welland Canal, uniting Lakes Ontario and Erie; also that connecting Manchester, England, with the sea, as well as many others of greater or less importance. But in none of them are the conditions so nearly like those which would surround the Nicaragua Canal as are the conditions presented by the Suez Canal. It will therefore be instructive to consider the results which have attended the operation of that canal since its construction, more than a quarter of a century ago. Almost from the beginning the commerce carried on through that canal became enormous, increasing from year to year until 1898, the last for which I have statistics, when the vessels using the canal for that single year numbered 3,698, with a total gross tonnage of 19,962,-622, yielding to the canal receipts to the amount of more than $12,000,000.

This, after paying whatever interest accounts the canal might have to pay, would certainly leave a handsome profit to be divided among the stockholders. It is safe to say that the Nicaragua Canal would not be less useful to commerce or less remunerative to the United States or whoever else might own it. There is no reason to doubt it when we consider the resources of our country, its phenomenal growth and development, as well as the bright commercial and business future now before the West Indies and Central American countries, which would be among the greatest patrons of the canal. This is an age of wonderful commercial development and progress. Not only are the farms, gardens, factories, and mines in this country increasing rapidly their production, but this same spirit of growth and development is being felt along every line of industry and commercial activity. Especially is this noticeable in our own export trade with every part of the world. We are rapidly increasing our commerce with China, Japan, and all the Oriental nations, which will continue to increase the demand for a shorter route by water to these countries, and will make the canal from the very moment of its completion one of the most important waterways of the world.

In the report of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, to which I have already referred, the chairman, Mr. HEPBURN, than whom none is better qualified to speak on this subject, in discussing the business side of the question uses the following language:

> Gentlemen connected with the Maritime Canal Company gave it as their opinion that 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 of tonnage would be the amount that would pass through the canal annually.
>
> Of course we have a right to assume that, whatever the amount may be, it would be an increasing amount from year to year. At present $1.55 per ton is the total charged for the use of the Suez Canal. If that rate was the rate charged by the Nicaragua Canal, and 4,000,000 be the tonnage passing through it, an aggregate sum of more than $6,000,000 would be the receipts. It is estimated that the cost of maintaining and operating the canal would be $1,000,000 annually.
>
> If the United States borrowed the money to invest in the enterprise, this sum would pay the annual interest, the cost of maintaining and operating, and leave a surplus of more than $1,000,000; and with the increasing tonnage we might reasonably hope for such accumulations of surplus as would in a few years fully reimburse the Government for its outlay; or, if it should be the policy to use the canal to stimulate the building up of our merchant marine, it could be made a most powerful factor.
>
> A British merchant trading from any port in Great Britain to Hongkong, chartering a 6,000-ton vessel and using the Suez Canal, must pay as tolls a sum in excess of $18,000 for the round voyage. His American rival trading from New York to Hongkong, using the Nicaraguan Canal free of toll because he used a vessel made in an American shipyard, out of American material, and by American labor, and loaded with American merchandise, would possess marked advantages—advantages so marked as to make it his interest to stimulate American shipbuilding.

In these views I entirely concur, and I firmly believe that from a commercial standpoint alone the canal would be a paying investment from the very day of its completion, for among other features is the immense saving it would make to commerce in both time and distance.

From New York to San Francisco by water around Cape Horn the distance is 15,660 miles; by the Nicaragua Canal the distance between the same points will be only 4,907 miles, a saving of over 10,000 miles. From Manila to New York via Honolulu and Nicaragua Canal the distance is 11,277 miles; by the same route, omitting Honolulu, 10,662 miles; while the distance via the Suez Canal is 11,534 miles. From Pensacola, Fla., or any other Gulf port the distance to Manila via the Suez Canal route is over 12,000 miles; while by the Nicaragua route it would be less than 10,000 miles.

The distance from New York to the Pacific Ocean via the Southern Pacific Railroad is 3,709 miles; by the Canadian Pacific Railroad, 3,619 miles; by the Central Pacific Railroad, 3,269 miles; by the Northern Pacific Railroad, 3,237 miles; by water to Cape Horn, 7,897 miles; while by the Nicaragua Canal route from New York to the Pacific Ocean the distance is only 2,519 miles.

It will thus be seen that the advantages which the Nicaragua route has over the Suez Canal in the matter of time and distance are greatly in favor of the Nicaragua route, and their consideration but emphasizes the importance of the early construction of the canal.

I have said that the people of this country demand the early completion of this canal, and so they do. But I can say more. The business interests of America and of the world also demand its construction, and as we will not permit other nations to build it, we will have to do so ourselves. We can not adopt the dog-in-the-manger policy. Individual enterprise would construct it, but probably that is not wise. Other nations would be glad to build and control it, but at this American interest and American pride would rebel.

There is, therefore, but one course for us to pursue; that is to proceed at as early a date as is practicable, in view of all the circumstances, to construct this great waterway ourselves. It is true I would prefer to wait a few months for further information. I would like to proceed in a little different way in the acquirement of the rights and franchises we would need in its construction, maintenance, and protection than is provided for in this bill, but am willing to go ahead even now and begin its construction. I

would certainly like to see work begun before the year 1900 shall have drawn to a close.

This, Mr. Chairman, has been the most eventful century whose flight has been recorded in the annals of the past, save that which witnessed the dawn of the Christian era, and it would be a fitting climax to the great chain of events which has marked its wonderful progress if its historian can write even on the last pages of its marvelous history the beginning of this great work.

The Agricultural Bill.

SPEECH
OF
HON ROBERT W. MIERS,
OF INDIANA,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Monday, April 9, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 10538) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901—

Mr. MIERS of Indiana said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have such confidence in the legal ability and the knowledge of moral philosophy of the President of the United States and the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee that I feel I ought to and must accept their conclusions of law and of morals, formed after a year and a half of study, on the Porto Rican problem. They concluded that good law and good morals required absolute free trade between the United States and Porto Rico. This decision was concurred in by the press and by the people of the United States without regard to party affiliation.

As lawyers and moral philosophers the President of the United States and the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee proved themselves to be entirely sound. As a Democrat I feel that I can follow the leadership of these great Republicans upon the legal and moral phase of this question and agree with them that law and duty require us to give free trade to the island of Porto Rico. After over a year's study as lawyers and philosophers these gentlemen were called upon by the trusts to reconsider this question and decide it by the rules of practical politics instead of those of law and morality. Practical Republican politics necessarily led them to a result which was against all law and against all morality. I can follow these gentlemen as lawyers and moral philosophers, but I can not follow them as politicians, because my conscience compels me to listen to the voices of law and morals rather than to those of the trusts.

It is natural that the trusts should not wish the rules of law obeyed or the paths of duty followed, for they are outcasts under the rules of law and morality. It is a singular fact that prior to the enactment of a statute making the formation of or participation in a trust a criminal offense very few trusts were organized in the United States. It was not until after it had become a criminal offense that trusts became plentiful. When it was made a crime, there seemed to at once be an epidemic of criminality. It looks like the representatives of the trusts had been invited to draw up the financial measures which would best promote their unlawful enterprises. This they did, and the Republicans enacted those bills into laws. The Republicans did not repeal the statute which made these acts criminal, but, through their Attorney-General, they assured the trusts that they would not be prosecuted.

At the behest of the trusts, the conclusions of law and morals reached by every administrative officer who studied the question has been set aside; and while the action of Congress in setting aside plain law and plain duty can not be justified by the rules of law or morals, it is demanded by those who are outside of the operation of law or morals, who have been promised unlimited license by the Republican party, and their mandates must be obeyed because of their dollars carrying the elections. A Republican party prefers to lack principles in its next campaign rather than to lack dollars; and having sacrificed the principles, it would be sad indeed if they failed to receive the dollars.

The much boasted prosperity, which consists in forming great combinations for the purpose of controlling all lines of commerce and industry, it is hoped will excuse the party for its abandonment of the demands of law and the dictates of duty.

But the trusts, created and fostered (as declared by President Havemeyer, of the sugar trust, before the Industrial Commission) in the secret technicalities of the Dingley tariff law, have not been wise in the manipulation of their concerns. Greed and avarice have been allowed too far to control judgment. They have been in too much haste to pile up their idle millions, and the prosperity which seemed to exist while they were paying for plants and thus placing money into circulation has already begun to wane. Even where wages have been increased, the workingmen have found that the value of work has not risen in proportion to the rise in the cost of living. And the many thousands whose wages have not been increased hear of the plenty said to exist around them while they and their families, although not idle, are denied many of what are ordinarily termed necessaries of existence. And then, too, while in some localities and some lines of industry there are fewer idle now than were idle during the panic of 1893, yet the condition is not what it ought to be, and many thousands of men willing to work are out of employment.

A few weeks ago some men were wanted to work upon the public improvements in New York City. An advertisement was inserted for the purpose of securing these men. So many men applied that the park was crowded and Broadway and Park Row were jammed. There were many men applied for every man who was needed. Go to any city in the United States, especially a manufacturing city, and you will find this same condition. With the largest circulating medium per capita of any year in our history; with the largest export trade; with the largest output of manufactured goods; with the blessings of Providence in magnificent crops throughout the whole country; with an increased foreign demand for our agricultural products by reason of failure of crops in other countries; with millions of dollars reported as being invested in new commercial and industrial lines; with all of these apparent signs of prosperity we find that hundreds of mills are idle, hundreds of thousands of men are unemployed, thousands of men in business for themselves five years ago have been forced out of business and are either idle or working for wages.

The farmers, who were temporarily prosperous by reason of the rise two years ago in the price of farm products, are again mortgaging their farms. There is more suffering among the middle classes than ever before in this country's history. The figures which seem to show prosperity will be used upon the stump by Republican speakers during the campaign, but it will be poor consolation to the men who are hungry that their masters, the trusts, are well fed and making money.

All political parties will declare in their platforms against trust combinations, and when the Republican leaders take the stump in the campaign they will become lawyers and moral philosophers, and what they say will be as sound as the just and righteous doctrine enunciated by President McKinley and the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee as to our plain duty toward Porto Rico. They will excoriate the trusts whose money pays the expenses of their campaign, and they will tell the people how they abhor these monsters of iniquity. Then when the campaign is over they will leave law and morality to the students of antiquity and once more assume the garb of practical politicians, abject servants of the god "Mammon" as incarnated in the form of a trust.

It is not every concern which has large capital that is a trust. In fact, some of the worst trusts have no capitalization at all. It is the purpose and the effect, not the organization or form, which governs the character of a corporation, association, or partnership. The most disastrous of all the trusts are perhaps the grain exchanges. These have been especially active during the past two years, and have succeeded remarkably well in forcing a period of low prices in the United States during a period of high prices in foreign countries. Any corporation, association, or partnership which has for its purpose the control of a product or the prices of a product is a trust, and as such it is a criminal offense for any person to be interested in such concerns.

In the Summary of Commerce and Finance for January, 1900, issued by the Bureau of Statistics of the Treasury Department, some very interesting figures are given which show conclusively the effect of the trusts upon the prices of grain. Upon page 2066 of this report we find that the farm price of wheat in 1898, the last year given, had fallen 23 cents per bushel since the year before. During the same period the average export price of wheat from the United States had risen 23 cents a bushel. The manipulators of the market had succeeded in reducing the farm price 22 cents a bushel at a time when their own selling price had increased 23 cents a bushel. They had literally robbed the farmer out of 45 cents for every bushel of wheat he sold during that year. This amounted during that year to a little over $20,000,000.

There is a table of prices given on pages 2392 and 2393 of this publication which contains some exceedingly useful figures. These figures show that the coal trust sold coal in Europe cheaper than it did in the United States. We paid for the bituminous coal which we imported in the month of February, 1899, $2.81 per ton, paid the duty in addition to that, and also the freight, when the American trust was selling that coal to foreign countries at $1.98. They asked double that to their home customers. The iron and steel trust has, during the past two years, been selling iron and steel in Europe at a very great reduction from what they sell it to American purchasers. A careful review of domestic and foreign prices during the past two years will show that in Europe the American trusts have successfully competed upon a falling

market, while in the United States they have succeeded, by reason of the high tariff upon the goods controlled by the trusts, in creating a constantly rising market.

The operation of these trusts is well shown by the history of the tin-plate trust. This is selected because it is neither better nor worse than the average, and its operations can all be proved by the books of the Statistical Bureau of the Treasury Department.

The duty on imported tin plates was 1 cent per pound previous to July 1, 1891; then 2.2 cents until October 1, 1894; 1.2 cents July 24, 1897; since which time it has been 1.5 cents per pound. The trust is capitalized at $50,000,000—$20,000,000 preferred and $30,000,000 common stock. It owns 40 plants, the cost of which, including the real estate, was $10,000,000.

Eighteen million common and $18,000,000 preferred stock was paid for these plants, of which the promoter received $10,000,000 in common stock. The present market value of the stock is 86 cents for the preferred and 38 cents for the common, which makes $26,000,000, or a profit of $12,000,000 upon the actual cost of the property. It has closed 34 mills, and has prevented any others being built. The company advertised these profits for 1898 as $3,701,754. Immediately after the formation of the trust prices were raised and have been constantly raised ever since, and very much more than was justified by any raise in raw materials. A student of this question has compiled the following tables, which will be found absolutely accurate:

Fiscal year.	Total pounds used.	Price per pound.			Cost of industry.
		In bond.	New York.	Difference.	
		Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	
1891	1,036,489,074	3.6	5.1	1.5	$15,547,336
1892	435,822,921	3.0	5.2	2.2	9,588,104
1893	728,245,104	2.9	5.1	2.2	16,021,392
1894	593,384,293	2.7	4.9	2.2	13,054,453
1895	701,840,011	2.5	3.9	1.4	9,825,760
1896	692,367,004	2.4	3.5	1.1	7,616,044
1897	677,055,746	2.4	3.2	.8	5,416,446
1898	853,336,373	2.3	3.0	.7	5,973,355
1899	856,489,826	2.5	3.4	.9	7,736,408
Total	6,577,030,952			1.5	90,769,298

The price of imported plates in bond in New York is obtained by adding one-tenth cent per pound to the foreign or invoice price, as given in the Statistical Abstract. This amount covers transportation charges. The New York price is the actual price at which IC Bessemer coke 14 by 20 tin plate sold in New York in each year. The difference column shows exactly how much more the wholesale buyer paid for tin plates in New York than he would have paid had there been no duty.

Rebates on reexported tin plates in manufactured form (the exact figures are not obtainable) reduce this total to between $80,000,000 and $84,000,000, as the direct cost in the last nine years of "creating" the industry. This is the extra amount paid by wholesalers and metal workers; but by the time they were repaid by the American people, who ultimately bought the goods and footed the bills, the addition of legitimate profits swelled the amount to over $100,000,000.

Average prices of tin plate at New York.

Date.	American.	English (in bond).	Difference.
1898.			
June	$2.65	$2.50	$0.35
July	2.80	2.50	.30
August	2.80	2.50	.30
September	2.80	2.55	.25
October	2.80	2.50	.30
November	2.80	2.60	.20
December	2.90	2.60	.30
1899.			
January	3.20	2.60	.60
February	3.55	2.65	.90
March	4.00	2.70	1.30
April	4.07½	2.80	1.27½
May	4.07½	2.90	1.17½
June	4.07½	3.10	.97½
July	4.35	3.60	.95
August	4.60	3.70	.90
September	4.85	3.65	1.20

Thus, not only did the trust advance prices immediately, but in March, four months after the trust was formed, it had them within one-fifth of a cent a pound of the importing point, the duty being 1¼ cents. The trust raised prices at the mills on July 14 to $4.37½, and again, on August 26, to $4.65, which price has been since firmly held. Although this makes the price at New York 30 cents under the importing price for 100-pound plates, it is so near the importing price for 80-pound plates that the trust dares not mark up prices again for the present.

How the tariff operates is told by the Wilmington (Del.) Every Evening of about October 1. After stating that 3-pound cans had advanced from $1.45 to $2.90 per 100, and that the increased cost was limiting the amount of tomatoes canned as well as the prices paid to growers, who are losing a large part of their crops, Every Evening says:

As the protective tariff makes it possible for American tin-plate manufacturers to increase the price of tin, and as this increase restricts the operations of the canners, with the consequent loss to farmers who have raised large quantities of tomatoes, and can not find the expected profitable market for them, the tariff, therefore, is the basic cause of the farmers' ill success. The farmers have been industrious, and brought forth large crops as the fruit of their labors. The tariff interferes with a profitable disposal of these crops. Thus the tariff injures the farmers instead of conferring a benefit upon them.

Had there been no duty at all, the tin-plate industry would probably have established itself here during the cheap iron and steel era, from 1893 to 1898, as did the bicycle and other steel industries. It was, in fact, cheap steel which made possible the very rapid growth of the tin-plate industry under the comparatively low duties of the Wilson bill.

Let Congress abolish the duties upon imported tin plates and we shall at once get rid of the evils of this iniquitous trust, high prices, watered stock, working "agreements," and other trusts, and monopoly of material and product. The whole structure rests upon our monopoly-producing tariff system.

The exports of agricultural products fell off for the year 1899 about $1,000,000 from the exports of 1898, while the exports of domestic manufactures increased about $48,000,000, and the imports of manufactured goods decreased very decidedly. This in ordinary trade would be a healthy condition, but when these lines are closely investigated it is found that there is not such an increase of production as such figures might appear to show. There is an increase of the foreign trade in articles controlled by the trusts and a decrease in importation of those articles. But the prices on these articles have steadily fallen in Europe and as steadily risen in the United States. This has lessened the consumption in the United States, and the trusts are not producing any more goods than were produced before the increase in exportations.

The people of the United States by increased prices are paying the profits on the goods sold to the people of foreign countries by the trusts. During the year 1899 there was paid in drawbacks the sum of $3,793,885.85. The only people who have the privilege of buying goods in the cheapest markets are the trusts in industrial lines. They obtain a drawback of 99 per cent upon all the raw materials they import which are manufactured into goods for the export trade. They are protected both ways. They are protected against the American consumer patronizing cheap markets, and they are protected by being given a special privilege to buy goods in the cheapest markets, and that privilege is exclusive. Hence it is that they have increased their exports and successfully competed with the falling prices in the foreign markets by the simple expedient of raising prices at home where the legislation gives them absolute control of the trade.

It is not remarkable, then, that practically every line of commerce and industry has been placed under the control of trusts. It would be very remarkable if that had not resulted from such legislation as the Dingley law. The capitalization of the trusts has reached a point where it is four times as great as the entire circulating medium. The intimate connection of these different trusts is shown by the statement of a prominent financier that he was a director in seventy-two of them. Practically all of them are controlled by a financial underwriters' association in New York, which in turn is controlled by foreign capital. We have so concentrated our commerce and industry into the hands of a few men that the conditions of Europe, and not those of the United States, control the commerce of this country, while the legislation of England, France, and Germany is more potent to bring about prosperity or adversity in America than legislation by the Congress of the United States can possibly be. The time is short during which we can correct this evil and resume control of our own commercial affairs. We will soon be bound like flies in the web of these foreign money spiders and be entirely helpless.

It is for these reasons, as well as for the natural sympathy which I feel for the people of Porto Rico, whom we are now robbing, that I regret that the decision of the President of the United States and the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee upon the legal and moral obligations involved should have been set aside at the behest of the trusts, and that the Republican party upon this question is to follow the commands of its masters and not the advice of its legal and moral advisers.

I want to see the day when the Government of the United States is strong enough to enforce its criminal statutes and bring its criminals to the bar of justice. This surrender of the United States to those who are openly and notoriously violating its penal laws is so cowardly that it must bring the blush of shame to the cheek of every good American. I want to see the day when the avenues of trade are once more opened to the people of this country and when the profits of commerce will be paid to those whose industry, enterprise, and wisdom create them. I do not want to see a continuation of the present time, when the intellect of this country is enslaved by avarice, when the brawn of the country is used only to do the bidding of greed, and when the morality of this country must be set aside whenever the right thing to do is not the thing which the men of dollars want done.

I want the man of limited means and business sagacity to be able to make a living for himself and his family through the proper use of his little capital. I want the laboring man of this country

to be able to save enough from his wages to enjoy the rest at the close of his days which his life of labor has earned.

We have entered upon the most dangerous era, from the standpoint of justice and humanity, that the world has ever seen. It is an era when law and right and all that goes to make up the true man and the good citizen is as naught when compared to the interest of the dollar, which ought to be only a medium of exchange and not a despotic power for the prevention of exchange.

I have no fight to make against wealth, for I would love to see the day when all men had sufficient of the medium of exchange to escape the burdens and privations of poverty. But I want money to be our servant; I do not want it to be our master. I have no quarrel with the man who in a lawful manner uses his money in his service in the extension of commerce and industry, no matter how much money he may so employ. But when a man in direct disobedience of the law of the land uses his money for the purpose of enslaving the minds and arms of other men it is but just that we should have a quarrel, and a quarrel which should result in his being compelled to cease the use of his money for any such purpose.

A man has no right to use his own in such a way that it will injure his neighbor's right of the same kind. The man who has millions has no right to so use those millions as to injure the use of the hundreds possessed by the man who only has hundreds. Money is an efficient servant, but it is the most despotic of all masters. The trust policy inaugurated and carried out by Republican legislation, in direct violation of penal laws, is a policy which makes the dollar the master and the man the slave. This policy is the one which has actuated this Congress in setting aside the plain provisions of law and duty as to the proper course to be pursued in our relations at the island of Porto Rico.

Several of the newspapers of the country published a statement up to May 27, 1899, the capitalization of trusts was $7,416,235,779.

Bradstreet is responsible for the statement that there was lost in these concerns by the depreciation of stocks during the first six months of 1899 the sum of $101,258,618. And yet Bradstreet has since that time reported the following new trusts:

Trusts, from July 1 to March 24, as reported in Bradstreet (1899).

July 1.	United States Worsted Company	$36,000,000
	Cattle in Texas (English syndicate)	100,000,000
July 8.	New England Cotton Yarn Company	11,500,000
July 22.	Coal combine in Pittsburg (Pa.), district (all the mines)	
	American Iron and Steel Manufacturing Company	30,000,000
Aug. 5.	During July the secretary of state of New Jersey granted certificates of incorporation to 150 concerns. The capitalization of 24 of the leading ones amounts to	254,000,000
	Pennsylvania incorporated 2 concerns, with a capital of	6,000,000
	Delaware 6, with a capital of	12,700,000
	And California 1, with a capital of	8,500,000
	It is stated that the stocks of 26 industrial combines declined $101,258,618 in the first six months of 1899.	
Aug. 19.	Fall River Print Cloth Mills	135,000,000
Sept. 2.	Agricultural combine in Kansas	20,000,000
Sept. 9.	The aggregate capitalization of concerns incorporated during August is represented by figures, a total far in excess of August in any preceding year	349,400,000
Sept. 23.	American Window Glass Company	17,000,000
Oct. 7.	In September 22 new corporations were chartered in New Jersey and their capital amounted in the aggregate to	72,200,000
	In West Virginia 20 companies were incorporated, the combined capitalization of which amounted to	65,000,000
	The grand total of capital of new concerns incorporated in all States during September is	193,000,000
Nov. 4.	Returns of incorporations having over $1,000,000 capital during October show that New Jersey led the list, as usual, with a total of 29, the combined capitalization of which foots up	200,000,000
	West Virginia had 30, with	85,000,000
	Delaware brought up the rear with a dozen new corporations, with	50,000,000
Dec. 2.	Incorporations in Eastern States for November	340,000,000
Feb. 3.	The aggregate capitalization of companies incorporated in January amounts to	203,750,000
	Which, in December, compares with about	200,000,000
	New Jersey charters amounted to	70,000,000
	And those in West Virginia to	55,000,000
	Delaware contributed	12,000,000
	While charters in other States footed up to	66,750,000
Mar. 3.	The February record of incorporations of companies of $1,000,000 capital and over is by far the smallest since the Journal of Commerce started to keep monthly records, about a year ago, the total capitalization of such companies in the States usually included in the compilation being only about	125,000,000
	For the month just ended, comparing with about	203,000,000
	In January and in December	200,000,000
Mar. 23.	Carnegie Steel Company	200,000,000

The question of right and wrong can only be decided in one way. The question of expediency ought to be decided in the same way; the right is always expedient. There must come a time when these inflated prices and these inflated stocks must seek the level of actual values. There must come a time when the slump of $100,000,000 during the first six months of last year will go into thousands of millions and break up all of the trusts. When that time comes, the failure of the trusts will create the worst panic and the one of the longest duration in the history of the United States. The accumulation of wrath that is now being stored up by the Republican party and the financial masters of that organization will, when it bursts forth, sweep the party and its masters out of existence. The worst feature of the disaster which is certain to come is that the innocent will be compelled to suffer on account of the sins of the guilty.

"I Desire to Say that I Challenge All the World in Arms to Successfully Condemn our Consular Service Abroad."

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES H. GROSVENOR,

OF OHIO.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, April 30, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (S. 1939) authorizing the President of the United States to appoint a commission to study and make full report upon the commercial and industrial conditions of China and Japan, and for other purposes—

Mr. GROSVENOR said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am quite aware that it is fashionable in this country to belittle and condemn and assail our consular service. The reason why, in my judgment, the administration of that service is attacked at this point of this bill grows out of the fact, if I am not mistaken, that the consuls of the United States do a considerable amount of work contemplated by this measure. But before I come to that I desire to say that I challenge all the world in arms to successfully condemn our consular service abroad.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the gentleman let me ask him a question to help him along?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Yes, if you can do it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Then, what business has the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS] to introduce a bill to reorganize our consular service on the ground that it is inefficient now?

Mr. ADAMS. If you will give the gentleman from Pennsylvania an opportunity he will tell you.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I do not yield my time. This is the regular performance of the gentleman from Missouri. I am not discussing that consular bill now, but I hope to be alive when it comes in here.

I communicated by letter or in person with every consul of the United States in Europe in 1891. I visited a large number of them in 1899 and many of them in 1898, but officially I visited or communicated with every one of them in 1891. And in that very process of acquaintance I became acquainted with the heads of the foreign departments of other governments in Europe, and the concurrent testimony of all of them, without a single exception, was that the consular service of the United States was most excellent and far ahead in efficiency in every direction over any other country of the world, and that is the testimony of every fair-minded man who visits Europe; that is the testimony of every intelligent man not swayed or actuated by some preconceived notion of some doctrinal theory that he is trying to weave into statute law.

I know how anxious some of our friends are to cater to the sickly sentimentalism and sort of political Miss Nancyism that has reached out toward some of our most valued and valuable commercial organizations and which has led to these criticisms. But I say now that any utterance, whether in Congress or out of Congress, whether in the form of a stump speech or newspaper article or resolution, that proceeds upon the idea that the American consular service is defective and inefficient proceeds upon a false and unworthy basis. There are men who went into that service in 1877 and have gone steadily through promotions and are there to-day, notwithstanding the vicissitudes of changes of Administration in this country. To-day there are prominent Democrats in some of the consulates in Europe, notably a most efficient one at the city of Geneva, a gentleman from Kentucky, drawing the munificent salary of $1,500 a year, and his personal emoluments in addition amounting to less than $500 upon an average; and yet a better officer, more fully representing the duties of his office and his country and more fully honoring the flag of his country, never lived than that Kentucky Democrat.

Now, what are the duties of a consul and how can it be said that they ought to be efficient enough to do the business connected with this proposed commission? In the first place, the duty of the consul is at the office where he is stationed, and he must be there all the year round except when he has a leave of absence; and when he goes away on a leave of absence he must take the money out of his own pocket to pay the vice-consul to superintend the signing of invoices. His duty at his office is to superintend and supervise and certify the invoices of goods exported to the United States. This, among other things, and this

a very prominent feature of his duty. So that he has not opportunity to travel over the country and get information. It is utterly impossible.

Last summer I visited the consul at one of the great manufacturing towns in England. He had been called upon by the State Department to make a report upon the subject of sewerage and municipal government, and in order to do that he had hired conveyances and traveled about the outskirts of the city and into the adjacent cities, but not a cent of compensation could he get for this extra duty, and while he was engaged upon it he was compelled to pay the substitute who took his place. And this is a type of the whole of this business. We seek here to scrimp the salary roll and curse this service. We degrade the country in the estimation of the world if they believe the talk here, while we pare with cheeseparing sentiment the appropriations for the support of the consular service. Double the salaries of the consuls in Europe and they will do work that will astonish the world, and they are doing more now than any equal body of men for the same amount of money. And I reiterate that if these wise men of this Congress would devote their time to some measure looking to the paying of the consuls of the United States salaries commensurate with their duties, we would have in that service a corps of men equal to all the demands of the situation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does not the gentleman know that in China we have consuls only at treaty ports?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I was coming to that.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And that we can not get any information we may want except at treaty ports?

Mr. GROSVENOR. That is exactly my point. We have these consuls at treaty ports and nowhere else, but there is a mighty empire consisting of people of wealth, of some progress, and, especially in Japan, of mighty progress, and we want to send this commission all over that territory—a thousand miles from any consulate—and a gentleman who talks about a consul making reports of that character will learn something if he will study the situation more fully. We desire to penetrate the dark places of those manufacturing and industrial countries now waking up; we want to know something about what is going on in Japan, where enterprise, intelligence, and almost Yankee push is being driven to its utmost speed in the development of that country.

We have in those mighty Empires of China and Japan of three or four hundred million people, only seven or eight consuls and a few vice-consuls, and gentlemen who understand the subject know that the vice-consuls are nine times out of ten residents of the country where they are operating. They are paid nothing except during the absence of the consul. The clerks are very apt also to be residents of that country, for our salaries to those clerks are so small that an American boy can not afford to go abroad. So the consuls themselves are the only persons we can depend upon, and they are located at these treaty ports and have no compensation, no allowances, no opportunities, to justify them in going out into the vast territory that is affected by the trade and commerce of those mighty Empires. Therefore it is, in my judgment, that this commission is absolutely as indispensable as though there were no such thing as a consul in any of those countries.

But I rose for the purpose, more than anything else, of condemning the constant aspersions cast upon our system of consular administration.

We have had now and then in that service a bad man. We have now and then at the head of our churches a bad man. We have bad men almost everywhere except in the House of Representatives. [Laughter.] But I say that as a class of men, as a class of educated gentlemen, as a class of patriotic citizens, as a class of men worthy of the name of Americans, our consuls are not excelled by any equal number of men in office anywhere on earth.

Take our consul-general at Frankfort—I do not distinguish him especially above all the others—a gentleman educated and graduated at a German university, who, coming to the United States, served three terms with honor on the floor of this House. He was consul-general to Mexico, learned the Spanish language, having the German language at his command when he came here; became a good scholar in the English language, capable of making speeches in Spanish, in German, and in English, and is to-day consul-general at Frankfort, upon a salary of about $2,000 or $2,500 a year.

Give that man adequate compensation; give the consuls of the United States even 50 per cent of what other countries pay their consuls in salary and expenses, and you will have a body of men unequaled by any corresponding class of men in any country. Why, then, should we condemn our consuls? Why hold up to the civilized world the declaration that America, the greatest manufacturing nation in the world, the greatest commercial nation in the world, is represented abroad by a set of men unfit for the service? It is a slander. It is utterly false in fact; is done for a purpose; it is done to advertise the notions of certain gentlemen; and I protest against it in the name of justice, in the name of fair play, and in the name of the honor of my country.

Nicaragua Canal.

SPEECH
OF
HON. B. T. CLAYTON,
OF NEW YORK.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, May 2, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 2538) to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans—

Mr. CLAYTON of New York said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I desire to put myself on record as favoring the building of this canal for two reasons. I believe that it is demanded by the development and progress of the country in expanding our commercial interests, and also because it will be a great means of defense in case of war with a first-class power.

Now, for the second reason, I believe this Congress should be very careful not to pass any measure here which would in any way commit us in the eyes of the world against the fortification of this canal or in any way limit our authority over the territory which we shall acquire adjoining it.

It is well known that fortifications on land are much superior to war ships, while at the same time the ships cost much more. Well-mounted guns on land are more effective than the same number, yes, than three times as many guns on vessels. It will be absolutely necessary for us to defend this canal from the land.

Now, it has been said here quite recently that the treaties of the Government are the supreme law of the land, and that we should live up to our treaties. I subscribe most heartily to the principle of the Government always keeping good faith. But, Mr. Chairman, there is a grave question as to the validity of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty at this time. For my own part I think that treaty has been violated. I think it is null and void.

Now, there is another feature of the treaty question to which I desire to address myself briefly; and that is as to the power of Congress to pass a law which shall establish our position with reference to a proposed treaty, called the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, which is now awaiting ratification by our Government. While it is true that a treaty has the same force as a law of the United States, yet I believe that an act of Congress, passed by both Houses and signed by the President, must be taken by the world as nearer representing the will of the people of the United States than a treaty which is proposed by the Executive and ratified by the Senate. And certainly any action taken by this House must be given due weight in the consideration which is to be given to this proposed treaty.

Let us recall a little of the history of the proposition to build this canal. The construction of a ship waterway across the Isthmus joining the two Americas has been in the minds of men ever since Columbus discovered America. In 1551 the project was seriously urged upon the attention of Philip II of Spain, and, even at that early date, attention had been directed to the three routes so much discussed within the last fifty years, namely, those of Tehuantepec, Nicaragua, and Panama.

In the present century many surveys have been made. Careful research and many experiments have shown that the project is not only practicable but that it is entirely within the possibility of being accomplished at a reasonable cost, and that it may be made a safe, paying investment. And the general opinion is that the canal by way of Lake Nicaragua is the most practicable one of accomplishment. Going as far back as 1825, we find that the matter was seriously discussed by this country, and the proposition was favorably considered by the Republic of Nicaragua.

The minister of foreign affairs of the then new-born Republic of Nicaragua in that year wrote to Henry Clay, our Secretary of State, asking for the assistance and cooperation of the United States in building the canal. His words were:

> Nothing would be more grateful to it than a cooperation by this generous nation, whose noble conduct has been a model and the protection to all the Americas; it would be highly satisfactory to have a participator not only of the merits of the enterprise, but of the great advantages which that canal of communication must produce, by means of a treaty which would perpetually secure the possession of it to the two nations.

The matter then drifted without serious discussion until about 1850, when the discovery of the great resources in that part of our country bordering upon the Pacific caused awakened interest in the construction of this waterway. But this time we met opposition from the British. They had established a foothold in that part of the American continent and were jealous of the United States. This led to the much discussed Clayton-Bulwer treaty, which declares that neither Government—

> will ever obtain or maintain for itself any exclusive control over the said ship canal, agreeing that neither will ever erect or maintain any fortifications commanding the same or in the vicinity thereof, or occupy, or fortify,

or colonize, or assume or exercise any dominion over Nicaragua, Costa Rica, the Mosquito coast, or any part of Central America.

To show how this agreement has been kept I quote from Senate Report No. 1944, Fifty-first Congress, second session, signed by Senators John Sherman, George F. Edmunds, WILLIAM P. FRYE, William M. Evarts, J. N. Dolph, JOHN T. MORGAN, Joseph E. Brown, H. B. Payne, and J. B. Eustis, which says:

We think it can be justly affirmed that the convention of 1850 has become obsolete, for the convention was based upon the idea of an immediate prosecution of the enterprise of creating this great international waterway, and that neither Government would be bound, so far as it regarded the particular question, apart from other considerations, to consider its stipulations as longer binding.

And again, to show how the British Government has disregarded this treaty, this report says further:

One of the provisions of the convention of 1850 most important to the United States and to the preservation of the republican Government on this continent was that which declared that neither party to the convention should "occupy, or fortify, or colonize, or assume to exercise any dominion over Nicaragua, Costa Rica, the Mosquito coast, or any part of Central America."

At that time the "settlement" of British subjects, as it was called, at the Belize, on the coast of Central America, was of the smallest dimensions, and had no substance or form of a territorial dominion. British woodcutters were there under an ancient Spanish license of timber cutting, and nothing more. These settlers in a country not belonging to the British Crown had, off and on, attempted to form a kind of local government for preserving order among themselves, and, after going through various phases, had reached the point in 1850 of some local magistrates and an imperial superintendent, merely and clearly for the purpose of preserving internal order among the English adventurers engaged in the lumber trade in that foreign country.

This was substantially the condition of things when the convention of 1850 was entered into.

The next step taken, after the convention of 1850, was in 1853, when a legislative assembly was constituted to manage the affairs of the settlement. This was followed by a convention between Great Britain and Guatemala in 1859 for the establishment of the boundaries between what the treaty chose to call "Her Britannic Majesty's settlement and possessions in the Bay of Honduras" and the territories of Guatemala. The country, or the largest part of it, belonged to Guatemala as the successor to all the sovereign territorial rights of Spain in that region, but by this treaty that which was before a licensed industrial establishment became instantly a possession of the British Crown. The settlement government continued until 1862 when the settlement was declared a colony and a regular colonial establishment was set on foot; and so, from that time to this, the form and substance of a regular colonial government as a part of Her Majesty's dominions has continued.

It is understood that its geographical dominion has been vastly enlarged from the licensed woodcutting limitations and boundaries that existed in 1850. All this has taken place systematically and persistently, notwithstanding the declaration of Her Majesty's Government that it should not "colonize or assume or exercise any dominion over * * * the Mosquito coast or any part of Central America."

If these proceedings of Her Majesty's Government, in respect of one of the most important subjects of the convention and in absolute opposition to it, do not discharge the United States from all and every of their declarations and engagements stated in that convention, it is impossible to concede what would.

In view of all these considerations the committee is of opinion that the United States is at present under no obligations—measured either by the terms of the convention, the principles of public law, or good morals—to refrain from promoting, in any way that it may deem best for its just interests, the construction of this canal, without regard to anything contained in the convention of 1850.

This report goes thoroughly into the history of the case, and I think the quotations made from it fairly set forth the conclusions of the committee.

The question now before us is, Should we bind ourselves in a similar manner concerning this new proposition to build a canal across the Isthmus?

When it was proposed to build the Suez Canal, England objected until she was certain of succeeding to the ownership and control. The neutrality of the canal was guaranteed, but England has fortifications near the entrances of this canal, and nobody to-day believes for one instant that great Britain would allow the use of this canal by any power hostile to herself. Can the United States afford to act the part of Egypt and France in the building of the Nicaragua Canal? I think not. I see no use in taking any action or in making any treaty which is going to complicate this question. For the purpose of clearly defining our position in this matter I am in favor of passing this bill containing the provision for fortifying the canal. Should this canal be built under agreement with the rest of the world, as provided in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, it would, in time of war, be a source of weakness to the United States, instead of a source of strength, as it naturally ought to be.

Under that treaty we would be bound to protect the vessels of our enemies passing through a canal built at our expense, their avowed object being to attack us as soon as they got through; an anomalous position indeed for this enlightened nation to allow our British cousins to persuade us into—an agreement that would not be kept and that ought not to be made. Now, in advocating action which would forestall this treaty, I am not advocating any hostility to the British Government. The people of the United States are glad to have the friendship of Great Britain, but what they do not want is "entangling alliances." The people of this country do not desire trouble with foreign countries, but they do demand that there shall be no surrender of the Monroe doctrine. We would gain nothing by binding ourselves in such a treaty. Indeed it seems to me that the Clayton-Bulwer treaty having been disregarded by Great Britain and this building of a canal by the United States being a new proposition, that there is no need for any treaty.

Surely if the United States is to furnish the men and the means to build this canal and at its own expense, there is no need for us to ask the permission of Great Britain. Some of our friends say that we want to avoid the expense of building fortifications and keeping soldiers there to maintain them, but this is not a good argument against maintaining our right to do so should that ever become expedient. Furthermore, as soon as this canal is built it will be necessary to provide police for protection and regulation, and the establishment of this police could be done with a view to its advantageous use for defensive purposes in case of necessity. Indeed it is possible to imagine a state of affairs when it might be advantageous to us to blow up some portion of the canal and temporarily prevent its use should we be threatened by the fleets of a nation more powerful at sea than ourselves. Our right to load the canal without becoming liable to all the nations of Europe for damages due to the suspension of its use is an important one that should not be thrown away.

Individuals do not sign contracts without some consideration or advantage to be gained, and neither should we bind our Government unless the Government is to reap proportionate advantages therefrom. Absolutely nothing can be gained by this proposed treaty except permission from Great Britain to attend to our own affairs.

I fully agree with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DALY] who in his remarks yesterday demonstrated the great importance of maintaining the Monroe doctrine and the direct bearing which our action in this matter has upon that policy.

He said:

The Monroe doctrine is one of the substantial and underlying principles of this Government. * * * There is no reservation expressed in this policy. It is against any monarchical power that seeks to invade or spread itself on any portion of American soil. President Cleveland in the Venezuelan controversy simply reiterated the doctrine which is the belief of the American people, viz, that the soil of these countries is to remain absolutely intact as against foreign acquisition by force or otherwise, whether it takes the form of gradual extension of boundary lines or the form of open conquest.

It is not enough for those who desire to cater to the demands of Great Britain to endeavor to dismiss the subject by classifying as "jingoes" those who desire to retain all the rights of the United States. We do not desire to enter into any "jingo" policy. We simply wish to state positively and firmly our positions, as we have a right to do, and to avoid all conventions and treaties compromising in their nature and unnecessary and sure to lead to future irritation and trouble. Unhampered by "entangling alliances" with any European power, what an addition to our power of defense this canal would be must be apparent to everyone. Free passage from one ocean to the other, enabling our vessels to assemble in large fleets on either coast, would double our sea power.

There are also commercial considerations for building and maintaining this canal free from unnecessary restrictions and agreements with foreign powers. The time may come when we would like to favor American ships in the matter of tolls as against the subsidized and protected ships of foreign nations. It is important that we encourage our shipping industry, and I believe this canal will afford us an easy and effective means of favoring American-built and American-owned vessels.

I believe that the time has come for action. This ship canal should be built without further delay. There is no doubt about the feasibility of the canal, or of its being built and maintained on a paying basis.

Engineers variously estimate the cost of construction, and that great statesman, Senator MORGAN, of Alabama, in his report to the Senate in 1896 on that subject, said:

Estimating that the canal can be completed in five years, and placing the cost at $150,000,000—the highest estimate—and the operating expenses at $1,000,000 per annum, we have an accumulation of interest, at 3 per cent, at the end of five years of $11,250,000 to be added to the cost of the canal, two and a half years being the average period of expenditure in its construction.

The cost of the canal on this estimate would be $161,250,000, and the interest thus compounded on this sum for the next ten years after the canal is completed would amount to $48,375,000. Add to this $1,000,000 each of the ten years for maintenance and operating expenses and the sum is $58,375,000. The earnings of the canal for the same period, computed on the lowest basis of tonnage that has been suggested by anyone—5,000,000 tons, including passenger fares—at $1.50 per ton (which is less than the toll rates of the Suez Canal), will amount to $75,000,000, thus giving a net profit of $1,662,500 per annum.

All the more recent calculations, especially in view of the improvements in machinery and the better methods of work developed by the construction of the Chicago Canal, warrant us in believing that the cost of construction would be much less than this estimate. That the yearly tonnage would be 8,000,000 is now generally conceded.

The Suez Canal, 99 miles long, cost in all, including construction and interest accumulated until completed, about $100,000,000.

It has a tonnage of about 8,000,000 and returns yearly a handsome net profit.

Our commerce is now seeking new fields in the Orient. New markets for our manufactured goods must be found. This new and shorter route is needed for our vessels going to the markets of China, Japan, etc., as well as for those carrying heavier freight between our seaboard cities on the Atlantic coast and those on the Pacific. The United States is becoming a nation of manufacturers. The world is entering upon a new era and all the nations are fighting for trade advantages. The building of this canal under the control and ownership of our Government will be a great step in the advance of the United States to a position of commercial supremacy. [Applause.]

Rural Free Delivery.

SPEECH
OF
HON. J. H. DAVIDSON,
OF WISCONSIN,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, April 24, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 10301) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901—

Mr. DAVIDSON said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I desire to congratulate the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads for the splendid manner in which they have responded to the sentiment of this House and the country upon the question of expansion in free rural mail delivery. The apppropriation of $1,750,000 for that purpose is most commendable, and I not only vote for it cheerfully, but would gladly have supported a much larger appropriation. The postal facilities of our country are being continuously improved. Each year abuses are corrected, changes made, and extensions provided for, which have in each instance been of benefit to the country at large. The attention of Congress has often been called to the matter of providing the business men of the cities with the best possible postal facilities.

Public buildings are constructed and properly equipped for the prompt handling of the mails. Delivery is made from the window or box to those who come to the office, while the free-carrier system has been established, perfected, and extended so that the business men, even though they may live but a few rods from the post-office, may have their mail delivered to them not only once, but several times a day.

I make no objection to this splendid service to the men who carry on the great industries of the country. The manufacturing interests and the different branches of trade and commerce are entitled to have the best mail facilities we can give them; but they are not more entitled to such facilities than are those who live more remote from these industrial centers—those who live in the country districts. These men have rights which we should respect. Those engaged in carrying on the great agricultural interests of the country have always borne their share of public burdens. They have contributed of their means for the maintenance of our public institutions, and when our country has needed their services they have always promptly responded to the call.

The farm has always been the foundation from which has come the grandest sentiments of patriotism, of devotion to country, of broad, liberal statesmanship that this Republic has ever seen. The best men of our day and of the years of our Republic have laid the foundation for the intelligent consideration of national questions at the hearthstone of the rural farm home. The hard knocks of farm work have fitted and prepared them for the emergencies which they have so fearlessly met and so grandly overcome in the management of national affairs.

This is an age of expansion. Expansion in education as well as in other things. Education to-day is obtained not alone from within the walls of the schools and colleges, but from that broad field wherein every man strives to attain knowledge upon all the subjects of interest to an enlightened, progressive, and intelligent people. The people of our country have attained a higher degree of education and a greater interest in national questions now than at any other time in our history.

The boys and girls of the rural districts have a broader and more thorough knowledge of the Constitution of our country and the principles of the Declaration of Independence than have their brothers and sisters of the city. Their evenings have been devoted to the study of history rather than to the frivolities of city life. The students in the country schools are taking an active interest in the great questions which come before Congress and the country, and are asking their Representatives for the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and other public documents which they may study and from which they may obtain the best information on these great questions.

The farmers are anxious to have the latest publications. If they are engaged in stock raising, they want the best stock journals, and they want them daily, or as soon as possible after publication. If they are interested in dairying, they want the dairy journals and the daily market sheets, which show the latest prices of cheese and butter. If grain raising is their specialty, they want the latest reports of supply and the price of grain.

By careful reading and thoughtful consideration they determine for themselves the possible advance or decrease in the price of grain or stock or wool or the particular commodity in which they have an interest, and instead of following the old-fashioned way of taking their produce or stock to market and selling it at the price offered by the buyer on the street, they keep the commodity at home until they know what the price is and determine for themselves whether they want to sell at that figure.

Rapidity in the transportation of mail matter is an important factor in the commercial world. Of but little less importance is the necessity for reasonably prompt delivery of not only letters, but newspapers, market reports, and other literary productions to all the people. Is there any reason why a man living 6 or 7 miles from the post-office should not be accommodated by daily mail service as well as the man who lives within that number of blocks of the post-office in the city or town? Certainly not. These men do not expect us to build public buildings in the rural districts, but they have a right to expect that we should give them the benefit of prompt mail delivery, and I know of no reason why we should not do so.

The farmer living at a distance from the post-office has been handicapped in his efforts for success because of the lack of proper mail facilities. Free rural mail delivery comes as a blessing to those thus situated. It puts them in touch with the outside world and enables them to take advantage of any sudden change in the condition of the markets, thus placing them on an equality with those who live at the industrial centers.

As an evidence of the appreciation of rural mail delivery, I desire to refer to a letter from a constituent of mine who suggests that the carrier on the rural route in that locality be directed to go in a particular direction on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday of each week, as in the afternoon of those days meetings of the dairy board are held, and it is important that they receive their mail and daily market reports prior to the meetings of this board.

The benefits of free rural delivery have been so clearly stated by the First Assistant Postmaster-General that I take the liberty of quoting from his report:

> There has been nothing in the history of the postal service of the United States so remarkable as the growth of the rural free delivery system. Within the past two years, largely by the aid of the people themselves, who, in appreciation of the helping hand which the Government extended to them, have met these advances halfway, it has implanted itself so firmly upon postal administration that it can no longer be considered in the light of an experiment, but has to be dealt with as an established agency of progress, awaiting only the action of the Congress to determine how rapidly it shall be developed.
>
> The facts hereinafter set forth, with some elaboration of detail, which the importance of the subject seems to me to warrant, will demonstrate—
>
> That the free delivery of mails in rural communities can be widely extended with great benefit to the people and with little cost to the revenue.
>
> That whenever the system has been judiciously inaugurated, with a sincere purpose to make it a success, it has been followed by these beneficial results:
>
> 1. Increased postal receipts. More letters are written and received. More newspapers and magazines are subscribed for. So marked is this advancement that quite a number of rural routes already pay for themselves by the additional business they bring.
>
> 2. Enhancement of the value of farm lands reached by rural free delivery. This increase of value has been estimated at as high as $5 per acre in some States. A moderate estimate is from $2 to $3 per acre.
>
> 3. A general improvement of the condition of the roads traversed by the rural carrier. In the Western States especially the construction of good roads has been a prerequisite to the establishment of rural free-delivery service. In one county in Indiana a special agent reports that the farmers incurred an expense of over $2,600 to grade and gravel a road in order to obtain rural free delivery.
>
> 4. Better prices obtained for farm products, the producers being brought into daily touch with the state of the markets, and thus being enabled to take advantage of information heretofore unattainable.
>
> 5. To these material advantages may be added the educational benefits conferred by relieving the monotony of farm life through ready access to wholesome literature, and the keeping of all rural residents, the young people as well as their elders, fully informed as to the stirring events of the day. The moral value of these civilizing influences can not be too highly rated.

I shall not undertake to add other reasons in favor of this appropriation. It is of interest, however, to note its early struggle for existence and the rapidity with which it has lately been developed. In the Fifty-third Congress this system was condemned by the House committee, and in 1894 Postmaster-General Bissell refused to make use of the appropriation of $10,000 to inaugurate the service. In 1896 Congress made $40,000 available and Postmaster-General Wilson selected 44 "widely divergent" routes for the experiment. Subsequent appropriations have been as follows: For the year ending June 30, 1898, $50,000; 1899, $150,000; 1900, $300,000; 1901 (the pending bill), $1,750,000.

On November 1, 1899, the system was in successful operation from 383 distributing points, radiating over 40 States and 1 Territory, as follows:

Alabama	1	Nebraska	3
Arkansas	1	New Hampshire	5
Arizona	1	New Jersey	7
California	14	New York	24
Colorado	5	North Carolina	1
Connecticut	6	North Dakota	3
Delaware	4	Ohio	49
Florida	1	Oregon	3
Georgia	4	Pennsylvania	15
Illinois	17	Rhode Island	5
Indiana	44	South Carolina	21
Iowa	23	South Dakota	2
Kansas	17	Tennessee	6
Kentucky	2	Texas	2
Louisiana	1	Utah	1
Maine	7	Vermont	6
Maryland	10	Virginia	4
Massachusetts	11	Washington	1
Michigan	15	West Virginia	7
Minnesota	7	Wisconsin	15
Missouri	12		

These routes supply daily service to about 300,000 people, at an average cost of 84 cents per capita. This is a remarkable showing, especially when we remember that free delivery in cities costs about $2.80 per capita and in estimating the cost of rural delivery no account is taken of the great increase of postal receipts, which average from 50 to 75 per cent wherever the service is established.

It is possible, of course, that an occasional route may not be a success, but this is not only the exception, but one not easily found. It should be borne in mind that successful routes can only be established under proper conditions. In the first place, there should be good roads, for without them the delivery of mail can not be prompt or regular. Then there must be density of population, so that a goodly number of persons may be favored within a given radius. Then also should be considered the desire of the people for this service and their willingness to patronize it when established. It is not to be expected that success would attend a route located in a sparsely settled locality and where the people themselves do not want the service and will not patronize it.

The service is intended for those who want it, who need it, and who are willing to meet the officials of the Government halfway in affording facilities for its proper establishment.

The agent of the Post-Office Department is expected to take into consideration all these conditions when he inspects a route and to recommend its establishment only when he finds the conditions favorable.

For the purpose of showing how well these routes are patronized when properly established, I desire to submit some figures on routes established in my district during the last year and which, I presume, are but fair illustrations of the success which has attended the establishment of other routes throughout the country. I might say that I have the honor to represent a district the greater portion of which is devoted almost entirely to agriculture. The soil is of the very best, the rural districts are thickly settled, the roads usually very good, and the people intelligent and progressive, well educated, and well informed upon the current events of the day.

In October of last year there were established at Ripon, Wis., two rural routes, each route covering a distance of about 25 miles and supplying mail daily to from 180 to 200 families, or an average from 900 to 1,000 people. These routes are known as No. 1 and No. 2. During the first week of the service carrier No. 1 delivered 240 and collected 47 pieces of mail; carrier No. 2 delivered 353 and collected 50 pieces.

During the last week in January, after the service had been in operation about four months, carrier No. 1 delivered 980 and collected 180 pieces of mail; carrier No. 2 delivered 953 and collected 128 pieces. This shows an increase in the number of pieces delivered by these two carriers from 597 to 1,933, and in the number of pieces collected from 97 to 314, the increase being about 222 per cent.

During the whole month of January carrier No. 1 delivered 3,904 and collected 748 pieces; carrier No. 2 delivered 4,139 and collected 1,504 pieces.

About the 1st of December I secured the establishment of two routes from Oshkosh, Wis. During the first week of this service carrier No. 1 delivered 504 and collected 67 pieces; carrier No. 2 delivered 400 and collected 72 pieces. During the last week in January, when the routes had been in operation about two months, carrier No. 1 delivered 1,095 and collected 128 pieces; carrier No. 2 delivered 982 and collected 126 pieces. This shows an increase in the number of pieces delivered of 127 per cent, and in the number collected of 82 per cent. During the month of January carrier No. 1 delivered 4,295 pieces and collected 495 pieces; carrier No. 2 delivered 4,783 and collected 429 pieces.

These were the first routes established in my district; and while I have not been able to receive any later reports than those given, these are sufficient to prove conclusively the popularity of this service and that these routes are entirely successful.

Since these routes were established I have yet to learn of any complaint, either in the service or the system. On the contrary, many of the persons favored have written me thanking me for the interest I have taken and expressing their appreciation of this service. They realize that it puts them in closer touch with the outside world, and it brings them the news of the day while yet it is news.

After one of these routes was established one of the farmers came to my office and said:

> By the establishment of this service you have added to the value of my farm at least 10 per cent, for if I were to offer it for sale to-day the mere fact that I could advertise that mail was delivered daily at the door would, I think, enable me to obtain at least that much more in its sale.

The convenience of having a line of daily communication between the farmhouse and the city is a matter worthy of consideration, especially in the busy season of the year. The good housewife may be short of some article needed in her domain. The farmer may need a new piece of gearing for some machine, or some article the weight or cost of which is trifling, but to obtain which would necessitate the spending of his own time and the time of a team in which to make the trip to town and return for the purpose of securing this article. Now, a word to the carrier on one evening, and the next morning he brings the article to the door.

I trust the Department will give early consideration to the question of the salary paid to the carrier. At present it is $400 per year, and out of this he is obliged to maintain himself and to furnish his own conveyance. The routes are usually about 25 miles in length. One horse can not stand this travel for six days in each week during the year. The carrier must either own two horses, or he will soon wear out the one and be obliged to pay nearly one-half of his year's salary to purchase another.

I believe the compensation to the carrier should be raised to $600 per year. Fifty dollars per month is not too much for a man who must go over this route every day, in all kinds of weather, in all seasons of the year, and who possesses the intelligence and ability to properly discharge the duties of his position. Good men should be chosen for this work. Their responsibilities are not small now, and with the extension and improvement of the service the responsibilities will increase. I trust the Department will soon be able to advance the compensation to be paid these carriers at least $100 per year, if they can not make it $200.

This system is intended for the rural districts. It is intended to give better postal facilities to those who are now poorly supplied, to give daily service to those who otherwise would have to travel several miles for their mail.

Now the question arises, What are the objections to its continuation? In my own judgment there are none worthy of our serious consideration. The system has been found to be practicable, and the routes, the most of them, are practically self-sustaining.

When existing abuses of the postal laws with reference to the amounts paid to railroad companies for transportation and the sending of matter as second class which ought to pay a higher rate are corrected, the Post-Office Department will, in my judgment, be able to extend free delivery to all the rural districts without any additional burden by way of taxation. I understand that the star-route contractors object to rural delivery.

Why? Because they see the end of those contracts out of which they have made fortunes. If better service can be given to the people, we need not worry over the objections made by these contractors. It is said that some of the fourth-class postmasters object for fear their offices will be discontinued. I have no personal knowledge of any such objections, but if there are any, they undoubtedly come from those who, while acting as postmaster, are also conducting some general public business, and the post-office is operated by them not for the money there is in it, but for the purpose of "drawing trade."

This is a selfish reason, and is not entitled to consideration. The fourth-class offices were established for the benefit of the people and not for the postmaster. In its day the small office in the rural district was of much benefit; but if in the general advancement of all things there has come a better system, a service which will bring greater benefits to the people as a whole, then the "old things" must pass away.

The broad principle of "the greatest good to the greatest number" should be applied in this as in other things. This applies also to those who reside in the business centers, and who have the benefits of daily mail service themselves, but who object to its extension into rural districts for fear that the farmer will not come to town to trade if his mail is delivered at his door.

I have no sympathy with such narrow, selfish reasoning. "Live and let live" should be our motto. Because we are favored in some particular line it is no reason why we should object to

like benefits being extended to others. On the contrary, we should encourage and aid them in all these matters.

I believe the time has come when Congress should declare that rural mail delivery has passed beyond its experimental stage and has become a fixed feature of our postal system. Let us appropriate money sufficient for its extension under reasonable and proper rules and regulations, not for the purpose of forcing the system upon people to whom it would be a detriment, nor to interfere with the present good mail facilities of any locality, but to the end that routes may be established in proper places and under proper conditions for the benefit of those who will appreciate the service and to whom it will come as a blessing.

We appropriate money for fast mail trains and for quick delivery in cities. Let us be reasonably generous in our effort to benefit those who have ever constituted the mainstay of our national existence, those who produce the food and fiber that feed and clothe the world.

I trust this appropriation will be made. I frankly confess that I shall endeavor to secure the expenditure of a portion of it for the extension of rural delivery in my district. I know of no part of the country where the conditions are more favorable, and I know of no people who are more entitled to enjoy the benefits of the service or who will appreciate more thoroughly its extension than the people I have the honor to represent. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I shall gladly favor the passage of this bill.

The Monroe Doctrine and the Nicaragua Canal.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHAFROTH,

OF COLORADO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, May 2, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 2538) to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, and having immediately under consideration the amendment, recommended by the committee, to strike out the word "fortifications," in the fourteenth line of the second page of the bill, and insert in lieu thereof the word "provisions"—

Mr. SHAFROTH said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The amendment under consideration, to strike out the word "fortifications," is, in my judgment, of great importance to this measure. So far as my position is concerned, I believe that we should have a fortified canal or no canal. If treaty stipulations of our Government stand in the way of fortifying the canal, then, either by diplomatic negotiations or by notice of abrogation, with restoration to England of her status at the time, such treaties should be annulled.

It seems to me to be absolutely foolish for this Government to raise the entire capital for the investment, to undertake all the hazards of such a gigantic enterprise, and at the same time to grant to the battle ships and merchant marine of Great Britain and the other nations of the world the same rights and privileges in the canal that we retain for our own vessels.

Great Britain and her colonies transport in their bottoms 48.5 per cent of the world's ocean commerce, while the United States carries in its vessels only 18.7 per cent of the same. The proposed Hay-Pauncefote treaty provides for the building of a neutral canal, and stipulates that no greater charge can be imposed upon the vessels of other nations than upon our own.

Sections 1, 2, and 7 of Article II of that proposed treaty provide as follows:

1. The canal shall be free and open, in time of war as in time of peace, to the vessels of commerce and of war of all nations, on terms of entire equality, so that there shall be no discrimination against any nation or its citizens or subjects in respect of the conditions or charges of traffic, or otherwise.

2. The canal shall never be blockaded, nor shall any right of war be exercised nor any act of hostility be committed within it.

7. No fortifications shall be erected commanding the canal or the waters adjacent. The United States, however, shall be at liberty to maintain such military police along the canal as may be necessary to protect it against lawlessness and disorder.

For the United States under such conditions to build the canal at its own expense would in effect make it construct a canal mostly for the benefit of Great Britain. As Great Britain carries three times the amount of ocean commerce we do, the benefit to Great Britain would be three times as much as to us, and yet she does not risk a penny in the venture, while we risk the entire capital.

It can not be denied that the hazards of this enterprise will be great.

COST WILL EXCEED ESTIMATES.

First. I feel confident that the construction of the canal will cost a great deal more than the amount fixed in this bill. Nearly every canal that has ever been constructed has cost a great deal more than the amount of the estimates.

It was estimated that the Panama Canal would not cost more than $120,000,000, and De Lesseps let a contract for the entire work for $102,000,000, but we know that it has cost the stockholders $256,000,000 up to this time, and not more than one-third of the same has been constructed. It is true that much of this money was squandered, but we must expect some losses from the same cause.

It was estimated that the Manchester Canal, of England, could be built for $47,750,098; but when all the bills were paid, it was found to cost $73,818,940.

It was estimated that the Suez Canal would cost only $40,000,000; but when completed, the amount was found to be $89,673,286.

It is more than likely that many difficulties unforeseen now will have to be met and that the cost will be far in excess of the estimates.

RETURNS WILL BE LESS THAN ESTIMATED.

Second. I am satisfied that the canal will not yield the revenue which is expected, and I am confident that it will not pay a fair return on the investment for many years to come.

The friends of this measure estimate that the amount of commerce which will pass through this canal each year will be between 6,000,000 tons 10,000,000 tons, while the opponents of the bill estimate that the amount of tonnage will not be more than 300,000 tons per annum. They are both wrong.

The total tonnage that now goes around the Horn and across the Isthmus is only 160,391 tons. The entire traffic of the long route is now conducted in sailing vessels. It is asserted that sailing vessels can not go by the Nicaragua route because of the lack of a sufficient breeze. Hence the canal can not get the traffic which now goes around the Horn, nor can it get the bulky cargoes, as they can not stand the toll charges.

Freight tonnage for canals has always proven disappointing when canals are first constructed. The estimate of tonnage for the Manchester Canal was 9,649,316 tons, while the actual tonnage was only 1,826,237. The estimated receipts were $8,174,659, while the actual receipts were $884,218, which was less than the operating expenses of the canal. Even the Suez Canal, with its great advantage of connecting important commercial nations without railroad competition, for the first decade of its operation did not pay.

The fact that New York is 181 miles and London 5,080 miles nearer Manila by the Suez Canal than by the Nicaragua route, together with the most excellent coaling facilities and the convenience of a sea-level canal, makes it almost certain that the Suez route will continue to retain nearly all the business it now controls.

The commerce to the Pacific coast, in my judgment, will be less than estimated. The transcontinental lines of railroad are bound to carry nearly all the freight from our eastern to our western coast. The year before the Union Pacific Railroad was built the freights carried by Panama was $70,202,029; in 1894 it was $3,317,582.

THE CANAL A MILITARY NECESSITY.

Notwithstanding the fact that the cost of construction is likely to be more than the amount of the estimates, and the receipts are likely to be much less than anticipated, yet from a military standpoint the importance of the canal to our nation is so great that I am in favor of building it at the expense of the Government, provided we retain the right to fortify the same.

It is the great advantage of the canal to our naval establishment which in my judgment warrants us in taking the risk of its financial success.

The value of our Navy, including the battle ships and cruisers now authorized and in course of construction, is about $300,000,000. To build this canal and fortify it is equivalent to doubling the strength and power of our Navy. The ability to concentrate all our vessels on the Atlantic or Pacific coast in less than half the time it will take the vessels of other nations to go around the Horn gives us an enormous advantage in military affairs, and one that will justify almost any expenditure to accomplish. But, sir, to give to other nations the same right to concentrate their fleets by going through our canal for the purpose of bombarding our cities would destroy all the military advantages we would gain by the construction of the same.

In fact, it would be better for our Navy if no canal existed, provided it be neutral, as the time consumed by the enemy in going by the long route would give us at least several months in which to fortify our Pacific coast cities, and when their fleets reached our Western shore their coal would be exhausted, and hence they would be in no condition to offer battle to even the few ships we keep in those waters.

THE CANAL CAN BE EASILY DEFENDED.

The contention that we could not successfully defend the canal in time of war is, it seems to me, preposterous. With the modern means of defense at each end of the canal we could defy with safety the largest fleet and most powerful battle ships in the world. The modern fortifications are not made of high walls and ramparts, which can be totally destroyed by 13-inch guns. They are sunk in the earth, with hardly any exposure for the shells of the enemy. It is almost impossible, by an attack from the sea, to destroy the modern works of defense. The use of the disappearing gun in fortifications diminishes by many times the chances of its being disabled in an engagement, while the high decks and exposed guns of the vessel seem to invite the explosion of destructive shells. The impenetrability of the modern fortification constitutes an enormous advantage over the vulnerability of the battle ship.

There has been a contest going on for years between the inventors of armor plate for ships and those of powerful projectiles. No sooner has an armor plate been discovered which seems to be impenetrable than a shell is invented which penetrates and shatters it with ease. The guns of a fortification can be heavier, of longer range, and of more certain sight than those used on a battle ship.

It is for these reasons that with powerful guns in fortifications a fleet can be totally annihilated before it can come within its own firing range.

Not only has a heavier disappearing gun on a firm foundation an advantage over the smaller exposed gun on a trembling vessel, but under the modern means of discharging torpedoes by electricity the entrance to a canal can be placed in such a perfect state of defense as to prevent a fleet from coming even within cannon range of the fortifications.

Mr. Edison, at the commencement of the Spanish-American war, said that by means of torpedoes which could be discharged from shore he could, in six weeks' time, make any harbor invulnerable to the attack of the enemy.

Of course it will take a considerable force in times of war to properly patrol the banks of the canal to prevent them from being blown up with dynamite, but that expense would only occur in time of war, and would not be a yearly charge for maintaining the canal.

If the canal were neutral and without such a patrol, would it be safe during war to send a battle ship through the same? How easy it would be for a sympathizer of the enemy to not only render the canal useless, but to also strand our battle ships as they pass through the same.

A neutral, unprotected canal in time of war would therefore be most dangerous for our own battle ships.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

But, sir, by far the greatest objection to agreeing to a neutral canal with any European power is that it violates a doctrine which has been maintained and held sacred by the people of this country ever since 1823.

It was in 1815, after the downfall of Napoleon, that an alliance was formed among some of the continental powers of Europe, by which they sought to perpetuate the principles of absolute monarchy as against the growing tendency for republican forms of government. In recognition of the idea of "the divine right of kings" this combination was termed the "Holy Alliance."

Spain was a party to that combination, and at a meeting of their diplomatic representatives held at Verona, Italy, in October, 1822, it was proposed that there be restored to Spain, as her colonies, the Spanish-American republics of South and Central America, which had asserted and established their independence. It was an alignment of powers in behalf of monarchies against republics, in behalf of oppression against liberty. As part compensation to France, one of the nations to the alliance for this proposed interference in the affairs of the Western Hemisphere, it was suggested that the princes of the restored Bourbons of France be placed over some of the Spanish-American empires.

It is a peculiar fact, but nevertheless true, that the suggestion of the announcement of the Monroe doctrine came from Great Britain. It did not come through love for us, but from an apprehension that France, at that time the deadly enemy of England, might become too powerful a rival, and that the assumption of power by France over the Spanish-American republics might endanger the trade which Great Britain had already established in Central and South America.

It was Mr. Canning, England's minister of foreign affairs, who asked Mr. Rush, our diplomatic representative at the Court of St. James, this question: "Are the great political and commercial interests which hang upon the destinies of the New World to be canvassed and adjusted in Europe without the cooperation or even the knowledge of the United States?" And he added that though Great Britain would throw no impediment in the way of an arrangement between the Spanish-American republics and the mother country by amicable negotiation, she "could not see any portion of them transferred to any other power with indifference." Mr. Rush immediately communicated this important matter to our Government.

John Quincy Adams, then Secretary of State, urged upon President Monroe the announcement of the doctrine which afterwards took the name of that President. Mr. Monroe doubted the wisdom of such a course, and wrote a letter to the great authority on political questions of his time, Mr. Jefferson, and received the following patriotic American reply:

> The question presented by the letters you have sent me is the most momentous which has ever been offered to my contemplation since that of independence. That made us a nation; this sets our compass and points the course which we are to steer through the ocean of time opening on us. And never could we embark upon it under circumstances more auspicious. Our first and fundamental maxim should be, never to entangle ourselves in the broils of Europe; our second, never to suffer Europe to intermeddle with cis-Atlantic affairs. America, North and South, has a set of interests different from those of Europe, and peculiarly her own. She should, therefore, have a system of her own, separate and apart from that of Europe. While the last is laboring to become the domicile of despotism, our endeavor should surely be to make our hemisphere that of freedom.

President Monroe was evidently greatly influenced by that letter, and by the attitude of Mr. Adams relative to the same question, and in his annual message to Congress on December 2, 1823, he announced the Monroe doctrine in the following terms:

> The occasion has been judged proper for asserting, as a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved, that the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European power. * * * We owe it therefore to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered, and shall not interfere. But with the governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as a manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

It is said that the foregoing part of the message was written by Mr. Adams.

The announcement of this policy elicited the greatest excitement in Europe, and received a most enthusiastic indorsement from the people of the United States.

Sir, it was an ultimatum to the monarchs of Europe in behalf of liberty and independence.

Sir, no Presidential message in the history of this Government has produced such far-reaching and beneficial results to the Republic as that of December 2, 1823. Truly has it been said that it was the second Declaration of Independence.

Although the doctrine enunciated therein has not been recognized by the powers of Europe as a principle of international law in express terms, yet it is nothing more than the same principle they all acknowledge in the doctrine of the balance of power, and it has in numerous instances been acknowledged by their conduct. France, in withdrawing its support to the claims of Maximilian to the crown of Mexico, and Great Britain, in consenting to arbitration of the Venezuelan boundary dispute, in answer to the demands of the United States, acquiesced in the clearest manner to this American doctrine.

OUR OWN SAFETY INVOLVED.

First. The principle of the Monroe doctrine is based, first, on the safety of our own Government. There is no power in North or South America that can endanger our national existence, even if it so desired. The rival powers are all located across the Atlantic Ocean. There is no danger from those powers as long as they have no footing on the Western Hemisphere. Hence our safety and self-protection dictate a policy which prevents them from obtaining paramountcy in any part of the New World.

The blessings which have flowed and must continue to flow from such a policy are inestimable. Instead of the constant disputes and wars which must arise between rival nations possessing contiguous or threatening territory, we are bound to have the blessings of almost universal peace.

Sir, the difference between the development of a country which has peace and one which has wars at frequent intervals is the difference between wealth and poverty, prosperity and depression.

To deplete the productive forces of a country at frequent intervals, in order to supply soldiers for war and for large standing armies, must, in a long series of years, affect most seriously the development of that county.

By adhering to this doctrine and confining our acquisitions of territory to this hemisphere, and to those only with the consent of the governed, we will not only have peace, but we will remove the necessity of a large standing army, which contiguous rival nations are compelled to maintain in order to insure peace.

The progress of a nation is, in the long run, determined by the amount that is levied upon its industries.

Its development is inversely in proportion to the amount of the taxes imposed.

In the nineteenth century there was expended by the nations of Europe in maintaining wars and standing armies more than $100,000,000,000. On account of the large military and naval establishments made necessary to preserve peace the taxes of Great Britain are 10 per cent: of France, 13 per cent, and of Germany, 10½ per cent of the earnings of their peoples. In the United States the taxes are only 5 per cent of the earnings of our people.

At the beginning of the century we possessed none of the accumulated wealth which made the European nations at that time powerful, and yet, by adhering to the policy enunciated by President Monroe, which insures peace and low taxation, we have built a nation which in wealth surpasses any one of our rivals and in productive power is equal to Great Britain, France, and Germany combined.

For our own safety and prosperity we can not be too careful in further scrupulously guarding the principles of the Monroe doctrine.

THE PRINCIPLE OF HUMAN RIGHTS INVOLVED.

Second. The second great result of the Monroe doctrine was its benefit to mankind. At the time it was announced republics other than the United States had not firm footing among the nations of the world.

They were scorned and ridiculed by all the monarchies. The Holy Alliance expected to extinguish all the republics of the Western World except the United States, and at one time it even intimated that it might assist Great Britain in restoring to her dominion the States of this Union.

Sir, that message called a halt to the movement of the European monarchies and assured the protection of our Government to the liberties of the people of North and South America.

It was an important step in the forward march of civilization and a great movement in behalf of human rights. It made the New World a refuge for the oppressed of every nation and the home of freedom and liberty.

The European nations have no use for republican institutions; and if the Monroe doctrine is modified or compromised, it will not be long until they get such a footing upon the Western World as not only to endanger the other republics, but to place in jeopardy the peace and existence of our own Government.

It is for these reasons that the building of the Nicaragua Canal under any arrangement with European nations would be weakening to our country and give them a continual excuse to question our conduct in the management of the same.

It forms the entangling alliance, against which we have been so solemnly and repeatedly warned by Washington, Jefferson, and other American statesmen.

Instead of such a course, the canal should be purely an American canal, guarded and fortified in such a way as to give to our Government the great advantage to which its location and independence is entitled.

Then why strike out the word "fortifications?" The Chairman of the committee having this bill in charge insists that we retain the right to fortify under the words to "protect the canal" in a previous section of the bill. It is possible that we may retain such a right, but why leave the matter in any doubt?

The effect of striking out the word "fortifications" is to either deceive other nations or deceive ourselves. Plain, open dealing with our own people and with other countries, in my judgment, requires the retention of that word.

It must be remembered that the right to "protect" the canal was stipulated in the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, and, at the same time, the right to fortify was expressly denied therein. The inquiry naturally arises, If we use the same word in this bill as was used in that treaty, do we not construe the word protect to have the same meaning intended for it by the parties to that treaty? The question would soon be raised by those who desire a neutral canal whether we could have a canal defended by our Government under the provisions of this bill. The only safe course is to retain the word "fortifications" in the measure.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman allow me a suggestion?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes, sir.

Mr. HEPBURN. Has the gentleman noticed that this word is used in connection with the direction made to the Secretary of War and that he has no diplomatic power whatever?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Nevertheless, the paragraph clearly expresses our intention to fortify the canal. It reads:

And the Secretary of War shall also construct such safe and commodious harbors at the termini of said canal and such fortifications for defense as will be required for the safety and protection of said canal and harbors.

I do not see where in the bill the right to "fortify" could be placed to give it clearer meaning. We have in the bill now a clear word, which expresses the intention of the committee and the chairman thereof, and we ought to let it stand.

Let the word "fortifications" remain, and we then will authorize by this bill the construction of an American canal for America's defense. [Applause.]

Late Representative Richard P. Bland.

REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES H. GROSVENOR,
OF OHIO,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Saturday, April 7, 1900.

The House having under consideration the following resolutions:

"*Resolved*, That the business of the House be now suspended in order that suitable tribute may be made to the high character and eminent public services of the Hon. RICHARD PARKS BLAND, late a most distinguished member of the House of Representatives of the United States from the State of Missouri.

"*Resolved*, That as a mark of respect for the memory of the deceased the House, at the conclusion of these memorial exercises, shall stand adjourned.

"*Resolved*, That the Clerk of the House transmit a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased statesman, and inform the Senate of the action of this body"—

Mr. GROSVENOR said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I made the acquaintance of the subject of these eulogies and I terminated my acquaintance with him in this Chamber. I had heard of him, as all persons in this country had who take an interest in politics. I knew something of his character, but nothing of his person, and therefore I came here and met an opponent, a prominent member of the political party to which I do not belong, and made the acquaintance which ripened, upon my part, into great admiration.

I recognized in Mr. BLAND a true type of the politician, and I put no qualifications to that term. There has been no man of prominence whose action has redounded to the honor and glory and greatness of this country who was not a politician under one or more definitions of that term. Following a suggestion that was made in the course of to-day, I am glad to have the opportunity to give my views upon that subject very briefly.

I know that the term "politician" in the United States, among the doctrinaires, and certain of the literary gentlemen of the country, is often and usually used as a term of reproach. I know of nothing in the United States appertaining to its greatness and glory that I would ask to retain, and I know of nothing in the United States that is of any value to the nation as an organized body that has not come to us as the achievement and handiwork of politicians. And there is not a man whose name is associated with the great history of our country and whose words are quoted when we come to discuss a great question who was not a politician.

George Washington was a politician in every true sense of the word. He not only belonged to a political party, but he and his associates were the creators of a political party; and even as early as the time of the adoption of the Constitution of the United States he showed the skill of a trained and practiced politician. Observe him, writing a letter to the governor of Massachusetts, and saying to him that if Massachusetts did not ratify the Constitution Virginia, he feared, would not; that Patrick Henry was sowing the seeds of discord throughout that State, and that the thing to do was to press forward upon that line in Massachusetts and secure the ratification of the Constitution there, and then he said he might be able, with the men who were helping him, the other politicians, to bring Virginia into line.

Madison was a politician, the father of the Democratic party, I believe. Jefferson was a politician, and those men who wrote the Constitution and who wrote the Declaration of Independence and who gave us the great start as a nation were all of them men of party creeds and party attachment and party fidelity.

Coming all along down the line the men who have built up this great structure of government, and to whom we refer, have been politicians. Even the great Chief Justice of the United States, whose decision has been so often referred to and so terribly mutilated and, I think, misunderstood in the debates upon this floor, was himself a member of a great political party, and worked as a friend and advocate of the principles of that party.

And I might come clear on down and name Lincoln and Grant and all the men who, following the war, by promotion of the scheme of one party, or the men who operated as the conservative influence on that majority, brought this country up to where it is now—upon the high plane of constitutional liberty—were all of them members of political parties and all of them operated through political organizations, and that is what first drew my attention to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, in whose honor we meet to-day.

RICHARD P. BLAND was a member of the Democratic party. He believed in that party, believed in its organization and principles. It may be that he did not concede the proposition that the Democratic party could never change, and it is likely that if he had been confronted with the suggestion that as to some of the dogmas which he advocated they were at variance with the early

teachings of the Democratic party he would have answered that that was but the necessary and natural evolution of party teaching, belief, and opinion. But he was a Democrat, and, while I think he had tolerance for others, he was a devoted friend of the Democratic party. He was opposed to sacrificing its principles to catch the support of the drifting particle of political matter that is constantly floating in the atmosphere of political organizations.

He was a strict party man. He never lost sight of what he believed to be the best interests of the country, as reflected through the best action of his political party. He may not have been an orator, but he had the power to stand upon this floor and answer the arguments that were made against him with a force and effectiveness that I have seldom heard in this Hall. It is not always the artful putting together of words and the smooth delivery of phrases that marks the orator. It is the man who can use the right word at the right time, in the right connection, and who carries convincing power into the hearts and consciences of those who hear him, who is the real orator and who affects the interests of the country.

And while I was strongly opposed to Mr. BLAND, there has never been on this floor since I have had the honor to be a member, now almost fourteen years, a man of whom I had greater fear, in his effect upon the position which I was occupying. It came from his sincerity in part. He was a good illustration of how weak is the most eloquent man if his words carry with them the suggestion of insincerity, and how powerful is the language of even a less cultured man if his words come from his own heart and belief and carry with them to the hearer the idea of absolute sincerity.

Now, I never could understand how that doctrine, so persistently advocated by Mr. BLAND, could fasten itself upon the mind of an intelligent man. I am not going to discuss the question here. I shall not come even quite as near it as did my distinguished friend from New York [Mr. CUMMINGS]; but I beg to say that to me it was the plainest proposition in the world that he was wrong, and yet I have sat and listened to him for half an hour or an hour, and many a time I got almost into the condition of the old fellow in the Scripture, excepting that the word "Christian" would not have fitted the situation and the word "Philistine" would; and I have often thought as I listened to him, "Almost thou persuadest me to get on the wrong side of this question."

He was a man of power. It came, doubtless, in large part from his thorough knowledge of his subject. I presume there was not a man in the United States who could stand a cross-examination by an expert upon the question of finance with the success that he could. There was no fact in history, there were no figures in statistics, there was nothing pertinent to the whole domain of financial consideration that he was not ready at all times to respond to.

Now, a great deal has been said about his personal characteristics by gentlemen who knew him far better than I did, but there was one thing particularly which I liked about him, and that was his ever readiness to give and take. No matter how strongly his opponent struck at him, no matter how directly and fiercely, it made no sort of difference to him. He heard it with the same placidity that he would have heard a commendation of his argument; but when he came to reply it was entirely apparent that he had appreciated the full force of the attack and was entirely and wholly ready to answer. He did more—and here is a curious ground for me to occupy—he did more to impress the people of the United States favorably upon the great question that he advocated so long and so persistently, in my judgment, than any other man or any other ten men in the United States.

His name had been attached to the Bland-Allison Act of 1878, which gave to us this dollar which we are coining in such large quantities to-day, and in that way had impressed upon the people of the country that he was the real champion of this condition of silver coinage and of other conditions which might grow out of the position which he occupied; and he did more to educate up to that standard than any other man, in my judgment, in the country. Whether he could have carried the banner of that temporarily lost cause, at least, as gallantly and as dangerously to us and as near successfully as did that champion of 1896, I can not say; but I have no doubt had he been the champion of 1896, with his calm educational argument to the people, that to-day, if he were living, he would be the most formidable champion of that cause in the whole country.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is something after a man's death for his friends to realize that he has been talked about in the American Congress as we have heard Mr. BLAND talked about here this afternoon. These eulogies have not been perfunctory. These eulogies are not the ordinary article that we have listened to. They are important in that they have come freighted and fragrant with the love and knowledge and eloquence of the men who knew BLAND, and who had a field in which they could well expend their very best efforts and not reach the high ground of glory that attaches to the name of this statesman, this politician, this good citizen, this honest man.

When the Democratic party assembled in convention at Chicago in 1896, handicapped as it was by the presence of Populist influence—an influence which, in my judgment, has hitherto for many years been the substantial ruin of the Democratic party and will continue, in my judgment, to be so—Mr. BLAND was recognized, through this country and throughout Europe among the reading people, as the true type and exponent of the doctrine of free and unlimited coinage of silver. No other man had acquired a standing comparable to his, and, entering as we were upon that issue, the average American citizen would have as quickly thought of the play of Hamlet minus the somber Dane as a Democratic nomination for President with RICHARD P. BLAND left out as a candidate. But he was a modest man. He did not push himself. He would not go to Chicago to play in the galleries or on the floor or through the ever-ready newspaper for a nomination which he considered his own by right of having constructed and builded it, and which everybody else understood was his.

But there are currents and tides and cyclones and simooms in politics that sweep away the acquirements of years of hard and faithful study and long and persistent devotion to principle, and like a breath it is gone. I did not stand in such a relation to Mr. BLAND as would justify me in speaking of whether or not he felt the blow that he received at Chicago keenly, or whether or not it made no impression upon him I can not say. That he had a right to have felt that blow keenly no one will deny. That he was too good a politician, too faithful a party man, too modest a citizen, too upright a gentleman to manifest or to complain about it is probably true. What the effect was upon him in his own person I can not say, but I can say this, that it brought to him a strong feeling of sympathy throughout the country and largely among men who did not belong to his political party.

It is true that it is never the proper business of men of one party to sympathize with the misfortunes or hard treatment bestowed upon others by men of other parties, but, all the same, the intelligent man thinks and even thinks about things that are none of his business.

I believe there was no man in the United States who so thoroughly understood the questions involved in free coinage at 16 to 1 as did BLAND. I believe that no man was quite so sincere in his advocacy as was BLAND. I believe that no man suffered more disappointment than did he when the campaign of 1896 failed; and if he could have looked forward and could have seen in the future that this great idea for which he had spent the greater portion of a great lifetime had reached its culmination in 1896; that that defeat was a final defeat, and that that overthrow was a final overthrow; who can say what its effect may have been upon a sensitive, honest, upright, sincere man? I can not, Mr. Speaker, nor can you. That he died while the fruition for which he had labored so long, so bravely, so incessantly was yet not reached is a fact.

Not like Moses was he even allowed to stand upon the mountain top and view the culmination of his hopes and efforts. He may have died in hope or he may have died in despair of the ultimate triumph of the great principle for which he had battled, but all the same he had fought a good fight, he had kept the faith, and amid disaster he had upheld the banner and was entitled to the plaudit in all time from the men who stood with him, "Well done, good and faithful servant."

Oh, strong soul, by what shore
Tarriest thou now? For that force
Surely has not been left vain;
Somewhere, surely, afar,
In the sounding labor house vast
Of being, is practiced that strength,
Zealous, beneficent, firm;
Yes, in some far-shining sphere,
Conscious or not of the past,
Still thou performest the word
Of the Spirit in whom thou dost live,
Prompt, unwearied as here;
* * * This was thy work,
This was thy life, upon earth.

Late Representative Richard P. Bland.

ADDRESS OF FATHER J. F. WOOD,

SUBMITTED BY THE

HON. DAVID A. DE ARMOND,

OF MISSOURI,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, May 7, 1900.

The House of Representatives having under consideration the following resolutions:

"*Resolved*, That the business of the House be now suspended in order that suitable tribute may be paid to the high character and eminent public services of the Hon. RICHARD PARKS BLAND, late a most distinguished member of the House of Representatives of the United States from the State of Missouri.

"*Resolved*, That as a mark of respect for the memory of the deceased the House, at the conclusion of these memorial exercises, shall stand adjourned.

"*Resolved*, That the Clerk of the House transmit a copy of these resolutions

to the family of the deceased statesman, and inform the Senate of the action of this body"—

Mr. DE ARMOND submitted the following address, which was delivered by Father J. F. Wood at the grave of Mr. BLAND:

My dear friends, we are assembled here to-day to pay our last sad tribute to one who is no more, but who during life endeared himself to us by his simplicity, humility, and honesty.

When years shall have rolled down the avenue of time and passed into oblivion the name and deeds of Hon. RICHARD PARKS BLAND will adorn the pages of history, and will occupy a place with Washington, Jefferson, and Webster, and other great statesmen. Although gone to his reward, his deeds live after him. As a statesman he had few if any superiors. He seemed to be always right. I believe if it were possible for him to return to life that he would not reverse a single vote he ever cast on any great measure.

I am not here to-day in my official capacity. This I very much regret. But as an admirer of this great and good man, and to extend to the family my sympathy in their sad bereavement, I will remind you that death is but a messenger that comes to conduct us to our future home beyond the clouds. Are we sad at his coming? Will we go to heaven reluctantly? Must we be brought there by force? And will we approach the abode of our eternal reward in tears and lamentation?

Perhaps, my dear friends, you will say, "I would be most willing to die if I knew for certain that I would go to heaven."

Let me ask what causes you to doubt, what takes away your hope? What would cause you an unhappy death? You say, "The sins I have committed." You answer rightly, for Royal Prophet says, "The death of the sinner will be most terrible." What foolishness! If the lots determining a good or a bad death were drawn from a covered urn, then you would have reason to fear and tremble. But this is not the case; the lots are open before your eyes. You know the lot of sin, and that eternal death awaits it, but you also know that the lot of penance will insure you a happy death.

Do you hesitate which to choose? Look above. So many saints in heaven were as great sinners as you, but they became, by penance, as great saints as they were sinners. If you have in the past followed them in the path of sin, follow them now in the path of penance. Why, then, should we weep and lament when we know that we will be again united with those who have gone before us, never more to be separated from those we have loved on earth? Therefore let us hope and pray that the Almighty may in His infinite mercy forgive whatever imperfection the deceased may have been guilty of.

Free Homes.

SPEECH
OF
HON. ROBERT J. GAMBLE,
OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, May 3, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 996) providing for free homesteads on the public land for actual and bona fide settlers, and reserving the public lands for that purpose—

Mr. GAMBLE said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I shall endeavor not to trespass too much upon the patience of the House in the discussion of the pending measure. Its main features have been fully explained by the gentlemen who have preceded me. I remember well in the Fifty-fourth Congress this measure, as far as the principle is involved, was fully discussed in what was then known as the Oklahoma bill. It has been repeatedly stated here to-day, and denied by no one, that each of the great political parties, in their national platforms in 1896, with practically this identical measure before them, indorsed the provisions of this law and are thus committed to its enactment. I read their respective declarations as follows:

Republican: Homesteads.—We believe in an immediate return to the free-homestead policy of the Republican party, and urge the passage by Congress of the satisfactory free-homestead measure which has already passed the House and is now pending in the Senate.

Democratic: The Democratic party believes in home rule, and that all public lands of the United States should be appropriated to the establishment of free homes to the American citizens.

Populist: We demand that bona fide settlers on all public lands be granted free homes, as provided in the national homestead law; and that no exception be made in the case of the Indian reservations when opened for settlement, and that all lands not now patented come under this demand.

Two years ago it came up for consideration in the House as an amendment on the Indian appropriation bill, and was then resisted largely because by the judgment of the House it was thought it imperiled the standing and support of the agricultural colleges and experiment stations. An amendment proposed here, and now pending, is advocated and urged by the representatives of these institutions, which places their income upon a certain and sure foundation and in no sense contingent upon the amount received annually from the sale of public lands.

Mr. Chairman, appropriations have been made year after year for these institutions and recommended in the Book of Estimates, without any consideration whatever as to the amount of money received from the sale of public lands. In different years the net amount received from the sale of public lands has been insufficient to support the agricultural colleges. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that from the report of the Secretary of the Interior for the last year, it is disclosed that after paying the expenses of maintaining the General Land Office and the United States land offices throughout the country, there would be left little more than sufficient to support the agricultural colleges and experiment stations. During many years the amount received has been largely inadequate. Year after year it has been appropriated directly from the Federal Treasury without regard to the amount received from the sale of public lands.

The amount received from the sale of public lands during the last fiscal year is largely in excess of what has been received from that source for a number of years preceding. The surplus left to go into the Federal Treasury the past year was comparatively small after paying the expenses of administration and the amount provided by existing law for the support of agricultural colleges.

Total cash receipts from sale of public lands for the year ending June 30, 1899		$2,594,690
Disbursements for support of agricultural colleges for year ending June 30, 1899	$1,152,000	
Disbursements for maintaining United States land offices for year ending June 30, 1899	661,402	
Disbursements for maintaining General Land Office for year ending June 20, 1899	525,160	
		2,338,562
Balance		256,128

The receipts from the sale of public lands are gradually growing less each year. The support of these important institutions should not be contingent upon the amount of revenue derived from this particular source. The following table shows the receipts for the respective years from the sale of public lands from 1881 to 1897:

Year.	Amount.	Year.	Amount.
1881	$5,408,000	1890	$7,470,000
1882	8,394,000	1891	5,105,000
1883	11,088,000	1892	4,387,000
1884	11,840,000	1893	4,479,000
1885	7,486,000	1894	2,674,000
1886	7,412,000	1895	1,866,000
1887	10,783,000	1896	1,847,000
1888	12,701,000	1897	1,596,000
1889	9,270,000		

I am gratified, Mr. Chairman, at the sentiment displayed by the House to-day in the discussion of the pending measure. Its membership has risen above partisanship and has been willing to treat the questions involved fairly and upon their merits. We mean to ask only for justice and for fair treatment to the settlers upon the reservations in question. Let us repudiate the mistaken and unjust policy inaugurated in 1890 and go back to the original law of 1862, and why should we not do so? A law that brought such blessings, such happiness, such development into the great West. It is idle for me to discuss the beneficent provisions of that law, not only to the West, and to the marvelous growth and development it brought to that region and the great wealth it produced which has flowed into the lap of the East and of every section of this country to make it strong and powerful and great.

The census of 1890 shows the public-land States and Territories to have a population and wealth, real and personal, as follows:

State or Territory.	Population.	Wealth.
Michigan	2,093,889	$2,095,016,272
Wisconsin	1,686,880	1,833,308,523
Minnesota	1,301,826	1,695,831,927
Iowa	1,911,896	2,287,348,333
Missouri	2,679,184	2,307,902,945
North Dakota	182,719	237,006,506
South Dakota	328,808	425,141,299
Nebraska	1,058,910	1,275,685,514
Kansas	1,427,096	1,799,343,501
Alabama	1,513,017	622,773,504
Mississippi	1,289,600	454,242,688
Louisiana	1,118,587	495,306,597
Oklahoma	61,834	48,285,124
Arkansas	1,128,179	455,147,422
Indian Territory		150,765,462
Florida	391,422	389,489,588
Montana	132,159	453,135,209
Wyoming	60,705	169,773,710
Colorado	412,198	1,145,712,267
New Mexico	153,593	231,459,897
Arizona	59,620	188,880,976
Utah	207,905	349,411,234
Nevada	45,761	180,323,608
Idaho	84,385	207,836,591
Washington	349,390	760,698,726
Oregon	313,767	590,396,194
California	1,208,130	2,533,733,627
Total	21,198,000	23,583,339,104

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we ought to go back to first principles and reinaugurate the policy that wrought such marvelous results. We ought to repeal the vicious and unfair policy adopted in 1890. Many of the reservations are situated in the semiarid regions of the West. Prior to the settlement upon these reservations practically all the desirable lands had been occupied, and the settler was obliged, if a home was to be secured, to assume the risk of settling upon these reservations under the adverse conditions imposed by the Government. Under the old law settlement and cultivation were deemed a sufficient consideration, but under

the law of 1890 there was added the additional burden of payment. The acts of Congress, repeatedly passed, extending the time of payment is a sufficient warrant to assert that this provision was unfair and that the settler was unable to meet the hardships of the situation.

Why should not the poor settlers who have gone upon these reservations, made their homes there and occupied and improved them, be placed on an equality with the settlers in Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska, and in the balance of my own State, where they received their lands from the Government, under the law of 1862, without money and without price?

I have here a map prepared by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, showing the allotments upon the Sisseton Reservation in my State. This map makes substantially the same showing as that made by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FLYNN]. The brown shading on the diagram shows the allotments taken by the Indians. All the better lands were appropriated by them. The undesirable lands were left for the settlers who might go there. These allotments taken by the Indians are exempted from taxation for a period of twenty-five years. The settlers who go on the reservation must make their selections from the remaining portions of these lands, and are obliged to bear all the burdens of local taxation. It is incumbent on them to build schoolhouses and support and maintain schools, to build highways and bridges, to build court-houses and jails, and maintain all the expenses of local government. The Indians assume none of these burdens and pay nothing in their support.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, the obligations of the Government are such that the Indians are its wards. All these burdens ought not to be imposed upon the poor settler, the Government relieving itself practically from any obligation. If the settler assumes these responsibilities in behalf of the Government in carrying out its policy toward the Indians, it at least should not insist upon payment for the land in addition to the exacting burdens of the settler.

I might make the same statement, substantially, in regard to the Yankton Reservation, in my own State. What I have said as to the Sisseton is still further accentuated in the case of the Great Sioux Reservation. I submit the following communication from the Commissioner of the General Land Office for the information it affords as to the condition on these reservations, respectively:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, GENERAL LAND OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., January 24, 1900.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of January 17, 1900, requesting the following information relative to what was formerly the Great Sioux Indian Reservation, in South Dakota, which was opened to settlement under proclamation of the President on February 10, 1890:

1. The number of acres in the reservation opened to settlement.
2. The number of filings that have been made thereon by settlers. In this I would not care to have included, if the record will show, where filings have been made more than once upon the same tract.
3. The number of filings canceled.
4. The number of cancellations recommended, or pending and undisposed of.
5. The number of final proofs made and paid for. Under this head would be pleased to have disclosed, if the record shows, the number of final proofs made at $1.25 per acre, at 75 cents, and at 50 cents per acre.
6. The total amount of money paid into the Treasury on account of final proofs made.
7. How often Congress has extended the time for making final proof and payment to the settlers on this reservation.
8. The number of filings uncanceled or recommended for cancellation, and how soon the same will have completed their term of residence and be ready for proof.

You state that you would also be pleased to receive the same information as above indicated separately as to the Sisseton and Wahpeton and the Yankton reservations, both in the State of South Dakota, and that you also desire a map indicating the tracts filed upon and now occupied in each of said reservations. You state that you desire the information for use before the Committee on Public Lands.

In reply I have to advise you as follows:

GREAT SIOUX RESERVATION.

1. There were 8,550,938 acres in said reservation opened to settlement and entry under section 21, act of March 2, 1889 (25 Stat., 888). This includes lands in the States of South Dakota, North Dakota, and Nebraska. The figures are not kept separately by States in this office.
2. There have been 4,633 homestead entries made for lands in the Great Sioux Reservation in South Dakota. In order to eliminate the number of plural entries for the same tract of land, an examination of all the tract books for these lands would be required, which it is impracticable to make.
3. The number of these entries canceled, 1,607.
4. About 125 entries are pending on reports recommending cancellation.
5. Number of cases in which final proof and payment have been made, 545. It can not be ascertained, except by considerable labor, the price paid per acre in these cases.
6. Total amount paid into Treasury to December 31, 1899, $98,910.43.

Under section 2291, Revised Statutes, a homestead entryman was required to submit final proof within seven years from date of his entry; the act of July 26, 1894 (28 Stat., 123), extended this time for one year in all cases where the entry was existing at the date of said act. The acts of June 10, 1896 (29 Stat., 342), and June 7, 1897 (30 Stat., 87), each extended for one year the time within which to make the required payments by entrymen of ceded Indian lands, and as proof and payment must be made at the same time, an extension of time for making payment involves a corresponding time within which to make final proof. In addition the act of February 26, 1896 (29 Stat., 16), extended for one year the time for making final proof and payment for all lands located under the homestead laws in any former Indian reservation in South Dakota. A party who made a homestead entry of ceded Indian land in South Dakota prior to July 26, 1894, is allowed eleven years from date of entry within which to submit proof and make payment.

7. The number of entries, on which proof and payment have not been made, or which have not been canceled, or reported for cancellation, is 2,356. This office is unable to advise you how soon the entrymen will have completed their term of residence and be ready for proof.

SISSETON AND WAHPETON LANDS.

1. Opened to settlement under act of March 3, 1891 (26 Stat., 1039), 573,882 acres, in North and South Dakota, of which it is estimated about 57,000 are located in North Dakota.
2. Total number of entries made in said reservation to January 1, 1898, 4,481. This includes entries for lands in both North and South Dakota, but the most of them are for lands in South Dakota. The moneys derived from the sale of these lands goes to reimburse the Government for moneys paid the Indians, and the series of entries is the same as other public lands. To ascertain the number of entries to date, exclusive of plural entries for the same tract, would require a careful examination of the tract books for all these lands, which would involve considerable labor and time.
3. For the same reason as stated under 2, it is impracticable to give the number of canceled entries.
4. Few of these entries are pending on reports recommending cancellation. I am unable to give you more definite information.
5. Number of entries on which proof and payment have been made to September 30, 1899, 183.
6. Total amount paid into Treasury to September 30, 1899, $55,961.34.
7. See answer to No. 7 under Great Sioux lands.
8. It is impracticable to give figures showing uncanceled entries, or entries not recommended for cancellation.

YANKTON SIOUX LANDS.

1. Number of acres thrown open to settlement under act of August 15, 1894 (28 Stat., 314), 151,692.
2. Number of entries to September 30, 1899, 1,240. It is impracticable, for reasons given above under No. 2, Sisseton and Wahpeton lands, to eliminate the number of plural entries for the same land.
3. The moneys derived from the sale of these lands are for the purpose of reimbursing the Government for moneys paid the Indians. The lands are entered under the public-land series, and the number of canceled entries can not be ascertained except by a careful examination of the tract books.
4. Definite information can not be given, but few of these entries are pending for cancellation.
5. Number of entries on which proof and payment have been made up to September 30, 1899, 98.
6. Amount paid into Treasury to September 30, 1899, $112,161.45.
7. See answer to No. 7 under Great Sioux Reservation.
8. For reasons given above, definite information as to uncanceled entries can not be given.

This office does not have maps showing the lands in said reservations which are appropriated. To prepare such maps would require the expenditure of a vast amount of time and labor, which would greatly retard the public business.

Very respectfully, BINGER HERMANN, *Commissioner.*

Hon. ROBERT J. GAMBLE,
House of Representatives.

It is urged in the report submitted by the Interior Department that if this bill should pass there will be a relinquishment to the Government on the Great Sioux Reservation of something more than $4,000,000. According to the communication just submitted from the Commissioner, only 5 per cent of those lands have been settled upon, although they have been open to settlement for more than ten years.

The Government in 1889 entered into a treaty with the Sioux Nation of Indians, agreeing through the settlers to pay the Indians $1.25 an acre for all lands settled upon within three years from the taking effect of the act, 75 cents per acre for those lands taken up in the two years following, and 50 cents an acre for those taken up during the five years succeeding. At the expiration of ten years the Government was to pay the Indians 50 cents per acre for all the lands undisposed of. The foregoing treaty and act of Congress were made operative by proclamation of the President on the 10th of February, 1890.

The Government now owes the Sioux Indians something like $4,000,000 for that part of the reservation undisposed of. But, Mr. Chairman, although this reservation has been opened for ten years, a very limited amount of the lands has been taken under the onerous burdens imposed. The land is largely of such a character that settlement and occupation under the statute of 1862 ought to be sufficient to entitle the settler to the land instead of compelling him in addition to pay $1.25, or 75 cents, or 50 cents an acre.

The Great Sioux Reservation contains 8,550,938 acres. It was opened to settlement February 10, 1890. From the foregoing report of the Commissioner of the General Land Office, only 4,633 entries have been made. Of these, 1,607 have been canceled, and 125 additional have been recommended for cancellation, leaving practically 2,901 in force, or upon which final proof has been made.

Final proof has been made on 545 entries, representing 87,200 acres. Number of entries in force, 2,356, representing 376,960 acres. Total acres on entries in force or upon which final proof has been made, 464,160.

It will thus be seen that only 5 per cent of the lands upon the reservation has been filed upon, leaving 8,086,778 acres for which the Government must settle with the Indians at 50 cents per acre, Practically only 1 per cent of the reservation has been paid for. The total amount paid into the Treasury from lands upon which final proof has been made is $98,910.43. The amount of land filed upon and upon which final proof has not been made, if paid for at 50 cents per acre, would amount to $188,480.

The reservation having been open to settlement for ten years, I assume few additional entries would be made under existing conditions. Computing the amount due upon the filings still in force at $188,480, and deducting from this sum the amount already received by the Government, $98,910.43, the passage of the pending measure would only mean a direct loss to the Treasury of $89,569.57. The facts as they actually exist on this particular

reservation stand in striking contrast to the table prepared in the report submitted by the Interior Department, in which it is claimed the loss to the Government would be $4,616,140.

The same condition exists on the Sisseton Reservation, though not to such an exaggerated extent as on the Great Sioux. This reservation was opened to settlement March 3, 1891, at $2.50 per acre. It embraces 573,882 acres. I am informed there are 28,000 acres upon which no filings have been made. The report shows there have been 4,481 filings, representing 160 acres in each tract. Unless filings have been duplicated upon the same tracts, there could not have been exceeding 3,412. This would indicate there was nearly one-third of this reservation either unoccupied or upon which the filings since the opening of the reservation had been canceled and other filings made upon the same tracts. The amount paid upon final proof on this reservation is $65,961.37.

The Yankton Reservation contains 151,692. It was opened to settlement August 15, 1894, at $3.75 per acre. It is reported to me there are about 25,000 acres upon this reservation upon which no filings have been made. The report of the Commissioner shows there have been 1,240 filings made at the Land Office. Unless filings were duplicated upon the same tracts, there could not have been made more than 792. This would show that upward of 50 per cent of this reservation had not been occupied or was subject to changing occupants upon the same tracts. The amount paid into the Treasury by the settlers upon this reservation is $112,161.45.

In the report made by the Interior Department, opposing this measure, it is claimed the loss to the Government on the reservations in South Dakota in case the bill passed would be as follows:

Great Sioux Reservation	$4,616,140
Sisseton Reservation	1,400,000
Yankton Reservation	500,300
Total	6,516,440

Under the facts, however, as they actually exist, the loss to the Government, as shown by the foregoing report, would be much less. I submit the following statement, and I believe it is eminently fair and gives full credit for all lands on the Sisseton and Yankton reservations:

Great Sioux Reservation		$80,509.57
Sisseton Reservation	$1,400,000.00	
Less amount already paid	66,000.00	
		1,334,000.00
Yankton Reservation	500,300.00	
Less amount already paid	112,160.00	
		338,140.00
Total		1,761,709.00

I am free to state there is much interest in my own State in the passage of the pending measure. We believe it is just, fair, and equitable. We insist that the settlers upon these reservations be placed on an equality with their neighbors in my own and adjoining States. The Government never before insisted upon the settlers paying the amount required to extinguish the Indian title. The Government has made large outlays in the purchase of lands and in the administration of its Land Department. As an investment simply the Government has been the loser. Whether the Government paid much or little, the principle is the same. Mr. LACEY, in his valuable report on substantially the same bill, then pending in the Fifty-fourth Congress, makes the following statement:

The entire public domain up to 1880 had cost $88,157,389.98, or 4.7 cents per acre.

Up to 1880 the Government had sold or disposed of land to the amount in value of $300,702,849.11. This included extensive grants to the new States for school and other purposes. The average amount realized per acre, including these grants for public purposes, was 36⅞ cents.

After charging up all the expenses of surveys, Indians, cost of administration, etc., the Government, on June 30, 1880, lacked $121,346,746.85 of having been fully reimbursed; its total outlays up to that time being $322,049,595.96.

The total actual cost, after adding those expenses, was 17¼ cents per acre.

As indicating the interest of the people of my State, I submit the following memorial, passed by the legislature at its session in 1899:

A joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States for the passage of a free-homestead law.

Be it resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), The legislature of the State of South Dakota respectfully and earnestly petition and memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact a law granting to all settlers, under the homestead laws of the United States, upon the public lands acquired by treaty or agreement from any of the Indian tribes, who have or shall hereafter reside upon the same in good faith for the period required by existing law, a patent for the same, upon the payment to the local land officers of the usual and customary fees, and without any other charge or payment whatsoever.

We believe the proposed legislation to be wise, just, and equitable, not only to the settlers, the sections immediately interested, but also to the nation at large. It is the concurrent judgment of the several political parties as expressed in their last national platforms. No good or sufficient reason has been shown why the pronounced policy of the Government for more than a generation should be reversed and an excessive hardship and burden imposed upon the later settlers.

The greater portion of our national domain was purchased at varying prices by the General Government, and the lands made largely subject to the homestead law; great States and Territories were speedily peopled and marvelously developed under its munificent influence and inspiration. A policy that added so extensively to the development of so vast a region should not be abandoned without substantial reasons. The result, both in population and in the accumulation of such vast wealth, in the regions benefited is a constant source of strength and revenue to the whole nation.

The settlers upon these lands are entitled to the same consideration that the Government has shown to all its other settlers upon the public domain. There is no just reason why the law should place a mortgage upon these particular lands sufficient to reimburse the Government for its outlay in extinguishing the Indian title.

If this is the correct and just policy, then the original homestead law can not be justified, for the Government was compelled to pay, more or less, for all its public domain. Neither can the existing law be justified upon the ground that the relinquishment of the payment of the price required by the settlers would involve a loss to the Government. As an investor in land, considered solely for the immediate money return, the nation has always been a loser. In the year 1880 it lacked upward of $120,000,000 of being reimbursed for its outlays on the public lands and their management and disposition.

The Indians are the wards of the Government. It can not renounce its obligations toward them. It is unjust to transpose this duty by law and fix it largely upon the unfortunate settler and compel him to pay for that which has heretofore been taken from the General Treasury. The settler without payment for the land, is called upon to bear unnatural burdens and to assume unusual responsibilities. The most desirable lands on these reservations were selected and awarded to the Indians under their allotments. The settlers, in most cases, were obliged to take undesirable tracts and are compelled to mingle with this foreign and largely helpless race. Local conditions in many of these new localities are crude, and all the machinery of the community must be put into operation. The settlers are forced largely to assume the responsibility in behalf of the Government as its civilizing agents. It is incumbent upon them to organize the local governments and bear practically all its burdens.

The lands allotted to the Indians are made absolutely exempt from taxation for a period of twenty-five years. The Indians, by act of the Government, are admitted to full citizenship, and they exercise this right without sharing practically any responsibility whatever. Highways are to be laid out, bridges constructed, schoolhouses erected, the schools maintained, outlays for county buildings have to be made, courts maintained, and court and county officers paid, with all the necessary adjuncts of a proper and safely regulated community. To bear these responsibilities in behalf of the Indians, who are alone the especial wards of the Government, would be far more than sufficient to compensate the United States for the free gift of the lands.

These responsibilities must necessarily be assumed by the settler if the Indian is to be made a safe and reliable citizen of the community and State. Some consideration should be shown by the Government to the hardy pioneers who have and now are undergoing great privations in the developing and upbuilding of the newer regions and cooperating and aiding in the solution of the Indian problem. The free gift of a homestead is but a pittance in return for the service that is directly rendered by the settlers to the General Government.

That the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to the President of the Senate.

And your memorialists will ever pray.

In addition to what I have already stated, I might further add that the people of South Dakota do not feel they were fairly treated by Congress in relation to the admission of the State into the Union. I suggest this as a matter for equitable consideration in the discussion of the pending measure as applied to the reservations within South Dakota. They feel they met all the conditions relative to admission at least nine years before they were permitted to exercise the powers of a sovereign State. They repeatedly petitioned for admission, but without moving Congress to action. The census of 1880 shows that part of the territory of Dakota now embraced within the limits of South Dakota had 98,288 population. Many of the States were admitted with a much less population. Of right she was entitled to admission. It was, however, denied her, and she was not admitted until November 2, 1889.

During these years the larger part of the public lands within the prospective State was disposed of by the Federal Government. Had the State been admitted, 5 per cent of the amount of the moneys so received would have been paid to the State. By denying the State admission this large sum was lost to her treasury. The amount received from the sale of public lands in the Territory of Dakota, within the limits of the State of South Dakota, from July 1, 1879, to November 1, 1889, was $10,258,237.26. Five per cent of this sum would have given the State $512,911.86. Whether the State will ever be able to secure this sum is problematical.

Although justly and equitably entitled to the money, it will require great patience and labor to secure legislation to that purpose. Although the State has been admitted to the Union for more than ten years, the amount received from the sale of public lands within the State from November 2, 1889, to June 30, 1899, is only $1,114,603.70. Where the State is entitled to 5 per cent on the foregoing sum, amounting to $55,730.18, she ought to have received $568,000.

I submit a communication and statements from the Commissioner of the General Land Office in support of the foregoing figures:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, GENERAL LAND OFFICE.
Washington, D. C., February 8, 1900.

SIR: In response to your letter of 6th instant I herewith inclose statement of the total cash receipts from sales of public and Indian lands in the State of South Dakota from November 2, 1889, to June 30, 1899; also statements showing the total cash receipts by fiscal years arising from sales of public and Indian lands from July 1, 1879, to November 2, 1889, at the several local land offices established prior to the admission of the State into the Union and which were subsequently included within the limits of said State of South Dakota.

Very respectfully,

BINGER HERMANN,
Commissioner.

Hon. ROBERT J. GAMBLE,
House of Representatives.

Statement showing the amount of money received during each fiscal year from the sale of public land lying within that part of the Territory of Dakota, now comprising the State of South Dakota, from July 1, 1879, to November 1, 1889, inclusive, at the following-named land offices.

Fiscal year.	Sioux Falls.	Springfield.	Deadwood.	Watertown. a	Yankton.
1880	$47,154.79	$5,249.00	$3,841.30	$5,248.76	$10,407.46
1881	.....	.....	13,309.38	82,943.44	56,275.17
1882	.....	.....	26,102.53	210,997.12	90,745.99
1883	.....	.....	39,883.72	253,909.80	108,275.66
1884	.....	.....	46,362.14	228,723.33	115,653.79
1885	.....	.....	88,050.86	123,877.18	92,243.91
1886	.....	.....	104,183.10	151,120.76	50,107.52
1887	.....	.....	60,535.97	134,765.26	31,814.29
1888	.....	.....	36,146.42	81,401.32	20,358.27
1889	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
July 1 to Nov. 1, 1889	.....	.....	.....	19,647.52	4,927.60
Total	47,154.79	5,249.00	458,495.48	1,740,068.06	750,194.37

Fiscal year.	Mitchell. b	Aberdeen. c	Huron. d	Rapid City. e	Total cash receipts, by fiscal years, public lands.
1880	.....	.....	.....	.....	$71,901.31
1881	$277,482.58	.....	.....	.....	430,010.57
1882	404,661.95	.....	.....	.....	732,507.59
1883	466,900.47	$298,453.87	$901,019.29	.....	1,768,451.81
1884	469,265.28	485,090.26	1,160,554.54	.....	2,771,748.42
1885	251,962.15	279,242.04	670,099.08	.....	1,592,042.53
1886	117,763.67	187,460.02	229,859.53	.....	839,255.16
1887	99,441.98	226,551.44	246,796.63	.....	878,205.43
1888	60,996.13	149,554.36	133,941.92	.....	571,607.93
1889	53,468.39	74,985.46	52,649.21	$33,624.64	332,533.71
July 1 to Nov. 1, 1889	12,970.61	36,882.85	17,600.24	32,442.43	124,531.25
Total	2,194,922.21	1,738,000.30	3,112,582.43	66,067.07	10,112,793.71

a Opened May 1, 1880.
b Opened January 3, 1882.
c Opened October 2, 1882.
d Opened October 9, 1882.
e Opened January 15, 1889.

Statement of moneys received from sales of land embraced within the Sioux Indian Reservation in that part of the Territory of Dakota now comprising the State of South Dakota from July 1, 1879, to November 1, 1889, under act March 3, 1863.

Fiscal year.	Office.	Total receipts from sale of Sioux Indian lands.
1880	Watertown	$1,180.00
1881	do	45,481.41
1882	do	34,328.57
1883	do	No sale.
1884	do	No sale.
1885	do	963.32
1886	do	51,117.97
1887	do	9,734.43
1888	do	1,347.98
1889	do	865.01
July 1 to Nov. 1, 1889	do	484.86
Total	.....	145,443.55

Public lands	$10,112,793.71
Sioux Indian lands	145,443.55
Total receipts from sales of public and Indian lands from July 1, 1880, to November 1, 1889	10,258,237.26

GENERAL LAND OFFICE, *February 8, 1900.*

Statement showing the total cash receipts from the sale of public and Indian lands in the State of South Dakota from November 2, 1889, to June 30, 1899.

Fiscal year.	Public land.	Sioux Indian lands.		
		Under act Mar. 3, 1863.	Under act Mar. 2, 1880.	Total from sales of Sioux lands.
Nov. 2, 1889, to June 30, 1890	$181,081.16	$1,376.90	$253.65	$1,630.55
1891	150,154.39	1,517.50	168.68	1,686.18
1892	181,291.05	1,374.52	7,714.89	9,089.41
1893	159,887.88	989.93	19,593.83	20,583.76
1894	72,441.81	708.11	16,957.77	17,665.88
1895	73,017.79	195.93	13,663.39	13,859.32
1896	33,586.82	1,430.09	17,939.08	19,369.17
1897	98,533.16	340.00	1,993.59	2,333.59
1898	64,852.10	689.79	3,480.67	4,170.46
1899	110,445.80	778.97	7,644.39	8,423.36
Total	1,015,792.02	9,401.74	89,409.94	98,811.68

Public lands	$1,015,792.02
Sioux lands	98,811.68
Grand total	1,114,603.70

Receipts from sales of Sisseton and Wahpeton lands ceded to United States under act March 3, 1891 (26 Stat., 1039), also Yankton Sioux lands, under act March 15, 1894, are included under head of "Public lands."

GENERAL LAND OFFICE, *February 8, 1900.*

Mr. Chairman, I would not rest the claims of the pending measure upon any question of sectionalism. It is but fair, however, to call attention to the act of Congress of June 23, 1836, entitled "An act to regulate the deposits of public money." This act has never been repealed. I quote two sections from the law, as follows:

SEC. 13. *And be it further enacted*, That the money which shall be in the Treasury of the United States on the 1st day of January, 1837, reserving the sum of $5,000,000, shall be deposited with such of the several States, in proportion to their respective representation in the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, as shall, by law, authorize their treasurers or other competent authorities to receive the same on the terms hereinafter specified; and the Secretary of the Treasury shall deliver the same to such treasurers, or other competent authorities, on receiving certificates of deposit therefor, signed by such competent authorities, in such form as may be prescribed by the Secretary aforesaid; which certificates shall express the usual and legal obligations, and pledge the faith of the State for the safe keeping and repayment thereof, and shall pledge the faith of the States receiving the same to pay the said moneys, and every part thereof, from time to time, whenever the same shall be required, by the Secretary of the Treasury, for the purpose of defraying any wants of the public Treasury, beyond the amount of the five millions aforesaid: *Provided*, That if any State declines to receive its proportion of the surplus aforesaid, on the terms before named, the same shall be deposited with the other States agreeing to accept the same on deposit in the proportion aforesaid: *And provided further*, That when said money, or any part thereof, shall be wanted by the said Secretary to meet appropriations by law, the same shall be called for, in ratable proportions, within one year, as nearly as conveniently may be, from the different States with which the same is deposited, and shall not be called for, in sums exceeding $10,000 from any one State, in any one month, without previous notice of thirty days for every additional sum of $30,000, which may at any time be required.

SEC. 14. *And be it further enacted*, That the said deposits shall be made with the said States in the following proportions, and at the following times, to wit: One-quarter part on the 1st day of January, 1837, or as soon thereafter as may be; one-quarter part on the 1st day of April; one-quarter part on the 1st day of July, and one-quarter part on the 1st day of October, all in the same year.

Under this act money was deposited by the United States with the respective States as follows:

State.	Amount.	State.	Amount.
Maine	$955,838.25	Maryland	$955,838.25
New Hampshire	669,086.79	Virginia	2,198,427.99
Vermont	669,086.79	North Carolina	1,433,757.39
Massachusetts	1,338,173.58	South Carolina	1,051,422.09
Connecticut	764,670.60	Georgia	1,051,422.09
Rhode Island	382,335.30	Alabama	669,086.79
New York	4,014,520.71	Louisiana	477,919.14
Pennsylvania	2,867,514.78	Mississippi	382,335.30
New Jersey	764,670.60	Tennessee	1,433,757.39
Ohio	2,007,260.34	Kentucky	1,433,757.39
Indiana	860,254.44	Missouri	382,335.30
Illinois	477,919.14	Arkansas	286,751.49
Michigan	286,751.49		
Delaware	286,751.49	Total	28,101,644.91

From this table it will be seen that there was distributed among the 17 nonpublic land States therein named the sum of $22,271,041.48, as follows:

State.	Amount.	State.	Amount.
1. Maine	$955,838.25	11. Maryland	$955,838.25
2. New Hampshire	669,086.79	12. Virginia	2,198,427.99
3. Vermont	669,086.79	13. North Carolina	1,433,757.39
4. Massachusetts	1,338,173.58	14. South Carolina	1,051,422.09
5. Connecticut	764,670.60	15. Georgia	1,051,422.09
6. Rhode Island	382,335.30	16. Tennessee	1,433,757.39
7. New York	4,014,520.71	17. Kentucky	1,433,757.39
8. Pennsylvania	2,867,514.78		
9. New Jersey	764,670.60	Total	22,271,041.48
10. Delaware	286,751.49		

This money was largely, if not wholly, derived from the sale of public lands. It certainly is a subject for just consideration in a discussion of the pending bill. Computed on the basis of 4 per cent, this loan to the respective States would now amount to the vast sum of $101,041,000. The State of New York would stand indebted in the sum of $14,290,000; Pennsylvania, $10,208,000; Massachusetts, $4,763,000; Virginia, $7,826,000; Ohio, $7,145,000; North Carolina, Tennessee, and Kentucky, each $5,104,000, and the balance of the States in the same proportion to the amounts originally donated.

Although the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized under the act to call upon the respective States to refund the original amounts to the Federal Treasury, it is not presumed any such action will ever be considered It was intended as a donation when the bill was enacted. Representatives of the States that have been thus highly favored by the generous action of the Government certainly should see to it that the claims of these younger communities should receive just, fair, and equitable treatment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not care to trespass too much upon the patience of the House. If I had the time, I might take up the items

in the report of the Secretary of the Interior, wherein it is claimed, in case this bill passes, the Government will suffer a loss of $35,000,000. The claim is a gross exaggeration. That report is based upon the proposition that all these lands are desirable and will be settled upon and paid for. The fact is, however, substantially the same conditions exist in the other reservations as I have stated exist in the Great Sioux Reservation. Only a limited amount of land on many of the reservations has been taken, although they have been open to settlement for many years.

The trust feature of certain reservations mentioned in the report is largely eliminated owing to the lapse of time and the changed conditions since the report of the Interior Department was submitted.

From a careful computation upon existing conditions in these reservations I am satisfied the loss to the Government will not reach the sum claimed by the Interior Department and will not exceed from $10,000,000 to $11,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me this question has been thoroughly discussed, is well understood, and the merits of the measure admitted. I believe it is the judgment of the members of this House, no matter to which political party they may belong, that as American citizens we should rise above questions of partisanship and vote for the American home. Let us reaffirm the principle of "free homes" and restore the original law so ably championed by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROW]. [Applause.]

Nicaraguan Canal—Hay-Pauncefote Treaty.

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. RYAN,
OF NEW YORK,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, May 1, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 2538) to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans—

Mr. RYAN of New York said;

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the debate opened on this bill I had about made up my mind to sit and listen—to be a student, as it were—while the members who have traversed the various routes, literally back and forth, proposed for an isthmian canal, gave to the House the information they have and the knowledge they have acquired on this subject. I was willing to be taught, Mr. Chairman; but when that teaching would have me believe that this Government can not build the canal on its own responsibility; when I am asked to be convinced that we must first secure consent from a foreign power, then I am not willing to accept the teachings of my colleagues, and I want to say that I believe the American people will demand—if we are to have a canal at all—that it be built, owned, and controlled by the United States Government, without considering the whims and desires of Great Britain or any other country in its construction.

I feel that we are united on the proposition that the canal must be built. There are some who maintain that the present time is not opportune and that we should wait until we have all the facts from the latest commission. Assuming we do wait, what assurance has the House that we would not be asked to appoint another commission to secure new facts, make new surveys, refurbish the report of its predecessor and so shape matters as to leave an avenue for the appointment of a successor? Every year's delay puts us back a step in the progress of time. Every moment's delay is a loss to American commerce and to American shipping. All the eminent commissioners of the numerous commissions which have investigated the subject, all the learned and experienced engineers who have surveyed the ground, unite in declaring that the project is perfectly feasible. Naval experts say that it will increase our preparations for defense one hundredfold.

Every American citizen who swears by the American eagle is convinced that the construction of the canal would be one of the greatest benefits that could come to a progressive country like ours, and every American citizen expects this canal for ourselves, except wherein we can grant its privileges without detriment to our own interests. What further need has Congress for direction in this matter? The details of construction are an after consideration, which, while holding our attention and consideration in the formation of the plans, must largely be mapped out as time and circumstances surrounding will dictate. We can not design the exact course of the canal; we can lay its course in a general way. We can not say it must equally divide this or that section of the country; we can say it must be near that section. We can say, Mr. Chairman, that we are going to build this canal, just as our forefathers said, "This country is and of right should be free." We can say we are going to build this canal and control it, and fortify it, and defend it, and protect our commerce by it, and we do not care whether Great Britain or any other foreign country likes it or not. We are catering to no one but ourselves.

A gentleman who preceded me on the floor quoted a portion of the language of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. He deprecated and condemned the language, and I like his sentiment. His quotation is as follows:

> It is agreed that the canal may be constructed under the auspices of the Government of the United States.

In what crucible of God or man was Great Britain made the guardian of our action? By what right does that country say "we may" construct this canal? Better by far, one hundred times, that no canal be built if conditions have so changed that we must ask the consent of a foreign power before we can proceed.

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of important considerations in this question. One is the Monroe doctrine; another is the source to which the benefits of this canal will accrue. As no other government is willing to spend a dollar in the construction of the canal, and as, therefore, the money to build it must come from the labor of this country, the benefits to be derived from the canal must likewise be the reward of this labor.

I do not wish to say which route I believe the more practical or the cheaper. While I have studied the question, I do not feel that my knowledge is sufficient to say that we should vote to finish the Panama Canal or to build the Nicaragua Canal. I do wish to go on record, however, to the effect that I believe we should not assume in the outset the liabilities, the obstructions, and the losses of a private enterprise. Either route, I feel, would be of marvelous benefit to the country; and, with reports from men of science, it is not necessary that I take up the time of the House hashing and rehashing their opinions and scientific researches, demonstrating the absolute necessity of this canal in order to put American shipping on the same or nearly equal footing with the boats of other countries. I do not wish to say that the commerce of this country and our products will all be carried in American bottoms, but it will give an impetuous character to our shipping that will make us a hardy and willing rival to any country on God's green earth.

Nicaragua is peculiarly situated for this improvement in shipping. Admitting that we were to allow foreign boats to use it on the same equal terms as our own, the American vessel would still have a great advantage in distance. The canal would save that great rail haul from the Pacific to the Atlantic seaboards. California would be a strong competitor with Spain for the premiership of wine-producing centers of the world. Our internal commerce would be magnified and expanded to an extent that no other improvement could give us. We would have an advantage in China and Japan that would almost repay us for the cost of building the canal, to say nothing of the increase of commerce with the other countries of the Far East. The water shipments of the Pacific side of South America would come to us and ours would go to them. It would bind our commerce with those countries in an inseparable tie.

Let me quote to you the figures presented by the Bureau of Statistics of the Treasury Department relative to our trade with the countries of the lower Americas and the countries of the East. I desire to show that American bottoms carry but a scant portion of this trade. I contend that the canal would reverse this order of things and undoubtedly give us a majority.

In the year 1899 we imported from Argentina $5,112,561. We exported to that country $9,563,510. We imported from Brazil $57,875,747, and exported to Brazil only $12,239,036. We imported from Chile $2,942,962, while we exported to Chile $2,107,124. We imported from Colombia $5,126,731, while we exported to Colombia only $3,042,004. We imported from Ecuador $1,054,653, and exported only $882,591. We imported from Peru $1,496,978, and exported to Peru $1,325,650. We imported from Uruguay $1,281,109, and exported to Uruguay $1,242,822. We imported from Venezuela $6,507,847; we exported to Venezuela $2,851,634. We imported from South America altogether $86,587,893.

We imported from Costa Rica $3,581,899, and exported to Costa Rica $1,240,950. We imported from Guatemala $2,111,264; we exported to Guatemala $1,102,963. We imported from Honduras $911,849; we exported to Honduras $832,016. We imported from Nicaragua $1,514,630; we exported to Nicaragua $1,186,511. We imported from Salvador $1,085,703; we exported to Salvador $625,414.

In Asia it was no different. We imported from Aden $1,924,941, and exported to Aden $993,741. We imported from China $18,619,268, and exported to China $14,493,440. We imported from the British East Indies $32,560,312, and exported to the British

East Indies $4,341,996. We imported from the Dutch East Indies $21,313,945; we exported to the Dutch East Indies $1,548,973. We imported from Japan $26,716,814, and exported to Japan $17,264,688. We imported from the total of Asia $107,091,214, and only exported to Asia $48,360,161.

With the building of this canal the dangerous trips around the Horn will cease. It will mean the obliterating of 10,000 miles of ocean transportation, and each man may figure for himself the saving in the cost of transportation.

As to the amendment proposed that we insert the words "fortify and defend," I wish to say that I am heartily in accord with this amendment. The gentleman from Iowa states that there is embodied in the word "protect" all authority for defense. I know that the American people will always defend and protect their own, but I see no reason why the House should not so state in this bill and thus cut off any opportunity for international disputes.

I am opposed to giving to Great Britain the slightest ground on which to cry "international agreement," or "international courtesy." I particularize Great Britain in this instance, because that country has for years been trying to force herself into a partnership in the rewards of this canal, yet, has she ever made a move to indicate that she was willing to bear the brunt of the expense of its construction? Has Great Britain ever offered to contribute one cent toward its construction? I think not. Why, then, should we consider her interest in this project?

Mr. Chairman, we must be equal gainers by this canal in times of war as in times of peace. Our naval experts tell us that we need have no fear of invasion in case we have the canal. All members of the House are indeed familiar with the trip of that gallant battle ship the *Oregon*. We are likewise in ready memory regarding the anxiety that overspread the country when it was known that Admiral Cervera's fleet was headed from Spain toward our coast. Dewey was at Manila; Schley and Sampson were off the southern reefs dodging about. The *Oregon* was on her long trip around the Horn. No one knew where Cervera was. We did not know where he was headed. The good people of Boston town sought the storm cellars o' nights fearing that dynamite bombs was to be their greeting in the morning.

Reports came from our Pacific coasts declaring that the Spanish fleet had been seen off the entrance to the Golden Gate. Another report would startle another section of the country, and well it might. The Pacific coast was bare. Our fleets were in Southern waters. Neither Sampson nor Schley nor Watson could have reached there in less than a month's time. The people had cause to be startled. Would they have shown this anxiety had the canal been constructed? Mr. Chairman, we could have put a fleet on the Pacific coast in a few days and could have brought it back in an equal length of time. With a fortified canal we would be able to defend our coast against the combined forces of the other continent.

But we are told, Mr. Chairman, that we must not fortify the canal. We are confronted with the statement that the Clayton-Bulwer treaty is still in force. This treaty is condemned by the people from the Lake of the Woods to the Tropics, from Maine to California, and from the Klondike to the colony of Porto Rico. There has been a shrewd though somewhat transparent effort on the part of the friends of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, which has been prepared to supersede this defunct and entombed arrangement of Clayton and Bulwer, to have it appear that the opponents of the treaty are also the opponents of the canal.

We must repudiate the new treaty just as the country has repudiated the old; and I trust that the members in the upper branch of Congress will spurn that agreement entered into by our Secretary of State and Great Britain's diplomatic representative. We are not to build an international canal, and we want no international alliances. I admit that men will claim and have claimed and are claiming that we should construct an international canal; but I want to ask them, as they have undoubtedly asked themselves, by what authority and under what clause of the Constitution do they intend to draw from the United States Treasury the money to construct an international canal? Would they have this Government bear the full burden of expense for the construction of a waterway for the benefit, equal with ours, of all foreign powers? Would they have us build a canal neutral in war and in peace by a specific agreement which we could not break, even were we so inclined, without arraying all Europe against us? No, Mr. Chairman, that treaty should be defeated, absolutely and without reservation.

Mr. Chairman, let us refer to the eighth section of Article I of the Constitution, which says:

> The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

It is contended on the floor of this House and elsewhere—and contended with absolute common sense and good judgment, I believe—that in the event of war, the canal, bound hand and foot by the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, would be our undoing. To build it under this agreement would not be providing for our defense, but would be our weakness. It would not be expending the people's money for our general welfare, but rather in the interest of foreign powers. England, Germany, Russia, France, all would be entitled to the same privileges of the canal as we would enjoy, and it would give to them a vast advantage. Great Britain could use it to strike in the East and to attack our Pacific coast.

She would save the distance around the Horn, just as we would. That country has now a powerful military station on the island of Santa Lucia, off the entrance to the canal. She has other strategic points from which to operate against us. Our plain duty, Mr. Chairman, in view of these facts, is to cut off all idea of an international canal. Why this secret parleying and snobbery with Great Britain anyway? Can not we be fair to that country without putting on the bells and bowing before the throne? Will American citizenship allow any foreign power to tell us that we may build this canal, providing we grant it or them the privileges of the same in time of war? I charge the Administration with nothing but blunders in this regard.

Mr. Chairman, the United States has suffered enough through treaty enactions. Darkest among these is the infamous Clayton-Bulwer agreement, which produced nothing but discord and inharmonious relations, and was a source of annoyance until Great Britain by her perfidy abrogated its bindings. Each nation put a different construction on that agreement. England would have it bind this country and herself go unleashed. International law is at its best but a flimsy guidance, and I appeal to the members of the House to weigh well these facts in acting upon this measure. We can not reiterate too strongly nor too often our determination to construct this a canal for the people of the United States, for their benefit, for their protection, and for their advancement, both commercially and from the standpoint of war.

I ask the attention of the House while I quote here a few excerpts from letters of James G. Blaine and other able statesmen of his time. First I will read the preamble and first article of the treaty, which run as follows:

> Her Britannic Majesty and the United States of America, being desirous of consolidating the relations of amity which so happily subsist between them, by setting forth and fixing in a convention their views and intentions with reference to any means of communication by ship canal, which may be constructed between the Atlantic and Pacific oceans by the way of the river St. Juan de Nicaragua, and either or both of the lakes of Nicaragua or Managua, to any port or place on the Pacific Ocean. * * *
>
> ART. I. The Governments of Great Britain and the United States hereby declare that neither the one nor the other will ever obtain or maintain for itself any exclusive control over the said ship canal; agreeing that neither will ever erect or maintain any fortifications commanding the same, or in the vicinity thereof, or occupy, or fortify, or colonize, or assume or exercise any dominion over Nicaragua, Costa Rica, the Mosquito coast, or any part of Central America; nor will either make use of any protection which either affords, or may afford, or any alliance which either has, or may have, to or with any state or people, for the purpose of erecting or maintaining any such fortifications, or of occupying, fortifying, or colonizing Nicaragua, Costa Rica, the Mosquito coast, or any part of Central America, or of assuming or exercising dominion over the same. Nor will Great Britain or the United States take advantage of any intimacy, or use any alliance, connection, or influence that either may possess with any state or government through whose territory the said canal may pass, for the purpose of acquiring or holding, directly or indirectly, for the subjects or citizens of the one, any rights or advantages in regard to commerce or navigation through the said canal which shall not be offered, on the same terms, to the subjects or citizens of the other.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to show how ill advised and how much regretted was the signing of that treaty. The words of General Cass, then Secretary of State, stand out emblazoned before us as a guide that the country may not fall into the same trap. General Cass says, in a letter to Her Majesty's representative:

> The Clayton-Bulwer treaty, concluded in the hope that it would put an end to the differences which had arisen between the United States and Great Britain concerning Central American affairs, had been rendered inoperative in some of its most essential provisions by the different constructions which had been reciprocally given to it by the parties. And little is hazarded in saying that, had the interpretation since put upon the treaty by the British Government, and yet maintained, been anticipated, it would not have been negotiated under the instructions of any Executive of the United States, nor ratified by the branch of the Government intrusted with the power of ratification.

In a letter James G. Blaine quotes President Buchanan as follows:

> If the Senate had imagined that it could obtain the interpretation placed upon it by Great Britain, it would not have passed. If he had been in the Senate at the time, that treaty never would have been sanctioned.
>
> With reference to arbitration (which Lord Napier had only thrown in as a suggestion of his own), he could not give any opinion at present. The President also inveighed against the excess of treaties, affirming that they were more frequently the cause of quarrel than of harmony, and that if it were not for the interoceanic communications he did not see there was any necessity for a treaty respecting Central America at all.

In communication with Lord Napier, General Cass, on October 20, 1857, inserted this clause in a letter:

> I have thus endeavored to meet the frank suggestions of your lordship by restating with corresponding frankness the general policy of the United States with respect to the Governments and the interoceanic transits of Central America. But since your lordship has referred to the Clayton-Bulwer treaty of 1850 as contemplating a harmonious course of action and counsel between the contracting parties in the settlement of Central American interests, you will pardon me for reminding your lordship that the differences which this treaty was intended to adjust between the United States and

Great Britain still remain unsettled, while the treaty itself has become the subject of new and embarrassing complications.

In view of these facts, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that the division of Congress which has the power and duty of ratification, will vote to bring into existence, in connection with the construction of the canal, another treaty which will not alone confirm the "gold-brick" provisions of the Clayton-Bulwer arrangement but will bring to us a multiplicity of evils in addition.

Because this is so, Mr. Chairman, is no argument that we should not construct the canal. It simply demonstrates that we must avoid the rapids of entangling alliances and reassert our independence and our ability to push this work on our own responsibility, come what will.

Look at the chart I here present and view another reason why we should build the canal for the United States alone. Compare the distance between New York and Liverpool by the present route and the distance when the canal is completed:

	Horn.	Nicaragua.	Distance saved.	Advantage to New York.
	Miles.	*Miles.*	*Miles.*	*Miles.*
Liverpool to San Francisco	14,700	8,700	6,000	
New York to San Francisco	14,800	5,600	9,200	3,100
Liverpool to Hawaii	14,000	9,100	4,900	
New York to Hawaii	14,200	6,200	8,000	2,900
Liverpool to Yokohama	17,500	12,100	5,400	
New York to Yokohama	17,600	9,100	8,500	3,000
Liverpool to Melbourne	13,300	12,700	600	
New York to Melbourne	13,500	10,000	3,500	2,700
Liverpool to Valparaiso	9,600	7,400	2,200	
New York to Valparaiso	9,700	4,600	5,100	2,800
Liverpool to Greytown		4,769		
New York to Greytown		2,021		

We can be dignified, yet reasonable and even magnanimous, after the canal is constructed, and permit foreign countries to enter and use it under toll for commercial purposes. We can do this, Mr. Chairman, but we can not, should not, and, if the sentiment of the nation is truly represented, will not allow a foreign power to say that we may construct it providing we "do not assume to ourselves any rights or advantages in regard to commerce or navigation through the said canal which shall not be offered on the same terms to the subjects of Great Britain." The question is not what Great Britain will permit us to do in this regard, but what we shall permit her to do. We are the dictators.

Just a word more, Mr. Chairman, and then I am done. That the people of my district at least may know of Administration blunders, I quote a portion of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty:

The high contracting parties, desiring to preserve and maintain the "general principle" of neutralization established in Article VIII of the Clayton-Bulwer Convention, adopt as the basis of such neutralization, the following rules, substantially as embodied in the convention between Great Britain and certain other powers, signed at Constantinople, October 29, 1888, for the free navigation of the Suez Maritime Canal, that is to say:

1. The canal shall be free and open, in time of war as in time of peace, to the vessels of commerce and of war of all nations, on terms of entire equality, so that there shall be no discrimination against any nation or its citizens or subjects in respect of the conditions or charges of traffic, or otherwise.

2. The canal shall never be blockaded, nor shall any right of war be exercised nor any act of hostility be committed within it.

3. Vessels of war of a belligerent shall not revictual nor take any stores in the canal except so far as may be strictly necessary; and the transit of such vessels through the canal shall be effected with the least possibly delay, in accordance with the regulations in force, and with only such intermission as may result from the necessities of the service.

Prizes shall be in all respects subject to the same rules as vessels of war of the belligerents.

4. No belligerents shall embark or disembark troops, munitions of war or warlike materials in the canal except in case of accidental hindrance of the transit, and in such case the transit shall be resumed with all possible dispatch.

5. The provisions of this article shall apply to waters adjacent to the canal, within three marine miles of either end. Vessels of war of a belligerent shall not remain in such waters longer than twenty-four hours at any one time except in case of distress, and in such case shall depart as soon as possible; but a vessel of war of one belligerent shall not depart within twenty-four hours from the departure of a vessel of war of the other belligerent.

6. The plant, establishments, buildings, and all works necessary to the construction, maintenance, and operation of the canal shall be deemed to be part thereof, for the purposes of this convention, and in time of war as in time of peace shall enjoy complete immunity from attack or injury by belligerents and from acts calculated to impair their usefulness as part of the canal.

7. No fortifications shall be erected commanding the canal or the waters adjacent. The United States, however, shall be at liberty to maintain such military police along the canal as may be necessary to protect it against lawlessness and disorder.

Mr. Chairman, there is magnanimity personified. A revival of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, and for what? I charge no secret alliance, but there is circumstantial evidence of a toadyism to Great Britain on the part of the present Administration totally out of accord with our independent democratic institutions. Every nation has a mission. Our mission, Mr. Chairman, has ever been to defend and protect the oppressed. Our mission is and ever has been the mission of independence, and I believe we can never ally ourselves with a nation or a people whose chief aim is oppression. For this evidence of alliance with that unmotherly mother country, look to the South African republics now struggling for their very existence. The people of this country are not unmindful of the failure of their official representatives to declare for them that sympathy which it is our boasted mission to feel, and when necessary to demonstrate to the world.

The full truth of the matter is that the country is to-day asking itself for some clean-cut explanation of the Administration's apparent alliance with Great Britian in this war of devastation and spoliation upon the South African republics.

It is well to bear in mind that this country's is an impulsive, brave, and daring people. They burn incense to valor, humanity, and justice, but they condemn in unequivocal language unfairness, bad faith, and cruelty. They see in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty a chasm filled with shameful possibilities. They are watching the conduct of their official representatives in what they begin to suspect of being a dangerous and abominable tendency.

Let us have the canal, Mr. Chairman, by all means, but burn the Hay-Pauncefote treaty and consign its ashes to a foreign port.

The Nicaragua Canal.

SPEECH
OF
HON. OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD,
OF ALABAMA.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, May 2, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 2538) to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans—

Mr. UNDERWOOD said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On former occasions I have taken advantage of the opportunities offered to me to express my views to the House as to why I was in favor of the Government of the United States constructing a canal from the Caribbean Sea to the Pacific Ocean. I believe that my constituents thoroughly understand my position in this matter, but it is a question of so much importance to them and to the people of the United States that I feel that I would be derelict in my duty to the people that I represent should I allow the present opportunity to pass without again giving some of the reasons why I think that this bill should become a law.

Ever since I have been a member of the House of Representatives, for a period of nearly six years, bills for the construction of an isthmian canal have occupied a most extraordinary position. I have never known a day or an hour during that time when a personal poll of the House would not have found a majority of the members in favor of building the Nicaraguan Canal, but during all that time we were unable to secure a vote on such a bill, and to-day is the first opportunity I have had since I have been in Congress to directly cast a vote in favor of the proposition.

Although I believe that the bill will pass by a successful majority to-day, yet there is opposition to it—very serious, forcible, and dangerous opposition—as there has always been in the past, but it is not an opposition that will come out in the forefront of the battle and vote an open and manly vote. It is the same to-day as it has always been, concealed and hidden. It does not come out openly and say that the canal should not be built, or that it will not be to the interest of the people of the United States, but they fight by indirection, and contend, first, that we have not sufficiently investigated the question or surveyed the route; next, that the present is not an opportune time for the economical building of the canal, and third, that if we build the canal under this bill, it will be in violation of some of our treaty rights.

These are the arguments that have always been made against every bill that has ever been introduced, no matter how they have been changed and shaped and smoothed and pared to meet their views and satisfy the objections of those gentlemen who say that they want a canal, but always vote against it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that there is any measure before Congress in which the whole people of the United States are more vitally interested, which would be of more benefit to the commerce of the country, which would bring more prosperity to the masses of the people, than the present measure. Both of the two great political parties have declared in favor of it in their national platforms. The press of the country, voicing the sentiments of their constituency, have emphatically indorsed the building of the canal, and I believe that the time has come when action should be taken and that this Congress should not adjourn until the measure has passed.

Let us consider for a few minutes, in detail, the objections that are made at present. First, they contend that we should have

more light thrown on the question by surveys. For fifty years this Government has been considering the advisability of building this canal. We have had repeated surveys made by the Government and by private parties. We know accurately all the engineering difficulties to be encountered both as to the Nicaraguan route and the Panama route. But yet the gentlemen of the opposition insist that we should have more light and more information.

I do not pretend to have the information on this question that the Government engineers have, but I desire to state briefly a few facts showing the information that has been furnished us on this question.

The canal is to begin on the Atlantic side at the harbor of San Juan del Norte, near the mouth of the San Juan River, in the Caribbean Sea. The first 9 miles will require dredging through soft, alluvial sand to reach lock No. 1, where a low range of hills has to be pierced, and at this point the vessels must be raised 30 feet by locks and dams to enter the basin of Deseado, which is nothing but a series of submerged basins. Two more locks will be built that will raise the vessels to the level of Lake Nicaragua, a distance of a hundred and ten feet above the level of the sea. There are no new engineering problems to be encountered in the construction of these locks. They will be similar to the ones now in use on the Great Lakes and a great many of our rivers.

Beyond these locks a rocky spur of the Andes must be gone through for a distance of 3 miles to reach the San Francisco basin, which will be wide enough to admit the passage of vessels freely. Beyond this divide to Lake Nicaragua, a distance of 45 miles, there are 800,000,000 yards of dredging required, which, with modern dredging machinery, is in no wise a difficult engineering problem. The next work of importance will be the building of the Ochoa dam, which will hold the waters of San Juan River. This will require a wall 1,800 feet long and 70 feet high, which will raise the water of the river to a level with that of the lake, and will do away with a number of rapids now encountered in the river.

When Lake Nicaragua is reached, after traveling in slack water down the San Juan River for 65 miles, there will be comparatively little work to be done. This lake is a magnificent basin of fresh water, and is nearly one-third of the total length of the canal.

When the opposite shore is reached we will be but 17 miles from the Pacific Ocean. On this, the west side, a little river called the Lajas will be dammed up, and an artificial reservoir made in a natural depression of the mountains. Three more locks will be built between this point and Brito, the entrance of the canal from the Pacific terminus. No greater engineering difficulties will be encountered in the construction of these locks than in the construction of the locks at Deseado basin. At Brito large breakwaters of masonry will have to be constructed in order to afford an artificial harbor.

This is a brief statement of what is gathered from the engineer's reports that have been made. The cost of building this canal has been estimated at from sixty-five to two hundred million dollars, but the experts sent by this Government, who have lately surveyed the route, place the cost at $125,000,000.

Nowhere in the range of mountains reaching from the North Pole to Patagonia can we find another narrow depression where it will require a vessel to be raised only 110 feet to cross between the two oceans. It should also be remembered that the San Juan River reaches from Lake Nicaragua to the Atlantic, and is navigable for a ship of 500 tons burden to and across Lake Nicaragua to within 12 miles of the Pacific Ocean. The only necessity of additional work on this portion of the canal is to make it large enough to accommodate modern vessels of heavy tonnage. The reports show that there is suitable timber and stone along the route of the canal for its construction.

It is true that the economists who desire to postpone all action on this bill say that it would be better to build the canal across the Isthmus of Panama, but we have the survey of that route before us, and we know that the French Government and the French people have expended $4,000,000 on that route: and the lowest estimate is that it will cost $100,000,000 to complete the canal at that point by locks and dams. De Lesseps himself says that if the system of locks and dams is used, the Nicaragua Canal would offer the best route.

Besides, the Panama Canal would be in the calm belt and could not be used by sailing vessels, whereas the vessels going through the Nicaragua Canal would not encounter this difficulty.

As to the saving to the people of the United States in freight charges, the great railroad lines now running across the continent charge $24.80 per ton, whereas the freight by water through the canal, according to the best authorities, would be less than one-fourth of this cost per ton. The toll that the Suez Canal charges is $3 per ton, and there is no reason why the toll through the Nicaragua Canal should be more than this.

To express briefly the advantages to American commerce, it is only necessary to say that by the Nicaragua Canal, Melbourne, in Australia, will be 1,850 miles nearer to New York than Liverpool, while Japan by the same route will be 2,400 miles closer to Philadelphia than it will be to London.

What this will mean to our Government in time of war requires no argument when we remember the famous voyage of the battle ship *Oregon* from San Francisco to Florida by way of the Straits of Magellan during the Spanish war.

It is contended by others that should we construct the Nicaragua Canal under the present bill it would be in violation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, and that no action should be taken until the Senate of the United States disposes of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty now pending in that body. I do not propose to discuss here the treaty rights in which we may be involved in constructing an isthmian canal, but I contend that it is a proposition on which the House of Representatives has no power to act.

Under the Constitution of the United States the power to make treaties with foreign countries is vested in the President and Senate of the United States. No matter what we write in this bill, except the mere appropriation of the money to construct the canal, all other limitations can be overthrown by a treaty made by the President and Senate of the United States. If the President is authorized to begin the construction of this canal, it will be necessary for him to negotiate treaties with the Governments of Nicaragua and Costa Rica authorizing its construction. These treaties will be submitted to the Senate of the United States for ratification, and as the treaties will be entered into after the passage of this bill, any terms or stipulations contained therein, though they are in conflict with the provisions of this bill, will become the law of the land.

So that I do not agree with the gentlemen who are opposed to the bill on account of its provisions providing for the terms by which the canal shall be constructed, because, as stated above, when the bill passes, the power and control of the question has gone beyond the House of Representatives and is vested in the President and Senate of the United States and we will be compelled to accept their conclusions in this matter no matter what our opinions in the premises may be.

Therefore, if we intend to construct the canal, if we believe that it will build up our commerce and develop our country and bring prosperity to our people, there is but one provision in the bill in which we are concerned, and that is the appropriation of the money for its construction, and there is no reason why we should delay making this appropriation on account of other stipulations contained in this bill. If we are not willing to trust the President and the Senate to look after the American interests in making these treaties, we should not pass this bill; but if we wish to pass a bill, we of necessity must leave the foreign questions involved in the construction of the canal to the President and Senate of the United States.

I believe that the time for action has come, and that those who are earnestly and truly in favor of the construction of the canal will vote for the passage of this bill.

Pensions.

SPEECH
OF
HON. MARTIN H. GLYNN,
OF NEW YORK,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Monday, May 7, 1900.

The House having under consideration the bill (S. 1477) amending sections 2 and 3 of an act entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents," approved June 27 1890—

Mr. GLYNN said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This bill has my hearty support for the reason that I believe it is a step in the right direction, a step which should have been taken by this country long ago. Unmeasurable is the debt which the United States owes the men who fought for its preservation, and less measured should be the rewards it has been bestowing upon its defenders and its saviors. For my part, I believe in a most liberal interpretation of the pension laws. I believe that this Government can foster patriotism in no better way than by generous treatment of the men who have been hurried to physical infirmities through their nights on the camp field; their days on the march; their hours on the battle ground; their gamut through dangers indescribable, sickness debilitating, wounds whose sores have healed, but whose effects remain written upon their constitutions in traces that will be effaced only by the hand of death.

In responding to the bugle blast of duty that summoned them to rally round the Stars and Stripes, the "boys in blue" showed

their allegiance to the United States and consequently proved their love of country, for in love alone is planted the root of true allegiance. For our country's sake they cast aside every thought of self, every idea of personal gain, every tie that bound them to loving hearts, and rushed away to war—all to danger, many to death, many to come back home honored though racked and tossed along in Time's path many years ahead of their day in life by the infirmities which follow a soldier's life, just as weakness follows in the wake of overtaxed nature. For those now wrapped in the mantle of death we have erected shafts of marble and tablets of brass, written songs of glory and recited poems of praise. For those who yet live and suffer because of their soldierly duties we will to-day erect in law a monument, sing a song of glory, and recite a poem of praise by passing this bill which allows a more liberal interpretation of the pension laws, wipes out some of the absurd provisions of the old pension enactments, and gives the soldier some of the generous treatment which so rightly should be his.

I do not want to be considered, however, as holding this bill to be the acme at which we should aim in pension legislation. Far from it. I am in favor of a still more liberal law than this, and hope to see a more beneficent one placed upon the statute books in the near future. Inasmuch as this proposed law is more liberal toward our soldiers than the old one, and inasmuch as it has the indorsement of the Grand Army of the Republic throughout the country, I am pleased to vote for it, but in voting for it I indulge the hope that before many years have run their cycle Congress will see its way clear to give a reasonable pension to every man of 60 years of age who suffers from infirmities received in war, provided that every such man served at least three months in the Army and received an honorable discharge. To my mind that would make bearable, in a measure, the declining years of men who gave their best days to the service of their country and risked their lives for its preservation. To my mind that would dry the tear of sorrow and alleviate the pain of age under many a humble roof sheltering a man who served his country as well as did Grant, Sheridan, or Sherman, though because he was a private he must go to his grave with no world echoings of honor or funereal salutes of farewell from brazen-mouthed cannon or echo-ringing rifle. [Applause.]

In this bill we honor the private; we pay a tribute to the man behind the guns, the man who wins our victories, and create a competence for his widow and his family that must make them feel that, though republics may be ungrateful, as philosophers have held, still the United States, the Republic of republics, the only Government upholding a brotherhood of man and a fatherhood of justice, has a heart that pulses to the music of humanity and holds out a hand of justice to her soldier sons. And such soldier sons as are hers! The greatest in the annals of the world. Neither those of Alexander, nor of Hannibal, nor of Cæsar, nor of Napoleon, were the equals of the boys who lined up as adversaries in that bloody conflict of the sixties. In his history of the Peloponnesian war Rollin makes narration that the Athenians gave perpetuity to the custom of strewing flowers over their soldier dead, of burning incense over their graves, and of establishing a sort of memorial day in honor of the men who fell in battle.

The Athenians were a great people. We have imitated them in founding a memorial day. To-day we will outstrip them by passing a law which shows that we believe in honoring our soldiers while they live, and if my vote could do it we would honor them still more by passing a bill that would give them reward with a more lavish hand. I agree with old Cato, the famous philosopher, who once said that he hated "a soldier who moves his hands when he marches, his feet when he fights, and who snores louder in bed than he shouts in battle." [Laughter.] I hate that kind of a soldier, but I love our soldiers, because on the march and in the battle were ever embodied in them the very opposite characteristics which Cato despised, characteristics which command admiration wherever mind rules over matter, characteristics which have caused the world to look upon the American soldier as the synonym of victory and the personification of all that is desirable in military life. [Applause.]

There is no doubt in my mind that this bill will attain a large degree of popularity with all fair-minded people for its amendment of the rightfully abused sections of the law of June 27, 1890. Under that law many deserving men have been denied a pension because they could not prove that their disability resulted directly from service origin. Think of the absurdity of such a law! Imagine for a moment how impossible it is to prove more apparent and more traceable events after a lapse of nearly thirty years. Surely the rulings under the old law were saving the Government a few blood-earned dollars by many twistings of the neck of Justice! Thanks to the Committee on Invalid Pensions and the zeal of the Grand Army of the Republic, this travesty of right will soon come to an end. The passage of this bill will ring down the curtain on this despicable farce.

The unanimity of the members of this House from North and South proves conclusively that the justice of the provisions of this bill are almost universally appreciated within this Hall. It is eminently right, too, that this bill should change the existing law so that the disabilities of the soldier can be aggregated. It is eminently right, too, that this bill should change the existing law so that the limit of income of a poor widow should be raised from $96 to $250 a year. If ever there was a law upon the statute books bringing crimson disgrace to this country, it was the provision which prevented the widow of a poor soldier from securing a pension if she had an income of more than $95 a year. Think of it! Ninety-five dollars a year! Why, it would hardly buy a human being enough food to eat, not to say anything about the other necessities of a civilized community. Ninety-five dollars a year to prevent a soldier's widow from getting a pension! Less than 27 cents a day! One of the proudest acts of my life will be to vote for this bill which wipes that disgraceful provision off the statute books and in its stead writes that the limit of preventive income shall be $250, and even this strikes me as rather small.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have covered about all the provisions of this bill upon which I care to speak. I had no intention of attempting an oration, but simply purposed to state in plain, hard terms some of the reasons why I believed that this country should come in the hour of trouble to the assistance of the men who came to the country's rescue in her hour of peril. And in closing allow me to say that I for one believe that this Government should see to it also that there is exercised a noble generosity in the bestowal of pensions upon worthy soldiers in the Spanish war. The spirit of a republic is opposed to a large standing army, and this Republic will never have need of a large standing army as long as it continues to treat its citizen soldiery according to the ethics of justice and of right. [Applause.]

Porto Rico.

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANCIS G. NEWLANDS,

OF NEVADA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, April 11, 1900.

The House having under consideration the bill (H. R. 8345) entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues for the relief of the island of Porto Rico, and for other purposes," and the Senate amendments thereto—

Mr. NEWLANDS said:

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not my purpose to enter into the constitutional question which formed so large a part of the discussion when the Porto Rico tariff was before the House on a former occasion. It is my purpose only to call attention to the governmental features of this bill outside of the revenue features and to call your attention to the fact that, although we made provision early in the day for the serious and deliberate consideration of all matters relating to the government of these insular acquisitions by the appointment of an Insular Committee, composed of the ablest and best men of the House, and that while that committee has been having hearings upon this subject with the intention ultimately of framing a bill and presenting it to the House, this measure providing civil government for the island of Porto Rico comes from the Senate, tacked on the House tariff bill, and is presented to us as an entirety without opportunity for amendment.

It is a measure considered in the Senate in the heat of debate over the revenue features of the bill, and without the calm deliberation that is essential to the consideration of these governmental features. It comes to this House, is referred to the Ways and Means Committee, is reported back to the House without deliberate consideration there, and this House is now called upon to vote upon the entire bill without the report of the Insular Committee and without opportunity to present amendments to it. This is in startling contrast with the deliberation of our action on the Hawaiian government bill. There commissioners were appointed by the President, went to Hawaii, came in contact with their people, familiarized themselves with their institutions, touched the soil from which these institutions sprang, and reported a bill which went to the Committee on Territories of this House and was submitted there to careful and deliberate scrutiny, and, having been perfected there, was presented to this House, was considered during three days of debate, during which amendments of great value to the liberties of that people and to the proper government of these islands were submitted and adopted.

You will all recollect when a motion was made by Representative HILL, from Connecticut, to the effect that the section providing for a Delegate from Hawaii should be stricken out and a mere commissioner should be substituted, similar to the commissioner

provided for in this bill, without right to sit in the deliberations of this body, but simply to act as the representative of the insular government in the Departments here—you will all remember the earnest, vigorous, and eloquent speech made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT] in response to that motion, and you will all recall that the entire House, Republicans as well as Democrats, responded favorably to his appeal that we did not need a lobbyist from the Hawaiian Islands, a mere commissioner who would dance attendance upon our Departments, who would meet Representatives in the corridors, hat in hand, grateful for a moment's recognition, but a Delegate representing an intelligent people, deputized by them to represent them on this floor, without the power to vote, it is true, but with the right to participate in debate and to represent the interests of his constituents in Congress, this House having the opportunity to subject his views to the scrutiny of inquiry and to test the sources of his information.

I insist upon it that to-day if this House were untrammeled by the rule which has been adopted, a motion to substitute a Delegate from Porto Rico to the Congress of the United States for a commissioner to our Departments would carry this body by an overwhelming vote. And recollect that such a provision was adopted in the Hawaiian bill, though but one-fifth of the people there are white, whilst in Porto Rico seven-tenths of the people are white. Then you will also recollect the beneficial provisions which were put in the Hawaiian bill regarding the land monopoly and the conditions of labor.

I contend it is impossible to legislate regarding any of these new possession unless you take into consideration their economical conditions. For the first time in our history we are called upon to legislate regarding tropical countries, those regions kissed by the sun, where animal life of intense vigor and fierceness exists, and where vegetable life displays itself in all the enlarged forms of production, and where man alone is inferior. I contend that the initial step in legislation regarding these islands should be the development of the individual man; that man who is to become a citizen; that man who is to exercise self-government; that man who is to have the intelligence to protect and the courage to defend his rights.

Now, what has been the conditions in these tropical regions? Why, sir, labor there has always been degraded, sometimes as the result of economic conditions, sometimes as the result of the oppression of power, sometimes as the result of the oppression of wealth represented by the land-owning classes. This is true of Porto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippines. The masses of the people are ignorant, degraded, abject. Republican institutions are impossible in a country where such conditions exist, for the very strength of a republic is not in the wealth, cultivation, or refinement of the few, but in the intelligence and sturdy independence of the many.

If, then, we are to prepare the people of these islands for the blessings of self-government, the most important thing is the development of the laboring classes.

Now, what are the discouraging conditions in all these islands? They are that the laborers are semiservile, having no interest in the soil, but merely attached to it as peons or serfs. This is true of Hawaii, where the sugar plantations are owned by wealthy corporations and individuals, and the lands are worked by Asiatic labor. It is true of Luzon, where the land has drifted largely into the hands of the religious organizations. It is true of Porto Rico, where nearly 1,000,000 people occupy an island 100 miles long and 40 miles wide—one of the most densely populated agricultural regions in the civilized world and where the great masses of the people have no interest in the soil.

Porto Rico produces sugar, tobacco, and coffee. We are about to take her into the commercial union of the United States and to give her the benefit of our enlarged markets. The agricultural production of Porto Rico will be largely stimulated and the prices realized for her products largely increased. What will be the tendency of all this? Why, simply that capital will seek to acquire the land, and that gradually these lands will drift into large holdings and will be controlled by syndicates and corporations. Shall we, then, simply content ourselves with prescribing a form of government suited to a free people without taking into consideration the fact that the entrance of Porto Rico into our commercial union will vastly increase the value of the lands at the expense of the labor employed on the lands, or shall we take into consideration the economic conditions of these islands, the degraded condition of labor, and seek to establish a system by which the benefit of the increased production will go to the laborers themselves and not entirely to the landowners?

It seems to me apparent that the time for action upon these questions is now, for otherwise, when this governmental bill shall go out of our hands, the whole subject-matter of conditions in Porto Rico will drift from our consideration and our whole time will be taken up with domestic affairs. Preventive legislation is much more beneficial than remedial legislation. If we allow things to drift, the most oppressive land monopoly will be organized in Porto Rico, based upon semislave labor, and it will be extremely difficult later on to remedy conditions; but if we take hold of the matter now we can make provision in this very bill that will prevent land monopoly, and will secure to the laborers the advantage secured by the incorporation of Porto Rico in our commercial union.

In the Hawaiian bill we take these matters up. We limited the holdings of agricultural corporations, we provided for reports to the Department of Labor as to the area and extent of agricultural holdings, the condition of the laborers employed on the holdings, their nationality, and their wages. We also provided for a commissioner of labor, who should make reports both to the Hawaiian legislature and the American Congress regarding the condition of labor as to sanitation, intelligence, wages, and other conditions; and thus we laid the foundation for intelligent action both upon the part of the Territorial legislature and of Congress. This bill is entirely wanting in these matters. It provides simply for government without regarding the conditions of the people governed and without regard to the economic conditions which, if neglected, will make good government absolutely impossible, however perfect may be the form of the government framed.

The question of land monopoly is one that is not familiar to the people of this country. We have here 70,000,000 of people in a country capable of supporting four or five hundred millions, but this question is one which has become a most vital question in all densely populated countries, and we must recollect that Porto Rico is one of the most densely populated countries in the world. The best security for stable and intelligent government there will be small holdings or present proprietorship, and a bill providing for the government of Porto Rico which does not take hold vigorously of the land and labor questions utterly fails in all the purposes of scientific government.

Seneca Nation of New York Indians.

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. RYAN,
OF NEW YORK.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, May 7, 1900,

On the bill (H. R. 4718) to regulate the collection and disbursement of moneys arising from the leases made by the Seneca Nation of New York Indians, and for other purposes.

Mr. RYAN of New York said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This bill is for the purpose of correcting abuses which have become chronic with the Seneca Nation of New York Indians and are a disgrace now not alone to the fair name of the Empire State, but also to the United States Government, whose wards these red men are. I submitted the measure to the House at the request of a large number of representative members of the tribe. It has the approval and commendation of the board of Indian commissions, and Mr. W. A. Jones, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, has urged that it be passed. Investigations by Congress have proved that the moneys accruing from leases and otherwise have been improvidently expended.

While I do not wish to contend that there are no redeeming features to the form of government and practices in vogue in the collection and disbursement of this money, still I wish to draw the attention of the members of the House to the fact that time and again Congress has taken this matter up and has given the officers of the tribe every opportunity to convince the members in control of Indian affairs in the House and Senate that no irregularities were going on, but they have absolutely and totally failed on each and every occasion. In fact, the whole burden of evidence has proved conclusively that the funds of the Seneca Nation are being misappropriated.

THE SIX NATIONS AND THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT.

Prior to the year 1784 the Six Nations of Indians were rampant in New York State, the Senecas being particularly numerous in that section of the State which borders on Lake Erie and its attributary streams. In that year, however, the Government entered into a treaty of peace with the Senecas, to bring to a close the ravaging exploits of the red men. By the provisions of that treaty, as I understand it, the United States assumed protection over the Senecas, and took them in as wards of the Government. Reservations were then established throughout the entire western portion of New York. Senate investigations have held that the Government—the Federal Government—held title to this land in trust for the Indians. It appears that Massachusetts claimed the land under a charter to the Plymouth Company from Charles II of England. New York claimed the same lands under a grant from the Duke of York. A commission was appointed by each State to settle these disputed claims. That commission met at

Hartford, Conn., and a settlement was effected on December 16, 1786, Massachusetts ceding to New York all claims of government, jurisdiction, and sovereignty, and New York gave to the Bay State the right of preemption from the natives. It was practically, in a few words, granting sovereignty to New York and the right of Massachusetts to buy the land in case the Indians desired to sell.

This quasi settlement of the ownership of the lands was effected two years after the peace-treaty conference. At the time the peace treaty was signed by the Government and the famous Indian chief Cornplanter, who acted with other chiefs for the Seneca Nation, the United States set aside about 6,000,000 acres of this land for Indian reservations.

THE LAND TITLES.

Some few years later Robert Morris received from the State or Massachusetts its preemption rights to this land and what title it may have had to give. I fail to see, however, that Mr. Morris received any title from the State of Massachusetts except the right to buy this property in case the red men wanted to sell. Nevertheless, in 1797 Mr. Morris secured from the Indians all but thirteen of the reservations, being all save about 1,000,000 of the 6,000,000 acres set aside by the Government. From this transfer, I believe, the Seneca Nation received $75,000, which was deposited in the Treasury of the United States, the agreement being that the interest on this sum was to be turned over annually for the support and maintenance of the tribe.

Mr. Chairman, we have now reached the point where the Indians have left about 1,000,000 acres of their original grant. In those earlier times it seems that 5,000,000-acre land sales where the city of Buffalo, the city of Rochester, and many smaller cities and towns now stand were passed over without much comment or record and on very flimsy titles. I believe the Indians have to-day about 55,000 or 60,000 acres of that land, and the white men are still claiming title to it.

THE OGDEN LAND COMPANY.

A corporation known as the Ogden Land Company was the institution that passed out title to those now claiming ownership. Let us see what title the Ogden Land Company had to this property. The Ogden people derived their alleged title from Robert Morris through and under his deed from the State of Massachusetts, his title being one of preemption solely.

Webster defines preemption to be the act or right of purchasing before others, as the privilege or prerogative formerly enjoyed by the king of buying provisions for his household in preference to others. This was abolished by Charles 11. In American law, a privilege enjoyed by Government in relation to Indian lands. Congress has the exclusive right of preemption to all Indian lands lying within the territory of the United States. (Burrill's Law Dictionary, supra; 8 Wheaton, 543; 1 Kent's Commentaries, 257.)

The late Hon. Charles Daniels, for many years a justice of the supreme court of New York State and a jurist of the highest standing, was thoroughly familiar with all the facts concerning the claim of the Ogden Land Company. He said in the House of Representatives:

Now, Mr. Speaker, all that the Ogden Company have in connection with this matter is simply the right to buy out the Indians in case the Indians are willing to sell. They have no further authority over the property in any shape or form, and the Supreme Court of the United States, in 5 Wallace, decided that the Indians were owners of the property and no person had the right to interfere with them or force an exchange of property unless they were willing to sell. It was simply the option to buy the lands of the Indians, and the Indians refused to sell. From the time when the treaty was first made with them—and they were cheated by the treaty—the Ogden Company were really required to and did convey back to the Indians these two reservations because of the fact that they had been cheated; and, I repeat, from that time to this the Indians have been unwilling to make any agreement with these people or to part with their title under any circumstances.

In the case of the New York Indians (5 Wallace, 761) the Supreme Court of the United States held—

That until the Indians have sold their lands and removed from them in pursuance of the treaty stipulation, they are to be regarded as still in their ancient possessions and are under their original title, and entitled to the undisputed enjoyment of them.

Judge Nelson says:

All agree that the Indian right of occupancy creates an indefensible title to the reservation that may extend from generation to generation, and will cease only by dissolution of the tribe or their consent to sell to the party possessed of the right of preemption.

Indian Commissioner Jewell, when in charge of the Seneca Agency, made a thorough study of the title to the property. In closing his report he has to say:

The consensus of opinion would seem to be that the Indians have an indefeasible right and title to the occupancy of their lands reserved to them and their heirs forever, subject only to the right of preemption when they choose to sell. Preemption and sovereignty being inseparable, it is difficult to see what tangible interest the Ogden Land Company have in these lands. In my opinion it is clear that the Ogden Land Company have no vested right in these Indian lands. If the Indians choose to sell their title, and the Ogden Land Company purchase upon the terms made by the Indians, and the sale is made with the consent of the agents of the State of New York, and in the presence of a commissioner of the United States Government, and ratified by the United States Government, and the terms of sale completed, then the Ogden Land Company would get a title, and not otherwise.

It is beyond question that the Indians are entitled to occupy their lands from generation to generation, and until they become absolutely extinct, and when they do become extinct the title is in the General Government. I have cited the progress of title and depletion of these lands in order to demonstrate how watchful Congress should be lest all the lands of the Seneca Nation be taken from them and they become, in their entirety, a burden on the Government. As I have before stated, there are still two reservations up in the western end of the State, comprising about 55,000 acres, occupied and owned by the Allegany and Cattaraugus tribes of the Seneca Nation. The property is known as the Allegany and Cattaraugus reservations, and is located in the counties of Chautauqua, Cattaraugus, and Erie.

THE TREATY OF 1826.

In the year 1826 a treaty was entered into between the Indians and the Ogden Land Company whereby the Indians were to release 86,887 acres of their property in New York State, and were to receive from the land company $48,260. This treaty was never ratified by the United States Senate. In addition to this, the Government provided them with other lands west of the Missouri River for their permanent homes.

Acting under that agreement, the Government set aside for them 1,834,000 acres of land in the State of Kansas, allowing approximately 320 acres to each individual of the 5,700 New York Indians. When the territory comprising this land was opened up for settlement under the Administration of President Lincoln the Indian lands were bought up. Some of the red men received their pro rata share of the money; others did not. In the urgent deficiency bill of this session there is an item appropriating $2,000,000 to satisfy the claims of the Indians who did not receive their money from the sale.

The tenth section of that treaty provided that the tribe was to remove to their new homes within five years. The deed from the Seneca Nation to Ogden & Fellows (comprising at that time the Ogden Land Company) conveyed four reservations—the Buffalo Creek Reservation, estimated to contain 49,920 acres; the Cattaraugus Reservation, estimated to contain 21,680 acres; the Allegany, estimated to contain 30,469 acres, and the Tonawanda, estimated to contain 12,800 acres.

The status of this case has been determined by the Government, the Senate investigating and reporting.

However, the Indians were given five years in which to migrate to their new homes, five years in which to forsake their familiar camping grounds, their hunting grounds, and their fishing grounds, and strike out for the West, where the red men were fast being driven. It is not unnatural that they revolted a bit at this procedure, and we find that before the expiration of the five years in which they were given to "vamose" difficulties arose between them and the Ogden Land Company, which finally resulted in another treaty—that of 1842. The Indians had refused to accept the new conditions. We note that the land company made another backdown, and by this treaty of 1842 stipulated that the Seneca Nation might continue in the occupation of the reservations of Cattaraugus and Allegany, two of the four which had been deeded by the treaty of 1838. The cession of these lands by Ogden and Fellows gave the Indians a further title of some sort in these two reservations. They at least held the land thereafter by the right of occupancy.

The Seneca Nation for its part of the treaty—and we all know that the Indians were dealing with men who had no more right to these lands than they themselves had, and it is my belief not near as much—for the nation's part of the treaty, it conceded the right of occupancy of the Buffalo Creek and Tonawanda reservations to the predecessors of the Ogden Land Company, Messrs. Ogden and Fellows. But the Indians residing on these two last-named reservations still refused to give up their lands. They had been given large tracts of land in Kansas on which to establish their permanent homes. They accepted this, but refused to quit the occupancy of the Tonawanda Reservation, and they are there yet.

The Kansas land was sold. The bulk of the money from this sale did not go direct to the Indians, but was taken by the Ogden Land Company, and the Indians were told they could have the Tonawanda Reservation for it. This deal was consummated by a treaty formulated in 1857. The Indians' refusal to leave the reservation left the treaties of 1838 and 1842 still unexecuted, so the treaty of 1857 did nothing further than to put the Tonawandas back to the position they held prior to the treaty of 1838. The status of the Indians and the Ogden Land Company had undergone no change during the intervening years, but by virtue of the terms of the treaty of 1857 and by an act of Congress in March, 1859, the Indians' purchase of the land from the Ogden Company—with the funds from their Kansas sale—gave them all the title the Ogden people were able to give, as well as their own right and title. The full title of the reservation, therefore, is now held by the comptroller of the State of New York in trust for the Indians.

The Cattaraugus and Allegany tribes did not receive their money from the Kansas sale, but Congress has at this session appropriated money to reimburse them. They did not, however, quit their reservations. What I have here stated to the House is, in general, I believe, the status of the Indians in so far as their land rights are concerned. Eliminating the verbiage that usually accompanies the reports of the ethnological researches—and their burden of proof flows always in the same direction—there is much circumstantial evidence to show that in earlier days the Indians were not given the voluminous portion of the many transactions into which they were drawn by the white investors and prospectors, but I have not touched on this fact, because we have now to deal with the Indian as he is to-day, not what he was one hundred years ago. Congress must shape his future. He has been taken out of his natural channel and placed amid new conditions and surroundings, and his training for generations back has not been such as would enable him to adapt himself to this new life. He can not battle successfully with his white brethren, and, being under the protection of the Government, Congress must assist him along his way until his race is run.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE SENECA INDIANS.

While we are looking to the future of the Seneca Indian I ask the indulgence of the House in an effort to show how corruption has existed in the handling of the funds of the Seneca Nation for years back and has become worse with age. We note that until the year of 1847 the tribal form of government was in vogue in the Six Nations. The chief was absolute. He directed the affairs of the tribe and handled all the funds. In 1847, however, the members of the Seneca Nation revolted against the chief. For what? Because it was charged that he was misappropriating the funds of the members of the tribe. The chief had to go. The tribal government was abolished and a constitutional form was established. The tribe elected a president, a treasurer, a secretary, and a council. This council was composed of 16 members, 8 from the Cattaraugus Reservation and a like number from the Allegany Reservation. The chief had received for distribution about $12,000 annually, being the interest on the funds held in trust by the Government.

We now have on the Cattaraugus and Allegany reservations about 2,300 Indians. The form of government established in 1847 still prevails. The nation receives from various sources each year between $20,000 and $25,000. The greater portion of this money is received from leases given by the Indians for divers purposes, but in the main bought up by oil and gas speculators. In 1870 a grant of 45 acres was given to the New York, Lake Erie and Western Railroad, and a few years afterwards the individual Indians began to grant leases to settlers outside of this 45-acre tract. The people holding these individual leases applied to Congress, and in 1875 the leases were confirmed by both Houses under the stipulation that they were to run for twelve years. Again in 1891 Congress extended the leases, which had been confirmed by the council, to ninety-nine years.

MONEY TO BE DISTRIBUTED—HOW?

Since this trafficking in leases began the individual Indian has fared very badly. All moneys received should be distributed pro rata among the members of the two reservations; but the officers have been most careless in this distribution, and as a result the Indian receives approximately about one-tenth of his pro rata share. A bill similar to the measure now before this House passed the Senate in the Fifty-fifth Congress, but died here. At the time the measure was before the members in the other end of the Capitol an investigation was ordered, and I quote here some of its findings. The following is the officer's report:

JUNE 1, 1895, TO 1896.

Paid officers under the administration of Frank Patterson from June, 1895, to June, 1896	$1,847.20
Paid board bill for officers and people	1,092.60
Paid school trustees and wood for schools	127.00
Paid poormasters for the poor of Cattaraugus and Allegany reservations	443.00
Paid highway labor, Cattaraugus and Allegany reservations	464.50
Paid miscellaneous accounts allowed	895.00
Paid attorney and disbursements in suits	147.00
Paid land claim	20.00
Paid agriculture	150.00
Paid for churches and public buildings	150.00
Total	5,321.30

The total receipts and disbursements of the treasurer of the Seneca Nation of Indians under the administration of Frank Patterson, president.

W. C. HOAG, *Treasurer.*

Total receipts	$6,850.15
Total disbursements	6,841.60
Balance on hand	8.55

1896 TO 1897.

Paid officers under the administration of William C. Hoag, president, June, 1896, to June, 1897	$1,016.19
Paid board bill for the officers and the people in council	1,055.15
Paid school trustees and for schools, Cattaraugus and Allegany reservations	128.50
Paid for the poor relief, Cattaraugus and Allegany reservations	389.00
Paid highway labor, Cattaraugus and Allegany	696.13
Paid miscellaneous accounts allowed	4,783.16
Paid attorneys	$50.00
Paid for churches	105.00
Paid agriculture society	175.00
Total	8,398.13

The total receipts and disbursements of the treasurer of the Seneca Nation of Indians under the administration of William C. Hoag, president.

T. F. JAMERSON, *Treasurer.*

Total receipts	$10,443.21
Total disbursements	10,082.61
Balance on hand	360.60
Of all the disbursements from June, 1891, to June, 1897, the total amount paid on orders issued prior to June, 1891	3,136.10

All of which is respectfully submitted.
Dated this 28th day of December, 1897.

THEODORE F. JAMERSON,
KING TALLCHIEF,
HARRISON HALFTOWN,
JOHN SNYDER,
Committee.

It will be noted from the table that the account listed "miscellaneous accounts" increased nearly $4,000 in one year.

The Committee on Indian Affairs of the House gave a hearing on this bill some time ago. All the officers of the Seneca Nation attended and two representatives of the tribe. The officers opposed the bill. The representatives of the tribe were strongly in favor of it. I will read the report of the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, which fully explains what transpired at that hearing. The officers, by their own statements, showed incompetency and carelessness bordering on crime in the handling of the funds of the tribe. The report says:

The committee gave a full hearing to the parties interested in this bill, at which there were in attendance the officers of the Seneca Nation opposed to certain members of the Seneca tribe, who favor the bill, and members of the Board of Indian Commissioners, who were earnestly in favor of the bill. That hearing, together with Senate Document No. 190, second session Fifty-fifth Congress, discloses the fact that the method of keeping accounts in the Seneca Nation now is totally defective; that the officers were unable to explain any discrepancies that appeared in the accounts, and stated that it was the custom of the nation at the close of each year to pass the accounts and immediately destroy all vouchers. It also disclosed the fact that in addition to irregularities in the handling and accounting for the moneys that there is extravagance in the disposal thereof, and it is believed that the bill now reported will correct these errors. Therefore it is favorably reported.

PROVISIONS OF THIS BILL.

The bill provides that all moneys arising from the various sources, rents from village leases, rents from oil leases—for a portion of the reservation has been leased out to oil and gas speculators—all this money under the provisions of the measure will be collected by the United States agent of the New York Indian Agency and disbursed by him pro rata among the Indians. It provides that he shall make a report to the Government here of all money collected and from what sources and how distributed. Of the money he receives he will turn over, if the House and Senate pass this bill, $2,500 to the treasurer of the Seneca Nation to meet the routine expenses of the council in the government of the two reservations. After this amount has been deducted, together with his fee of $250, he will distribute the balance among the heads of the families of the nation in the same manner and under the same conditions that the annuities paid to the nation by the United States are distributed.

Further, the agent will be under bond to the United States in such sum as will be approved of by the Secretary of the Interior.

Now, Mr. Chairman, my motive in pressing this bill is none other than to protect these Indians from the pernicious methods of the officers of the tribe. The Government is bound to support the Seneca Nation, but in doing so we must insist that the funds of the reservation be divided pro rata among the members of the tribe, and not go to enrich a few.

Post-Office Appropriation Bill.

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN W. GAINES,
OF TENNESSEE,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, April 23, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 10001) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901—

Mr. GAINES said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Congress is given the express power to establish a postal system, the words of the Constitution being: "The Congress shall have the power to establish post-offices and post-roads." This grant gives Congress the sole power over and control of the postal system. The courts of last resort without dissent hold that this power gives Congress the sole right to say what shall be included in and excluded from the mails.

The recent case of Rapier ex parte (143 U. S., 134-135), the Louisiana Lottery case, affirms the older case of Jackson ex parte (96 U. S., 729), which held that—

The power possessed by Congress to establish post-offices and post-roads embraces the regulation of the entire postal system of the country.

The right to designate what shall be carried (in the mails) necessarily involves the right to determine what shall be excluded.

Chief Justice Fuller, in affirming the Jackson case, says:

While the legitimate ends of the exercise of the power (postal power) in question is to furnish mail facilities for the people of the United States, it is also true that mail facilities are not required to be furnished for every purpose.

Interstate trust contracts are prohibited by the anti-trust statute of 1890, under the power given Congress to regulate commerce between the States and foreign nations. Although thus condemned, we still permit and thereby aid such trusts by allowing them to use the mails to carry on their outlawed business.

Why should we exclude these obnoxious combines from the front door and let them in at the side door? Why not say trusts shall not use the mails to carry on their business? We have said this to the Louisiana Lottery and other obnoxious concerns and crushed them throughout the entire domain of the United States. Congress, under the adjudications alluded to, has the sole power and the right to exclude anything it chooses from the mails, whether moral or immoral. The right to use the mails is a privilege, not a fundamental right. This service is not, as Justice Fuller says, "furnished for every purpose."

At an early day in this Congress I introduced a bill, found at length in my speech in this House January 19, published in the RECORD, volume 33, page 10756, which proposes to bar these obnoxious monsters commonly called trusts from the use of the mails. In that bill I undertake to define, and I think I have successfully defined—and if not, I pray that this Congress may successfully do so—exactly what trusts are, and exactly what trusts or combines or monopolies should be included in, and exactly what should be excluded from, our mails. We know what this powerful, far-reaching power can do. It crushed outright the Louisiana Lottery, which had been upheld by the State and Federal courts.

I am glad to say that what I have said heretofore, and possibly what others have said, so far as I know, has brought sharply to public attention the question of this power of Congress and its capacity to destroy trusts. I am delighted to find my distinguished friend the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Mr. HEPBURN, agrees with me in the construction of this power. He has introduced a bill excluding the pictures, periodicals, advertisements, contracts, etc., of prize fighters from the mail. And I submit, if this postal power can be legitimately invoked to bar from the mails those who knock out a few of the people a part of the time, certainly it can and should be invoked to close the mails to concerns which knock out all the people all the time.

So you see, Mr. Chairman, that great minds are really taking up this question [laughter] and suggest that we invoke this postal power of Congress to crush out these concerns rather than permit them longer to paralyze the arms of industry and strike from the lips of the laboring people their hard-earned crumbs.

Mr. Chairman, I find in a recent issue of the American Law Review, March-April, an article from the pen of evidently a distinguished gentleman who has been thinking along the same line, Prof. E. W. Huffcut, of Cornell University, who concludes that one of the ways to crush out the trusts is to invoke the power of exclusion from the mails. He says:

There are perhaps three ways in which Congress could effectively exercise a power to restrict or destroy the business of State corporations engaged in interstate commerce. * * *

(1) It might forbid such corporations as fall within a definition of monopoly the use of the mails. (2) It might tax State corporations upon their interstate commerce. (3) It might directly prohibit State corporations from engaging in interstate commerce.

His second and third propositions do not commend themselves altogether to me. Upon his first proposition—to exclude from the mails—he says:

Congress has exercised the right to exclude from the mails letters or circulars concerning lotteries or other enterprises in which there is the element of chance (act September 29, 1890, 26 Stat. L., 465), and this legislation has been held constitutional, citing the Jackson and Rapier cases. It has exercised the right to prohibit the carriage of indecent publications and articles in the mails or by interstate carriers. (25 Stat. L., 496; 29 Stat. L., 512.)

It has forbidden the transportation of diseased cattle or meat which has been exposed to infection. (23 Stat. L., 31; 26 Stat. L., 1039.) All these acts are a proper exercise of the Federal police power.

But it is now clear that the police power is not confined to the protection of health or morals or safety, but extends to the protection of the reasonable and convenient exercise of private rights. (173 U. S., 285; Lake, etc., R. R. vs. Ohio.)

Why, then, may not Congress denounce monopolistic combinations, whether in the form of corporations or not, as a hindrance to such rights, and deny to such combinations the use of the mails?

It may denounce gambling contracts into which persons voluntarily enter, and forbid such contracts to be made or executed by the use of the mails a fortiori. It may denounce a monopoly which compels the people at large to buy the necessaries of life at a price fixed by the monopoly, and may deny to it the use of the mails.

The postal power is exercised regardless of the police powers of Congress. Congress, being the author and sole director of our postal system, has the power to exclude from the mails, regardless of the question of whether or not the thing excluded is moral or immoral. That it is immoral is an additional reason why it should be excluded. The postal power, as stated, is a granted right, and could and does exist regardless of the often-doubted police power of Congress.

The postal system would be more effective in crushing trusts than we at first blush would judge, for the reason that it applies uniformly to State and interstate mails. And therefore to say to trusts, whether engaged in State commerce only, or interstate only, or both, that you shall not use the mails, so necessary for your business, would crush trusts engaged in State commerce only, as well as those engaged in interstate trust business only, or those engaged in both. The commerce powers of the several States operate and can only operate upon commerce carried on within the limits of the respective States, while Congress can only regulate interstate commerce. But we see the postal system operate on both State and interstate trade. Hence, to deprive them—trusts engaged in State trust or interstate trust business—would be a uniform denial and sweeping destruction of these institutions.

The power of the several States over State commerce and of Congress over interstate commerce—both powers being clear and now exercised by the several States and by Congress respectively—has failed to control or destroy these nefarious combines. Whether the State laws are insufficient or not enforced or the Federal law is insufficient or not enforced we do not here stop to question, but we do say that the trusts are increasing and thriving while the people are crying out against these concerns that are daily sinking their fangs deeper and deeper into the body politic and destroying the people's right of free trade between the States and in the States.

If protection, "the mother of trusts," is to remain the law of the land, as it will under Republican administration; if we are not to have free trade, which would largely destroy these trusts, then we should, and at once, exclude from the mails these concerns and aid both the States and the United States in dealing promptly, vigorously, and successfully with them. It has been long the law of the land that Congress, through the commerce clause of the Constitution, can not reach monopoly and trust engaged in trade done within the several States.

It is equally clear Congress alone can regulate trade between the States, and that the States have the power to control State commerce is unquestionable. In the leading recent case, Addystone Pipe Company Trust Case (175 U. S. Rep.), decided December 4, 1899, by unanimous court, it was found that a trust was doing a State trust trade and interstate trade. The court held the anti-trust act of 1890 prohibited the interstate trust traffic, but that the act did not, and could not under the Constitution, control the State or domestic trust trade. I quote the conclusion of the court in this case:

The views above expressed lead generally to an affirmance of the judgment of the court of appeals. In one aspect, however, that judgment is too broad in its terms—the injunction is too absolute in its directions—as it may be construed as applying equally to commerce wholly within a State as well as to that which is interstate or international only. This was probably an inadvertence merely. Although the jurisdiction of Congress over commerce among the States is full and complete, it is not questioned that it has none over that which is wholly within a State, and therefore none over combinations or agreements so far as they relate to a restraint of such trade or commerce. It does not acquire any jurisdiction over that part of a combination or agreement which relates to commerce wholly within a State, by reason of the fact that the combination also covers and regulates commerce which is interstate. The latter it can regulate, while the former is subject alone to the jurisdiction of the State. The combination herein described covers both commerce which is wholly within a State and also that which is interstate.

In a still later case (March 19, 1900), the Waters-Pierce Oil Company vs. State of Texas, Justice McKenna, reading the opinion for the court, discussed the power of the States to require domestic and foreign corporations to comply with State laws regulating them. The court said:

A corporation is a creature of the law, and none of its powers are original. They are precisely what the incorporating act has made them, and can only be exerted in the manner which that act authorizes. In other words, the State prescribes the purposes of a corporation and the means of executing those purposes. Purposes and means are within the State's control. This is true as to domestic corporations. It has even a broader application as to foreign corporations.

The court cites and reaffirms the old cases, amongst which we find the Head Case, 2 Cranch., 127 (1804).

The court in this case reaffirms the former holdings of the Supreme Court, and in brief says: "They [the States] may exclude the foreign corporation entirely." * * * They may be restricted in the "discretion" of the States. "The whole matter rests in their [the States'] discretion." I now call attention to what the court says on the State's powers over foreign corporations:

In Paul vs. Virginia (8 Wall., 168), the dependent and derivative rights of corporations were again declared. Bank of Augusta vs. Earl was quoted from; and it was again cited that a corporation is the mere creation of local law and can have no legal existence beyond the limits of the sovereignt

where created, and the recognition of its existence in other States and the enforcement of its contracts made therein depend purely upon the comity of those States.

Having no absolute right of recognition in other States, but depending for such recognition and enforcement of its contracts upon their assent, it follows, as a matter of course, that such assent may be granted upon such terms and conditions as those States may think proper to impose. They may exclude the foreign corporation entirely; they may restrict its business to particular localities, or they may exact such security for the performance of its contracts with their citizens as in their judgment will best promote the public interest. The whole matter rests in their discretion.

Here, then, is the old law recently reenunciated as to the powers of the respective States over "domestic" and "foreign" corporations. As to the former, we see the "purposes and means are within the State's control," while as to "foreign corporations" the power is "broader," which is that the States may go so far as to "exclude" them "entirely."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. MOON. I yield ten minutes additional to the gentleman.

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Chairman, there is something wrong somewhere, that in the face of these powers of the States and the Federal Government they are not exercised so as to relieve the people from the burden imposed by these unnatural, insatiate combines. I have heard of no new cases filed against any trust or combine by order and direction of the Attorney-General of the United States, who alone has the power and right under the trust act of 1890 to direct such suits. I have heard of many suits filed under State trust laws, and I am glad to know that this oil case comes from the Democratic State of Texas and arose from the fact that this great oil concern defied the anti-trust law passed by that State.

And I am equally delighted to state that the Addystone Pipe Company case came from Tennessee, and rejoice to state that there was a criminal proceeding filed as well as the injunction heard in this case against this corporation, and that both suits were instituted by Democratic officials, one of whom I knew well; he was my particular friend, now dead, the Hon. James H. Bible, United States district attorney. He was a Democratic elector with me in 1892, and his memory is near and dear to all who knew him. His record shows he was a faithful and patriotic official. Here are two leading cases against trusts from Democratic States.

What do we hear from the great State of Ohio, the home of the President and his distinguished aids-de-camp? We hear the trusts there refuse to comply with the orders of the courts and that relief is denied the people, the legislature just having adjourned without taking any action. Why, General Monnett, the distinguished ex-attorney-general of that State, practically says to me, in a letter, that the trusts in that State are more powerful than the courts; that the courts have submitted interrogatories to the trusts and they refused to answer, and the Republican legislature that has just adjourned refused to remedy the law, though General Monnett and others, as private citizens, urged proper amendments.

What is the history of the Republican party in that State on this subject? The President of the United States was four years governor of Ohio, yet no trust legislation was had during his administration. Why? The power of the State to so legislate was old and well known. Justice McKenna cites cases decided in 1804, ninety-six years ago, in support of the opinion of the court in the Texas case two months ago. The President can not plead ignorance of this old law and right of the States. He failed again to do his "plain duty." But it remained for the trusts to bury politically Governor Bushnell and the patriotic Monnett, by whose influence a trust law was passed in that State.

General Monnett undertook to enforce it vigorously, with the result that the courts were overridden by the trusts, and he and Governor Bushnell turned out of office without even a decent political burial. The administration of General Monnett was not indorsed by the Republicans on the trust question, but the Democrats did indorse it and went down in defeat.

I will read a clipping from the St. Louis Republic of April 16, 1900, showing that the Ohio legislature failed to pass any anti-trust legislation, although General Monnett writes me that he had suggested certain amendments which would strengthen existing law. The Republic says:

NO ANTI-TRUST LAWS—OHIO LEGISLATURE WILL ADJOURN WITHOUT OFFENDING MONOPOLIES.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, *April 15.*

The Ohio legislature will adjourn sine die at noon to-morrow. The past week has been a perfect orgie of legislation, and all records have been broken in number of laws enacted. None of the anti-trust bills have become a law. The Price bill, requiring all domestic and foreign corporations to make annual reports to the secretary of state, passed the house, but the senate has not acted upon it. A final effort will be made to break the deadlock on the appropriation for the Ohio centennial, but there is little hope that it will succeed.

Compare the record of Democratic State legislatures and Republican legislatures, Democratic State and Federal officials with Republican State and Federal officials, and you will find that the Democrats prove their faith by their works—oppose trusts and enforce the laws against them, where the Republican officials pretend and do nothing but cultivate these monsters "of so frightful mien as to be hated need but to be seen."

I have before stated that the great weakness in the Sherman anti-trust law is this: That the Attorney-General of the United States has the sole power to say when suits shall be instituted against these concerns and when they shall not. If he had the disposition to vigorously insist on this prerogative, he has not the time. This was never intended to be a one-man government. The President is one man, it is true, but his powers are limited and he is controlled largely—absolutely in some matters—by Congress, and sometimes by the Senate alone. But as the law is, the Attorney-General has too much power and it should be changed, even if no other legislation is had.

I am opposed to putting it in the power of any one man, I would not care if it was Andrew Jackson himself, to say when and whether or not suits against trusts should be filed. I want the right given to the people, the suffering people, the people who are the victims of these nefarious concerns, and let them go to the criminal courts, the Federal courts, and say: "Here is a trust that is grinding me to death and I have not the money to employ a great lawyer to back up a lawsuit; I have not the railroad fare to go to the Federal Government at Washington to see the Attorney-General about my rights." I want to give the right to the plain people, who are the sufferers. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Government for Porto Rico.

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALBERT J. BEVERIDGE,

OF INDIANA,

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

Thursday, March 29, 1900.

The Senate having under consideration the bill (H. R. 8245) temporarily to provide revenues for the relief of the island of Porto Rico, and for other purposes—

Mr. BEVERIDGE said:

Mr. PRESIDENT: The first issue joined in this debate involves the power of Congress over the islands and the peoples which Providence has placed in our keeping, and therefore the possible expediency of retaining them. It involves the power and progress of the Republic throughout the future. For if Congress has not a free hand to deal with these islands as their different conditions and changing needs demand, it may not only be inexpedient but it may be difficult to hold them. To treat Porto Rico as we treat Hawaii, and to deal with the latter as we deal with the Philippines, and to apply to all *immediately* the same form of government which the intention of statehood has prescribed for our Territories from which our States were formed, is a proposition the unwisdom of which appears in its statement.

We have the greatest opportunity, the greatest duty with which Fortune ever blessed a nation. Events have established us in positions of command over the Pacific. The key to the commerce of the East is in our hands. We are the warden of the gates of the Gulf. With the canal a completed work, we control the natural future highways of ocean commerce more than any power than England. More than any people of history, Providence is placing us where, finally, we may compel the peace of the world. Porto Rico, Cuba, the Canal, Hawaii, the Philippines, make us the sovereign power among the nations. I say this because I can not believe that we will surrender our possessions to others because we can not invent appropriate methods for their government.

I can not believe that our Constitution so manacles our hands and narrows our vision and numbs our brain. I will not admit that our Constitution is such a charter of death. I will not admit that our fathers, those master minds of history's most expanding and administering race, so anchored us within a narrow harbor when the high seas call us, their islands are ours, and the inhabitants thereof need our guiding hand to civilize and to redeem them. My faith is in a Constitution which is a chart by which we sail all seas and make all ports—a Constitution which is a commission for the appropriate exercise of our strength as it develops.

For one, Mr. President, I rejoice that we have these possessions. I believe that we have them by the decrees of a Providence which, in all our history, has outrun the wisdom of Presidents and Congresses; and I accept the privileges, duties, and burdens of our situation in the spirit expressed to me by our great Admiral, as

we stood on the *Olympia's* decks and looked across to the mountains of Luzon, when he said:

"A higher power than mine was in this business; a higher will and a wisdom than ours unfurled that flag over this ocean empire—ours now, and ours forever."

The Philippines, Porto Rico, Hawaii, and, as I hope, in the future, by the free choice of her people, Cuba—all ours. In the markets they command, in the markets they afford, in their resources to be developed, in their people to be educated, in their sovereign location upon the future highways of the world's greatest commerce, in their strategic positions in all future wars, rendering us impregnable ourselves and giving the validity of superior power to any arbitration we suggest; in a hundred circumstances these possessions are valuable to the Republic beyond our present ability to estimate. If we hold them, this Senate chamber, in coming centuries, will ring with praise of the wisdom that accepted our opportunity and placed the Republic on the throne of the world. If we surrender them to more discerning and powerful peoples, succeeding generations will condemn the folly that not only yielded our high advantage, but placed the Republic at the mercy of its possible future foes.

FREE HAND NECESSARY TO PROPERLY CARE FOR OUR POSSESSIONS.

And yet I repeat again that the possible surrender of all the war has won for us is the first issue in debate; for it may be difficult to keep these islands unless we may provide for them according to the wisdom of events—according to the common sense of situations. The needs of Porto Rico are peculiar to Porto Rico; we must administer to them as good judgment may demand. The needs of Hawaii are peculiar to Hawaii. The needs of the Philippines are peculiar to the archipelago. The needs of all are unlike the needs of our American States when they were Territories.

The people of each island group are unlike the people of the other. And none of them are like the American pioneers who dominated our continental wilderness. And if we may not adopt measures fitting the condition and the necessities of each and change those measures as conditions and necessities change, it might possibly develop that it would be better to give them up. The alternative proposed by the opposition is not inviting.

That alternative is the proposition that our Constitution extends, whether we wish it to or not, over peoples who do not understand its meaning; that these peoples shall be provided for according to a fixed formula of government prepared for the highest type of self-governing communities the world ever saw; that before these people even comprehend the term self-government, before they realize its duties, burdens, and rewards, exercise of that function is to be forced upon them; that they are to be made a part of the American people, States of the American Union, and that Porto Rican Senators, Hawaiian Senators, and Filipino Senators shall sit here, equal in dignity and power to the representatives of Massachusetts, New York, or any State of this homogeneous Nation, *and that all this shall be determined immediately and irrevocably, now and for all the future.* This is the alternative forced upon us by a partisan opposition. This is the alternative which a political faction, searching for a campaign issue, advances at one of the critical periods of our history.

PRINCIPLE OF FREE HAND STATED.

Let me state what is here involved again. The Government says that Congress may provide such a government for these islands as will be best for them and for us; the opposition says that we can act in only one way toward them, and that way the way devised for our infant States, which were bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh when they were Territories. The Government says that the Republic must teach and train and guide these children for years, for decades—in some instances it may be for generations—till they comprehend what equal laws, free speech, and all the *substance* of liberty means before we give into their hands that self-government which it required hundreds of years for us to comprehend and then hundreds of other years for us to learn to use. The opposition says that we shall bestow self-government *now.*

The Government says that it is unwise *at the present time* to consolidate them with the self-governing people of the Republic; the opposition says that they are this already, by a Constitution that travels faster than our intentions, and applies, by its own force and in its entirety, to situations for the control of which the fathers wrote an apt and specific clause in that very Constitution itself.

The Government says that our power is as ample as the necessities of our situation; that to unprecedented conditions we may apply new and appropriate devices, just as our fathers applied new methods to the novel conditions that surrounded them, and that the Constitution does not limit us to a single form and method of government in "territory belonging to the United States." The opposition says that our power is limited to a fixed method not designed for, nor applicable to, the conditions before us. The opposition says that, in working out the welfare of our island wards, we have no liberty of invention, no scope for the exercise of common sense, no power to apply to one situation that method which is best for it and to a different situation another method which is best for it.

According to the opposition, the Constitution ties our hands and nullifies our understanding; according to the Government, the Constitution places in our hands the commission of all needful powers, and inspires our minds to their best efforts to invent new laws for new conditions, new methods for new necessities. The opposition says that now, this moment, the decree shall be, nay, is, irrevocably registered that the Philippines, Hawaii, Porto Rico, and every other possession we may acquire during all our future shall be States of the American Republic, with Congressmen and Senators helping to devise our laws or to corrupt them. The Government says that *we reserve the future for the future,* but that for the present we will hold these islands as a sacred trust, dealing with them as wisdom and righteousness from day to day shall dictate, developing them into gardens, their inhabitants into happy and prosperous peoples, and when the time shall come that American ideas, American methods, and the American spirit changes their minds, their characters, their habits of thought, and their conception of government, then we or our successors in Congress may admit them into or reject them from the blood of our National life, as the wisdom and justice of posterity may determine.

In a word, the question is whether the Constitution gives Congress a free hand over our possessions, or whether, if we retain them, the Constitution gives them a free hand over us.

We are like a farmer with a farm, part adapted to corn, part to fruit, part to woodland pasture, part a swamp which draining will render fertile, part a highland which irrigation will make productive. The Government says that we must have a free hand to deal with each portion of that farm as its situation and quality requires. The opposition says that, over all, precisely the same agricultural treatment must prevail, regardless of difference of soil or conditions. The sower who sowed alike by the wayside, among thorns, in stony places as well as in prepared ground, is repeated here in those who seek to scatter self-government and the Constitution alike on the people of the Philippines, Hawaii, and Porto Rico, in equal measure, no matter whether they are prepared for it or not, as well as on the brothers of our blood in our American Territories, whom centuries of race education, experience, and tendency had prepared.

We are like a modern business man with many and dissimilar enterprises. The opposition says he must deal with all alike, must devise and apply a common system to different situations; we declare that he should have a free and constructive mind, to meet each situation with appropriate and, therefore, different action.

And so the results of our determination will be as important to the Republic in the future as they are to-day, for they involve directly our growth and its method, our mission and our power to perform it, our whole destiny as the sovereign people of the world.

Mr. President, that phrase is no vague nor vain expression. It is the holiest article of faith in the breast of the common American citizen. He believes that the American people is becoming and is to be the sovereign and saving power among the nations. He knows that human progress is not steady and continuous, but by successive impulses imparted by the master people of each period of human development; that those master peoples who have been the successive guardians of the progress of mankind have been endowed with a vitality, an organizing, administering power which made them in their day the sovereigns of the world; and that, to the eye of History, the work of each of these master peoples has been a necessary part in the development of the human race.

And the profoundest faith of the American people is that our day as the master people of the world has dawned. Their profoundest resolution, so deep and elemental that it is an instinct, is that we will, in our great day of world dominion, do our great work of world regeneration better even than England did and is doing her vast and yet, compared with what ours will be, her lesser work in her day; better even than Rome did hers (and at her Titanic achievements let no man sneer); better still than the Greeks did their work, into which the roots of our civilization and liberty sink and draw, through the soil of three thousand years, some of the most valuable elements of our moral and intellectual life.

It is time to announce the higher law of our National power and the duty it implies; of our National aspirations and the work that justifies them. The American people were not made for a passive example; we were made for a constructive force among mankind. Ours is not the destiny of him who eats, drinks, and is merry because to-morrow he dies. Our energy, passing the power of any people in the world to-day, yea, of any people who ever lived, is meant for a vaster work and a nobler than self-adornment, self-indulgence, and self-admiration.

And if this is so, are we to be stayed by some quibbler's strained construction of our Constitution considered as a dead and merely

written instrument, and not as a living, growing Constitution, developing as the American people develop, and, like Christianity, revealing new beauties and new powers as our sight becomes stronger, clearer, more enlightened?

THE VALUE AND DANGER OF PRECEDENTS—OUR PRESENT SITUATION UNPRECEDENTED IN OUR OWN HISTORY.

The present exact situation is, for us, unprecedented. Our action must be without example in our own history. The decisions of our Supreme Court are not to the precise point, and where analogy applies those decisions to the present conditions they are conflicting and confused. This is fortunate rather than the reverse. New situations should be met with new methods. Search for precedents where none can exist, effort to apply opinions of judges to a condition neither before them nor dreamed of when they wrote those opinions, is not helpful. There are some cases containing expressions which appear to be on one side of the present controversy and others containing passages apparently on the other side; but none of them completely illumine the new fields of effort and of duty into which we have entered.

I admit and assert the authority of precedent. I understand that the philosophy upon which the authority of precedent rests is as deep as civilization itself. But that very philosophy demands that precedents shall apply only to like situations and that the solutions of new problems shall not be hampered by fitting them into inapplicable precedents. The very philosophy of precedent demands the creation of new precedents out of new occasions. Surely we can see more clearly the situation before us with our living eyes than with the dead eyes of the fathers, and even those dead eyes looking not at our problems, but at theirs.

Precedent has its rightful authority, but it has its danger, too. It sanctifies the past, but, used beyond its rightful sphere, it forbids the future. China, we say, is living in the past. She is living in her precedents. She inquires not the best way; she asks only the way of the fathers. She is reminiscent; not inventive. Her memory is abnormal; her initiative is atrophied. Drugged with the opium of precedent, she sits and dreams of ancient glories and the ancient gods. The science of the modern world is a lie to her, because the fathers knew it not. Our medicines are poison, because they are not inherited from the distant past, and enchantment is efficacious still, because her ancestry dealt with the magic of the night. Spirits of evil fly upon the air, and workmen fix charms upon buildings where they labor, to frighten the fell influences of the nether world, because their fathers did the like for a thousand years. Precedent has shod with lead the feet of this puissant people and put upon her eyelids the somnolent spell of dreams. Happy for China when she shall shake that slumber from her blood, and her people, refreshed and inspired by the energy of progress, shall meet each new emergency, opportunity, and duty by the wisdom of a living mind, and not by the wisdom of a brain which, for a thousand years, has been thoughtless dust, and, even when quick and vivid, was solving, not the problems of to-day, but those of the entombed and storied centuries.

Can we, therefore, unaided by judicial decisions, find in the Constitution the free hand needful for our new task? Have we the discretion of our own wisdom? Are we to have the liberty of our national manhood? Are we to have the power of our mission? Did the fathers, unthinking, put a period to our career as an administering people and close the door of the future in our faces? Is this great movement, which has aroused the world to wonder, inspired the American people with the noblest national feeling mankind has seen since the days of Elizabeth, and which makes us, for the first time, the masters of our fate, because it makes us a master among the nations; is this most hopeful movement in the evolution of the world's civilization, this awakening of the American people to their power, their opportunity, and their mission; is this elemental, racial development to cease because a partisan faction so construes our Constitution as to forbid the American people from moving forward to their destiny? And cease it must, if we find not the amplest power, expressed or implied, in our Constitution, for we, above all the peoples of the world, are a people of law, and our Constitution is the supreme ordinance of National life.

CONSTITUTION GIVES FREE HAND UNDER FUNDAMENTAL GENERAL LIMITATIONS.

But the Constitution does give us power as ample as our present opportunities; power so express and emphatic that the opposition dare not quote it, lest it confound them, but fly to subtleties and refinements of other sections not bearing on the matter in dispute; power written by the instinctive anticipation of our development; power penned by the racial impulse in the blood of the fathers; power so complete, emphatic, and unusual that there is in it the suggestion of duty—

"The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States."—*Constitution of the United States*, Article 4, section 3.

So the Constitution says that there can be territory "belonging to the United States." Congress can even "dispose" of that territory. But "territory belonging to the United States" can not be a part of the United States in the sense the opposition insists—that is a contradiction in terms. If "territory belongs to the United States," and at the same time is a part of the United States in the sense in which the opposition uses that word, it belongs to, is owned by, a body politic of which it is itself a part—which is an absurdity in reasoning. And Congress may even "dispose of territory belonging to the United States." "Dispose" of—how? Not by making that territory States only; not by making that territory a part of the Republic only. No; and *provision for such disposition of territory is made elsewhere in the Constitution.* But the words "dispose of any territory belonging to the United States" stand there unlimited as to the method of that disposition.

We can make it a part of the United States if we wish. We can set up independent government if we wish, and alienate it utterly; and yet we could not do that if it is a part of the United States; for how can the United States alienate any part of itself? Or how can any part of the United States alienate itself from the United States?—which is the converse of the proposition. Our Southern brothers asked the latter question, and a million men answered it with their lives.

"Congress shall have power to dispose of territory belonging to the United States."

"Dispose of." We can sell this "territory belonging" to us, then; yet how can we sell it if it is a part of us?

We can sell Puerto Rico; we can sell the Philippines; we can turn them adrift, and all this has been proposed by those who now declare that they are a part of the United States. Does any man doubt that the United States can dispose of Puerto Rico by selling it to another nation? And yet this could not be done if it is a part of the United States in the sense in which the opposition maintain that it is a part of the United States. So that the very power to "dispose of territory belonging to the United States" is the power of the free hand over that territory. The bestowal of that very power is a denial that the Constitution extends over that territory, since, if it so extended, such power would be inconsistent with and contradictory of such a condition.

"The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States."

"Power to make all needful rules and regulations."

Think of power more comprehensive than that. You can not. Power to "dispose of," to sell, to abandon, to exchange, to set up independent government, if we do not keep this "territory belonging to the United States;" power "to make all needful rules and regulations respecting territory belonging to the United States," if we do keep such territory. And it is not a power implied from other sections, as are many of the powers now exercised by Congress and the entire National Government. It is a power expressed—not a power implied.

"The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting territory *or other property* belonging to the United States."

"Territory or *other* property." "Territory belonging to the United States" is "*property*" of the United States, says that Constitution. And if "property," we have the rights of "property," which are familiar to all. But the Constitution even emphasized those rights, and unnecessarily declared that Congress might even "dispose of" it, if Congress so pleased.

Of course Congress, in exercising this power, must pass laws in the manner prescribed in the Constitution. The Constitution determines the method of Congressional action in exercising all its powers, as, for example, the passage of the bill by both Houses, its signature or veto by the President, and so forth. And the Constitution fixes certain fundamental general limitations to and absolute general prohibitions on the power of Congress, as, for example, the passage of ex post facto laws, and so forth; and when Congress makes "needful rules and regulations respecting territory or other property belonging to the United States," it can not transgress these general limitations or prohibitions any more than it can pass laws in any different manner than the one marked out in the Constitution. This is, of course, self-evident, but I state it only that even partisanship shall not say that we put Congress above the Constitution.

OUR INSTITUTIONS EXPLAIN OUR CONSTITUTION.

Does partisanship say that, under power so broad, we could, in providing a new government for Porto Rico, establish a monarchical form of government there, and that therefore we must so construe the Constitution as to forbid such a power? I answer that we could not, even if another section of the Constitution did not, in terms, forbid it.

Why not? Because our Constitution in terms forbids? Yes. But also because our institutions forbid. Institutional law is older, deeper, and as vital as constitutional law. Our Constitution is one of the concrete manifestations of our institutions; our

statutes are another; decisions of our courts are another; our habits, methods, and customs as a people and a race are still another.

Our institutional law is like the atmosphere—impalpable, imperceptible, but all-pervading and the source of life itself. There is scarcely a decision of our courts of last resort involving great constitutional questions which does not refer to the spirit of our institutions as interpreting our Constitution. It is our institutional law which, flowing like our blood through the written Constitution, gives that instrument vitality and power of development.

Our institutions were not established by the Constitution. Institutional law existed before the Constitution. Our institutions had their beginnings well-nigh with the beginning of time. They have developed through the ages. Magna Charta only marked a period in their growth; the assertion of the rights of the Commons marked another; our Revolution marked another; the adoption of our Constitution marked another still. Our institutional law, therefore, the spirit of our written Constitution, as well as that instrument itself, forbids the establishment of monarchy by American authority, in devising new governments for our possessions. Partisanship shrieks "imperialism," and asks where we find words to prevent the development of a czar, beginning with absolute power in our possessions and ending with absolute power in the Republic, if such power as the Government claims the Constitution confers be exercised.

I answer: I find the impossibility of such a development in our Constitution itself; but also, and as fully, in our institutions. I find it in the speech of the people; in the maxims of liberty; in our blood; in our history; in the tendencies of our race. Words would not prevent autocracy if the desire for a king were in the hearts of the people. Words can not bestow republican institutions if the idea of and preference for an absolute ruler is in the minds, traditions, and practices of a people, as they are in Asia.

And words can not impose a czar upon a people whose very speech is the speech of self-government, whose ideals of self-rule for centuries have grown clearer, brighter, dearer. And those who utter fear of "imperialism," meaning by that the overthrow of our republican institutions, are either insincere or else unbelievers in the soundness of American institutions, the purity of the American heart, and the noble intentions of the American mind.

OUR PROGRESS DUE TO OUR INSTITUTIONS AS WELL AS TO OUR CONSTITUTION AND SOMETIMES IN SPITE OF OUR CONSTITUTION.

I have no respect for constitutional learning which deals alone with the written words of the Constitution, or even with the intention of its framers, and ignores the sources and spirit of that great instrument. The Constitution did not give us free institutions; free institutions gave us our Constitution. All our progress toward liberty and popular government, made since the adoption of the Constitution, has been the spirit of our institutions working out its sure results, through the Constitution when possible, and over it when necessary.

Jefferson wrote, in the Declaration of Independence, a denunciation of slavery and called it an "execrable commerce;" it was stricken out at the request of Georgia and South Carolina, and years afterwards slavery was recognized in our Constitution. But slavery was opposed to the spirit of our institutions, and while legalized by our Constitution and defended by armies as brave as ever marched to battle, constitutional slavery went down before institutional liberty; and Appomattox was the capitulation of the word of death in our Constitution to the spirit of life in our institutions.

The Constitution contemplated and provided for the election of Presidents by electors, who should select the best man to preside over the Republic, irrespective of the people's choice. That was the intention of the fathers. But in that they did not correctly interpret the spirit and tendency of our institutions, which is toward getting the Government as close to the people as possible; and so, in spite of the Constitution, in spite of the intention of the fathers, in spite of the fact that this plan was pursued for several elections, the spirit of our institutions prevailed over our Constitution, and no Presidential elector now dare cast his ballot against the candidate for whom the people instruct him to vote.

Every amendment of our Constitution marks the progress of our institutions.

Wherever the Constitution has correctly interpreted our institutions it has lived; wherever it has not correctly interpreted our institutions, it has died. Wherever our Constitution has been weak and insufficient in its apparent expressed powers, the spirit of our institutions has given it life. Read Marshall's opinions; read most of our great constitutional decisions; read the whole history of American constitutional progress, if you would know the beneficent influence of our institutions on our Constitution. Our institutions are not the destroyers of our Constitution, as partisanship would have men believe. No; our institutions are the saviors of our Constitution. The doctrine of implied powers, which has saved the country and the Constitution too, has been made possible only by reading our Constitution by the light of our institutions, as Hamilton and Marshall did.

OUR INSTITUTIONS AS WELL AS OUR CONSTITUTION OUR SECURITY.

And so our security, the security of our island wards, the security of liberty, is not in the written word of the Constitution alone; it is there, of course, but it is in our institutions also, which are the spirit of the Constitution, which illuminate and emphasize the meaning of that noble instrument. England has no written constitution; some countries have had ideal written constitutions. And yet England has steady and continuous liberty and law, while those others, even with written constitutions, sometimes have had bureaucracy and military absolutism. They had the forms of liberty and popular government in these written constitutions, but they did not have free institutions, which alone make formal constitutions living and vital things. England, without a written constitution, is almost as free a government as ours. Law reigns supreme. The poorest gatherer of rags has equal rights before the bar of justice with belted earl or millionaire, and those equal rights are impartially enforced. Neither wealth nor title are favored more than poverty or humble rank in the courts of England; and even royalty appears as witness, the same as his meanest subject.

The Government itself is subject to the will of the people; and no ministry remains in power in face of an adverse majority, or forces into law an act of which the people disapprove. The suffrage is constantly enlarging, and the rights of labor are almost as carefully guarded by the laws of England as by ours. England's treatment of Ireland has been harsh, severe, unjust; and yet even there the spirit of a larger liberty is gradually growing, and Parliament has put through a measure in the interest of the Irish tenant, compelling the landlord to sell his land whether he wants to or not, at a price fixed by others than himself, and enabling the tenant to buy the land by the payment of his rent. Tolerance, justice, and individual liberty are steadily developing throughout the British Empire, instead of diminishing.

To-morrow's RECORD could be filled with examples of the exercise of free government throughout England's dominions and of laws in the interests of labor, of poverty, of life's unfortunates. And yet England has no written constitution. But she has institutions, free institutions, institutions similar to those we have here in America. We surpass England in having developed free institutions, until our Constitution, which is the highest expression of free institutions, has been produced. And the most inspiring thing in all the history of human hope is the development of free institutions on either side of the ocean, by two great peoples, one in blood, speech, religion, law, and in their world-wide mission, but two peoples in nationhood, in interests, and in destiny.

OUR INSTITUTIONS NECESSARY TO UNDERSTAND OUR CONSTITUTION.

It is the free institutions of England that preserve and increase the liberty of Englishmen, and diminish and destroy the authority of the monarch, who is now only the personification of the Nation—the emblem of the Empire. It is England's free institutions that, in Egypt, in Hongkong, in Ceylon, in the Malay States, in India, have given the people of those dark places the *fruits* of liberty to eat for the first time in all the strange history of the oppressed and wasted Orient. And it is our free institutions, as well as our Constitution, that in America make kings impossible, and have, for a hundred years, wrought for a larger liberty and a more popular government.

And it is the spirit of our institutions, as well as our Constitution, that will prevent the abuse of power by American authority in Porto Rico, Hawaii, the Philippines, or any other spot blessed by the protection of our flag—aye, and write, "Accursed!" across the brow of him who, even in thought, would wield a scepter. It is our free institutions, working now by one method and now by another, after the fashion of our practical race, that will establish order, equal laws, free speech, unpurchasable justice, and "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" throughout our ocean possessions and prepare the way for the Constitution itself.

For, Mr. President, our institutions can go to these people before our Constitution goes to them. Our institutions can precede our Constitution, as they did here in America itself. Did not Washington and his countrymen have free institutions for years before the Constitution was adopted? Did not the signers of the Declaration of Independence have the spirit of free institutions, although the Constitution was not thought of at that time? Where our institutions go, there our Constitution *may* go, when conditions justify it, for our Constitution is the last and highest and most precious expression of our institutions. "First the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear."

It is our institutional law, therefore, of which men should inquire who would know the meaning and the life of our constitutional law. We have heard "Constitution," "the letter of the Con-

stitution;" we have listened for our institutions, and in vain. And yet is it not written that "the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life?" Is it not written that "man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God?" I respect not the expounders of constitutional law who have not learned the history of our institutions, of which the Constitution is the richest fruit, until that history is a part of their being.

I respect not constitutional charlatanism that fastens its eye on the printed page alone, disdains our institutions as interpreting it, and refuses to consider the sources of that Constitution—the development of our present form of government for a century and a half from the old crown charters, the English struggle for the rights of man regulated by equal laws which preceded that, the spirit of Dutch independence, Dutch federation, and Dutch institutions, working upon that, and still back to the counsels of our Tenton fathers in the German forests in the dim light of a far-distant time.

KNOWLEDGE OF CHARACTER OF A PEOPLE NECESSARY TO UNDERSTAND THEIR INSTITUTIONS.

If a people adopt a written instrument, you must understand that people and their institutions before you understand the writing. You can not separate a people and their history from a written constitution which is only a part of that history. The same words by one people may have a different meaning used by another people. Any writing can only be an index to the institutions of a people. A people's institutions are the soul of the written and unwritten law. You must understand the French people, their history, and their institutions, before you can understand their written constitution. You must understand the American people, our history, and our institutions before you can understand our Constitution.

Our institutions embrace individual liberty and self-government, but they also embrace organization and administration.

They are the expression of the characteristics and tendencies of our race, as are the institutions of every people. Our race is the most self-governing but also the most administrative of any race of history. We are the explorers, the colonizers, the administrators of the world. We are this, not from necessity, but from irresistible impulse, from instinct, from racial laws inherited from our forefathers. Even in our own national history our pioneers reclaimed Kentucky and the Mississippi wilderness; they crossed the Rockies and seized Oregon; even when their homes behind them were still surrounded by virgin forest and untouched plain, they explored new regions and claimed new empires, and left behind them the crimson trail of their own blood, shed that the march of our race might not be stayed.

They did this because they could not help it. And wherever our race has gone it has governed, and wherever it has governed law, order, justice and the rights of man have been established and defended. All this has been in obedience to our institutions, which, in turn, are merely expressive of racial character. Our institutions are carried in the breasts of American citizens and soldiers wherever they go.

CONSTITUTION CAN NOT BE READ BY THE DICTIONARY ONLY.

So we have in our Constitution not only express words of power to acquire and govern new lands, as our race had always done, but those words must be read as the large expression of our institutions as a people. If our institutions are not adapted to administration as well as self-government; if they are fixed and unyielding; if our racial instincts are against expansion, organization and administration of governments; if our history and traditions are reactionary, then these words of power in our Constitution must be read as power merely to dispose of and regulate territory possessed at the time the Constitution was written and in the way then established.

Whatever our history, our race tendencies, our institutions, these large and vital meanings must pour through the Constitution, which is their medium, and without which the Constitution is only an assemblage of lifeless words. We can not read our Constitution by the dictionary only; we must read it by the great lexicon of our institutions and their history. We can not read it by the temporary intentions of the fathers only; we must read it by all the experience of all our past as a race, and all the necessities of all our future as a people. Even the wisest of the fathers saw but poorly into our future with their thoughts, but they comprehended all that future with their race instincts. For example, Jefferson said we had territory enough for our posterity to the thousandth generation, and there spoke his thought; but at that very moment he was securing Louisiana, even when he was declaring that he had no constitutional power to do so, and there spoke the instincts of our race. In a century the Republic will number more than 200,000,000 souls; problems undreamed of by the fathers will arise; they will be unsolvable if the Constitution is but an instrument of words; they will be solved if the Constitution is the expression of our institutions.

And so, when we read those institutional words—

"The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States"—

we must read them as the utterance of the most vigorous branch of the world's greatest expanding and administering people. Coiled up in those words of racial purposes and power is all the energy of Raleigh and of Drake, of Clive and Cook, of Winthrop, Smith, and Penn, of that whole resistless people that has poured around the world its healing tide of civilization, always and everywhere giving equal rights under equal laws, protecting commerce, planting social method, and establishing the statutes of the Almighty Father to whom our race has ever looked, upon whose Name we have ever called, and of whose divine Will we are the agents in our day.

These words of power in our Constitution contain the law of our growth; they are the statute of the free hand to achieve that growth; and back of them is the guaranty of our institutions that, beneath that free hand, justice and liberty shall dwell among the peoples given into our keeping. And it is not possible that such power will be perverted or abused until our institutions, rooted in the soil of centuries, are no more, and until the high character and purposes of the American people are, by some malign miracle, changed and debased.

In the end it all comes to that—faith in the American people who, as I believe, are the trustees under God of the civilization of the world in the great day of our sovereignty now dawning. It is this faith which exalts our service to the Republic to the dignity of a rite. It is a faith the American people hold with a silent fervor that gives them power and purity; and woe to them and to us if we justify not that faith by our works—for "faith without works is vain."

If, then, the Constitution gives Congress a free hand over our possessions, how shall that power be exercised over each? How shall we deal with Porto Rico, whose case is immediately before us? This is the second question involved in the present discussion, and the answer is that we should give the people of that island a civil government adapted to their needs, and with that civil government we should give them reciprocity of trade with us.

HYPOCRISY OF DEMOCRATIC FREE-TRADE PROPOSITION.

Mr. President, the partisan opposition pretend to want free trade not only with Porto Rico, but with the Philippines also. But there is no sincerity in their attitude, for they advocate free trade with our new possessions, they say, because they are a part of the Republic, as our States and organized Territories are a part of the Republic, and in the same sentence advocate the abandonment of the possessions themselves—which is an antagonism in premises and a nonsequitur in conclusion. This partisan opposition asks free trade with Porto Rico and the Philippines not because they believe in it, except as they believe in free trade with all the world, but to frighten the timid with incorrect statements about competition with pauper labor, and so to induce the Nation to abandon these priceless possessions.

That is the motive of the partisan opposition in urging free trade with Porto Rico. It is an issue they shall not have. Reciprocity is the policy first announced by the President of the United States, followed by formal bills in both Senate and House. When, later, the necessity for money for Porto Rico was believed to be urgent and instant, a bill to raise it by the method which was thought to be the best at the moment was reported in the House. The supporters of that bill in the House stated that the tax it proposed was a temporary expedient, and that reciprocity was to follow it. But after that bill had passed the House and had come to the Senate, the President, through a second message to Congress, recommended an expedient—the appropriation of more than $2,000,000 collected from the present tariff between this country and Porto Rico (*and which is more than the House bill would have yielded during its entire life*)—which gives the island and its people the money needed for the present without the tariff provided for in the bill which had passed the House, and which now enables us to stand for the reciprocity of trade which the President had announced from the first as our policy and duty.

And so the statesmanlike recommendation of the President relieves us from the necessity of long deferring reciprocity with our little island and takes from an obstructing partisan opposition an issue which it had attempted to appropriate for the purpose of blinding the American people, and thus stripping the Republic of those possessions which have cost the Nation so much in money and in blood.

Can men ask why members of the House voted for the House tariff bill, and why we do not vote for the same measure here? The answer is that, with the immediate necessity for revenue for Porto Rico confronting the House, it had that reason for its course. Were that the situation here our similar action might be similarly justified. But our appropriation of more than $2,000,000 the Government had already collected from the present tariff

between this country and Porto Rico, giving Porto Rico more ready money *at this very moment* than the tariff bill which passed the House would have afforded in the two years of its life, takes from the Senate the reason for voting for that bill which was influential with the House.

By this appropriation the Porto Ricans should have money enough to last till a scheme of local taxation on land and the products of land, on luxuries and stimulants, on the scores of approved subjects of taxation, can be adopted and put in operation; or until experience shall compel or justify a continuous tariff.

PUERTO RICO NO PRECEDENT FOR PHILIPPINES.

Reciprocal trade with Porto Rico is no precedent for the same thing with the Philippines. None of our measures with Porto Rico are necessary methods for our administration of government in the Pacific archipelago any more than our Hawaiian bill furnishes an example for Porto Rican legislation. The free hand given Congress by the Constitution means appropriate measures for Porto Rico determined by the conditions of that island and its relations to us and to the world; appropriate measures for the Philippines determined by the same considerations of wisdom; appropriate legislation for Hawaii, determined by like standards of common sense; appropriate action as to Cuba and to such other portions of the earth as may become ours or fall under our protection, as conditions and all the elements of sound judgment may dictate in each particular case.

And there is no business in the world that would not run into bankruptcy on any other plan. To declare for a uniform policy of government or taxation in the beginning; to ignore differences of peoples, of distance, of location with reference to other markets, of resources in comparison with our own, and of all the long catalogue of facts out of the consideration of all of which alone, sane conclusions can come, is to write "failure" on the swelling sails of the largest, noblest, most hopeful movement ever launched by any people upon the seas of world endeavor. And such a uniform policy is what the opposition to the Government urges in order to defeat the whole movement of expansion; and we decline to adopt the opposition's programme, either by declaring for uniform tariff or for uniform free trade.

THE ATTEMPT TO CONFUSE THE ISSUE.

I repeat, that it is for this purpose that those who, for partisan reasons, oppose the Government, attempt to intertwine a tariff with the constitutional principle of a free hand. They try to mingle reciprocity with Porto Rico with Calhoun's doctrine that the Constitution, of its own force, extends over "territory belonging to the United States." If a continuous tariff were inextricably involved with Lincoln's constitutional principle of a free hand, for which Lincoln's party stands to-day as he stood forty years ago, I should fight to have a continuous tariff adopted. For the power to act freely with our possessions is the best condition on which we can successfully keep them; and to surrender them is treason to our future.

But the imposition of a tariff is not involved in the constitutional principle of a free hand. The very reverse is true. This is proved by the statement of the principle itself, and it can not be stated too often, for its statement is its best support. The free hand, under the Constitution, means that we can adopt reciprocity with Porto Rico, if that is wisest and best for Porto Rico and for us; a Territorial form of government in Hawaii, if that is wisest and best for Hawaii and for us; a tariff relation with our possessions in the Far East, if that is wisest and best; and do anywhere and at all times what is wisest and best for our possessions and for us within the fundamental prohibitions in the Constitution. It does not mean uniform tariff or uniform free trade, but exactly the reverse. And so the highest exercise of the constitutional free hand is the adoption of reciprocity with Porto Rico, because that is wisest and best for her and for us at the present time and is a fulfillment of implied national engagements.

Gentlemen of a partisan opposition, you shall not make this false issue. You shall not be permitted to say that reciprocity with Porto Rico means that Calhoun's doctrine is again alive and that the Constitution, *without our consent*, extends over the territory which that Constitution itself declares is "territory *belonging* to the United States." And you shall not make the plea that the Constitution extends over our possessions; that they are therefore a part of the Republic as our States and organized Territories are a part of the Republic, with full free trade; that if we have free trade with our possessions we will come into competition with their labor; and that, therefore, we should get rid of those possessions—I say you shall not make that plea without having that fallacy exposed to the people. For if, as you declare, the Constitution does extend over these possessions, if they are a part of the United States, then you, if you were in power, could not get rid of them; for no power can alienate territory that has become a part of the United States, in the sense that our States are part of the Republic and that, as the opposition insists, all of our new possessions shall be immediately made a part of it—nay, *are* a part of it now.

So that if your position is correct, gentlemen of the opposition, your success in the coming elections would not relieve Americans from competition with Filipino labor, which you say free trade would create, *but, on the contrary, would forever fasten that competition upon us.* For Democratic success would be declared by you to mean that the people indorse the Calhoun theory that the Constitution extends over these islands; that they thereby are a part of the United States, with free trade and all privileges of States; and if that is so, it is a condition you could never change, since you could not alienate a part of the United States.

But if the Government prevails among the people in the coming election, it means that we can do as we please with these possessions, even to alienating them, if the interests of the Republic demand it—though that contingency is unthinkable. If we are right, we can protect ourselves from Filipino labor, if it should be found necessary to do so. If the opposition is right, free trade is there now, and there irrevocably and forever.

RECIPROCITY WITH PUERTO RICO A VALUABLE EXPERIMENT.

Reciprocity with Porto Rico will help that island; it can not hurt us. It will help us as much as it will help Porto Rico. It affords us a safe experiment with our possessions at the very beginning of our experience as an administering power. A Nation of 70,000,000 of people with a continent for its home, and practiced in all the arts of industry, can not suffer in competition with an island smaller than a single county of Texas, more than a thousand miles from our nearest port and peopled by fewer inhabitants than any one of several of our large cities, poverty stricken and prostrate, ignorant of the meaning of self-government, and beholding modern civilization as through a glass darkly. If the American Republic, just embarked upon the grandest world career of all time, fears competition with the least of its possessions before we have tried the experiment, let us strike our colors as a sovereign power, tack from our course marked out by the high inspiration of great events, put into the port of decay, go out of commission, and let the mighty voyage on which our Nation started be sailed by other peoples of bolder hearts, loftier faiths, and eyes of clearer vision, as the opposition to expansion and to our entire world career would have us do.

Reciprocity with Porto Rico is not only a matter of duty and good policy—it is a measure of economic wisdom. It is a part of the reciprocity for which the great statesmen of the Republic have planned and toiled. And it is reciprocity, not with a foreign country, but with our own possession. It is a reciprocity of nature; Porto Rican products supply what we need and can not so well produce; we supply what Porto Rico needs and can not as well produce. It is a reciprocity decreed by natural laws to which our acts must in the end conform.

When our markets are open to Porto Rican products, industry will and must of necessity be be stimulated all through our island, and Porto Rico, now desolate, will be placed in the position of prosperity justified by its resources, location, and possibilities. She will herself pay all the money needed for her government with greatest ease. And with her prosperity she will in turn endow us. Her markets will exclusively be ours, for our tariff against Europe and the world will be her tariff against Europe and the world, and so our clothing, flour, corn, implements, and all the products of our farms, mills, and looms will have exclusive markets there. And the more prosperous we make her by offering our markets to Porto Rico, the more she can buy of us, and will. Increasing prosperity means increasing desires; increasing prosperity means more money to satisfy those desires.

And so reciprocity creates a new and exclusive market for what we raise and make, and supplies the money to make that market valuable—supplies the money by buying from our own island necessities now purchased from foreign lands. But to close our markets to our own possession or to make those markets dear and difficult is to take from our masses the opportunity to purchase at lowest prices the necessities produced on our own territory; and to make the markets of our own dependency dear and difficult to our producers is to deny to ourselves the opportunity to sell our own products at best prices to our own possession. It may be that experience will demonstrate the contrary, or that experience will confirm these apparently clear conclusions; but until experience does demonstrate the contrary reason indicates that reciprocity with our own possessions is a logical and desirable result of expansion, and that obstruction to trade between us and our possessions is a negation of expansion. It is unwise to refuse the instruction of an experiment that can not injure us and that we owe to our island as a matter of justice and fulfillment of implied national obligations. And now that we have given Porto Rico more ready money immediately than any tariff that has been proposed would give in two years, the Senate has not a reason left which influenced the House in passing the House bill.

THE EXPERIMENT CONCLUSIVE.

And the reciprocity recommended by the President in his first message, and made possible by our appropriation of more than $2,000,000 to the Porto Ricans as recommended in his second message, gives us this experiment in insular administration, right at the outset, that will not occur again—an experiment that will indicate the results of reciprocal exchange of products between us and our possessions as satisfactorily as if that course had been pursued as to all, just as a drop of some new compound in the chemist's test tube reveals all its qualities as completely as if a gallon of it had been examined, which, if dangerous, would have destroyed the experiment, and the experimenter, too.

It may be that reciprocity with Porto Rico will suggest consequences so damaging, if experienced in larger measure, that it will be abolished even there, and never again proposed in the development of our policy as an administrator of government in our island possessions. It may be that it will show the fears of many to be groundless, and discover benefits and blessings undreamed of even by its advocates, and thus furnish a light for our now unillumined pathway as an administrator of insular dominion. And whatever the results of reciprocity with Porto Rico, they will enable us to outline a policy as to our new possessions based on actual experience.

But to permanently continue a tariff between the Republic and "territory belonging to the United States," as though that territory were a foreign country and not our own possession, would be to leave unsolved all the problems before us and unanswered all the speculation in which it is our duty to indulge in thinking out the best way to administer our ocean empire. And we will not refuse this instruction in our new task, afforded us by the same favoring Providence that placed the task itself before us. We have before us a new career, and the censure or applause of the world and history; and we have an object lesson which can not injure us and can not fail to enlighten us; and we will avail ourselves of it.

EFFECT OF OUR ACTION ON LATIN AMERICA.

Weighty as these reasons are, there is another charged with almost destiny-determining consequences. It is the effect of our action on the Latin-American—the Spanish-American—mind, over which our influence has been growing for a quarter of a century, and which the welfare of the Republic requires shall become controlling. It has been the dream of American statesmen for three-quarters of a century to make this Republic the friend and protector of the weaker South American republics, until finally, in imagination, the colors of our flag might intertwine with theirs, the symbol of mutual trust, mutual affection, mutual trade, mutual prosperity, and mutual defense.

Into deeds this great thought has gradually grown until pan-American congresses actually convene beneath the Stars and Stripes, and the Bureau of the American Republics is a part of the machinery of our Government. Our growing influence in South America is fraught with blessings to the Republic and to those countries too, second only to the trade of the Orient. This great advantage, this long-fostered influence in South America, we propose to foster still. We have appropriated to Porto Rico more than $2,000,000 ready money as suggested by the President. We will adopt a civil government and reciprocal trade. And thus, by a generosity without precedent, we establish forever our friendship with all Latin America which Republican statesmen have so long, so patiently, and so painfully been erecting.

Why will Latin-Americans be influenced in our favor by this course? Think of the circumstances! This island of beauty and natural wealth came to us like a bride to the arms of her beloved. Where Luzon resisted Porto Rico submitted—no, she did not submit; she welcomed us. Where Cuba was turbulent, Porto Rico was and is tranquil. We do not remind Porto Rico of her unfitness for self-government; she asserts it herself and asks our instruction. With a humility that touches the hearts of the American people she asks our protection.

Sir, where our flag is fired on my voice is for war, overwhelming, relentless, decisive war, till resistance is utterly exterminated; but where our flag is welcomed my voice is for mercy and loving-kindness for the very same reason that it is for war when that flag is opposed. Bullets for bullets, but bread for blessings. Porto Rico came to us like Ruth, saying, "Entreat me not to leave thee, or to return from following after thee; for whither thou goest I will go, and where thou lodgest I will lodge; thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God."

Thus comes this little land, pleading, like Ruth, only that she may glean in the harvest after the reapers. And she is hungry; we will feed her. She asks for the liberty to live; we will free the hands of her industry. She is bruised and wounded and weak; we will soothe her bruises, heal her wounds, strengthen her weakness. The American people will have it so. Call it sentiment, if you will; but sentiment is the strongest quality of the American character. It is sentiment that has inspired all the heroism of our heroic history and written on the statute books of the Republic every law that will, in the world's future, be the justification for our existence.

Our giving reciprocity of trade to this faithful little island, then, will inspire confidence throughout Latin America. It will increase that friendship which is the basis of all genuine international understandings. It will encourage other peoples to welcome our protection whenever it may be to our interest to extend it; and it will be the unimpeachable witness at the bar of the nations and of history to our fidelity to our national pledges, even when only implied, and to the purity of national purposes, even when not specifically declared.

But if we had refused reciprocity of trade to our own island, that came to us willingly, and to whom our national promises were at least impliedly made, every envious nation of Europe would have pointed all South America to that act, denounced us as betrayers of the confidence reposed in us, and planted distrust of us in the hearts of millions who should look to us as their friend and elder brother. As the power that is to be the chief councilor among the nations of the western world; as the power that is, as it were, to be the presiding officer in the congress of the peoples of this hemisphere, with all the incalculable advantages to them and to us that come from such relations, we must not destroy, but we must increase their faith in us.

And our treatment of Porto Rico, which is of their blood and speech and faith, will advance us decades in their confidence and esteem. It is a situation in which the future sleeps. The economic results of any fiscal act that has been proposed in either branch of Congress are temporary; but their effect upon our future as the dominant power of the Western Hemisphere, and therefore of the world, is permanent and beyond computation. Tens of millions of money might be spent and years of patient effort given to create an opportunity for binding the common people and the governments of Central and South America to us in confidence and affection, equal to the present one, which Fortune has placed before us. And it will not be thrown away.

And this relation of friendship, which we have so long been cultivating, and which we will now make stronger, means for us, on its material side, increasing and finally predominance of trade throughout the Western Hemisphere, and therefore new and practically exclusive markets for all our farmers raise and all our factories make. And if we refuse to consider this phase of the situation we refuse to do our duty to the American people, whose servants we are, and fail to discharge our national obligations to a people that welcomed us.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT IMMEDIATELY REQUIRED.

For these reasons I favor immediate reciprocity, and I shall go on record, if I am able to be present, as voting for amendments giving immediate and unrestricted freedom of trade to our island of Porto Rico. But if we in the Senate who believe that Porto Rico should have reciprocity at once are not able to so amend the civil-government bill here, I shall, after voting for reciprocity amendments, vote for the civil-government bill as recently modified by the committee, because we must not deny civil government to the people of Porto Rico a moment longer; because the bill, as now modified, insures reciprocity with Porto Rico as soon as the civil government of that island provides a system of taxation of its own; and because the bill, as now changed, gives free food, clothing, and implements to the islanders at once.

So that the sooner Porto Rico gets civil government the quicker it will get absolute reciprocity, under the modifications which the committee have finally made to the bill. I should be glad if the bill could be so separated that we might vote for civil government without the revenue feature, although the committee have now modified that feature so as to insure early freedom of trade—and this modification is much better than the House proposition, and infinitely preferable to the present tariff arrangement between this country and Porto Rico. But as the bill stands, unless we can amend it further, we must vote for it as modified by the committee, or else vote against civil government altogether; and civil government must no longer be denied to the people of Porto Rico. Longer delay of civil government to these people is denial of justice.

And so, after voting for immediate and unrestricted reciprocity amendments, I shall vote for the civil-government bill because it does establish civil government at once, and because, under the recent modification by the committee, it also establishes absolute reciprocity in the near future. It ought to establish unrestricted trade instantly, and it may be that the House will so amend it if we should not so amend it here. But if we are not able to so amend it here, and if the House should not so amend it, but adopts the modified civil-government bill, the committee's late modification does give us the absolute certainty of unrestricted trade at no distant date.

On the other hand, if we deny civil government to Porto Rico, if we leave the present tariff untouched and deal with our island

as if it were a foreign country, we make no progress of any kind toward helping Porto Rico. It is, therefore, better to adopt the civil-government bill, with the revenue feature as now modified by the committee, if we can not agree to further amend it, than to deny all constructive legislation to the island. The bill providing for a tariff both ways, about which there has been so much conflict, is not before us now. The committee's final modification, made after consideration of opposing views, has destroyed that bill, admitted the principle of reciprocity to be desirable, and provided for its partial realization immediately and its complete realization soon.

While the bill as a whole is still not what I would have it, in its failure to give immediate reciprocity to Porto Rico, and in other particulars, and while it may have to be amended by future Congresses, it does establish a working civil government which must not be delayed another moment, and does insure early reciprocity, and so is a step in the right direction in our progress as an administering Nation, and is a recognition of those great principles on which that progress depends.

MEANING OF OUR NEW NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. President, the great movement on which the American people have embarked is a movement of conscience as well as of power; of civilization as well as of commerce. It touches the shores of every sea. Directly or indirectly it affects all humanity. We go forth on a world career; we must conduct it with a world statesmanship—a statesmanship that considers the effect of every law we pass upon the peoples over whom our influence is extending and upon the world at large, as well as upon ourselves.

Sir, administration of government means more than balance sheets; more than weights or measures. It means this, but it also means the weighing of the hearts of men and the balance sheets of the affections of the governed people. Why to-day do England's colonists voluntarily tax themselves by preferential tariffs in order to give England the advantage of their trade? Why to-day do Canadians, Australians, and sons of the Empire everywhere voluntarily enlist to fight and die in far and savage lands that the dominion of England's flag may be extended? Why to-day are England's governed people themselves among the bravest of those who charge to their deaths in defense of that banner? What, within a single half century, has thus reversed English colonial history and experience? Simply a statesmanship practical enough to consider sentiment as a real factor in the government of peoples.

The American masses, in whose breasts dwell the purity, power, and hope of the Republic and of the world, understand this well. They mean to profit by the world's large lesson. They feel and deeply know that we are henceforth the master people among mankind. And they mean that our dominion shall be exercised in righteousness. They doubt not that human progress is one vast and swelling harmony which not even all the discords of history can destroy, and they mean that in all that divine and splendid composition the noblest, highest, purest, tenderest note shall be that struck by the American people as the sovereign power of earth.

Military Academy Bill.

SPEECH
OF
HON. HENRY C. SMITH,
OF MICHIGAN,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, May 15, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 11589) making appropriations for the Military Academy—

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The educational features of the bill under consideration meet my hearty approval.

I have the honor to represent a district which contains one of the largest educational institutions of our country, which leads me to take cognizance of and an interest in the matter of the pending bill.

That institution is the great University of Michigan, which has and exerts an influence throughout our land. It may almost be said to control the legislation of Congress, for it has 19 representatives in this Congress—more, I believe, than any other institution of learning. And yet, with all of its far-reaching power and influence, with all of its civilizing influence, the cost of that institution of learning from the beginning till now has not been, I am told by its president, as much as the cost of an ordinary battle ship. There is no question of the patriotism of our people. There is no question that there is no pressing necessity for a large standing army. The history of the past forty years shows plainly that we have an Army available at all times, because within the last forty years over 400,000 men have given up their lives in this country for the flag. [Applause.]

Our armies prove successful, unconquerable, and formidable because they are men of education, men fighting for wife and home. They are not mere hired assassins, paid butchers, but real patriots.

The flag means more to the poor man in this country than to any other. It is a grand spectacle to see the poor man leave the farm and the home, part paid for—all that is dear to him—leave duty to wife and children, to fight his country's battles, without hope of adequate reward. And my heart goes out not to the trained officer in command, but to the common soldier who faces the leaden hail to see the flag ride in triumph above the smoke of battle. He is my hero.

The patriotic fervor found among our people in times of national peril leads me to believe that there is no call upon this Government to maintain at great expense a large and useless standing army.

The people love the flag, not because of the grand achievements of our armies on land and on sea, but because that flag represents their sacrifice; because they know and feel that wherever we may go, if the Stars and Stripes wave above us, there freedom is.

The law of self-defense is instinct in the lowest of God's creation. And it animates the loftiest and the gentlest of all creation.

The great General Grant, when Lee passed his sword to him at Appomattox, and all was over, did not want to humiliate the fallen and the vanquished. He sought to urge the erring ones to return to their homes, and to the pursuits of peace, and to the Union.

So long as our schools teach patriotism, that war is for peace and not for conquest, they ought and will be sustained, and not longer.

General Deficiency Bill.

Imperialism, intrigues, and secret alliances threaten the life of the Republic. All patriotic citizens should join in the battle to save the Republic, and when that victory is won the people can then carry all needful reforms to a successful conclusion.

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN S. LITTLE,
OF ARKANSAS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, May 14, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 11537) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, and for prior years, and for other purposes—

Mr. LITTLE said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Many people in this country believe that there exists between this country and Great Britain "an understanding" that reaches far beyond the ordinary relations of friendship that should properly mark the extent of this country's relations with the kingdoms and monarchies of Europe.

Many potent evidences exist to show that there is a secret understanding or, in other words, a secret alliance existing between this country and Great Britain. No thoughtful man can study the history of these two nations for the last two years without entertaining the gravest suspicions that such is the fact.

England for many years has foreseen the danger of an alliance by her neighbors that would threaten her national existence, and as soon as war had been declared between this country and Spain she at once set about to show great friendship for this country and to inspire bad blood between this country and Germany.

The greatness as well as the friendship of the Anglo-Saxon race was heralded in every pro-English newspaper on both sides of the ocean and sung by every pro-English patronizing citizen in this country. Everything possible was done and said to belittle Germany and to engender bitter feelings between their citizens and ours. And several times during the Spanish war it was made to appear that we were on the very verge of war with Germany, which afterwards proved to be without any foundation. It is boldly claimed by the English sympathizers here and in England that England, on account of her great friendship for us, stood by us in the Spanish war. If she did, it was because we did not need

her assistance, and she could make the pretension without sacrifice and use the "good understanding" to her own advantage. And well has she accomplished her purpose.

Mr. McKinley, his advisers and diplomats, have been but clay in the potter's hands. She inspired the imperial policies that are being pursued by this Administration, and drew our nation into the politics of Europe and engaged them in the unholy business of conquest and empire. Strange as it may seem, yet it is true that no sooner had this purpose been accomplished, and the "good understanding" thoroughly established, than she set about to overthrow the two little Dutch Republics in South Africa. And while that small band of liberty-loving people are struggling to maintain their independence against overwhelming odds, our Government officials look on with indifference, while they compare the list of dead and captured from the Philippine Islands with like returns from South Africa. No official expression of sympathy, no offer of friendly mediation is made; and when it is learned that their envoys are coming to the nation's capital to ask the good offices of this Government in bringing about a peaceful cessation of hostilities, consternation seizes the Administration, the Cabinet is assembled, consultations are doubtless had with the British ambassador, Mr. Pauncefote, and it is given out to the press that they will be received as citizens but not as official representatives of their Governments. The Administration is bound hand and foot by its advocacy of English policies, and stands dumb while defying public sentiment and rejecting the appeals of the Boer envoys.

Mr. Chairman, I will insert as a part of my remarks an extract from an editorial and many statements not only charging but strongly tending to prove the existence of a secret alliance between this Government and Great Britain, all from the Irish World of May 5, 1900, as follows:

We charge President McKinley with having entered into a secret alliance or understanding—call it what you will, the effect is the same—with the English Government. It is the most serious charge ever brought against a President of the United States, and we do not make it upon mere assumptions or upon unsubstantial grounds. But we back the charge with proofs, with evidence from the President himself, from his ambassadors, ministers, and consuls, from his Secretary of State, from his special commissioners, from his Army and Navy favorites, from his supporters in both Houses of Congress, from English cabinet officials, and from his ardent friends and backers here.

To this charge Mr. McKinley has entered two general denials, which, in strict justice to himself, we shall quote. In his message of December 5, 1899, he said:

"We have remained faithful to the precept of avoiding entangling alliances as to affairs not of our direct concern."

At the annual dinner of the Ohio Society of New York a few months ago, Mr. McKinley said:

"We are neither in alliance nor entanglement with any foreign power, but on terms of amity and cordiality with all."

Against these rather equivocal disclaimers we place the evidence spoken of above, introducing it with a synopsis as follows:

PRESIDENT M'KINLEY'S PRO-BRITISH UTTERANCES.

At the annual meeting in London on May 8, 1899, of the British and Foreign Sailors' Society at the Mansion House, the lord mayor presiding, United States Ambassador Choate read a letter from President McKinley which expressed warm admiration for the society's work, and added:

"This is a great year for the Anglo-Saxon race."

Ambassador Choate in a speech before the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the United Kingdom in London, March 15, 1899, said that President McKinley in his letter of credence "relied with confidence upon my constant endeavor during my stay in Great Britain to promote the interests and prosperity of both countries."

The Hon. Barry Foster, M. P., who was in this country in 1898, called upon President McKinley November 18. In speaking of the President, Mr. Foster said: "Quite naturally what impressed me most strongly was his good will toward Great Britain."

The most elaborate state dinner given at the White House during the present Administration was given on the evening of November 16, 1898, in honor of the Anglo-Canadian commissioners on the Alaskan boundary dispute. The English ambassador was seated in the place of honor, and the British flag was much in evidence among the table decorations.

Mr. McKinley's message of December 5, 1899, denied entangling alliances "as to affairs not of a direct concern."

The London papers of December 6, 1899, blamed Chamberlain's alliance speech at Leicester for the equivocal denial of entangling alliances in Mr. McKinley's message.

SECRETARY HAY'S ALLIANCE WORK AS AMBASSADOR TO ENGLAND.

At the Easter banquet held in the Mansion House, London, on the evening of April 20, 1898, Mr. Hay, now Secretary of State, made his first public speech as United States ambassador to England. Speaking of the relations between the United States and England, Ambassador Hay said: "The good understanding between us is based on something deeper than mere expediency. All who think can not but see there is a sanction like that of religion which binds us in partnership in the serious work of the world."

At the annual dinner of the "American" Society in London, July 4, 1898, Ambassador Hay was the principal speaker. Among other things, he said:

"Now that the day of clear and cordial understanding has come, which so many have long desired and waited for, may we not hope it will be permanent?"

The Marquis of Ripon presided.

A committee of the Anglo-American League of London, headed by its chairman, Mr. James Bryce, presented to United States Ambassador John Hay, September 8, 1898, an address congratulating him upon his acceptance of the portfolio of Secretary of State in Washington. In response to the address Colonel Hay said:

"I shall hold myself signally fortunate if I am able to do anything to continue and strengthen the relations of fraternal amity between our two nations."

AMBASSADOR CHOATE AND HIS ALLIANCE WORK.

London papers of March 12, 1899, expressed jubilation and satisfaction over the announcement that President McKinley had appointed Joseph H. Choate ambassador to England.

The gross and wanton insult hurled at the Irish in America by Joseph H. Choate, while the guest of an Irish society on Ireland's great national feast day in 1893, made him persona grata to England, a fact which influenced Mr. McKinley in making choice of an ambassador to the Court of St. James.

Ambassador Choate was the guest of the Hardwicke Club, of London, on May 6, 1899, where all the leading judges and most of the distinguished members of the English bar had assembled to welcome him. Among other things, Mr. Choate said:

"I feel very much at home to-night. A characteristic of the Anglo-Saxon race is to make ourselves at home wherever we go. Our nation has now followed your example in that respect."

Ambassador Choate, at a luncheon at the Staffordshire Agricultural Society's show at Wolverhampton, England, July 25, 1899, said he believed that no question could ever arise between the United States and Great Britain to interrupt the constant peace which had held them together during the last eighty-five years.

Ambassador Choate, speaking at the banquet of the American Society in London on July 4, 1899, said: "When an American, on hearing that I was to come to England, cried out, 'God save the Queen!' he completed my outfit, for when a man couples 'prosperity to the American people' with the other sentiment he gives an American ambassador the fullest credentials and all the diplomacy he needs."

Ambassador Choate, speaking before the Sir Walter Scott Club, in Edinburgh, Scotland, November 10, 1899, referred to "the ironclad friendship that now prevails between the two nations."

COLONIAL SECRETARY CHAMBERLAIN PROCLAIMS ANGLO-AMERICAN ALLIANCE.

In a speech delivered at Leicester, England, November 30, 1899, Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, secretary of state for the colonies in Lord Salisbury's cabinet, said:

"The union, the alliance, if you please, the understanding, between these two great nations (England and the United States) is indeed a guaranty of the peace of the world."

AMBASSADOR CHOATE CORROBORATES CHAMBERLAIN.

At the annual Thanksgiving banquet held by the American Society in London on November 30, 1899, Mr. Joseph H. Choate, American ambassador to England, said: "Let England and America clasp hands across the sea, and the peace of the world is absolutely secure."

The press of England on December 1, 1899, received Mr. Chamberlain's announcement of Anglo-American alliance at Leicester with great joy, commenting upon it as an official utterance.

As early as May 13, 1898, Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, England's colonial secretary and Salisbury's right-hand man, proclaimed the English intention to procure Anglo-American alliance. In a speech at Birmingham he said: "It is one of the most satisfactory results of Lord Salisbury's policy that at the present time these two great nations understand each other better than they ever have since, over a century ago, they were separated by the blunder of a British Government."

The Marquis of Salisbury, premier of England, in the course of a speech at the annual banquet of the lord mayor of London, November 9, 1898, said, in reference to the appearance of the United States as an Asiatic factor, that it was "a grave and serious event which may not conduce to the interests of peace, though I think in any event it is likely to conduce to the interests of Great Britain."

At the lord mayor's banquet in London November 9, 1899, Lord Salisbury spoke of the "happy relations existing between the United States and ourselves."

Mr. Michael Davitt put a series of questions to Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs George N. Curzon in the House of Commons March 14, 1898, with a view of eliciting information concerning Anglo-American alliance negotiations. Mr. Curzon said the questions were of such a nature that it was inexpedient to reply to them. [Loud cries of "Hear!" "Hear!" from the Unionist benches.]

In March, 1898, Sir Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett, M. P., wrote a pamphlet advocating an alliance with the United States. "Till this country," said Sir Ellis, "recurs to the alliance marked out for it by history and nature our foreign and imperial policy is bound to meet with disturbance, danger, and but too probably disaster."

THE ANGLO-AMERICAN ALLIANCE IN SAMOA.

In March, 1899, the American and English consuls in Samoa, with Rear-Admiral Kautz, of the American Navy, commanding the *Philadelphia*, and Commander Sturdee, of the English navy, issued a proclamation deposing King Mataafa and requiring his followers to leave Apia on pain of forcible expulsion if he refused to obey. The King's friends made a move toward his defense, when the American and English war ships began a bombardment of native villages, burning many of them. The Anglo-American attack upon Mataafa was made in defiance of the protest of the German consul, who refused to allow the German war ship *Falke* to participate in the slaughter of innocent people.

Rear-Admiral Kautz, writing to his cousin, Mrs. Charles N. Lindley, of Cincinnati, Ohio, from Samoa, under date of March 23, 1898, said: "I am not at all popular here with the Germans. But I am all right with the English and hope to pull through with them."

THE ALASKA BOUNDARY AGREEMENT GAVE ENGLAND A FREE HAND AGAINST THE BOERS.

A dispatch from Washington, dated May 20, 1899, announced that the Government had been requested by England to abandon its intention to send troops to Pyramid Lake, in the disputed Alaskan territory. An order for troops to proceed there was countermanded by the War Department at the request of the Secretary of State.

The Alaska boundary modus vivendi was officially ratified October 20, 1899, by an exchange of notes between Secretary of State Hay and Mr. Tower, British chargé d'affaires. This agreement released England from complications here and enabled her to draw upon Canadian troops for the conquest of the Boers.

PRESIDENT M'KINLEY ENGLAND'S ALLY AGAINST THE BOERS.

On October 12, 1899, the English colonial office officially announced that "Mr. Macrum, the United States consul in Pretoria, with the consent of his Government, has taken charge of British interests in the Transvaal." Mr. Macrum did not know that he had been loaned bodily to England until afterwards.

The President's "strictly neutral" attitude on the war in South Africa was proclaimed by Second Assistant Secretary of State Adee October 12, 1899.

The State Department announced through the press on November 4, 1899, that this Government had never recognized the independence of the Transvaal Republic.

William McKinley has refused to receive an accredited representative of the South African Republic officially. Russia, France, and Germany recognized Dr. Leyds as the Transvaal's diplomatic representative.

The appointment of Adelbert S. Hay, son of Secretary Hay, consul at Pretoria, South African Republic, to succeed Charles E. Macrum, was announced from Washington December 3, 1899.

English newspapers, commenting upon the appointment of the son of Secretary Hay as consul at Pretoria, called it "a gracious concession."

EX-CONSUL MACRUM'S EVIDENCE, WHICH HAS NOT BEEN IMPEACHED.

Ex-Consul Charles E. Marcum's charge of Anglo-American alliance, based on evidence which he secured as consul at Pretoria, which evidence has not been impeached by the State Department. Published February 14, 1900.

Reported from Washington, December 16, 1899, that Mr. McKinley was angered by the refusal of President Kruger to allow the United States Consul to supply the English prisoners in Pretoria with delicacies and money.

Secretary of State Hay, December 27, 1899, defended England's action in seizing a cargo of American flour consigned to the neutral port of Lourenzo Marques.

The London Times, December 29, 1899, said, apropos of Secretary of State, Hay's defense of England's action in seizing American flour: "The Washington Government is acting as we should have wished and expected them to act."

The Hon. Anthony M. Kelly, ex-mayor of Richmond, Va., one of the judges of the international court at Cairo, Egypt, wrote a strong protest to a home paper against the Anglo-American alliance against the Boers, which he heard the English boasting of in Cairo.

The cruiser *Montgomery* was sent out to the coast of Africa to do police duty for England, keeping the natives of Sierra Leone quiet while releasing British war ships for service against the Boers.

President McKinley's offer of mediation in the South African war last March was made without consultation with any other power. This course prevented a joint offer and gave England a coveted opportunity to declare that she would not tolerate intervention. This declaration made it impossible for any country to intervene in a peaceable way. The London correspondent of the New York Sun, writing under date of March 17, 1900, hinted that this complete clearance of the situation for England was the result of a previous understanding between Salisbury and McKinley.

MR. M'KINLEY'S MINISTERS AND CONSULS AS ANGLO-AMERICAN ALLIANCE PROMOTERS.

On the departure of the Australian contingent for South Africa to fight against the Boers the American consul at Sydney, New South Wales, hung a banner from the consulate which bore this inscription:

"America wishes Australia's patriots Godspeed."

Henry L. Wilson, Mr. McKinley's minister to Chile, congratulated the British minister February 22, 1900, on English successes in South Africa.

Mr. Thomas S. Harrison, United States agent and consul-general at Cairo, Egypt, and Ethelbert Watts, United States vice-consul-general, spoke in approval of Anglo-American alliance at a banquet to Gen. Sir Francis Grenfell, given by British army officers in Cairo December 25, 1899.

The London Daily News announced in December last that "the British and American ministers at The Hague have asked permission to retire to Antwerp, with a view of avoiding personal unpleasantness during the anti-English attitude of the Dutch."

MR. M'KINLEY'S SUPPORTERS IN CONGRESS DEFEAT PRO-BOER RESOLUTIONS.

Pro-Boer resolutions buried in the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives: Resolution of sympathy, introduced by Representative JETT, of Illinois, December 11, 1899; resolution of recognition, introduced by Congressman SULZER, of New York, December 16, 1899; resolution of sympathy and intervention, introduced by Representative SULZER March 1, 1900.

Senator MASON'S resolution of sympathy for the Boers, introduced December 6, 1899, has been kept from a vote by the backers and supporters of Mr. McKinley in the Senate.

A resolution introduced in the House by Congressman SULZER, of New York, asking information of the Secretary of War concerning English fortifications on our northern frontier, was adversely reported by the Republican Committee on Military Affairs, which report was sustained by the Republican majority in the House by a vote on March 20, 1900.

HAY-PAUNCEFOTE CANAL TREATY OF ANGLO-AMERICAN ALLIANCE.

A letter published in the London Daily Mail of May 30, 1898, from its Washington correspondent, announced that the writer had learned from "a high authority in the State Department that important preliminary steps toward an Anglo-American alliance have already been taken." He made this prediction, since verified to the dot: "The United States are to build the Nicaragua Canal and Great Britain is to have the use of it in time of war."

The Hay-Pauncefote Nicaragua Canal treaty conceded all the claims of England under the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, which three American Secretaries of State had declared abrogated through the repeated violations of its provisions by England.

The Hay-Pauncefote agreement also prohibited the United States from erecting fortifications on the entrances or closing the canal to its enemy in time of war.

Ambassador Pauncefote's term here extended a year, because, as the London Times said, March 3: "It is largely due to his personal action that the United States and Great Britain have been brought closer together."

WORKINGS OF THE ANGLO-AMERICAN ALLIANCE AT THE HAGUE PEACE CONFERENCE.

The American delegates appointed by Mr. McKinley to the peace conference held at The Hague voted with the English representatives on June 22, 1899, in the disarmament section, for the retention of dum dum bullets. All other nations voted against these horrible projectiles.

At the final session of the international peace conference at The Hague, July 21, 1899, the American delegates appointed by Mr. McKinley stood with the English delegates and prevented the abolition of dum dum or explosive bullets by civilized nations.

MR. M'KINLEY'S COMMISSIONERS ARE FOR ANGLO-AMERICAN ALLIANCE.

President Schurman, of Cornell University, chairman of Mr. McKinley's first Philippine commission, in a speech before the Congregational Club of New York, at the Hotel St. Denis, December 18, 1899, said:

"One of the most beneficent results of the war with Spain was the bringing together of the British and American people."

The award of the Anglo-Venezuela boundary arbitration commission, rendered October 3, 1899, sacrificed the interests and rights of the South American Republic to the Anglo-American good understanding. Ex-President Harrison, Venezuela's counsel, said of the verdict:

"The award is a matter of mutual concessions—a compromise. The decision was dictated by considerations which had nothing to do with justice to Venezuela."

MR. M'KINLEY'S FAVORITE ARMY OFFICERS FOR ANGLO-AMERICAN ALLIANCE.

General Merritt, Mr. McKinley's confidential agent during the Paris treaty negotiations, said at the St. David Society's dinner in New York that he sympathized with the British in the present war—that is, the war against the Boers.

At a banquet held by the New England Society of New York December 22, 1898, Gen. Wesley Merritt, Mr. McKinley's mouthpiece at the Paris peace conference, said: "I am willing to bring you testimony as to the English feeling of gratitude that we are extending our dominions to include the Tropics. We have the English feeling with us."

American Army and Navy officers in Habana and Manila honored the Queen's eightieth birthday, May 24, 1899, by holding banquets and making pro-English speeches.

MR. M'KINLEY'S NAVAL FAVORITES WANT ALLIANCE WITH ENGLAND.

Rear-Admiral Sampson, McKinley's favorite naval officer, made an address at the banquet held by the British Schools and University Club of New York May 24, 1899, in which he said: "That homely proverb, 'Blood is thicker than water,' appeals to every man of us here, and is itself an outcome of the good-fellowship which has existed between our naval services for years."

Admiral Sampson, McKinley's favorite in the Navy, joined the New England Society members in singing, "God Save the Queen," at a banquet in New York December 22, 1899.

Captain Coughlin, of "Hoch der Kaiser" notoriety, an Administration naval favorite, writing in the New York Independent in May, 1899, said:

"I believe that the Americans understand and appreciate it (English good feeling), and that we are certainly moving toward an alliance."

Capt. A. T. Mahan, member of Mr. McKinley's "board of strategy," advised "Americans not to hold pro-Boer meetings; such conduct might offend England."

MR. M'KINLEY'S FRIENDS AND SUPPORTERS ANGLOMANIACS.

A petition, accompanied by a confidential circular of explanation, dated New York, July 27, 1898, was sent out in thousands for the signatures of persons in favor of Anglo-American alliance.

Mr. Whitelaw Reid, owner of the New York Tribune and Mr. McKinley's envoy to the Queen Victoria jubilee celebration, was its chief promoter.

The New York Chamber of Commerce, which has been loyal to England since it received its charter from George III, ardently supports McKinley with voice and purse.

At its one hundred and thirteenth annual dinner, November 14, 1898, "The Queen of England" was the first toast proposed. It was drunk standing, the whole company singing "God Save the Queen."

Senator DAVIS, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and one of Mr. McKinley's Paris peace commissioners, said in an interview with the Paris correspondent of the London Daily Mail, published in that paper December 13, 1898: "I favor a treaty of alliance, including the United States, England, and Japan. I do not see why other nations should object to the alliance. If they do, let them."

Gen. Stewart L. Woodford, ex-minister to Spain, in a speech before the Army and Navy Club, of New York, early in February, 1899, said: "Had it not been for the unfaltering, unchanging, and loyal friendship of England, and the attitude of her minister at Madrid, your minister might have failed to do the little he did do, because the representatives at Madrid of Continental Europe were ready at any time to interfere with the plans of the United States if the British minister would only join them."

Judge William R. Day, McKinley's ex-Secretary of State and president of the Paris Peace Commission, at a banquet held in his honor by the Stark County Bar Association at Canton, Ohio, January 2, 1899, said: "If I were called upon to state the most gratifying circumstances of our foreign relations during the war, it would be in the uniformly cordial and hearty friendship of the English before and during the struggle."

Mr. CHAUNCEY M. DEPEW, Mr. McKinley's close friend and political supporter, made a speech in the Union Methodist Church, New York, May 15, 1898, in the course of which he said: "The two great English-speaking countries, standing shoulder to shoulder, are the most inspiring and magnificent spectacle of the century."

A banquet was held at Tampa, Fla., in honor of the Queen's birthday May 24, 1898. "The Queen of England and Empress of India" was the first toast. Army officers were present.

A letter of regret was read from President McKinley at the celebration held in Buffalo, N. Y., May 24, 1899, in honor of Queen Victoria's eightieth birthday. Chapin Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Buffalo, organized the Anglomaniac love feast, and had as guests of honor the mayor of Hamilton, Ontario, and a body of English army and navy veterans of that city. Mayor Diehl, of Buffalo, presided over the exercises, which were held in the Central High School.

At the celebration in honor of Queen Victoria's eightieth birthday held by the citizens of Tampa, Fla., May 24, 1899, American war ships were ordered to participate, which they did by firing salutes and decorating with bunting.

Commenting upon Anglomaniac celebrations held in this country in honor of the Queen's eightieth birthday, the London Times of May 25, 1898, said: "It must be among the deepest satisfactions of her age to see the unhappy feeling evocated by that sense of Anglo-Saxon brotherhood and presage of Anglo-Saxon destiny to which Colonel Taylor, of the American Society in London, gave eloquent utterance, and which President McKinley has expressed as the regard and affection which the American people cherish toward our Queen."

PROTECTING THE ALLIANCE—REPUBLICANS IN THE HOUSE DEFEATED AN INQUIRY INTO ENGLAND'S CANADIAN FORTIFICATIONS.

On March 20, 1900, the Republican Committee on Military Affairs, through Chairman HULL, reported adversely upon this resolution, introduced by Congressman SULZER, of New York:

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of War is hereby directed to inform the House of Representatives as early as possible what fortifications Great Britain is erecting, constructing, and completing along the northern frontier of the United States, especially at Puget Sound and other places on the Pacific Ocean contiguous to the State of Washington and the District of Alaska."

The question of tabling the resolution was put to the House and the Republican majority sustained it by a vote of 110 to 96.

NO OFFICIAL SYMPATHY—PRO-BOER RESOLUTIONS IN THE HOUSE SQUELCHED BY M'KINLEY'S SUPPORTERS.

WASHINGTON, *March 1, 1900.*

Representative SULZER to-day introduced the following resolution in the House:

"*Resolved*, That the Republic of the United States sympathizes with the brave Boers in their struggle for freedom and independence, and hereby declares that the people of the South African Republic and the Orange Free State are, and of right ought to be, free and independent.

"The Congress of the United States hereby protests and remonstrates against the barbarous war now being waged by Great Britain against the patriots of South Africa, and the President is hereby authorized to take such steps as may be expedient in his judgment to secure and bring about an honorable peace between the contending parties."

The resolution was referred to the Foreign Affairs Committee, where, of course, the Republican majority buried it out of sight.

RECOGNITION RESOLUTION KILLED.

WASHINGTON, *December 16, 1899.*

Representative SULZER, of New York, introduced a joint resolution declaring that a state of war exists in South Africa and according belligerent rights to the Transvaal Government. The resolution was as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the Senate and House of Representatives of the Government of the United States recognize a condition of public war between the Government of Great Britain and the Government of the Republic of the Transvaal, and the United States of America hereby declare that they will maintain a condition of strict neutrality between the contending powers, and accord to each all the rights of belligerents in the ports and territory of the United States.

"The Congress of the United States protest and remonstrate against the barbarous manner in which the war has been conducted by Great Britain, and the President is hereby authorized to take such steps as may be expedient in his judgment to secure an observance of the laws of war as recognized by all civilized nations and bring about an honorable peace."

This resolution has not been reported.

SYMPATHY RESOLUTION SQUELCHED.

WASHINGTON, *December 11, 1899.*

To-day Representative JETT, of Illinois, one of the influential members from the Middle West and a leading member of the Committee on Military Affairs, introduced this joint resolution in the House of Representatives:

"Whereas the people of the United States are, and have been from the time of gaining their independence, a patriotic and liberty-loving people, and at all times opposed to oppression, and have regarded with sympathy the struggles of other peoples to free themselves from domination and oppression: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the United States watches with deep and abiding interest the heroic struggle of the people of the South African Republic against cruelty and oppression, and it is our desire and hope that they may achieve their independence in the present struggle in which they are engaged."

The Foreign Affairs Committee, or the Republican majority of the committee, has kept this resolution pigeonholed up to date.

SENATORS BACK M'KINLEY—A PRO-BOER RESOLUTION INTRODUCED BY SENATOR MASON KILLED IN COMMITTEE.

Senator MASON, of Illinois, on Wednesday, December 6, 1899, introduced a resolution in the United States Senate declaring that the sympathy of the people of the United States is with the Boers. The resolution reads as follows:

"Whereas from the hour of achieving their own independence the people of the United States have regarded with sympathy the struggles of other people to free themselves from European domination: Therefore,

"*Resolved by the Senate of the United States*, That we watch with deep and abiding interest the heroic battle of the South African Republic against cruelty and oppression, and our best hopes go out for the full success of their determined contest for liberty."

Senator MASON has framed his resolution in the language of the paragraph in the Republican platform relating to Cuba.

Mr. MASON'S repeated efforts to get this resolution before the Senate have been defeated by Mr. McKinley's supporters in that branch of Congress.

STOOD BY ENGLAND—THE UNITED STATES DELEGATES AT THE PEACE CONFERENCE THE ONLY BACKERS OF THE ENGLISH FORDUM DUM BULLETS.

THE HAGUE, *July 21, 1899.*

Baron de Staal presided at the plenary session of the International Peace Conference to-day to place the final seal upon the labors of the disarmament section.

The first part of M. Van Karnebeck's report relating to the prohibition of dropping explosives from balloons was unanimously agreed to.

M'KINLEY'S DELEGATES ENGLAND'S SERVANTS.

The second part, prohibition of the use of asphyxiating projectiles, was agreed to by all except the United States and Great Britain, whose dissent nullifies the agreement of the others.

The third part, which relates to expanding bullets, occupied the major part of the sitting, owing to the question of the dum dumbullet used by the British army.

DUMDUM BULLETS SUPPORTED BY ENGLAND AND THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. White, head of the United States delegation, made a speech opposing the prohibition of the dumdum bullet.

Captain Crozier, the military member of the United States delegation, offered as a substitute the following:

"The use of bullets should be prohibited which inflict unnecessarily cruel wounds, such as explosive bullets, and in general every kind of bullet exceeding the limits necessary to put a man immediately hors du combat."

Eight countries voted for Captain Crozier's proposal—the United States, Great Britain, Denmark, Greece, Servia, Portugal, China, and another. All except the first two named supported the substitute only in hope of securing unanimity in the conference, it being known that the impossibility of securing the adhesion of America and Great Britain to the committee's report would render futile any treaty.

GIVING WAY IN ALASKA—ENGLAND'S SUGGESTION THAT AMERICAN TROOPS BE WITHDRAWN COMPLIED WITH.

WASHINGTON, *May 20, 1899.*

The British Government has suggested to the State Department that, in view of the danger of a conflict between the contending factions in the disputed territory connecting Alaska and the British Northwest, the United States reconsider the reported intention to send troops to that territory.

This Government has abandoned for the present the intention to send a company of infantry to Pyramid Lake, in the disputed territory. An order for troops to proceed there was issued by the War Department, but this has been countermanded at the request of the Secretary of State.

M'KINLEY A FRIEND IN NEED—THE PRESIDENT AGREES TO A MODUS VIVENDI ON THE BOUNDARY DISPUTE TO FREE ENGLAND'S HANDS FOR THE WAR AGAINST THE BOERS.

WASHINGTON, *October 20, 1899.*

After an exchange of formal notes to-day between Secretary Hay and Mr. Tower, the British chargé d'affaires, the modus vivendi defining temporarily the Alaska boundary line became effective.

The preamble of the modus vivendi, omitting the references to American and British maps, is as follows:

"It is hereby agreed between the Governments of the United States and of Great Britain that the boundary line between Canada and the Territory of Alaska, in the region about the head of Lynn Canal, shall be provisionally fixed, without prejudice to the claims of either party in the permanent adjustment of the international boundary, as follows." The temporary boundary is then fixed and an agreement made for jointly policing the line and setting up temporary boundary posts.

AMERICAN CONSUL'S MAIL OPENED BY BRITISH CENSOR.

The mail for the Transvaal had been stopped at Cape Town by order of the (British) high commissioner. When the mail was finally forwarded to me, after Colonel Stowe, the consul-general at Cape Town, had secured its release, I had the humiliation, as the representative of the American Government, of sitting in my office in Pretoria and looking upon envelopes bearing the official seal of the American Government opened, and officially sealed with a sticker, notifying me that the contents had been read by the (British) censor at Durban.—*From statement made by Charles E. Macrum, ex-consul to Pretoria, South African Republic*, February 14, 1900.

AMERICAN CONSUL'S CABLEGRAMS DELAYED BY BRITISH CENSOR.

On November 14 I again wired the Department, stating that I could not leave without permission; that I would forfeit my post if the reasons which I would give to the Department did not prove satisfactory. This cable was delayed by the censor until December 2, when I had advices that it had just been forwarded.—*From statement by Charles E. Marcum, ex-consul to Pretoria, South African Republic*, February 14, 1900.

MACRUM'S TESTIMONY CORROBORATED.

Facsimile of United States official envelope opened by the censor at Durban, printed in Irish World of March 3, from the New York Journal.

After examining the contents the mail matter was replaced, and the opening closed by what is known as a "sticker," bearing the British coat of arms and the initials V. R. (Victoria Regina), and the general post-office number of the document.

AMERICAN WAR SHIP IN ENGLAND'S SERVICE—THE CRUISER MONTGOMERY SENT OUT TO THE COAST OF AFRICA ON POLICE DUTY, TO RELEASE ENGLISH SHIPS FOR SERVICE IN SOUTH AFRICA.

It was by the merest accident that the country discovered last December that the Navy Department has placed one of our war ships at England's disposal. The first knowledge the public had of the entire cooperation of one of the Departments in the Boer war was obtained through a letter of a sailor which appeared in the New York World. The writer of the letter was attached to the cruiser *Montgomery*. Why this ship was sent to Africa is thus explained in the letter:

"Now, about these English and Boers, we have the pleasure of cruising up and down the west coast of Africa to keep those 'niggers' quiet. Things look very bad here for the English; they took all the troops out of Sierra Leone and sent them down to Cape Town. Now those 'niggers' are breeding trouble and trying to get the best of the English.

"It seems to me and to everybody else that we are doing the work for the English."

This was denied at the Navy Department, and the station chart, showing the *Montgomery* to be at Montevideo, was triumphantly produced. Senator MASON, of Illinois, heard about the letter. He got hold of it. It was brief, and informed the recipient that the *Montgomery* had been doing patrol duty at Sierra Leone to protect the interests of the British.

Senator MASON visited the Department and inquired about it, but got little satisfaction. He then announced in a Washington newspaper his belief that the *Montgomery* was doing police duty for England and his purpose to inquire into it. Even after the publication it was denied at the Navy Department that the *Montgomery* had been at Sierra Leone at all. Afterwards the Department refused to discuss the matter, and then it was freely admitted that the *Montgomery* had been in those waters.

EVIDENCE FROM EGYPT—THE HON. JOHN M. KEILEY SENDS A PROTEST FROM THE LAND OF THE NILE.

A significant link of evidence comes from Egypt in the shape of a vehement letter from the Hon. John M. Keiley, one of the judges of the international court at Cairo. Judge Keiley, who was formerly mayor of Richmond, Va., is in a place where English army officers and other English officials freely discuss international relations, and the boast of McKinley's friendship for England has rung in his ears since the beginning of the war in South Africa.

The indignation aroused by these triumphant proclamations of American backing prompted Judge Keiley to write a strong letter of protest, which was addressed to the Richmond Times. The letter is dated November 18, 1899, and, among other things, Judge Keiley says:

"May I be allowed to raise a discordant note in the envious concord of hostility to a sister Republic, which seems to voice the opinion of the people of our country, as to the war on the burghers of the Transvaal?

* * * * * * *

"With only one dissent, the people of Christendom are denouncing it as the most wicked, causeless, and cruel assault made in our days by one nation on another; and that dissent comes from America. Have we forgotten our own history?

* * * * * * *

"Cut off from all the world, this little handful of farmer patriots, driven, after fifty years and more of heartless persecution, to defend their homes, numbering less than the population of Richmond, are defending their liberties against an Empire which embraces more than one-fifth of the people on the earth.

"It is a spectacle illuminating with immortal glory the dying days of a sordid century.

"And the great Republic alone of all the nations on the globe refuses them even sympathy. For shame!"

MERRITT LOVES ENGLAND—M'KINLEY'S COACH TO THE PARIS PEACE COMMISSIONERS A RED-HOT ANGLOMAN.

The New England Society of New York celebrated on the night of December 22, 1898, the ninety-third anniversary of its own birth and the two hundred and seventy-eighth of the landing of the Pilgrims.

The current sentiment for England was shown by President Howland, who said:

"I think it is due to our friends across the water to drink to the health of the Queen."

Her Majesty's health was drunk amid tumultuous applause and the waving of napkins and handkerchiefs.

Among the speakers was Gen. Wesley Merritt, Mr. McKinley's special mouthpiece at the Paris peace conference. Among other things, Mr. McKinley's favorite general said:

"MR. PRESIDENT AND GENTLEMEN: I have been a long way from home and have not heard much of what was going on in the United States, but I have heard a great deal from the colonists in the Far East, and while not a wise man from the East, I am willing to bring you testimony as to the English feeling in the colonies and their gratitude that we are extending our dominions to include the Tropics. [Applause.]

"We have a great work before us. What we have done, and what the Administration has done, has been in the interests of the country. There is much that attracts us from every side in the Tropics. We can extend our

commerce there, and we can extend the trade of America. We have the English feeling with us." [Cries of "Good!" and applause.] "When we are in the colonies of England, as I discovered in returning from the Tropics, they assure us that we can not let go of anything that we have. A great many people have insisted that the Constitution forbids it. To those I have said: 'We have outgrown the Constitution; it is not worth while to discuss it. We are here, and we are here to stay.'" [Applause.]

WHAT GENERAL MERRITT SAYS—THE GENERAL WAS SELECTED BY M'KINLEY TO CONVEY THE PRESIDENTIAL WISHES TO THE PEACE COMMISSIONERS AT PARIS.

Maj. Gen. Wesley Merritt, U. S. A., who interpreted the Presidential mind to the American Peace Commissioners at Paris, spoke at the sixty-fifth annual banquet of the St. David Society (Welsh) of New York. He said that he "sympathized with the British in the present war."

"At Manila," he said, "they stood by us, proving that blood is thicker than water. They are with us in trying to establish the principle all over the world, in South Africa and Manila, that every man is entitled to enjoy untrammeled the right to liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Whatever may be said about the Nicaragua treaty, I am satisfied that the British tried to do the right thing by their American cousins."

ADMIRAL KAUTZ'S BOAST—WRITING FROM SAMOA HE SAID: "I AM ALL RIGHT WITH THE ENGLISH."

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *April 26, 1899.*

A letter written by Rear-Admiral Kautz to his cousin, Mrs. Charles N. Lindley, of Cincinnati, has been made public by the recipient. It is dated March 23. In the letter he says:

"You will probably read a lot of stuff about me in various newspapers, but I can assure you that I am all right and have done nothing that I nor my friends may be ashamed of, unless it is the making of a king, which I was obliged to do to-day. But he is a very inoffensive sort of young fellow—a native, 10 years of age. He wears a French admiral's cocked hat, but no shoes or stockings or trousers; still, considering the torrid weather, he looks very well in this climate. But I hardly think he would look as well on Fourth street, Cincinnati. I am not a king here, but just plain 'boss of the ranch.'

"The German consul had that position up to my arrival, but since then he has been a very silent partner. I am very much afraid he does not like me—in fact, I am not at all popular here with the Germans. But I am all right with the English, and hope to pull through with them. I have no doubt of being sustained by the Government in all I have done. I hope to get away from here in a month from this time, but will not be in San Francisco before the middle of May.

"With love to the Kentucky Colonel and yourself.

"Your cousin,

"ALBERT KAUTZ."

LONDON REJOICED OVER ANGLO-AMERICAN ALLIANCE IN SAMOA.

The news that British and American sailors joined in the work of slaughtering Samoans for supporting their lawfully elected ruler was hailed with joy in London. The London Morning Post, in referring to this partnership in murder, said of it: "The one bright spot in the dark business is that the Americans and English fought splendidly together."

A press dispatch dated Apia, March 23, said: "The American and British troops are standing side by side, vying with each other in occupying the post of greatest danger. During the night fighting they both displayed the greatest bravery. The war ships have continued the shelling of the villages for a week. Whenever gatherings of Mataafa's troops are sighted within range of the cruisers' guns, fire is opened. Several villages have been burned.

PRO-BRITISH MINISTERS—OUR DIPLOMATIC REPRESENTATIVE AT THE HAGUE SHOWS HIS SYMPATHY FOR ENGLAND.

The London Daily News announced last December that "the British and American ministers at The Hague have asked permission to retire to Antwerp with a view of avoiding personal unpleasantness during the anti-English attitude of the Dutch." We have here a sample of the ill feeling created against us abroad by the ostentatious manner in which the McKinley Administration has ranged itself on the side of England. Our representatives in Europe, taking their cue from Washington, have made it known that they, too, favor English interests.

M'KINLEY'S ARMY FAVORITES FOR ANGLO-AMERICAN ALLIANCE—GENERAL DAVIS FOR ALLIANCE—"I FAVOR A TREATY OF ALLIANCE, INCLUDING THE UNITED STATES, ENGLAND, AND JAPAN."

LONDON, *December 13, 1898.*

The Paris correspondent of the Daily Mail summarizes this morning an interview he has had with United States Senator CUSHMAN K. DAVIS, of the Peace Commission, who, he says, advocates a triple alliance between the United States, Great Britain, and Japan. The correspondent says:

Mr. DAVIS declared that American and British interests in the Far East run quite parallel, and that therefore the two powers should act jointly. "I am not appealing to sentiment," he said, "though blood is thicker than water, and this argument should not be ignored. My thesis in favor of co-operation is borne out by the coldest logic. I favor a treaty of alliance, including the United States, Great Britain, and Japan, for the protection of all their interests north of the equator. The rest of the world would have a wholesome fear, synonymous with respect, for us."

"There are still five hundred years of vigorous fight in England," said Mr. DAVIS, "which shows no sign of decrepitude, while strong as America is it will take promise and policy. I do not see why other nations should object to the alliance. If they do, let them. Germany already, by special legislation, has immensely injured America's commercial interests. German-Americans regret this attitude on the part of the mother country."

Senator DAVIS has been one of Mr. McKinley's most ardent supporters. He is chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

WOODFORD HELPED ALLIANCE—THE EX-MINISTER TO SPAIN CALLED ENGLAND OUR PROTECTOR.

Gen. Stewart L. Woodford, ex-minister to Spain, talked to the members of the Army and Navy Club of New York, early in February, 1899, on things he knows about the preparations for the recent war. Among other things, he said:

"Your minister did the best he could; but let me tell you that had it not been for the unfaltering, unchanging, and loyal friendship of England and the attitude of her minister at Madrid, he might have failed to do the little he did do, because the representatives at Madrid of continental Europe were ready at any time to interfere with the plans of the United States if the British minister would only join them."

In the London dispatches in New York papers of February 5, 1899, we find the following:

"The recent speech of Gen. Stewart L. Woodford, former United States minister to Spain, before the Army and Navy Club at New York City, has been applauded by all Englishmen and has provoked divers comments. The moral most of them draw is that it helps the friendly understanding between the two countries."

The London Globe says: "Our moral support of the United States has been of incalculable value to them, by their own admission. In return we require something more than Admiral Dewey's platonic approval of the civilizing mission of England."

M'KINLEY'S NAVAL FAVORITES FOR ANGLO-AMERICAN ALLIANCE—SAMPSON IS PRO-ENGLISH—MR. M'KINLEY'S PET ADMIRAL SAID WE ARE TOGETHER, MEANING ENGLAND AND THE UNITED STATES.

In an address made by Rear-Admiral Sampson before the British Schools and University Club, of New York, on the evening of May 24, 1899, he said:

"The thoughts suggested by the sentiment of our fraternal relations are too fine to be spoiled by indifferent speech, and I am no speechmaker. Thoughts crowd upon me and plead for worthy utterance. That homely proverb, 'Blood is thicker than water,' appeals to every man of us here, and is itself an outcome of the good fellowship which has existed between our naval services for many years.

"This year's experience has made us realize its truth, and we of England and America feel, as we perhaps would not have felt twelve months ago, that we are together about this board as members of one great, world-wide family, with interests and sympathies in common.

"The warm feeling which we mutually rejoice in to-day has many causes, too many and too subtle to be here discussed. But, underlying them all, and making them all fruitful, has been the wise and uninterrupted policy of the Government of Her Majesty, your Queen, whose birthday we are here to celebrate. May she live long and prosper, and may we never prove ourselves her unworthy children."

MORE SAMPSON ANGLOMANIA—THE MAN WHOM MR. M'KINLEY TRIED TO MAKE THE HERO OF SANTIAGO LOVES THE QUEEN.

Mr. McKinley's pet naval commander, the man whom he advanced over the heads of others, but who was destined by fate to get no more honor than justice would have decreed, attended the annual banquet of the New England Society of New York December 22, 1899, in company with General Merritt, also a Presidential favorite.

Judge Howland, a rank Anglomaniac, presided. He proposed a toast to "Her August Majesty, the Queen." "At that," says a New York paper, "Gen. Wesley Merritt, Admiral William T. Sampson, J. Pierpont Morgan, and many others sprang to their feet at President Howland's call. The band struck up. It was a love feast. They sang:

God save our gracious Queen,
God save our noble Queen,
God save the Queen.

SCHURMAN FOR ALLIANCE—HE WAS CHAIRMAN OF MR. M'KINLEY'S FIRST PHILIPPINE COMMISSION.

At a regular meeting of the Congregational Club of New York, in the Hotel St. Denis, December 18, 1899, President J. G. Schurman, of Cornell University, and chairman of Mr. McKinley's first commission to the Philippines, said:

"Whether England be right or wrong in taking up the gauntlet thrown down by Kruger, I will not undertake to say, but I do know that in the Orient, where we have had trouble, our cause has been England's cause. I do know that while observing neutrality she has facilitated our work in all ways possible."

President Schurman said that the British home government had ordered British ships to go through the archipelago and that their captains were instructed in the course of their voyage to meet the leading insurgents and point out to them the folly of further resistance to the United States. One of the ships that went on this mission, he said, was the *Powerful*, commanded by Captain Lamberton, of whom much has been heard in South Africa.

One of the most beneficent results of the war with Spain, President Schurman said, was the bringing together of the British and American people.

CHAMBERLAIN'S VISIT HERE—HE PROCLAIMED THE ENGLISH DESIRE FOR AN ANGLO-AMERICAN ALLIANCE.

Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, England's colonial secretary, was in this country on mysterious business in September, 1898.

Here is the enthusiastic manner in which he indorses the proposal to have this country pull England's chestnuts out of the fire. We quote from an interview which appeared in the daily press:

"When I declared in Birmingham in May that even war itself would be cheaply purchased if in a great and noble cause the Stars and Stripes and the Union Jack should wave together, I had no mental reservation, and I am happy to say that I voiced the sentiments of nine hundred and ninety-nine out of every thousand Englishmen.

"England is ready," and this was said with emphasis upon each word, "to meet the United States more than half way.

"It is for you to determine how close the relations between the two countries shall become. There are no great obstacles to be overcome in bringing the English-speaking people in alliance. When your Senate decides that it is to your interests to join with us in securing certain benefits to both nations, the alliance will quickly be an accomplished fact.

"Why should not we be allied? Our interests are common, as is our language.

"We are both trying for the betterment of mankind. Now let us have a little better understanding all around and we can snap our fingers at hostile intrigues."

CHAMBERLAIN PAVED THE WAY—IN MAY, 1898, HE ANNOUNCED THAT THE TIME HAD ARRIVED FOR ANGLO-SAXON ALLIANCE.

LONDON, *May 13, 1898.*

The Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, secretary of state for the colonies, made an important speech on public affairs at Birmingham this evening.

Referring to the policy of strict isolation that England has pursued since the Crimean war, he remarked that this had been "perfectly justifiable," but he added:

"The time has arrived when Great Britain may be confronted by a combination of powers, and our first duty, therefore, is to draw all parts of the Empire into close unity, and our next to maintain the bonds of permanent unity with our kinsmen across the Atlantic. [Loud cheers.]

"There is a powerful and generous nation," said Mr. Chamberlain, "speaking our language, bred of our race, and having interests identical with ours, I would go so far as to say that, terrible as war may be, even war itself would be cheaply purchased if in a great and noble cause the Stars and Stripes and the Union Jack should wave together over an Anglo-Saxon alliance. [Prolonged cheers.]

"It is one of the most satisfactory results of Lord Salisbury's policy that at the present time these two great nations understand each other better than they ever have done since, over a century ago, they were separated by the blunder of a British government."

SALISBURY'S PLAIN HINT—SPOKE OF THE "HAPPY RELATIONS EXISTING BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND OURSELVES."

At the lord mayor's banquet held in London November 9, 1898, Lord Salisbury, premier of England, said:

"And I will say that I have noted, as one of the cheering symptoms of the

present time, the happy relations existing between the United States and ourselves [cheers] and the sympathy with which we watch their approach toward the same great problems that we ourselves have had to solve."

CHOATE CORROBORATES SALISBURY.

LONDON, *November 10, 1899.*

Mr. Choate, the American ambassador, declared in a speech at the Sir Walter Scott Club, in Edinburgh, to-night, that Lord Salisbury's generous and cordial reference to the United States in his speech last night met with a great and hearty response in America. He added:

"The ironclad friendship that now prevails between the two nations means peace not merely between your country and mine but among all the nations of the earth. It tends by advancing civilization to promote the prosperity and welfare not alone of the Anglo-Saxon race but of the whole human race."

A FORECAST VERIFIED—ALLIANCE PREDICTIONS MADE BY THE WASHINGTON CORRESPONDENT OF THE LONDON DAILY MAIL IN MAY, 1898, HAVE BEEN FULFILLED.

LONDON, *May 30, 1898.*

The Washington correspondent of the Daily Telegraph, cabling Sunday, says:

"I have just learned from a high authority in the State Department that important preliminary steps toward an Anglo-American alliance have already been taken. How far these negotiations have proceeded it is not easy to ascertain, for, naturally, strict secrecy is maintained. But my information is that the preliminary suggestions have been made and that the subject of such an alliance is practically before the two Governments.

"The recent visits paid by Sir Julian Pauncefote to the State Department have not, it seems, had reference altogether to the Canadian negotiations. According to my authority, the features of the proposed alliance now being considered are these:

"Great Britain is to recognize the Monroe doctrine, is to attempt no increase of her territorial possessions in the Western Hemisphere, and is to indorse the American construction of that doctrine.

"The United States are to build the Nicaragua Canal and Great Britain is to have the use of it in time of war.

"The United States are to have all the territory from Spain in the present war, and Great Britain is to protect the United States in the possession thereof if this should be threatened.

"The United States are to stand by England in her policy in China and the East, and all the British ports in the East are to be opened to the United States under the most-favored-nation clause."

The Hay-Pauncefote canal treaty and Secretary Hay's "open-door" negotiations with the powers give striking evidence of the accuracy of the London Daily Mail correspondent's information.

Mr. Chairman, I desire also to submit as a part of my remarks an article which recently appeared in the Washington Post, from the pen of a distinguished American, Hon. J. B. Henderson:

UNRESTRAINED AUTHORITY—THE DEVELOPMENTS IN CUBA WERE INEVITABLE UNDER EXISTING CONDITIONS.

EDITOR POST: Our people, along with yourself, seem to manifest great surprise at the development of frauds in the government of Cuba by the United States.

In government, as in nature, like causes produce like effects. This fact was known to our forefathers. They knew not only from historical teachings, but from their own personal experience as colonies of England, that unlimited power is always corrupt. Hence, the whole scheme of our Government is a careful and guarded limitation of powers. Their solicitude on this subject is expressed in almost every line of the Federal Constitution.

After General Washington, the president of the convention which framed this Constitution, had nearly completed his second term as President of the United States, he bequeathed to his fellow-citizens that priceless legacy known as his Farewell Address. In it he said:

"Respect for its (the Government's) authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government; but the constitution which at any time exists, till changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power and the right of the people to establish government presupposes the duty of every individual to obey the established government."

That Constitution which he so earnestly asked us to obey as a sacred duty provides as follows: "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law, and a regular statement and account of the receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time."

The origin and history of this provision demonstrate the purpose that all money collected under Federal authority, whatever its source, should pass into the Federal Treasury. And when once there, it should not depart therefrom except in pursuance of appropriations made by law.

The lawmaking power, by that same Constitution, is vested alone in Congress. And Congress, in 1789, created the Treasury Department, and certainly tried to make its Secretary in this regard independent of the President. As to the public moneys, the Secretary of the Treasury is made responsible not to the President, but to the people of the United States. He is required to make his reports to the Congress, while all other secretaries must report to the President.

Even General Jackson, with his unbridled temper and the promptings of his military education, did not assume the power to touch the public deposits. He asked Mr. Duane, the Secretary, to do what was clearly within the Secretary's discretion, and he refusing, Jackson claimed no greater power than that of his removal from office. It is true that he accomplished by indirection that which he could not do directly, and this exercise of power toward an unjustifiable end will be best honored in its future avoidance.

Not only must public moneys go into the Treasury and remain there until Congress, the lawmaking power, shall order its removal by specific appropriation, but to the end that the general public, the masses of the people, may be duly informed, regular statements and accounts of both receipts and expenditures shall be published from time to time.

With all these guaranties of honesty in the handling of public funds, reenforced by the safeguards of checks and balances suggested by responsible accounting officers in an experience of a hundred years, it has been difficult to secure that fidelity and integrity sought and hoped for by the founders of our institutions.

Why should we be surprised, then, at the recent defalcations and embezzlements in Cuba? Are they not the legitimate consequences of a gross and radical departure from the Constitution, on which our institutions and our hopes of fidelity and purity of administration are all based?

Look at the order of the President, made through the Postmaster-General, in July, 1899, under which Mr. Rathbone's administration as director-general of posts in Cuba has been conducted. Upon him alone is conferred unlimited authority to establish post-offices and to appoint postmasters and fix their compensation.

He has unrestrained authority to establish post routes and fix the compensation of all persons and companies carrying the mail. He is to make all contracts touching the questions of transportation and distribution of the mail. And his power is equally unlimited to collect and disburse all moneys arising from that service in Cuba. Under this order he combines in himself, as regards this subject, all the functions of the legislative and executive departments of our Government on an island containing two millions of people. His sole will is the law. He is made pro hac vice an absolute monarch. No such autocracy exists on earth. He is to collect millions of dollars and expend it as his own sweet will may dictate.

There is no one to inspect his accounts. He is authorized to collect, and to hold and disburse as his own treasurer. He can disburse without an act of appropriation. He can pay out without a warrant. The lamentable part of this whole matter is that he who invokes constitutional limitations to restrain this wild delirium is no better than a traitor against his Government. After a while the traitors will probably be in the majority, and then, as heretofore in this uncertain world of ours, treason will again become respectable.

J. B. HENDERSON.

Mr. Chairman, I will also submit with my remarks the following extracts from a recent able editorial which appeared in the New York Journal:

IMPERIALISM THE NEGATION OF EXPANSION.

The difference between expansion and imperialism is the difference between strength and weakness. It is the difference between growth and agglomeration. An expanded nation is like a tree. Every part of it is a live, vigorous part of the organism, adding strength to the whole. An imperialized nation is like a hulk covered with barnacles. Move it into fresh water and its accretions drop off.

If you look at the maps of antiquity you will find seemingly mighty empires forming great splotches on the map, and a little later you will find other splotches covering almost the same spaces, but bearing different names. Now it is the Assyrian Empire, then the Babylonian, and again the Median, the Persian, the Empire of Alexander the Great, of the Seleucids, the Parthians, and the Sassanian Persians. It was not that one nation grew and died and was succeeded by another. It was that one tribe overran a vast tract of country, subjugated other tribes and ruled them for a time, and then was subjugated and ruled in its turn.

If Darius had been the ruler of a Persian nation, Alexander could never have chased him from end to end of his empire with 30,000 men. He was beaten because he was only the ruler of a dominant tribe, which had its hands full in keeping its subject populations in order before the invader came.

Spain was most powerful before she began to waste her vigor in foreign conquests. She became helplessly feeble when the sun ceased to set on her empire.

Even England, whose empire is the most stable that history has ever known, is not strengthened by her subject provinces. Her statesmen were beginning to talk of the "weary Titan" even before the Boers began to make that weariness more acute. It is doubtful whether England has ever been greater than she was in the time of Elizabeth, when her empire included not even Scotland.

But she has given us examples of what to follow and what to avoid. In Scotland we have pure expansion; in Ireland, imperialism. England took Scotland into full partnership. The Scotch were governed according to their own ideas. Their representatives were consulted before laws affecting Scotland were passed. Ireland was treated as a vassal. In passing Irish laws the rule was followed of finding what the Irish members wanted and then giving them the opposite.

The result has been that Scotland, which had been the hereditary enemy of England through her whole history down to the union of the crowns, is now more loyally British, if possible, than England herself, while Ireland is a permanently hostile camp in the heart of the empire.

The growth of the United States hitherto has been always true expansion. We have taken in territory with the purpose of making it an actual, integral part of the Republic. Now, for the first time, we are beginning to have subjects. The inhabitants of Porto Rico, says the bill that has just passed, "shall be deemed citizens of Porto Rico, entitled to the protection of the United States, and, together with such citizens of the United States as may reside there, shall constitute a body politic under the name of 'The People of Porto Rico,' with governmental powers as conferred by the bill with power to sue and be sued as such."

Here we have two classes of citizens in one place—citizens of Porto Rico and citizens of the United States. It is the case of Rome and her allies over again. And wherever the citizen of the imperial power resides, with his privileges not possessed by his neighbors, there jealousy and hatred spring up.

Porto Rico gives us our opportunity to expand in an American way if we choose. There has been a strong feeling in Central America in favor of annexation to the United States. It is almost certain that such a step would be popular in Nicaragua, if it should seem to be the only way of getting the canal. But that idea is based on the assumption that territory annexed to the United States becomes American. No independent republic, however weak or torn by dissensions, wants to turn itself into a colony.

If we had set Porto Rico on the highroad to American prosperity when Congress met sixteen months ago, the people of Cuba would not have been as clamorous as they are now for immediate independence. They would have been able to see the substantial advantages of American rule. As it is, Porto Rico is not an invitation, but a warning.

It has been customary to call each Presidential election the most critical in our history, but in truth there have been very few that could compare in importance with the one just approaching. Certainly there has been none such since the second election of Lincoln. After a hundred and eleven years of vigorous life under the Constitution, we are to decide whether that instrument has been outgrown.

We are to decide whether we shall abandon all our old maxims and start on the road down which Babylon, Persia, Macedon, Rome, and Spain moved to destruction.

Imperialism is not only not the same thing as expansion—it is its very negation. When imperialism begins, expansion stops. Under the imperial system the central power is stationary, and it reaches out and seizes all the outlying territory it can hold by force. The larger the pile of plunder becomes the weaker is the power that holds it.

FROUDE'S ROMAN LESSONS FOR AMERICA.

To the student of political history, and to the English student above all others, the conversion of the Roman republic into a military empire commands a peculiar interest. Notwithstanding many differences, the English and the Romans essentially resemble one another. The early Romans possessed the faculty of self-government beyond any people of whom we have historical knowledge, with the one exception of ourselves.

In virtue of their temporal freedom, they became the most powerful nation in the known world, and their liberties perished only when Rome became the mistress of conquered races to whom she was unable or unwilling to extend her privileges.

If there be one lesson which history clearly teaches, it is this: That free nations can not govern subject provinces. If they are unable or unwilling to admit their dependencies to share their own constitution, the constitution itself will fall in pieces from mere incompetence for its duties.

The Present Administration.

SPEECH

OF

HON. NICHOLAS N. COX,

OF TENNESSEE,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, March 26, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 8582) making appropriation for the support of the Regular and Volunteer Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901—

Mr. COX said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I simply rise in my place so that I may be entitled to print in the RECORD fully what I desire to say. I shall say nothing in malice or anger, but as far as I can give my reasons for opposing this enormous army and more than enormous expenses. I have done all I could do to prevent us from reaching a most deplorable state of affairs as I see it. In order to get together events and legislation as they occurred I shall try and give a condensed history of these things.

HISTORY OF EVENTS WHICH LED UP TO THE WAR AGAINST THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

Recognize at the outset what we have done in increasing our Army and the money it is costing the people to maintain it, with every indication that we have not yet reached the high point in our expenses. We had when these troubles commenced a Regular Army of about 25,000 men. Our appropriation covering its expenses of every kind was about twenty-three millions. We have now 95,042 enlisted men, 3,492 officers. All included makes an Army of 98,541 men.

The cost of this Army during the next fiscal year, ending last day of June, 1901, amounts to the enormous sum of one hundred and twelve millions, as contained in the appropriation bill, and a conceded deficiency of twenty-five millions, making for the year one hundred and thirty-seven millions. Last fiscal year we appropriated eighty millions, and a deficiency is presented of about forty-seven millions. So the sum total for a standing army for two fiscal years amounts to the sum of two hundred and sixty-four millions. Let it be remembered that this does not include our appropriations for fortifications or ordnance. These sums added, as estimated, will make a sum approaching three hundred millions.

This is what we have to meet, and certainly it is important to know the plain truth as to what brought this about. I need not recur to what led up to the declaration of war with Spain. The first proposed legislation, as was generally understood, came from the President. It consisted in declaring the object of the United States—to establish a stable government, etc., in Cuba. These resolutions were adopted by the House with 17 dissenting votes. They went to the Senate and were almost, if not entirely, ignored, and the resolutions were approved April 20, 1898, as prepared by the Senate. The resolutions are as follows:

[Public resolution—No. 21.]

Joint resolution for the recognition of the independence of the people of Cuba, demanding that the Government of Spain relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba, and to withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters, and directing the President of the United States to use the land and naval forces of the United States to carry these resolutions into effect.

Whereas the abhorrent conditions which have existed for more than three years in the island of Cuba, so near our own borders, have shocked the moral sense of the people of the United States, have been a disgrace to Christian civilization, culminating, as they have, in the destruction of a United States battle ship, with 266 of its officers and crew, while on a friendly visit in the harbor of Habana, and can not longer be endured, as has been set forth by the President of the United States in his message to Congress of April 11, 1898, upon which the action of Congress was invited: Therefore,

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, First. That the people of the island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent.

Second. That it is the duty of the United States to demand, and the Government of the United States does hereby demand, that the Government of Spain at once relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba, and withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters.

Third. That the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, directed and empowered to use the entire land and naval forces of the United States, and to call into the actual service of the United States the militia of the several States, to such extent as may be necessary to carry these resolutions into effect.

Fourth. That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people.

Approved, April 20, 1898.

On the 22d of April, 1898, an act was approved which referred to the organization of the Army. This act, in section 4, however, provides "that the Volunteer Army shall be maintained only during the existence of war or while war is imminent," and can only be raised after Congress confers on the President the authority to raise such a force.

A bill reached the Committee on Military Affairs which, in its original shape, conferred on the President the power to inaugurate war without the action of Congress. This raised a lengthy debate in the committee. The bill had been prepared at the War Office. On the first vote in committee to insert the following language, "That upon a declaration of war by Congress, or a declaration by Congress that war exists," then the President could call out the forces, etc.

On the first vote to insert this language it received only 2 votes. After reflection the motion was made to reconsider, and the amendment was inserted with only 2 dissenting votes.

On the 25th of April war was formally declared against Spain, and on the day after the general volunteer bill was passed with the amendment above referred to. This bill of April 25, under which the first volunteers were called and authority given to fill up the companies, regiments, etc., of the Regular Army to its maximum strength—this bill also declares:

That at the end of any war in which the United States may become involved the Army shall be reduced to a peace basis.

It further declares that nothing in this act shall be so construed as authorizing to increase the Regular Army, except 25 majors, which was necessary to organize according to modern tactics.

The calling out of volunteers and recruiting the Regular Army proceeded as rapidly as possible, and the fighting ended with Spain in a short time.

She was completely whipped and sued for peace. On the 10th day of December, 1898, a treaty of peace was signed between the United States and Spain. On the 11th day of April, 1899, this treaty was promulgated and became the agreement between United States and Spain.

Before the treaty had been ratified or promulgated, to wit, on the 21st day of December, 1898, the President issues his celebrated proclamation that the Philippine Islands belonged to the United States and declared our sovereignty over all these islands. This was the declaration of war against these people. This proclamation was issued on the above date, before the treaty had been ratified by the Senate.

On the 2d of March, 1899, the second volunteer bill was approved, authorizing the President to maintain the Regular Army up to its maximum strength of 65,000 men, and to call into service 35,000 volunteers, whose term expires July 1, 1901. These troops have substantially been called into service, as is shown by his message to the present Congress.

These are the substantial facts in regard to what Congress and the President have done.

Now I desire to state some undisputed facts in regard to Aguinaldo and his followers:

Admiral Dewey telegraphed Aguinaldo to come to the Philippine Islands. This arrangement was made through the United States consul. Aguinaldo did meet Admiral Dewey on our flagship *Olympia*. He was furnished with some arms belonging to the United States, and went to Cavite, his native town. From there he issued his proclamation calling his countrymen to arms, assuring them that the Navy of the United States and its Army were ready to help relieve his people from the tyranny of Spain. This proclamation was full of love and admiration for the Americans.

His people flocked to him, and, as Admiral Dewey says, it was wonderful. He forced the Spaniards almost under the guns of our Navy, and was holding them there until land forces of ours could reach Manila. About twelve thousand Spaniards surrendered, and after the surrender the forces of Aguinaldo were ordered by United States military authority to stay out of Manila, upon the ground that the Spaniards were afraid that they would massacre them. Admiral Dewey states that in every step, fight, or contact Aguinaldo had which put him in direct and personal contact with the Spaniards and his army, in driving the Spanish under our guns, he had conducted his operations according to civilized war. Another fact, he had captured many Spanish prisoners, who were treated kindly as prisoners of war.

When his army had reached near Manila, and he had fortified his position, he was ordered to fall back farther. He protested, and apprehended or feared that the Americans would leave him and the Spanish soldiers to fight it out. However, he obeyed the order and fell back.

On the 5th of February, 1899, the unfortunate firing on the picket line occurred, evidently brought about, to say the least of it, by carelessness, and on the part of the Filipinos without

authority. Immediately, as soon as Aguinaldo heard the facts, he sent one of his generals to General Otis, stating that his men had acted without authority and proposed to agree on a neutral zone, so that no more blood should be shed, begging General Otis to stop until the matter could be settled. General Otis replied, in substance, that the war had commenced and must go on. It has gone on for over one year, and the results are familiar to all.

These undisputed facts I have given, and now I propound the question: By what legal authority is this war waged? An army of 57,508 men are in the Philippine Islands or on their way there. Who authorized this—war with a people nearly 10,000 miles from our capital, who never did us an unkindness in our history?

Here is an army of 57,508 men in the Philippine Islands or on their way there to enforce a policy promulgated by the President of the United States without a single word, resolution, or act indorsing such a policy from Congress, although Congress was in session when he issued his proclamation declaring his policy.

That Congress authorized the war or made a declaration of war, or that war existed, as provided in the first volunteer act, no one contends. Is it not well to examine and see what the President bases his war declaration on; what influenced him to inaugurate this terrible conflict; call out more troops than Jackson had to whip Great Britain; more troops than it required to whip Mexico; in a war without the action of Congress against a people who had never fired a gun at us, but had fought side by side with us in defeating an enemy against whom Congress had declared war?

If Congress did not inaugurate this war, and the President did, we call for his authority. Let him speak for himself. In his proclamation he asserts two grounds to sustain his action: First, that inasmuch as our representatives to negotiate a treaty with Spain have signed an agreement that Spain will let us have these islands; and second, because our arms have been victorious over Spain; therefore, I, President McKinley, declare that the sovereignty of the United States is extended over these islands, embracing a population of probably 10,000,000.

Now, if the agreement made between our commissioners and the commissioners of Spain was authority for the President to act, without the action of the Senate, what was the necessity of any action by the Senate. Remember that this agreement was signed between the commissioners at Paris on the 10th day of December, 1898. On the 6th of February, 1899, Senate ratified the same. Ratified by the Spanish authorities March 29, 1899. Senate of the United States had to ratify it, and the proper authorities of Spain had to do likewise. Now, I submit that this agreement had no legal effect until ratified by the authorities of the contending parties.

The Senate could have rejected; so could the authorities of Spain. Now, suppose either had rejected it, where would have been the authority of the President to declare the sovereignty of the United States, by his proclamation, to extend over the Philippine Islands?

Remember that this proclamation was issued December 21, 1898, one month and a half before the Senate ratified the agreement, and over three months before Spain ratified.

Could not the Senate have rejected it? Could not Spain have rejected it? But regardless of this, the President declares the sovereignty of the United States over these islands before Spain had consented and before the United States had made legal the agreement.

As before stated, the President asserts as one of his grounds for making this strange declaration that our commissioners (whom he terms plenipotentiaries) had signed the agreement. No candid man can think that this authorized the celebrated order of December 21, 1898. He may have assumed that the proper legal authorities would ratify the agreement; but such an assumption would give no legal authority. When the Senate did ratify the treaty, war had already been declared by the President. We had to meet war, inaugurated by the President.

The other ground he asserts in this famous proclamation as ground of his authority is that on account of our victories over the Spanish we have gained this right to sovereignty. Now, if that be disconnected from the other reason assigned, then we have a clear case of "criminal aggression." It is seizing and acquiring territory by conquest. So the President declares in this famous unauthorized order that the United States owns the Philippine Islands, because our commissioners have signed a paper which has not been indorsed by either power, and because we have been triumphant over Spain.

Will anyone give themselves the trouble to compare this policy of the President with the joint resolution passed by Congress? Not one word in regard to the Philippine Islands, but an open, plain avowal that the United States disclaims any intention of acquiring territory by force. Yet the President says that because of our victories over Spain the sovereignty of the United States extends over every foot of these islands, and we will shoot you natives and destroy you until you agree to this.

Do not forget that Congress was in session when the celebrated order was issued—had just convened fresh from the people; yet no communication was sent to it asking what should be done or the policy to be adopted.

I call your attention in this connection to the flagrant violation of the agreement made between the two powers as set forth in the agreement:

ART. IX. The civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants of the territories hereby ceded to the United States shall be determined by Congress.

Not the President. Although the President, under his oath, signed the agreement and treaty, yet before it was law or a treaty he had plunged this country into war, and now proclaims, What will you do? Not in an official message to Congress, as provided for in the treaty, and as provided in the first volunteer act, that Congress should act; but war is upon us by the action of the President and the President only.

TREATY WITH SPAIN.

It is claimed by the supporters of the President that when we bought these islands from Spain under the treaty it was the duty of the President to force the inhabitants of the islands to recognize the complete jurisdiction of the United States over them. This the President asserted about three months before Spain agreed to sell them for twenty millions. How did the President know that Spain would sell for twenty millions before the proposition was submitted to proper Spanish authority? How did the President know over a month before the action of the United States Senate that the Senate would agree to this? How did he know when he declared war that Congress would appropriate the twenty millions? He did not know; but he in his order asserts the sovereignty of the United States regardless of what either power might decide. This he does in violation of the Constitution, which confers on Congress the power to declare war.

This he does in violation of the volunteer act of April 20, 1898, which requires him to reduce the Army to a peace basis as soon as the object for which they had been intended shall be accomplished.

He has violated the law in holding soldiers over the time of their enlistment and after the treaty with Spain had been made and peace proclaimed, when the law provides that they shall be mustered out when the objects for which they were called had been consummated.

Let me ask, who ever in Congress contemplated that after peace with Spain was made that the President should, of his own volition, hold the Army up to its maximum strength, and declare another war against our friends, and in truth our allies in defeating Spain? Who ever heard the Philippine Islands even named in the discussion about war on account of Cuba? Were the joint resolutions in regard to the war with Spain a fraud? Can Congress afford to engage in such business? Here is what Congress declared:

That the people of the island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent; that it is the duty of the United States to demand, and the Government of the United States does hereby demand, that the Government of Spain at once relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba, and withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters.

Spain was compelled to do this; and after she had done this the President declared war against the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands.

But it is said we bought out Spain, and all her rights inured to us. Let me ask here, Was not the cruelty of Spain to the Filipinos equal to the cruelty to the Cubans? We were fighting Spain for humanity's sake; we are killing Filipinos for territory.

Congress declares war for humanity. The President declares war for territory.

Congress had Spaniards killed for the sake of humanity; under the present war the President declares his war against Filipinos because they want to be free.

But let us carefully examine this agreement with Spain. Who made it and what was the condition of the contracting parties?

Spain was at our feet. Her navies sunk, and her land forces defeated. She could not resist further. The commissioners, for generosity, offer her twenty millions for certain islands which Spain claims. The United States could have as well said, We demand these islands to indemnify us, and we will take them. Spain could have only responded, We can resist no more.

Now, it is here the claim is set up that it is the duty of the President to conquer these people and make them recognize the sovereignty of the United States. It has gone so far that the term is often used that the President is suppressing an insurrection. An insurrection against the laws of the United States, when no laws of the United States ever prevailed over them! But let us closely follow the power of the President under our Constitution to precipitate this country into a war; not how weak are the people or whether they can govern themselves or not. Where is the President's authority to inaugurate a war against a people who never were guilty of a hostile act against us?

The only pretext is found in the claim that we bought the country from Spain and paid twenty millions for it. Could Spain sell us more than she had? It is notorious that she only held a small portion of the seaports, and had utterly failed to bring the citizens under her dominion. So the plain truth is we bought the fight Spain was waging against these people. We undertook to do what Spain had utterly failed to do, and we took a bad job off of the hands of Spain and gave her twenty millions for the job.

Now, assume the President had authority to inaugurate war, and assume he had a right to abrogate the express terms of the treaty; that Congress should fix the political status of these people; by what authority is he now waging the war? If it is answered that, as President of the United States, on him devolves the responsibility to suppress insurrections, repel invasions, etc., tell me what law of the United States have these people rebelled against. The very strongest answer that can be made is that Spain, a power these people had been resisting for years, without their consent, without even a hearing from them, sold them out at about $3 per head, and the United States is trying to enforce the sale.

Does the President of the United States claim he is waging the war as President, or does he claim he is doing so as Commander in Chief of our armies? If he bases his action on the latter proposition, that he as Commander in Chief has a right to declare and wage war, then he is but a military dictator. If he puts it on the ground that he is President, and as such Commander in Chief, then he derives his power from the Constitution, which confers the power. If he relies on the Constitution, then he must abide by it. What clause of the Constitution confers on the President the power to declare that 10,000,000 people shall submit to the sovereignty of the United States, although they are opposed to it—people who had never been living under the Constitution? Especially may this question be asked: By what authority did the President declare this policy before the United States had even gone through the approval of a treaty made at its own dictation?

By what authority is the Army of the United States in the Philippine Islands? Is it there by virtue of the powers of the President? If so, then he acts under the Constitution, not above it. If these islands are ours and form a part of the domains of the United States, then the inhabitants are under the protection of the Constitution unless they have rebelled against it. But they could not rebel, because there was nothing, so far as our laws operated over them, to rebel against. But the President puts them in rebellion because they refuse to obey an order or proclamation of his unauthorized by any law or treaty.

If we should purchase one of the South American States, and this were done through the President and the Senate, and the people refused to agree to the sale, then the President of the United States and the Senate would inaugurate a war although every member in the other House was opposed to it. Then what use or power is in the Constitution which confers on Congress the power to declare war?

I ask why was it that the President precipitated this war without the consent or consideration of Congress? That body was in session. His party had control. He had offered a treaty, or did shortly afterwards, which distinctly declares that Congress shall have the power to fix the political status of the inhabitants of these islands. Why did he violate the law that called out the first volunteers, which directed him that as soon as the objects of the war were obtained—the defeat of Spain—that the Army should be brought back to the original peace basis? That law stands to-day. Did he not sign this act, which notified him at least that his authority to call for troops or inaugurate a war must be based on a declaration of Congress declaring war or that war existed?

You have an army of over 57,000 men operating against the Philippine Islands; and, without a word from Congress as to whether it is right or not, is simply engaged in voting these enormous sums of the people's money to pay this Army, called out and engaged in war inaugurated solely by the President of the United States, and that, too, before the constitutional body had even said we have bought these islands from Spain.

What kind of policy is this? We entered the war for the sake of humanity. We drove the Spaniards off the island of Cuba. This we declared to be our purpose, and only purpose, when we declared war—in the constitutional way—against Spain. We soon accomplished our avowed purpose. But to make it clear, we avowed we had no intention of trying to seize territory by force. This way of obtaining territory the President denounced as a crime. "It would be criminal aggression." What territory was referred to in this declaration? It certainly could mean no other territory than Spain laid claim to. It could not mean that we avowed not to take territory by force from a friendly power. It referred to Spain, and no one but Spain.

As soon as Spain was driven from Cuba the President—no one else—declared that the people of the Philippines should submit to our sovereignty. We could as easily put the island of Cuba in the treaty as any other island. We wrote our own agreement. Spain submitted, because that was all she could do. Our Government at once commenced to give the Cubans the right of self-government. Although the Cubans resisting Spain rendered us but little service, nothing in comparison with Aguinaldo and his army, we gave the Cubans self-government and declared war against the Philippines because they wanted self-government.

The President now, without one word from Congress, says to the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands, You surrender; lay down your arms; disband your organizations; kneel at our feet; hoist our flag over your country, and we will be upright and just to you. When Aguinaldo and his troops were driving the Spanish army under the guns of Admiral Dewey—and he was speaking in the highest praise of his conduct—and held the Spaniards in a pen until our forces arrived, did he or his people ever dream that they should be refused the privilege of entering Manila?

And that refusal based on the ground that the Spaniard soldiers, crying, cringing, and moaning for fear the Filipinos would butcher them. Our sympathy then turned to the Spaniard, whom we had driven out of Cuba, because of his brutal, inhuman, and un-Christian conduct had rendered him unfit even to be our neighbor. But they were prisoners of war, and the Filipinos had done their part in capturing them, and they, our enemies, received the kindnesses of the American Army, and the Filipinos ordered not to enter the city; but not only this, our general conceived that their lines were too close to the city, and they were ordered to fall back. They did so, and obeyed the United States officer. Is it strange that the confidence in their supposed friends was shaken?

Still tracing this suicidal policy, when the unfortunate firing occurred on the picket lines, Aguinaldo sent in post haste to General Otis to stop the fight. Says, too, "The action of my men is unauthorized. Let us establish a neutral ground until we can settle the matter." Immediately, without any conference with the President (for none was necessary), he replies, "The war has commenced and must go on." In a short time, so reported, 600 Filipinos were dead.

What brave, true American approves this policy? Who approves such conduct?

When the United States commissioners had met the Spanish commissioners at Paris, and the great interest of 10,000,000 people—our friends, who had helped us to defeat the common enemy—stood at the doors and begged simply to be heard, tell their thoughts, and maintain what they thought of their interests, we said: "No; we have used you as far as we need you. Begone! We will be humane and just." And before this agreement (all made by one side) had the authority of law the President declares war against these people, without a hearing and without even their presence in this treaty-making body, although they had more interest than anyone. To close the matter, General Otis tells these people war has commenced and must go on; all negotiations refused unless they surrender their arms, acknowledge their master, and on bended knees beg for mercy.

Who approves such a policy? Let me here for one minute call your attention to this famous policy. We thought enough of Aguinaldo to use him in assisting us. Call it by any name you please—alliance, agreement, or something else—one thing is certain, he was our friend. Your policy refuses to even talk the matter over or to negotiate. But while you are shooting his followers, who pray alone for liberty, you dispatch a general of our Army, and he goes to meet an old Mohammedan, surrounded with his harems and his slaves, and you put this chief on a pension for the liberty of hoisting our flag to float over his wives and slaves. You bought a place for the Stars and Stripes, and the same flag is used to destroy a people who were our friends and who ask only for liberty. Who approves this policy?

But let us take another step in considering this unholy war. The United States was agitating the feasibility of meeting the suggestion of the ruler of the Russians and to send our representatives to a meeting. The great purpose was to avert wars. The President of the United States sent five of our distinguished men to meet that great council. The appointment of these men was made on the 17th of April, 1899. Now, what was transpiring in the United States? Already the President had issued his declaration of war in December, 1898. But he did not stop at that. He wanted more troops, more soldiers, more war.

On the 2d day of March, 1899, the President approved an act, passed by his friends in Congress, authorizing him to maintain the Regular Army up to its maximum strength of 65,000 men, and to call into service 35,000 volunteers, with the power to officer these men and call them from any place he pleased. In this act the old volunteer act was abandoned. It provided that when the objects of the war were obtained these soldiers should be mustered out, and the Regular Army brought back to its peace basis. But the act of March 2, 1899, provided that this increased military power was "to meet the present exigencies of necessity of the military service."

Who was to judge what the exigencies of the military service

were? The President, who brought about the necessity for this force? The President, by declaring war on the Filipinos, notwithstanding, by the treaty with Spain, ratified by the Senate and approved by the President, Congress should have the power to fix the political status of the inhabitants of these islands.

Do you approve of this policy? When this bill of March 2 was pending, time and time again, the question was asked, "What do you want with these new troops?" Not one word came from the President in answer, and not one word from his immediate leaders and his champions on the floor. We see now what he wanted them for. But as to the President's power to proceed and involve us in a war, let Senator FORAKER answer this question. The whole matter of governing these islands is with Congress, and Congress could establish such a government as it pleased, and this power was verified by the treaty of Paris, confirmed March 30, 1900, in the Senate.

What policy has the President? He has taken it away from Congress, in violation of the treaty, and assumed to manage the entire matter.

In Cuba the policy seems to be to allow them to govern themselves after we get done with them.

In Porto Rico the first opening of a policy is to confer on the President the appointing of a legislative body, a majority of whom may never have seen that island. In Porto Rico a tax is levied on the commerce of that island without any resident being consulted; a tax on their commerce if they dare trade with us.

Look at the policy! People who owe their allegiance to the United States, and have without resistance surrendered to the authority of the United States; 900,000 of them; many of them starving and dying; yet the policy is to confer on the President the governing power and then tax them without representation.

In regard to the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands, the policy is to shoot them. Was there ever such a contradictory, uncertain, and unjustifiable policy adopted by a civilized nation? But it becomes more indefensible when we examine what the President has said. As to acquiring territory by force, just what he is doing or attempting to do with the Philippines, he had denounced as criminal aggression.

In regard to Porto Rico, in a solemn message sent to Congress, he avowed himself in favor of free trade for Porto Rico, but in less than four months he changes and wants a tariff on the goods sent from that island to the United States.

He is reported as saying in one of his speeches in the West that a band of outlaws on the island of Luzon had rebelled against the authority of the United States, and of course this great Government could not submit to them; that they fired on our boys and the boys fired back. Look at these outlaws! After sixteen months fighting this band of outlaws were on the 1st of January last in sight of the headquarters of our army. Nearly 60,000 men have been sent to destroy them. General Lawton was killed within 14 miles of Manila, and the last skirmish was within 5 miles of the city. Outside the city we have hardly territory enough to camp our army on.

If the latest news is correct, General Otis is coming home and a demand for more troops is to be made. However, General Otis has accomplished something. He captured the wearing apparel of Aguinaldo's wife and his boy; neither was ever returned.

RESULTS SO FAR.

If I have been correct in following up this unfortunate policy, to put it mildly, will it not be well for us to examine some of the results? Let us see where we are going.

Imperialism and militarism are always twin sisters. No imperialism will be inaugurated if it has no military force to back it. The reason is plain. Public sentiment and love of individual liberty revolt or oppose it by force. Thus to be successful it must overcome the opposing force. But imperialism can not succeed without the force of an army. I do not mean to say that the army must be used to carry out on every occasion the policy of imperialism. I do not mean to say that force must in every instance be invoked to sustain arbitrary and unauthorized acts. But military force is behind, and the power to enforce the decisions and edicts of its chief. He would be harmless without it. Neither is it imperative that this force behind the despot should be used on every occasion. It is more terrible because it is not so used. It works its way insidiously, and it fastens itself as it goes. Especially is that so in a government like ours.

Look at your standing Army! Called into existence to whip Spain; and when Spain was whipped you increase your military force to whip a people you never had cause to complain of. A standing Army of over 100,000, and over half of which is engaged in killing people who never did us a harm on earth.

Can you reduce it? No; it will grow, and its power as a military force will be extended.

The United States mails are examined, and literature, not obscene, is taken from the mails because it may influence the volunteers to abandon a service they were never called upon to perform. Citizen soldiers are prohibited from obtaining information. You answer me and say the soldiers willingly stood by the exigencies. So much the worse. A combination between the soldier and the imperialist is but a common way to reach absolute power. Is our Government afraid to let its defenders read?

Nearly 1,000 citizens arrested in Idaho and imprisoned, with the liberty to talk through barbed-wire fences, in the presence of a sentinel, with their wives. No charge against them; no warrant to arrest them; no notice of the charge against them; no information how long they will be held in prison; guarded and released by military authority, under the approval of the Commander in Chief of the United States Army; courts open; no resistance to civil authorities, and not one civil officer molested in discharge of his civil legal duties.

A large standing army, numbering over 100,000; most of them employed in a war declared by the President and in plain violation of law.

A large navy, looking to like power, and the taxpayer utterly ignored.

There are powers sufficient to convert this Republic into a monarchy or military government; and if Congress does not act, the end is not far off.

Who are the allies of this tremendous power? Who is said to be our friend? Who approves our conduct? Great Britain. She applauds us and shoots the Boers. Great Britain kills the Boers because they want to be free. We shoot and kill the Filipinos for the same reason. Of course we are friends when engaged in the same crime. The only difference is, Who are you shooting? You will not permit a resolution of sympathy for the Boers because you are engaged in the same business. Look at your toadyism with Great Britain. Look at your recent treaty made with that power. A canal treaty, hung up in the Senate, but approved by the President. I challenge history to name the time or place Great Britain ever fired a shot for the individual liberty of man. Washington and Lafayette whipped her for freedom. Jackson enforced the result, but, but, oh, but.

This at last has reached the necessary result. A Senator of the United States stands in his place addressing the people of this great Republic (once was) and proclaims that in Cuba and the other islands seized by us the will of the Commander in Chief is supreme. What is that but absolute authority in the hands of one man? This might be excused as the expression of one man, but another has spoken—the Adjutant-General of the United States, not exactly in the official family of the Commander in Chief, but certainly so close that he speaks by his authority. Hear what he has to say:

> Of course under the Army regulations no officer is allowed to draw more than his salary. It must be remembered, however, we are in Cuba under a military government, which knows no law other than the behest of the President and the Secretary of War.

I am unable to see why the Secretary of War was a necessary adjunct to the President. He is but his appointee, but the proposition is more startling when the doctrine is asserted that there is no law in Cuba except the behest of the President and Secretary of War. I suppose naturally this doctrine would apply to the other islands, the difference only would be in the behest of the President and his Secretary of War. Let every man who loves our Constitution and form of government stop and think.

We waged war against Spain for just such doctrine and when we whipped her her doctrine is announced; this is a part of our humanity.

Every advocate of this present war asks the question, We are in it; what will you do?

Do right; do not prosecute further a wrong. Let the people establish for themselves a government. It may be crude, but give them a chance. Say to them, We do not desire to subjugate you and annex territory by force; that is, in our opinion, a crime. Hold them independent of the world, and let them know and realize that we are for those who govern themselves and the unfaltering friend of individual freedom.

Many arguments can easily be made for our own advantage and interest. But, in the name of all that is sacred, keep our flag over freemen.

Let me say in conclusion: I heard a great Southern man, at least great in words, proclaiming, "We will fire the Southern heart, instruct the public mind, and precipitate the cotton States into a revolution." I read of another prominent man of the North proclaiming that the "Constitution of the United States was a covenant with death and a league with hell." And now it is proclaimed by an officer of the United States, one who seeks to be made a major-general, and a Senator of the United States that although Congress organizes and pays an Army of 100,000 men, this great Army, at least in certain places, knows no law, obedient to no law, except the behest of the President. How fast the Constitution is melting away.

Pensions.

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS M. JETT,

OF ILLINOIS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, May 7, 1900,

On the bill (S. 1477) amending sections 2 and 3 of an act entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents," approved June 27, 1890.

Mr. JETT said:

Mr. SPEAKER: This is a bill the provisions of which provide for the amendment of what is known as the pension law of June 27, 1890. I am most heartily in favor of this amended bill, because I think it will enable the applicants who apply under this act to get a better rating, and more nearly what is justly due them. Whilst this measure does not go far enough, yet it is a step in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, there is in my judgment a great inequality in the administration of the pension laws, and this becomes more and more apparent as the years go by. Just why this is so I will not undertake here to say, but that it is so no one I think will deny. This amended act if properly construed will give to the applicants for pensions under the act of 1890 a rating upon all of their disabilities. That is, in determining the inability of the applicant to earn a support each and every infirmity shall be duly considered and the aggregate of the disabilities shown shall be the basis for the rating. This, I believe, will prove a great benefit to the veterans who are applying under this act, and many apply under the act of 1890 beause by reason of the lapse of many years they are unable to show to the satisfaction of the Dapartment that their disabilities had their origin in the service.

There is no doubt in my mind, and the more I have to do with the Bureau of Pensions, the more confirmed are my convictions, that many, many veterans are compelled to resort to this act and their pensions are limited to this act, whose disabilities were incurred in the line of service.

And now, Mr. Speaker, when we know, as we all surely do know, that such is the case, why should high-spun technicalities be brought in to defeat the soldiers from receiving their just reward and compensation.

These laws should receive at the hands of the Commissioner of Pensions a liberal construction instead of a strict construction.

Mr. Speaker, there is another feature in this pending measure that commends it to me. That is that the pension shall commence from the date of the filing of the application in the Bureau of Pensions, and not from the time of the examination of the applicant, as has been the practice heretofore. By this amendment to the act of 1890 it directs the Commissioner of Pensions, in the case of widows, to grant them pensions when they are left without means of support other than their daily labor and an actual net income not exceeding $250 per year, thereby taking it out of the hands of the Commissioner of Pensions to say what shall be the limit as to the amount of property the widow possesses before she shall be entitled to a pension; and this, too, is a wise suggestion and meets with my approval.

Mr. Speaker, I have stated that in my judgment I believed there was a great inequality in the administration of the pension laws of the United States, I adhere to that statement. I believe that it is correct; and in support of my position I desire to call your attention to the comparison of ratings under the general law and under the act of June 27, 1890, and I am quite sure every member of this House will agree with me. This table shows corresponding ratings for same disabilities under the general law and act of June 27, 1890, and will be found in the last annual report of the Commissioner of Pensions:

The two systems of pensioning compared:

General law.	*Act of June 27, 1890.*
The bases for ratings under the general law are:	The basis of ratings under this act is incapacity to labor, joined with incapacity to earn a support, and the grades of rating are dependent upon these two conditions.
(1) For minor disabilities, an anchylosed wrist or ankle..... $8	Minimum rate under this act..... $6
(2) For incapability to perform manual labor, equivalent to loss of hand or foot..... 24	Maximum rate under this act..... 12
(3) For incapacity to perform any manual labor..... 30	

COMPARISON OF RATINGS.

General law.		*Act of June 27, 1890.*	
Second grade	$30	Maximum rate	$12
Third grade	24	Disability equivalent to loss of hand or foot	10
Single hernia	6 to 10		

COMPARISON OF RATINGS—Continued.

General law—Continued.		*Act of June 27, 1890*—Continued.	
Double hernia	8 to 14	Single hernia	6
Deafness:		Double hernia	8
Total both ears	30	Deafness:	
Nearly total	27	Total both ears	12
Total of one ear and severe of other ear	25	Nearly total	10
Severe of both ears	22	Total of one ear and severe of other ear	8
Loss of one eye	17	Severe of both ears	6
Loss of sight of one eye	12	Loss of one eye	6
Anchylosis:		Loss of sight of one eye	6
Elbow	10	Anchylosis:	
Knee	10	Elbow	6
Shoulder	12	Knee	6
Loss of portions of hand or foot: Rates vary, according to extent of amputation, from $10 to $17.		Shoulder	6
		Loss of portions of hand or foot: Rates vary, according to extent of amputation, from $6 to $10.	

Mr. Speaker, I contend that this table conclusively shows that my contention is right and is well founded.

Mr. Speaker, from the report of the Commissioner on Pensions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1899, it appears that there were then on the pension rolls for service after March 4, 1861:

Army invalids under the general law	316,834
Navy invalids under the general law	4,721
Army invalids under act June 27, 1890	405,987
Navy invalids under act June 27, 1890	14,925
Total invalid pensioners	742,467

Of this number of pensioners under the general law 143,051 are now in receipt of pensions below $12 per month, and of the pensioners under the act of June 27, 1890, 105,787 are drawing pensions at $6 per month, 128,143 are drawing pensions at $8 per month, 26,540 are drawing pensions at $10 per month, 160,403 are drawing pensions at $12 per month.

And information received from the First Deputy Commissioner of Pensions shows that there were pending in the Pension Bureau on March 1, 1900, the following invalid claims in which no allowance had ever been made, namely:

Claims under the general law for service after March 4, 1861	22,082
Under the act of June 27, 1890	47,474

And it further appears from the Commissioner's report for the year ending June 30, 1899, that there were then pending 28,113 widows' claims under the general law and 38,470 widows' claims under the act of June 27, 1890; also that there were then in the rejected and abandoned files of the Bureau the following widows' claims:

Under the general law:	
Rejected	14,927
Abandoned	80,266
Under the act of June 27, 1890:	
Rejected	15,584
Abandoned	35,264

And that there were in the rejected and abandoned files of the Bureau on March 1, 1900, 80,331 claims of invalids under the general law; 94,017 claims of invalids under the act of June 27, 1890.

Mr. Speaker, from the above it will readily be seen that legislation upon the subject of pensions is greatly needed if the veterans who fought for the preservation of this Union, and who were willing to sacrifice their lives, as many did, are to receive that just recognition to which they are entitled from this Government. For my part, Mr. Speaker, I am willing to see, and my vote shall be in favor of making, just, liberal, and proper provision for the men that left home and family and offered their lives that the Union should not perish, but live forever.

Again, by reference to the report of the Commissioner of Pensions above mentioned, it will be seen that of the total number of pensions 143,051 under the general law are drawing less than $12 a month, and 260,470 under the act of 1890 are drawing less than $12, and that 105,787 are drawing pensions only at the rate of $6 a month, and that 128,143 are drawing only $8 per month.

I mention this in connection with the great number of rejected claims, as is shown by what I have read from the report of the Commissioner of Pensions, to show that the present Administration has not been as liberal to the soldiers as they attempt to make believe.

Mr. Speaker, a short time ago I had occasion to make some remarks upon this floor, in which I referred to the policy of President McKinley in relation to the promotion of certain officers to the high ranks in the Army of the United States of major and brigadier general. And I desire here, Mr. Speaker, to insert, as a part of my remarks at this time, the list showing the appointments of major and brigadier generals that have been made within the last three years, and the length of service in the position to which they were appointed, together with the date of retirement.

List of appointees.

Name.	When appointed.	When retired.
MAJOR-GENERALS.		
Frank Wheaton	Apr. 2, 1897	May 8, 1897
J. W. Forsyth	May 11, 1897	May 14, 1897
Zenas R. Bliss	May 14, 1897	May 22, 1897
John R. Brooke	May 22, 1897	Not retired.
BRIGADIER-GENERALS OF STAFF.		
Samuel Breck	Sept. 11, 1897	Feb. 23, 1898
W. H. Bell	Nov. 14, 1897	Jan. 28, 1898
S. T. Cushing	Jan. 28, 1898	Apr. 21, 1898
M. I. Ludington	Feb. 3, 1898	Not retired.
Henry C. Corbin	Feb. 25, 1898	Do.
W. H. Nash	Apr. 21, 1898	May 2, 1898
C. P. Eagan*	May 3, 1898	Suspended.
Asa B. Carey	Jan. 30, 1899	July 12, 1899
A. R. Buffington	Apr. 5, 1899	Not retired.
Alfred E. Bates	July 12, 1899	Do.
BRIGADIER-GENERALS OF THE LINE.		
W. R. Shafter	May 3, 1897	Oct. 16, 1899
W. M. Graham	May 26, 1897	Sept. 28, 1898
James F. Wade	....do....	Not retired.
John M. Mizner	....do....	June 7, 1897
Anson Mills	June 17, 1897	June 22, 1897
C. H. Carlton	June 28, 1897	June 30, 1897
H. C. Merriam	June 30, 1897	Not retired.
H. S. Hawkins	Sept. 28, 1898	Oct. 4, 1898
Jacob F. Kent	Oct. 4, 1898	Oct. 15, 1898
Guy V. Henry†	Oct. 11, 1898	Oct. 27, 1899
W. S. Worth	Oct. 29, 1898	Nov. 9, 1898
W. M. Wherry	Jan. 27, 1899	Jan. 18, 1899
J. H. Patterson	Jan. 18, 1899	Feb. 6, 1899
William Sinclair	Feb. 8, 1899	Feb. 13, 1899
M. P. Miller	Feb. 15, 1899	Mar. 27, 1899
E. V. Sumner	Mar. 27, 1899	Mar. 30, 1899
T. M. Anderson	Mar. 31, 1899	Jan. 21, 1900
A. C. M. Pennington	Oct. 16, 1899	Oct. 17, 1899
Royal T. Frank	Oct. 17, 1899	Oct. 18, 1899
L. H. Carpenter	Oct. 18, 1899	Oct. 19, 1899
S. Ovenshine	Oct. 19, 1899	Oct. 20, 1899
D. W. Burke	Oct. 20, 1899	Oct. 21, 1899
E. R. Kellogg	Dec. 5, 1899	Dec. 16, 1899
G. S. Carpenter	....do....	Dec. 26, 1899
S. B. M. Young	Jan. 2, 1900	Not retired.
A. McArthur	....do....	Do.
William Ludlow	Jan. 21, 1900	Do.

*Suspended by court-martial. †Died.

At the time I called the attention of this House to the rapid process of making major and brigadier generals, and almost immediately placing them upon the retired list for the purpose of enabling them to draw an additional salary of $1,500 annually more than they would have been entitled to draw had they been retired with the rank that they had before these promotions were made, and the only justification that was made at that time or since were that these gentlemen were good officers.

I desire to say, Mr. Speaker, that the men who fought under these officers were good soldiers and that they too are entitled to much consideration.

I would not detract in the least from the achievements and success of the officers of the Army, nor of these officers whose names I have mentioned, nor do I blame them for being able to command influence to bring about their promotion to higher ranks; but I do not want it forgotten that it was the private soldiers and officers in the lower ranks in the Army who went to the front and did the hard fighting upon a thousand battlefields and more, that enabled these and other officers who have gained distinction to achieve their successes as officers of the Army. It was the gallantry of the private soldier that enabled the officers to win battles. When favors are being bestowed, I, for one, do not want to see the private volunteer soldiery of my country overlooked, because it is the citizen soldiery of the land that we have got to look to when a crisis is on hand.

And I believe in treating those who have fought the battles of the nation with that due consideration that will be an inspiration to those whom we may hereafter call upon to do like service.

Mr. Speaker, while we are making provisions for those who actually participated in line of battle upon the field and suffered the hardships of Army life, let us not forget those that remained at home in suspense and cared for the household and kept together the children while the husband might serve his country.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that our laws should be more generous toward the women who stood the trials and difficulties and suffered and endured the hardships incident to a time of war.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that those who, in the hour of peril and danger, for the honor and preservation of the Government, leave home and fireside, leave wife and children, father and mother, and all that is dear to them, save the love of country, and endure the hardships of Army life, should ever have the care of Government and be the recipients of its most generous bounty. [Applause.]

To such as have not enough of this world's goods to keep them from want and suffering, or are laboring under injuries received in service, or disease, the result of service, and to those over whom old age and decay are creeping, the most liberal and generous policy should be pursued, and I am ready and willing at all times, Mr. Speaker, to aid in passing such laws that this result may be reached. [Applause.]

The North Carolina Suffrage Amendment.

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN,

OF NORTH CAROLINA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, May 3, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 11212) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes—

Mr. KITCHIN said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Much has been said during this Congress against the election laws of North Carolina and the proposed suffrage amendment to her constitution which, if unanswered, may injure her good name with those who know not her people. As one of her Representatives, realizing that all patriots are sympathizing with her effort to solve the problem confronting her good people, I propose to speak in her behalf, and trust that her enemies, if such there be, wherever they are may be silenced by a plain recital of her conditions and a candid explanation of her honest attempt to improve them.

In North Carolina we have at present about 340,000 electors, and it is usually estimated that 120,000 of them, or about one-third, are negroes, the vast majority of whom live in the eastern part of the State.

Mr. Lincoln said at Charlestown, Ill., on September 18, 1858:

I will say that I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races—that I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of making voters or jurors of negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office, nor to intermarry with white people; and I will say in addition to this that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will forever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality. And inasmuch as they can not so live, while they do remain together there must be the position of superior and inferior, and I, as much as any other man, am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race. (1 Complete Works, 369.)

In ten years thereafter the ignorant negro, without conception of the principles of government, was intrusted with the ballot and constituted the bulk of the State Republican party. He filled offices which the best men in the State had filled. He was sheriff, deputy sheriff, justice of the peace, legislator, constable, county commissioner, etc.

Mr. Chairman, I remember when four out of the five commissioners of Halifax County were negroes, and one of them the chairman of the board. It was an era of extravagance and corruption. The great body of the white people came together, men of the west uniting with their brethren of the east, and hurled the Republican party from power and instituted good government, which continued to bless our State under Democratic rule for twenty years.

During those twenty years in the black counties there was an occasional negro register of deeds or member of the legislature, and even district solicitor and member of Congress, but the counties, towns, and cities were under absolute white control, and almost without exception under excellent government.

So excellent was the Democratic administration of State, county, and municipal affairs, that when the Populist party was making its first campaign its orators, without exception, proclaimed that they had no complaint against the State Democracy, but that their fight was solely on national affairs. Senator BUTLER'S paper, the Populist organ, the Caucasian, said on July 14, 1892:

Whatever differences may exist among North Carolinians over questions of national policy, there should be none in the State where Anglo-Saxon rule and good government is the paramount issue.

During these twenty years Democratic speakers throughout the State charged that if the Republicans ever regained control of the State they would again give over many of the eastern counties to negro control, and inflict upon the white people hundreds of negro officials. This charge many Democrats doubted; Republicans denounced it as false, and Populist orators said there was nothing in it. Their followers believed them, and thought we were erecting a scarecrow.

But, sirs, our prophecies came true, and the results of Republican success disappointed the white Republicans of the west and the Populists of the east. The large majority of them were and are honestly opposed to negro domination in any part of the State. Many of their leaders even had been disappointed. Of course, here and there are degraded white men who rejoice at negro domination, but they are few and usually without respect of their party fellows.

OPPOSITION TO NEGRO RULE.

I need not undertake to explain the opposition that white men have to negroes holding office over them. That opposition exists without contradiction; it is not hostility to the individual negro. White men respect negroes of intelligence and character; white men befriend negroes at all times. Here and there are negroes of education and character whom white men respect, but under whose official authority they will not consent to be. No white man of character and influence in North Carolina has ever publicly announced his approval of the vast number of negro officials that existed two years ago in North Carolina. White republicans of the west, when their party won with fusion with the Populists, in the legislature met the influence of the negroes in the east, and political demands exacted from them the laws which permitted the election of large numbers of negro officials.

Political parties rule, and when the Republicans are in control it is no wonder that the negroes, constituting the vast majority of the Republican voting element, require legislation that will enable them to control where their numbers prevail.

For years the negroes have had complete control of Republican organizations in many counties. They have even controlled district organizations, there being to-day, as I am informed, negro chairmen of the Congressional district committees in three districts. In many Republican district conventions negro delegates predominate. This is true of the second, third, and sixth districts. Even in my district in 1898 there were as many negro delegate as white delegates in the Republican Congressional convention which met in Burlington.

The great body of the people never objected to negroes controlling the Republican machinery, but they do object when they control cities, towns, and counties, which they have done when their party was in control of State affairs. If the Republican party should again control North Carolina, under present suffrage laws, the history of its conduct points unmistakably to another era of negro officials. This their leaders may in vain deny, as they denied such charges 15, 10, and 5 years ago.

MEANING OF NEGRO DOMINATION.

But, Mr. Chairman, we frequently hear denials of the existence of negro domination. What is it? Ask the taxpayers who have felt its evils. Ask the white men who have been arrested by negro officers. Go to Craven County and ask the white lady who has had to respond to the warrant of a negro justice of the peace. Go to New Hanover and ask its chamber of commerce whose business was paralyzed. Ask the ladies who for months dared not alone walk the streets of Wilmington at midday.

But I will give you a few facts showing negro domination two and three years ago. Negro domination does not mean that the government in every part of the entire State is under control of negro influences—few negroes live in the western part of our State. Counties and towns in eastern Carolina were under negro domination, which intelligent honesty can not deny. We say New York is under Tammany domination, or a certain community is under German domination. We understand that. When the great controlling element is the negro vote, and when that vote and its influences name the officials and dictate the policy of a town, city, or county, then it is dominant. When it elects negro officials of a town or county, there is negro domination.

When the voice and will of nineteen-twentieths of the white people, constituting more than that proportion of the virtue and intelligence of a town or county, is overwhelmed and defeated by the negroes, there is negro domination. Yet men are so partisan that, with apparent sincerity, they look such facts in the face and still declare, in order to mislead men in the west, that there was not in North Carolina anywhere in 1897 and 1898 any negro domination, and seemingly expect people to believe them.

FACTS.

But to facts. The Fusionists controlled our legislatures of 1895 and 1897. Behold their fruits!

In every case cited of justices of the peace, some good, honest white man, without wealth, had been by the Republicans or Fusionists replaced by a negro. Yet they pretend to be the white man's friend! New Hanover County had 40 negro justices of the peace, Edgecombe 31, Bertie 16, and Craven 27. I shall append their names to my remarks. Halifax County had 29 negro justices of the peace, Vance 15, Granville 17, Caswell 7, and many other counties had them, there being about 300 in the State. The jurisdiction of a justice of the peace, under our law, in civil actions extends to $200, in torts to $50, and in criminal matters to all cases where the punishment can not exceed $50 fine or thirty days in jail.

It has been with grossest misrepresentation asserted by opponents of the amendment that negro justices of the peace did not exercise jurisdiction in cases where white men or their property were involved. Mr. Chairman, my colleagues, Mr. BELLAMY, who lives in Wilmington, and Mr. THOMAS, who lives in Newbern, both eminent lawyers, have appeared for white defendants in the courts of these negro justices of the peace; for however unpleasant it may have been, a client of theirs never suffered from their personal feelings.

In those two cities scores of cases have been tried before negro justices of the peace in which white men and their property have been involved. Why, even in my district, in the county of Granville, away up in the middle of the State, on the Virginia line, often have negro magistrates issued their process against white men. I have here a certified copy of the papers in a case in which three separate negro justices of the peace performed services in a criminal case against an innocent white man, together with an explanatory affidavit of Hon. A. A. Hicks, now a distinguished member of our State senate, who represented the defendant and tried in vain to have the case removed before a white magistrate. It was removed twice, but both times it was sent to a negro justice of the peace. I shall append it to my remarks.

Halifax, Caswell, Vance, Granville, Edgecombe, Warren, Bertie, Northampton, and other counties had numerous negro officials, including county commissioners, registers of deeds, coroners, deputies (sheriffs, clerks, and registers), constables, notaries public, jailors, school committeemen over both white and colored schools, members of boards of education, etc.

Twenty-seven counties endured negro officialism. A negro was on the board of directors for the white deaf, dumb, and blind asylum. The National Administration emphasized the conditions by appointing many negro postmasters, several of whom became embezzlers; by giving Wilmington a negro collector of customs, and by appointing negroes as storekeepers and an internal-revenue deputy collector.

In 1898 there were about 1,000 negroes holding office in my State.

The Republicans in the last campaign ran negroes for the legislature in Edgecombe, Halifax, Granville, Vance, Pasquotank, Northampton, Craven, and Warren counties, electing their candidates in the two counties last named.

CRAVEN COUNTY.

The Fusion legislature put the towns of Greenville, Newbern, and Wilmington under the domination of the negro and those whom his vote controlled, and who drew their political sustenance from him. In the county of Craven, in which Newbern is, I understand that, while there are 2,000 negro Republicans, there are only 47 white Republicans; and I understand that in each of several other counties the number of white Republicans is less than 25. Craven in 1898 had 65 negro officials, among them the register of deeds, 3 negro deputy sheriffs, a negro coroner, a negro county commissioner, and many magistrates and school officials, and this county furnished a negro candidate for solicitor of the Second judicial district. Newbern had negro policemen and aldermen. Tell me, was that white domination?

The Republicans in that county ran as their regularly nominated candidates in the last election a negro, I. H. Smith, for the legislature; a negro, C. C. Roach, for county treasurer; a negro, John Willis, for register of deeds; a negro, Dr. Lassiter, for coroner; a negro, Robert Moseley, for county commissioner; a negro, Judge Stanley, for constable of Newbern Township; and a white man, J. L. Hahn, for sheriff; and a white man, E. W. Carpenter, for clerk, both of whom, as I am informed, were pledged to appoint negro deputies. All these negroes were elected. Stanley, Moseley, and Smith qualified and became officers; the others either failed to present bonds or presented such bonds as were held insufficient.

NEW HANOVER COUNTY.

New Hanover County had 86 negro officials; but as to Wilmington and that county, I take the following from the evidence in the Dockery-Bellamy contest case—it is from the sworn testimony of my colleague, Hon. JOHN D. BELLAMY:

Q. Did you read the deposition of one Secrest, a witness for Oliver H. Dockery, the contestant in this case, taken at Monroe, Union County, in the present case?—A. Yes; I did read it.

Q. Will you state, in substance, what that testimony was?—A. Although I hardly think it is necessary to contradict the statement of Mr. Secrest, as his character has been shown by a number of witnesses to be very bad, I will do so. He stated that he was present at a political speaking where I addressed the assemblage, at a schoolhouse in Union County, and that I stated that the people of Wilmington were armed with Winchester rifles and were going to carry the election if it was necessary to shoot down the negroes. I say in reply to that, that statement of Mr. Secrest is absolutely false. What I did say, and what has been testified to by other witnesses who heard me, was this: After I had discussed the policy and principles of the Democratic party and its position upon national questions, I came down to the question of the bad government of North Carolina under Fusion rule in State affairs, and then

finally in local matters. I stated to the assemblage as a reason why the Fusionists should be hurled from power and control in North Carolina was that they had subjected the citizens of Wilmington, Newbern, and Greenville to the horrors of misgovernment and negro domination and all that that implied; and after briefly stating how the town of Greenville had been gerrymandered and put under negro control, and how the city of Newbern had been likewise treated, I then came to the city of Wilmington, where I resided and was familiar with the state of affairs. I stated that as the result of fusion legislation the city had been put under negro control substantially; that although the white people owned about 97 per cent of the property and paid that much of the taxes of the city, that we had a board of aldermen, with a white man for mayor who didn't own a foot of land in the county, and paid comparatively little or no taxes; that three or four of the board of aldermen were negroes; that forty of the magistrates were negroes; that from fourteen to seventeen of the thirty on the police force were negroes; that nearly all of the deputy sheriffs of the county were negroes; that the register of deeds of the county was a negro; that every health officer of the city, a very important position, was held by negroes; that one of the three county commissioners was a negro; and the result of it was that a horrible state of misgovernment had been brought about; that night after night burglaries and robberies took place in town, without any detection; that within about 800 feet of the city hall six burglaries had been committed within ten days without a detection; that one burglar had been arrested in a lady's residence, a negro burglar, was captured and held by the ladies until a police officer arrived; and that, although the offense was punishable by death and not bailable, he was taken to the city hall and there let off on his own recognizance or a straw bond, I have forgotten now which, and the negro escaped; that murders and crimes of all characters were of constant occurrence; that within about a year six murders had taken place in the county; that the negroes showed an utter disrespect for and defiance of the law; that the city authorities, in the exercise of their discretion upon sanitary matters, had located a hospital for infectious diseases on the outskirts of the town, and the negroes, several hundred in number, a complete mob, armed with guns, pistols, and other weapons, went out, attacked, shot into, and burned it down, and the mayor and policemen, although remonstrating, were powerless to resist it, and none of the said negroes were ever arrested or tried for the offense; that in the trial of causes in the court-house it was impossible to convict a negro of crime where a question of credibility arose between white witnesses and negro witnesses; that the juries, composed partially of whites and partially of blacks, would retire, and a hung jury was the result, the negroes always voting solidly in the jury box in favor of the acquittal of the negro, if a negro was on trial. I recollect especially reciting an instance of my own experience, where I told them that I prosecuted for Mr. Hamme, a very gallant and reputable citizen, a hat merchant of this city, who was assaulted in broad daylight in his store by Richard Holmes, a negro policeman, and struck between the eyes with a pair of brass knuckles and felled senseless to the floor; and that on three trials, although the defendant himself, Holmes, did not take the stand, that the jury, although the evidence was uncontradicted, failed to agree a single one of the three times, standing the first time nine whites for conviction and three negroes for acquittal; the second trial taking place at the next term of the court all the white men on the jury stood for conviction and the negroes on the jury for acquittal; on the third trial, which took place at a subsequent term, it likewise stood eight or nine, I have forgotten the number, whites for conviction and three or four negroes for acquittal, according to the number of negroes on the jury; and that finally the Fusion solicitor, although I myself was associated in the prosecution, nol prossed the case without even consulting me; that day after day white ladies walked the streets of the city and were insulted, and in one instance a reputable young lady, going to the cemetery, was shoved from the sidewalk by a negro woman and struck over the head with an umbrella; that the daughter of one of the ablest divines of the city was brusquely hurled up against the fence and bruised by a negro on the streets in the broad daytime; that indecent remarks were made to ladies walking the streets by negroes, and complaint after complaint being made to the city authorities, which were the ones I have before related to you, they found themselves unable to repress it; that property, life, and good order were not safe in the town; that the city authorities were totally inefficient to secure it; that the chamber of commerce, a representative business body of the city, presided over by a Republican, passed resolutions stating the city authorities were unable to secure law and order substantially, and calling upon our people, as a matter of business and self-preservation, without regard to politics, to change the existing order of affairs. That in consequence of this demoralization that I had been informed that the white people of the city had ordered several thousand Winchester rifles to protect the lives, the property, and the welfare of the people, and that I deplored any conflict, and that I hoped none would come, but if it did come and a race riot ensued, that a fatal result would come to the negroes. I did not state in that speech or in any speech made in the campaign that the whites were going to carry the election by force or fraud or any illegal means, and if I had thought so, I say most positively that I would not have countenanced it, and I would have advised against it, and I say further that as far as my knowledge, information, and belief extend, there was no such purpose on the part of the Democratic party, or the white people, to carry the election by force or fraud; but there was a determination by every legal and peaceable and energetic means, such as argument and the like would prompt, as a matter of self-preservation to our people, to hurl from power the Fusionists then in control and restore peace, law, order, and good government to our distracted State. I will state, further, that having made those statements in that speech and substantially the same thing in many others that I delivered during the campaign, I now again affirm that the statements made are a statement of the true condition of affairs as they existed in Wilmington, and if I have failed in the statement, it was in not stating other and greater wrongs which actually occurred and which I forgot to mention, among them being the publication in a negro newspaper published in the city of a vile and slanderous attack upon the virtue and reputation of the white women of our State.

Such was the fruit of incompetence and corruption of fusion success in my beloved State! Tell me, was that white domination? It was not. Yet, so reckless is Republican leadership that it sullenly and blindly says there has been no negro domination, and that there is no danger of it. Do they approve the above-recited conditions?

Let them meet facts plainly and speak out like men. They have not condemned them. They have had the opportunity in their conventions. Do they favor a remedy? Do they offer one? No; but they have declared hostility to the only remedy in sight, and emphasized it by selecting as their standard bearer in the present campaign the only man mentioned for their gubernatorial nomination who had spent years as the Republican leader in a county the majority of whose voters are negroes, and who had been nominated by the same conventions that nominated negroes for the legislature, and elected on the same ticket with them.

MANLY'S SLANDER.

During the campaign of 1898, in the city of Wilmington, a negro editor of a negro newspaper, in an editorial, published the following vile slander upon the virtue of white women:

Poor white men are careless in the matter of protecting their women, especially on farms. They are careless of their conduct toward them, and our experience among poor white people in the country teaches us that the women of that race are not any more particular in the matter of clandestine meetings with colored men than are the white men with colored women. Meetings of this kind go on for some time, until the woman's infatuation or the man's boldness bring attention to them and the man is lynched for rape. Every negro lynched is called a "big, burley, black brute," when in fact many of those who have thus been dealt with had white men for their fathers, and were not only not "black" and "burley," but were sufficiently attractive for white girls of culture and refinement to fall in love with them, as is well known to all.

Is it any wonder that the great white pulse of the State beat strong and fast in the last campaign? Is it any wonder that the noble white men of the hill country and the mountains, when they heard the cries of distress and saw the danger signals in the east, sprang to their relief at the ballot box, and with unsurpassed zeal and determination defeated the cohorts of fusion, which had inflicted those curses upon their kinsmen in the lowlands? Is it any wonder that the Fusionists, who had given the State an administration marked by incompetence and scandal in many of its branches, should have been overwhelmingly defeated?

When that campaign was over and the State had shown her revulsion to such a state of affairs, the best wisdom of the State, I may say of all parties, began to consider the situation in great seriousness, and there came an almost universal desire to provide against a return to those horrible conditions which had damaged industry, excited fear, prejudice, and violence, and endangered the peace of men and the safety of women. Those conditions arose from a mass of voters who, as a constant menace to good government, after thirty years of experience, were too ignorant to understand the issues, too irresponsible to consider them, and too prejudiced to appreciate them. After the election, prominent Populists, among them their present candidate for governor, if he has been quoted correctly, said the people would expect the Democracy to establish permanent safeguards against such return.

The Democracy has undertaken this great task. It knew the cause—the great, impersonal mass of ignorance and prejudice considering the ballot as a means of opposition to the white race—and it proposed a remedy.

OUR ELECTION LAW.

Before I discuss that remedy, I hear a complaint that our election laws are partisan. On this floor my colleague, Mr. LINNEY, in discussing lynchings, criticised our election law. He argued that lynchings happened in a State in proportion to the number of men who did not vote, having stated that where they can vote they do vote. I think the following extract from his speech shows his views as well as those common to most white men of the South as expressed by the gentleman from Texas, Mr. BURKE:

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Will the gentleman allow me one more suggestion?
Mr. LINNEY. Yes, sir.
Mr. BURKE of Texas. I do not defend lynching. I am as much opposed to it as any man in the United States, and my people are opposed to it.
Mr. LINNEY. I believe that.
Mr. BURKE of Texas. But in justice to this House should not the gentleman state the fact that in almost every instance the lynching occurs in consequence of the assaults of colored men upon the virtue of white women? And if such things occurred in the North the same justice would be meted out to the offenders.
Mr. WHITE. Since my race is assailed, please allow me to answer.
The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LINNEY] yield? He has the floor.
Mr. LINNEY. Yes. I yield for that purpose.
Mr. WHITE. I have examined that question and I am prepared to state that not more than 15 per cent of the lynchings are traceable to that crime, and there are many more outrages against colored women by white men than there are by colored men against white women.
Mr. LINNEY. Mr. Chairman, the point I make is this: The suggestion of my friend from Texas is a good one, and I thank him for it. He has not these lynchings in his State, thank God, and we have them not in ours. Why? Because in his State they have a pure ballot, as we did have in ours up to the vicious election laws of 1899.

That my colleague was absolutely wrong in his reasoning is apparent from the statistics he used, if we will only compare Massachusetts with North Carolina, for in the last election there were cast in North Carolina an average of 37,000 votes in each Congressional district, while in each Massachusetts district the average was only 24,000. From his argument you would expect several lynchings in Massachusetts in that election year, and yet the statistics he used showed no lynchings in that State and four in North Carolina.

The gentleman also argued that our election law is unconstitutional because it authorizes the registrar to require the applicant for registration to prove his age, identity, and residence by at least two electors, and relied upon the case of Van Bokkelen *v.*

Canaday (73 N. C. Reports, 198), a case which construed the law under which an election in Wilmington was held. The gentleman entirely misconceived the principle in that case. Our present law does not conflict with it. The court held the old Wilmington law unconstitutional because it required the witnesses as to one's age, etc., to be *personally known to the registrar*. Judge Reade, in delivering the court's opinion, said:

It will be noted that any bystander may challenge the voter without proving anything against him, and the voter is not allowed to swear to his qualifications, but he must prove them by the oaths of others, and then they must be known to the registrar, and the registrar must be satisfied. Now, how is it possible for persons who move into Wilmington from other counties in the State to get witnesses from a distance, known to the registrars in Wilmington, to prove their age and residence? It is impossible. It is a practical denial of the right to register and vote.

Judge Rodman in concurring used this language:

I also agree with the majority of the court in its view of that part of the act which requires voters before being registered, and also if challenged before voting, to prove their qualifications by *witnesses personally known to the registrars and pollholders*.

* * * * * * *

The requirement that the witnesses to the qualification of a voter shall be personally known to the registrar is a new and most unreasonable addition to the qualifications for voters which the constitution prescribes, and in my opinion is clearly beyond the power of the legislature.

There is nothing similar to that in our election law. So without doubt the gentleman was wrong in his contention. He has been elected under a law which authorized the requirement of evidence by "one or more electors," which is very like "by at least two electors" in the present law. I submit that it is not only reasonable but obligatory in morals for the legislature to authorize the registrar to require proof when he, as an honest official, deems proper, of the age, identity, and residence of a voter, in order to prevent wrongful registration, otherwise the books might soon be encumbered with names of those not entitled under the law to vote. Under our law every qualified elector can register and vote. Many of its provisions are intended to prevent dishonest and illegal registration.

The fusion election laws gave the fusionists throughout North Carolina two members of the registration board, and the Democrats one, and the fusionists two judges of election and the Democrats one, thus giving the fusionists a complete majority, or two-thirds of the election officers. Under the present law we can have two-thirds, but the fusionists must have one-third. We have one registrar, and two judges of election who must be of different political parties. Under their law these election officials were appointed by the county election board, consisting of the clerk of the superior court, the register of deeds, and the chairman of the board of commissioners, who are nearly always strong partisans, and the majority of whom were, in 1898, fusionists in a great majority of the counties of North Carolina. Now we have a State board of elections, named by the legislature, of seven members, two of whom are fusionists.

They elect the county boards consisting of three discreet electors, who appoint the registrars and judges of election. In doing this the Democracy has not been more partisan than the majority of this House is in election cases and in the appointment of its election committees. It is less partisan than this Administration was in the census appointments of North Carolina under a law intended to be nonpartisan. There is not a Democratic census supervisor in all North Carolina, and few, if any, Democratic enumerators, and yet the fusionists who are responsible for this absence of Democrats in the census business in North Carolina talk of Democratic partisanship in election laws!

HAWAIIAN ELECTION LAWS.

The Hawaiian act continued by express terms the sections of the Hawaiian election laws with amendments, giving the governor the power to appoint the boards of registration, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, requiring the examination under oath of everyone who applies for registration as to every qualification, making a false answer in such examination perjury, giving any lawful voter the right to challenge one claiming registration and to cross-examine him, and denying registration until the board is satisfied that the claimant possesses the requisite qualifications. In case of such denial, claimant's only remedy is to appeal to the Supreme Court. These laws also require the tax assessor to furnish, by March 15, the board with a list of the males who have paid their taxes prior to January 1. These laws also give the governor the power to appoint three inspectors of election at each precinct, as far as practicable of opposing parties—which I interpret to mean two of one party and one of the other. These inspectors are empowered to set apart sufficient space around the voting place to prevent interference with the election. Such laws have this Congress and the President approved. They are very like ours—yet Republicans will praise them and denounce ours! Great consistency for statesmen!

SUBMISSION OF THE AMENDMENT.

But to the amendment, which I shall also append to my remarks in full, that the country may understand it.

Its opponents say it should not be submitted because a Democratic handbook issued in the last campaign promised that nothing of the sort would be submitted to the people by the Democratic party. Only its opponents say that. No man, in my opinion, who voted the Democratic ticket in order to redeem the State from the evils of fusion rule has yet said it. Where is the man who voted the successful State ticket on account of such promise that opposes the amendment? Those who put forth that handbook acted honestly. They then did not expect such amendment. At that time thousands of white men in the west did not appreciate the conditions in the east. As the campaign neared its end the truth began to be established throughout the State, and defeated the Fusionists. A few days after the election the revolution in Wilmington took place.

A conflict of the races occurred, resulting in great loss of life. After that no one doubted the seriousness of eastern conditions. Upon all good citizens was impressed the necessity of the legislature taking some steps to insure good government for the future, and to exclude the possibility of a return to such conditions as Wilmington, Newbern, and other communities had suffered. The legislature assembled in January. It then became their duty under their oaths to propose any and all legislation that to them seemed best for the State. No promise by others could compel them to violate their oaths or plain duty. An almost universal demand was made upon them to deal with the suffrage question in a manly, straightforward manner. They acted with great deliberation. Many able men put their heads together and formulated an act. Their proposition is submitted to the people.

No Populist should object, as it is in strict accord with one of his chief demands—the referendum. Who can, who should, who will object to leaving this or any other matter to the people? When men are afraid to submit a question to the people, the seeds of tyranny are being sown. When one fears to trust the people, the people should fear to trust him. Let them thoroughly understand it. Let them decide it. The people readily understand that criticism of its submission is intended to distract attention from its merits. We are acting under the Constitution. We have the right to discuss this amendment, to appeal to the people in its behalf, to explain its provisions, to impress its necessity, and to foretell its practical results.

PROMINENT REPUBLICANS FAVOR IT.

The Republican party, containing tens of thousands of ignorant negroes, may fret and fume over it, but can not force the individual judgments and consciences of all of its strong men against it. The people—not Democrats alone—but the people have the right to adopt it, and the world knows that its support comes from those who are charged with the civilization of the State.

Many prominent and influential Republicans favor the amendment, among them Hon. Thomas Settle, Member of this House in the Fifty-third and Fifty-fourth Congresses; Hon. H. R. Starbuck, present superior-court judge; ex-Governor Curtis H. Brogden, Messrs. Valloy Pace and J. M. Allen, of the Ninth district; Hon. J. B. Mason, Hon. E. V. Cox, Hon. A. W. Shaffer, Hon. T. P. Devereux, Messrs. R. P. Williams, Joseph Perry, and others. If the Democracy advocates it, and so many Republicans advocate it, surely it must be worthy of consideration. Thus, understanding conditions in my State, I think a thorough comprehension of the amendment will convince the impartial critic of its propriety, fairness, and constitutionality.

SECTIONS 4 AND 5.

Other sections of the amendment prescribe qualifications pertaining to sex, age, citizenship, residence, registration, and freedom from conviction or confession of a felony. The fourth and fifth sections are as follows:

SEC. 4. Every person presenting himself for registration shall be able to read and write any section of the Constitution in the English language; and before he shall be entitled to vote he shall have paid, on or before the 1st day of March of the year in which he proposes to vote, his poll tax, as prescribed by law, for the previous year. Poll taxes shall be a lien only on assessed property, and no process shall issue to enforce the collection of the same, except against assessed property.

SEC. 5. No male person who was on January 1, 1867, or at any time prior thereto, entitled to vote under the laws of any State in the United States wherein he then resided, and no lineal descendant of any such person, shall be denied the right to register and vote at any election in this State by reason of his failure to possess the educational qualification prescribed in section 4 of this article: *Provided*, He shall have registered in accordance with the terms of this section prior to December 1, 1908. The general assembly shall provide for a permanent record of all persons who register under this section on or before November 1, 1908, and all such persons shall be entitled to register and vote in all elections by the people of this State, unless disqualified under section 2 of this article: *Provided*, Such persons shall have paid their poll tax, as required by law.

Its purpose is not to injure, humiliate, or impede any class of our citizens. It will stimulate education, insure peace, and remove many obstructions from discussions of economic questions. We seek not strife and oppression, but safety and good government. The equal protection of our laws will continue to bless those who do not vote as well as those who do.

MANY NEGROES WILL VOTE.

Under it thousands of negroes will vote, some of them among the best and most influential of their race. Some will register under section 5, as in most of the thirteen original States free negroes could once vote. They voted in North Carolina prior to 1835, and in Massachusetts and other States in 1866.

There were 21,000 free negroes in North Carolina in 1835, 4,000 of whom were entitled then to vote. There are probably 10,000 negroes in the State who can register under section 5.

There are several thousand white men in the State of foreign birth, none of whom can register under section 5, though many of them can register under section 4. Unlettered white men, except those of foreign extraction, can vote under the amendment, provided they comply with the first three sections, are guiltless of felony, and pay their poll tax. The right of suffrage is limited to those who can read and write, and yet is not on that account denied to those, if otherwise qualified, who represent generations of electors, and on whom is the imprint of centuries of heroic and patriotic performance in public affairs.

Every citizen of every race, who has the reasonable qualifications required, will be a voter. The fifth section denies the right of no one to vote, and does no wrong in extending suffrage. Those who may register under it are conclusively presumed to have that sufficient intelligence which in others must be shown by ability to read and write. Common sense and observation teach that those whose ancestors have taken part in government and who have from their fathers and grandfathers learned the rights and glories of free institutions, receiving by tradition and inheritance a capacity and aptitude for independent thought and conduct, are, though unlettered, as intelligent—and frequently more intelligent—than educated persons who have not inherited that capacity, and who have had the advantage of no such traditions.

The object of the educational test is to insure sufficient intelligence, but ability to read and write is not the only evidence of intelligence.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I understood my friend to say that the object of the educational test was to insure intelligence, but that if the ancestors of the illiterates had been participating in the Government, then the illiterates were to be admitted to suffrage. Now it looks to me as if the only people who are to be shut out under such a provision as that are the illiterate blacks; and I heard my friend the other day pay such a glowing tribute to the beauty and blessedness of the Constitution of the United States that I would like to hear him justify such a statute or constitutional provision as indirectly excludes people from the right to vote on account of their color.

Mr. KITCHIN. If the gentleman will listen to what I have to say he will understand my position, and I will show him that we exclude no one on account of color. I repeat that the reason an educational test is adopted in any constitution is that it is an evidence of intelligence. But we take this further ground, that the ability to read and write is not the only evidence of intelligence. When I see a white man, American, English, German, or other, whose race has made the civilization of the world what it is, who has carried independence and liberty wherever independence and liberty have gone, with a great history back of him, when I see him built like my friend, with his physical characteristics, whether he can read and write or not, I see the evidences of intelligence, and you need not require education to show it.

Mr. DOLLIVER. The census of the United States shows that the deficiency in the matter of reading and writing is quite as much a characteristic, or nearly so, of the white people of North Carolina as it is of the black people.

Mr. KITCHIN. I say nothing of that, but the gentleman certainly understood me to say that white illiterates are endowed with more intelligence (and the intelligent people in my country know it) than the illiterate blacks. That is the point I make.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Why does not your proposed constitution say distinctly that colored people who can not read and write are to be excluded from the right of voting?

Mr. KITCHIN. Because our constitution does not mean that. There are some negroes who cannot read and write and yet who will vote. There are other people, of foreign birth, unable to read and write who will not vote.

Mr. DOLLIVER. How can the gentleman have studied the Constitution of the United States as a Representative on this floor, and then come here with a subterfuge of that character?

Mr. KITCHIN. I say we stand by the Constitution of the United States; I say plainly that we have not violated it and do not intend to violate it.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly you have dodged it.

Mr. KITCHIN. I have not, and the gentleman knows I have not. I do not like any such insinuation.

Mr. DOLLIVER. What I mean is that this instrument which you call the new constitution of North Carolina is certainly intended to dodge the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. KITCHIN. Now, if the gentleman will listen to me, if I have time I will state my views on that, and in my opinion they do not conflict with the Constitution. The gentleman is in error if he thinks the Constitution guarantees the right to vote to the blacks.

Mr. DOLLIVER. It certainly says that no State shall exclude people from the right to vote on account of their race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; it says the right of suffrage shall not be denied on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. It says that and no more. Now, I say this, that when this amendment has been passed in North Carolina, there will be probably from thirty to fifty thousand colored men who will continue to vote. Not one of those could vote if his right to vote was denied on account of his race or color.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Why don't you go ahead and apply that test of illiteracy to the white people as well?

Mr. CRAWFORD. If my colleague will allow me, in answer to the gentleman from Iowa, who thinks that it applies to black men alone, I would suggest that it will apply to Indians, to men of foreign birth, and all others of whatever color who or whose ancestors could not vote in 1867 or prior thereto, and is therefore not a discrimination against the negro as a race.

Mr. DOLLIVER. That is not a very great exception in North Carolina.

Mr. KITCHIN. In further answer, I say we think in North Carolina the illiterate whites, as a class, have sufficient intelligence. The educational test does not deny a negro's right to vote because he is a negro. Massachusetts has the educational test. Would you say the ignorant negro in Massachusetts is denied the right to vote on account of his color?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Massachusetts has made a very fair appropriation of money to teach people within that State to read and write, for one thing.

Mr. KITCHIN. North Carolina is doing that.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Why don't you put it as frankly as the Senator from South Carolina did about a similar constitution as to that State when he said that having tried to shoot and defraud the negro out of the right to vote they proposed to do it by the constitution.

Mr. TALBERT. The gentleman is in error. He was speaking of the time before that constitution was adopted.

Mr. KITCHIN. South Carolina had a right to deal with the matter by constitutional amendment and so have we. And I will state that we do not deny the right of any man to vote on account of his color or race. Every negro, every Indian, and every Chinaman can vote if he has the very reasonable qualifications laid down in this amendment.

Mr. DOLLIVER. That is a great concession to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. KITCHIN. I yield to the Constitution of the United States and deny that we contradict it in any respect. I will ask my friend, How could any black man vote if we denied him the right to vote on account of his color? I will further ask the gentleman, How could any former slave vote under our amendment if we denied him the right to vote on account of a previous condition of servitude? And yet there will be hundreds of ex-slaves that will continue to vote in North Carolina under this amendment. Not one of them could vote if we violated the Constitution of the United States and denied to them the right to vote on account of race, color, or previous condition. We do not do it; but when we come to the point of intelligence and require sufficient intelligence, then we say the intelligence of a man is to be determined in two ways: First, by being able to read and write.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Second, by inheritance.

Mr. KITCHIN. Second, by the man or his ancestors having voted prior to 1867.

Senator SHELBY M. CULLOM, a distinguished Republican, chairman of the Hawaiian Commission, in his report on the Hawaiian Islands on pages 2 and 3 of Senate Document No. 16, third session Fifty-fifth Congress, uses this language:

> An important subject of our investigation was that of the adaptability of the several races of the people who inhabit the islands for American citizenship, and their ability to sustain the obligations which attach to the right of suffrage. The American idea of universal suffrage presupposes that the body of citizens who are to exercise it in a free and independent manner have, by inheritance or education, such knowledge and appreciation of the responsibilities of free suffrage and of a full participation in the sovereignty of the country as to be able to maintain a republican government.

This is strong authority upon a great truth; that is, that intelligence, the capacity to grasp and understand situations and issues, is inheritable. Why, if you take one hundred illiterate white men such as live in my friend's district, perhaps——

Mr. DOLLIVER. Few live there.

Mr. KITCHIN. If you take 100 of them and stand them up in line, and then take 100 of the African race, who, at best, are only three hundred years removed from barbarism and only a generation from slavery, and stand them by the side of the 100 illiterate

white men, everybody knows that those 100 illiterate white men are superior to those 100 illiterate colored men in general information, in intelligence, and in everything that goes to qualify a man for the proper exercise of suffrage; and no one can deny it. I respect the colored man who in the last thirty or forty years has come out of slavery and risen in the esteem of his fellows and in the esteem of the white race. We have them scattered through North Carolina. We have nothing against them. We say they are an honor to the race and they show what that race can do, but when we say that the unlettered white man is superior in intelligence to the unlettered colored man we insult nobody, but only state a fact that every man knows. You recognize that wherever you go. You recognized it here in voting for the Hawaiian bill. I thought that was——

Mr. DOLLIVER. I think my friend denied it by voting in favor of universal suffrage, did he not?

Mr. KITCHIN. I did not.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I noticed my friend accused us some days ago of having denied some people in Porto Rico the benefits and blessings of our Constitution——

Mr. KITCHIN. I am in favor of the Constitution going everywhere our jurisdiction goes, and the gentleman again fails to perceive——

Mr. DOLLIVER. I would be delighted to see it applied somewhat at home.

Mr. KITCHIN. It has been applied in my State, and no man who is acquainted with the conditions there can deny it.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I would like to say this. I have a great deal of sympathy with my friend's argument, but I do not like to sit here and listen to tirades upon the Declaration of Independence, liberty, and the Democratic party, to be followed by such an argument as my friend's. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman may not like it, and I do not care whether he likes it or not. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DOLLIVER. If my friend will drop the Constitution and drop the Declaration of Independence and keep away from Kansas City, I will take more stock in his arguments.

Mr. KITCHIN. I shall neither drop the Constitution nor abandon the Declaration of Independence to obtain the gentleman's approval. Mr. Chairman, I shall now further proceed to demonstrate the constitutionality of this amendment as I intended when first interrupted.

FIFTEENTH AMENDMENT.

Political motives, when the best men of the South were not heard in undertaking to elevate the negro to the political position to which white men had struggled through ages, did not insure his right to vote, but merely enacted that it should not be denied on account of three particular things. The fifteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States says:

Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States, or by any State, on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

RIGHT TO RESTRICT SUFFRAGE.

With that limitation, the State has the absolute right to say who shall and who shall not vote. It legally denies the right to vote to citizens under 21 years of age, and to those who have not resided in the State a specified time. The fourteenth amendment, guaranteeing the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States and the equal protection of its laws to every person within the jurisdiction of a State, does not confer suffrage. If it did, women and children would vote, for they are persons and citizens.

The State still has the sovereign right to prescribe the qualifications for its voters. These vary in different States. The fifteenth amendment means that if a citizen of the United States has the qualifications required by a State to vote, then his right to vote shall not be denied or abridged on account of his race, color, etc.

Suppose Pennsylvania, which possibly has more foreign-born white men than negroes unable to write our language, should adopt our amendment, would any one question its constitutionality? If constitutional for Pennsylvania it is constitutional for us. It is sometimes urged that it will disqualify more negroes than whites. The constitution does not forbid that. The Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of Williams *v.* Mississippi, has expressly sustained the Mississippi suffrage provisions which disqualify more negroes than whites, this being their admitted purpose. Larceny throughout the South disqualifies vastly more negroes than whites. The number disqualified does not affect its constitutionality. A State can not deny one man the right to vote on account of his color, race, or previous condition of servitude, but it can deny a thousand the right to vote for other causes.

TO ELIMINATE THE UNFIT VOTER.

A reading of the amendment discloses no reference to race, color, or servitude. Those who adopt it and those who construe it will know that it says what it means, neither more nor less. Its enemies often ignore what all must concede, that in the essential requisites of the best and safest suffrage one race is, and inevitably so, from its traditions and history, its environment, its nature and condition, superior to another, and that under any reasonable rule intended to separate the fit from the unfit voter a larger proportion of the inferior race will necessarily be eliminated than of the superior race. A State has the right to adopt any reasonable rule, qualification, or expedient to separate the fit from the unfit voter not violative of the fifteenth amendment.

For this purpose Republican Massachusetts has an educational qualification, Republican Rhode Island a property qualification, Republican Pennsylvania a tax-paying qualification, and this Republican Congress passed the Hawaiian bill with an educational qualification for the people who wish to vote in those islands, and under which 30 per cent of the men can not vote. No rule will be perfect. No law will admit every fit voter and reject none, and reject every unfit voter and admit none. I submit, however, that the proposed amendment, under present conditions in North Carolina, is as nearly a perfect rule as wisdom is apt to devise. Its extension of suffrage to more whites than negroes is natural and necessary in distinguishing the fit from the unfit voter.

A voter should be patriotic, desiring his country's welfare; conscientious, loving right above all things; intelligent, fairly understanding the general principles of government and the ordinary matters presented for his suffrage, and fearless, acting upon his best judgment. He should vote honestly, without fear, favor, or corruption.

The ordinary unlettered negro is not prepared for the duties and responsibilities of suffrage. He usually knows nothing of and cares nothing for public issues. Appeals by bad leaders to his fears, passions, and ignorance usually control him. He has little pride in the glorious history of his country. He dares not vote openly contrary to the mass of negroes.

SUPERIOR TO UNLETTERED NEGROES.

The unlettered white man, on the contrary, has the courage of his convictions. He is intelligent. At his father's feet he learned the lessons of government and the duties and rights of citizens. He is superior to the unlettered negro in information and intellectual grasp. He has for generations attended the courts and habitually heard legal and political discussions. He understands American fundamental principles. He is a patriot. He fought at Kings Mountain, at Guilford, and Trenton. He was with Washington at Yorktown, with Jackson at New Orleans, with Lee and Grant at Appomattox. His moral faculty and firmness of purpose exceed those of the unlettered negro. He has claimed and exercised political rights for hundreds of years. Seven centuries ago he wrung the great charter from tyrant King John. He made Luther's reformation successful. He shouldered his rifle, builded his cabin on the frontier, and laid the foundations of the country's greatness. Is he not better qualified to exercise a patriotic, intelligent, incorruptible ballot than an uneducated man whose race and ancestry have never approached him in liberty, in government, in progress, in mind? It can not be surprising that more of his race than of any other will vote under any reasonable system of suffrage.

The white man conceived the railroad, steamboat, printing press, telegraph, and other inventions that bless—art, science, medicine are his. He organized our Government, created our educational and developed our religious systems. He has come in contact with the brown man, and his superiority appeared; he has met the yellow man, and the yellow man gave him the way; he has faced the red man, and the red man is disappearing from the earth; he has touched the black man in his native home, and the black man yielded to him.

EVILS OF IGNORANCE AND PREJUDICE.

The people of North Carolina, considering well their task, have undertaken to remove from the ballot the evils of ignorance and prejudice. Believing in the larger capacity, better intelligence, steadier character, and more constant patriotism of the race most greatly blessed by God, they will not deny the right to vote to unlettered men who cherish an ancient heritage of political rights and duties. We give all educated the same rights, but we refuse to place on the steady, intelligent, unlettered patriot responsibility for the defects of the shiftless, prejudiced, and uninformed. We draw a line of separation and appeal to enlightened judgment and conscience for justification.

STAND OR FALL AS A WHOLE.

The entire amendment will stand or fall as a whole. It is thus submitted to the popular vote. No one can vote for one section and reject another. All sections pertain to suffrage. Each section is material to the whole amendment. Its opponents can cite no authority in which an amendment or statute of similar nature and integrity has been sustained at all when declared unconstitutional in a material part. In support of the proposition I have stated there are numerous authorities, only one of which I will cite, as it is of universal fame. It is the case which shocked the

American public and limited the Government's taxing power, compelling it to resort to stamp taxes in time of need. It was strong enough to invalidate all sections of the income-tax schedule of the Wilson bill, on the ground that some of the taxes levied were unconstitutional, though many of them, standing alone, were admittedly constitutional.

The last paragraph of the court's opinion, after referring to those held unconstitutional, concludes that "all those sections constituting one entire scheme of taxation are necessarily invalid." Republicans usually approve that decision. No man who approves it can consistently say that one section of our proposed amendment can be declared unconstitutional and the others stand intact. I quote the following bearing on this proposition from the opinion of the court in that (the income tax) case (158 U. S., 636):

INCOME-TAX DECISION.

We think the rule laid down by Chief Justice Shaw in Warren *vs.* Charlestown (2 Gray, 84) is applicable, that if the different parts "are so intimately connected with and dependent upon each other as conditions, considerations, or compensations for each other as to warrant a belief that the legislature intended them as a whole, and that if all could not be carried into effect the legislature would not pass the residue independently, and some parts are unconstitutional, all the provisions which are thus dependent, conditional, or connected must fall with them." Or, as the point is put by Mr. Justice Matthews in Poindexter *v.* Greenhow (114 U. S., 270, 304): "It is undoubtedly true that there may be cases where one part of a statute may be enforced as constitutional and another be declared inoperative and void, because unconstitutional; but these are cases where the parts are so distinctly separable that each can stand alone, and where the court is able to see and to declare that the intention of the legislature was that the part pronounced valid should be enforceable even though the other parts should fail. To hold otherwise would be to substitute for the law intended by the legislature one they may never have been willing by itself to enact."

The court then cites Spraigue vs. Thompson (118 U. S., 90, 95) to the same effect. A constitutional amendment will be treated, if possible, with greater consideration, in order to ascertain the people's intentions, than an ordinary legislative act. I predict that no honorable man will ever assert that either the legislature or the people would have approved our amendment with the fifth section omitted.

I have referred to the above authority in order to cogently refute the main arguments generally made in North Carolina against it, when its enemies, abandoning other ground, appeal to the fears of the people after first saying that (which we controvert) the fifth section is unconstitutional, by declaring that the other sections will stand without it.

It is, however, now fully understood that the legislature in June will add another section to the amendment, declaring that if for any reason any part of the amendment shall fail, then the whole amendment shall be void. This will remove the fears of the most timid and unbelieving, and convince him that unlettered men who, or whose ancestors, could vote prior to 1867 will continue to vote. The intent of the legislature will then be plain. The amendment will remain as a whole or fail altogether.

Often when one attacks section 5 he wants no negroes disqualified, but if negroes are disqualified he wants whites also disqualified. The unlettered white man has no worse enemy than he who on the one hand labors to prevent the disqualification of incompetent negroes by opposing the amendment, and on the other hand strives to disqualify unlettered white men, after its adoption, by insisting that section 5 is unconstitutional and shall not stand, and that the other sections shall stand, thus demanding at every turn that unlettered whites with greatly superior natural and acquired qualifications shall be forever chained to equality with unlettered negroes.

NOT AN ABRIDGING SECTION.

No one questions the constitutionality of the first four sections. Section 5, instead of denying or abridging the right to vote, expressly says the right to vote shall not be denied to certain ones on account of the lack of educational qualification. This section is an enlarging, not an abridging section, and its reasonable extension of suffrage to certain ones is because of the actual intelligence and fitness for suffrage universally known to be usually possessed by them.

Consider the effect of the amendment as a whole. It is admitted that after its adoption thousands of negroes will vote; not one could vote if the right to vote were denied on account of his race. Thousands of living testimonials will contradict the assertion that it denies the right to vote on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

An unlettered white man, 30 years of age, born of parents who came to our country after the civil war, will not be benefited by section 5, but his right to vote is not denied on account of his race or color. No one can say, "You require me to read and write before voting. I can not read and write, therefore you deny my right to vote on account of my color."

In Massachusetts, in order for a negro to vote he must be able to read and write. If he has this reasonable educational qualification he votes, otherwise he does not vote. Yet his color does not prevent his suffrage. It is his lack of education. Exactly the same will be his case under our amendment. Under it every negro can vote in North Carolina who could vote in Massachusetts, and also an additional class, those whose ancestors in any State could vote at any time prior to 1867. He may be coal black, of the humblest race, and may have been a slave, yet if he has the reasonable qualifications prescribed, without effort at denial he will vote. If the amendment denied the right to vote on account of race, color, or servitude, then a former negro slave could not vote, though he might be the wisest and most highly educated man in the S tate.

VAST DIFFERENCE IN FITNESS.

Between the great mass of unlettered ones, who, or whose ancestors, could vote prior to 1867, and the great mass of the unlettered ones who or whose ancestors could not then vote, there is a real and vast difference in capacity, in fitness, in intellectual and moral force, in information, in love of home and country, in aspiration, in all that makes competence for good suffrage. It is a deep, time-proven, unmistakable, unchangeable, God-created difference, known to all men.

The position of those who oppose the amendment assumes that there is no difference in fitness for suffrage between the unlettered whites as a class who will vote under it and the unlettered negroes as a class who will not vote under it, and that the only difference between them is race and color. Those who will may contend that the unlettered negro is the unlettered white man's equal in this respect, but the advocates of this amendment stand for the white man's superiority. The Constitution does not forbid our position. Present conditions demand it, and its results will vindicate it.

POPULIST PLATFORM.

That the Populist organization admitted the existence of negro domination in the past and the danger of it for the future is conclusively shown, it matters not what their speakers may say, by the deliberate insertion of a plank in their present State platform favoring an amendment to disqualify any and all negroes, and persons of negro descent to the third generation, from ever holding office. The fact is, every man who favors that ought to favor our amendment, and I believe he does; and I further believe that that plank was adopted for the mere purpose, on the part of Populist leaders, to divide the votes of white men who oppose negro rule in any part of North Carolina.

If the educated negro of character is unfit in Populist eyes to hold office, is the ignorant negro competent to dictate who shall hold office? The Populist plank is the most ungrateful proposition ever adopted by a convention, for it can not be denied that the leaders who had that plank inserted owed their political positions to a large extent to negroes. When the great majority of ignorant negroes no longer vote, the evils which all white men dread will be avoided. The tool of ignorance can no longer be wielded by politicians contrary to the best interests of humanity.

The uneducated white man has never yet brought ruin and disaster by his ballot. He has stood as a patriot in every storm of political strife.

DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE.

The Declaration says "all men are created equal." It has been ably maintained that the signers of the Declaration had in mind men of European descent—white men. This was the view of the great Stephen A. Douglas. The Supreme Court, in the Dred Scott case, said it "was too clear for dispute that the enslaved African race was not intended to be included" in those words. It is, however, true that all men, women, and children, of every race, are equal and will remain equal, under the law, in the rights of person, and property, in the rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Voting is not necessary to that equality, for women, boys, and insane people have it. For the good of the public one man's life is taken by law and another is imprisoned. For the good of the public suffrage is limited. All men are created equal in a state of nature. When they organize society and establish government they surrender to that government—to their constitution—a portion of their rights. That constitution, or the sovereign power under it, then has the inherent right to say what class of persons shall constitute the electorate. Our organized society exists under two separate constitutions—the Federal and the State. Under them the people of the State can at any time change their laws or their State constitution in any respect not in conflict with the Federal Constitution.

THE 1908 CLAUSE AND THE POLL TAX.

It will be noted that everyone who registers for the first time after 1908 must be able to read and write. This is a great stimulus to education, and the white boy now 13 years old will learn to read and write, thus demonstrating the great characteristic of his race—the determination to qualify himself for governmental affairs, and showing his superiority over the negro, who will have the opportunity of similar public schools. It is derogatory to the intelligence of the white youth of our State to think they will not learn to read and write in the next eight years. It will be further noted that every illiterate white man who registers before 1908

will always thereafter enjoy the privilege of voting without regard to education in any manner. How can any man object to this? Certainly no friend of the uneducated white man can object to it—his enemies alone can oppose it.

Another feature is the poll-tax qualification. It is provided that those liable to a poll tax must pay that tax for the previous year on or before March 1 of the year in which he offers to vote, it being his last year's poll tax. This is a very wise provision. No man should take part in an election who willfully refuses to pay his poll tax, which goes to education and the poor. Our old men are, by the constitution, exempt from poll taxes, and our county commissioners are authorized to and do exempt all others from the poll tax who are in their opinion for any cause entitled to exemption. This prevents any hardship. It merely tells the able-bodied young and middle-aged men that they must pay something to support governmental objects, if they want to help elect the officers. Here again will the white race meet its duty and exhibit its superiority.

CONCLUSION.

Having studied this amendment with all side lights available, I am thoroughly satisfied that it is just, wise, necessary, and constitutional. Of course neither myself nor any other man can say how any judge or court will hold if its validity should ever be questioned in the courts. The utmost we can do is to give the reasons for the faith within us, and trust that the courts will consider the whole matter, if it ever reaches them, in a spirit of fairness and freedom from partisanship, confidently believing that when such a spirit shall guide them they can never find a word in the Constitution or a principle of fundamental law which our amendment contravenes.

Mississippi and South Carolina years ago limited the suffrage in a manner which separates the fit from the unfit voter, allowing the whites with superior intelligence to vote, and yet disqualifying the ignorant negroes. The qualifications in those States stand unchallenged. Louisiana has provisions very similar to our amendment. They stand to-day, and I am informed that no one has brought its validity into question in the courts. Her ablest lawyers and her entire delegation on this floor have entire confidence in its constitutionality, and express gratification that the race problem in their State is solved.

Many of you have doubtless been surprised at the novelty of our amendment, but on due consideration you will find no valid objection to its adoption by our people. Hold your hands off and let us deal with the problem. If you are interested on account of the negro, we say that we think more of the negro than you do and treat him better. He has not been shot down in my State because he wanted to work, as he was in Illinois. We have forgiven him for the evils he has inflicted on our State, for he knows not what he does; but we desire to forestall for the future the blighting effects of his ignorance and incapacity.

We believe that through causes which mankind could not control one race excels the other, and while those of the inferior race of sufficient intelligence will be among the States electors, we insist that we have the right to make an honest constitutional effort to place the intelligent unlettered white patriot on higher ground than the ignorant, careless negro. We are engaged in the white man's cause, the cause of better government and higher civilization, and upon white men we rely for success.

APPENDIX A.

Mr. W. B. McKOY,
Chairman of the Democratic Executive Committee:

AUGUST 20, 1898.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of this date (August 20, 1898), I herewith hand you a list of the negro magistrates of New Hanover County, as follows:

Andrew J. Allen, Thomas Brinkley, Jas. B. Dudley, Lewis Geyer, Valentine Howe, Daniel Howard, J. M. Jenkins, Elijah Lane, Washington McNeill, John G. Norwood, John H. Rivera, John H. Shaw, Thomas Smith, A. J. Walker, R. McN. Williams, Luke Grady, Richard J. Jordan, Jordan Nixon, Elijah Leonard, George E. Green, J. Primes Bowen, John H. Brown, Chas. A. Foreman, John Holloway, John H. Howe, Benj. J. Hooper, Major Loftin, R. H. Lane, Caleb M. Martin, George W. Price, Abel S. Robinson, Chas. Sullivan, J. E. Taylor, John H. Webber, Godfrey Willis, jr., Lewis Hollingsworth, Levi Nixon, J. H. Davis, A. L. Freeman, Samuel M. Wiggins.

Yours, truly,

JOHN D. TAYLOR, *C. S. C.*

WILMINGTON, N. C., *August 20, 1898.*

CERTIFIED LIST OF NEGRO JUSTICES OF THE PEACE ELECTED AND ACTING IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF EDGECOMBE.

Township No. 1.—Turner Prince, Y. D. Garrett, Dred Wimberly, Cammillas Dancy, H. H. Cherry, and H. N. Cherry.
Township No. 2.—Robert Brown, Jesse Jenkins, Albert Cherry, and Joseph Rogers.
Township No. 3.—Samuel Howard, Willie Jones, and Mack Stokes.
Township No. 4.—F. B. Bellamy, Benjamin Bridgers, John Henry Knight, and Lewis W. Smith.
Township No. 5.—Elbert E. Bryan, Kador Petway, and Samuel H. Foster.
Township No. 6.—Ross Bryan, R. H. Stokes.
Township No. 7.—Wesly Revis, Green Hinton, and Caswell Phillips.
Township No. 8.—Frank Dew and Preston H. Thorpe.
Township No. 9.—Alfred Reid.
Township No. 11.—David Lawrence, G. H. Porter, and Lewis H. Hart.

I, Ed. Pennington, clerk of the superior court of Edgecombe County, do certify that the above-named men were elected and are now acting justices of the peace for this county, and that each of the persons named is a negro.

ED. PENNINGTON,
Clerk of the Superior Court.

This 24th day of August, 1898.

CERTIFIED LIST OF NEGRO MAGISTRATES IN BERTIE COUNTY.

Emanuel Tayloe, David G. Raynor, Mark Law, Armstead T. Wilson, Authur Heckstall, Richard Biggs, Bryant Walton, Frank Peele, Wright Cherry, Haywood Cherry, Noah Cherry, sr., George W. Hardy, Wiley Wilkins, Daniel W. Stewart, John A. Bazemore, Harry B. Spivey.

NORTH CAROLINA, *Bertie County.*

I, W. L. Lyon, clerk of the superior court in and for Bertie County, do certify that the persons named above were duly elected to the offices stated, and that all of said persons are colored. The records of my office show their election or appointment.

Witness my hand and seal this 20th day of August, 1898.

W. L. LYON, *Clerk Superior Court.*

CERTIFIED LIST OF NEGRO MAGISTRATES IN CRAVEN COUNTY.

H. E. Dawson, W. D. Pettiphea, Jesse P. Godett, E. W. Fisher, David Ambrose, Dock Cooper, Abraham Dennis, Alonzo Pelham, Washington Spivey, Jas. R. Hooks, Albert Foreman, Alexander Pelham, A. A. Bryan, Lewis Ham, W. W. Lawrence, Robt. G. Moseley, Thos. O. White, Jno. B. Willis, M. W. Chapman, W. H. Green, W. H. Burton, Fred. Douglas, I. W. Eubanks, Dennis Perkins, Frank Rasberry, John A. Boons, W. A. Rountell.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA, *Craven County:*

I, W. M. Watson, clerk superior court of Craven County, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true list of the colored magistrates of this county, as appearing on the records in this office.

W. M. WATSON,
Clerk Superior Court.

NEW BERNE, N. C., *August 16, 1898.*

APPENDIX B.

[Transferred to Wm. Royster, justice of the peace, Oxford, N. C.]

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA, *Granville County.*

Before L. P. WORTHAM, *J. P.*

Henry P. Harris, being duly sworn, complains and says that at in said county, and in Fishing Creek Township, on or about the — day of February, 1897, Harvey Hobgood feloniously stole, took, and carried away personal property belonging to the said Henry P. Harris of said county, to wit: One driving wheel belonging to threshing machine, horsepower and separator, value $50, value of said wheel being $10, contrary to form of statute and against the peace and dignity of the State.

his
HENRY P. x HARRIS.
mark.

Subscribed and sworn to before me the 24th day of April, 1897.

L. P. WORTHAM, *J. P.*

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA, *Granville County.*

To any constable or any other lawful officer of Granville County, greeting:

You are hereby commanded forthwith to arrest Harvey Hobgood, and him safely keep so that you have him before me at my office, in Granville County, April 27, at 5 o'clock p. m., or some magistrate of said county, immediately, to answer the above complaint and be dealt with as the law directs.

Given under my hand and seal this 24th day of April, 1897.

[SEAL.] L. P. WORTHAM, *J. P.*

Summon the following witnesses:
Joe Lynch and Albert Harris.

NORTH CAROLINA, *Granville County.*

Henry Harris *vs.* Harvey Hobgood.

To J. P. Buchanan, constable of Fishing Creek Township, Granville County, N. C., greeting:

Whereas the within closed warrant was issued by me 24th day of April, 1897, with orders for trial 22d day of May, 1897, and whereas agreeable to the parties it was on said 22d day of May, it was supported by affidavit, sworn from under me and conveyed to Wm. Royster, J. P., of Oxford Township, Granville County, N. C., and whereas it was again sworn out from under him, the said Wm. Royster, and again returned before me for trial: Now, acting under the authority of the power in me vested, the constable of Fishing Creek Township, Granville County, N. C., will please hereby take due notice to summon all the above-named witnesses in person, and bring or cause to be brought the body of the defendant, Harvey Hobgood, before me for trial of the action now in question, at the office of T. J. Mitchner, esq., at 10 o'clock a. m., Tuesday, August 31, 1897. In which fail not. This 5th day of August, 1897.

L. P. WORTHAM, *J. P.*

Order to constable of Fishing Creek Township, Granville County, N. C.

J. P. Buchanan serve promptly under no less penalty than the law may inflict.

NORTH CAROLINA, *Granville County.*

Before T. J. MITCHNER, *J. P.*
State *vs.* Harvey Hobgood.

This cause coming on to be tried before me this 31st day of August, 1897, after hearing the evidence it is adjudged by the court that the defendant, Harvey Hobgood, be discharged from the custody of the sheriff. It is further adjudged by the court that this action is frivolous and that the prosecutor, Henry P. Harris, pay the costs of this action.

T. J. MITCHNER,
J. P., Fishing Creek Township, Granville County, N. C.

This May 26th, 1898.

NORTH CAROLINA, *Granville County.*

I, J. G. Hunt, clerk of the superior court of Granville County, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of the affidavit, warrant, order of removal, and judgment in the case of the State *vs.* Harvey Hobgood, as taken from the record filed in this office.

Witness my hand and official seal.

[SEAL.]

J. G. HUNT,
Clerk Superior Court.

This February 5, 1900.

NORTH CAROLINA, *Granville County.*

A. A. Hicks, being first duly sworn, says that he is an attorney at law, and has been practicing law in Oxford, Granville County, N. C., since the 4th day of October, 1887; that Harvey Hobgood, the defendant referred to in the foregoing affidavit and warrant, is a white man and has been his client for at least ten years; that after the removal of the trial from L. P. Wortham, esq., before William Royster, esq., of Oxford, N. C., he was employed by Harvey Hobgood to appear and defend him in said action; that he did appear before the said William Royster, J. P., and objected to the trial of the said Hobgood before him for the legal reason that the same had been removed from the township where the prosecution originated, and the same was sent by the said William Royster or L. P. Wortham, or both, before T. J. Mitchner, a justice of the peace for Fishing Creek Township; that affiant appeared with his client at the house of T. J. Mitchner and defended said action for the said Hobgood; that he has known L. P. Wortham, William Royster, and T. J. Mitchner for several years; that they are all negroes; that William Royster, to whom the said warrant was first sent, is a coal-black negro, a partisan Republican, and was the warm friend of the said Henry P. Harris, the prosecutor in said action, and had recently succeeded in procuring the governor of North Carolina, Hon. D. L. Russell, to pardon the said Henry P. Harris from a two years' term in the penitentiary, said Harris having been convicted of a secret assault upon a white man; that affiant used every means in his power to get the said negro justices to return Hobgood's case before a white magistrate, of whom there were one or two in the township, but his efforts were in vain.

A. A. HICKS.

Sworn to and subscribed before me February 5, 1900.

J. G. HUNT, *C. S. C.*

APPENDIX C.

AN ACT TO AMEND THE CONSTITUTION OF NORTH CAROLINA.

The general assembly of North Carolina do enact:

SECTION 1. That Article VI of the constitution of North Carolina be, and the same is hereby, abrogated, and in lieu thereof shall be substituted the following article of said constitution:

ARTICLE VI.

SUFFRAGE AND ELIGIBILITY TO OFFICE—QUALIFICATION OF AN ELECTOR.

SECTION 1. Every male person born in the United States, and every male person who has been naturalized, 21 years of age and possessing the qualifications set out in this article, shall be entitled to vote at any election by the people in the State, except as herein otherwise provided.

SEC. 2. He shall have resided in the State of North Carolina for two years, in the county six months, and in the precinct, ward, or other election district in which he offers to vote four months next preceding the election: *Provided*, That removal from one precinct, ward, or other election district, to another in the same county, shall not operate to deprive any person of the right to vote in the precinct, ward, or other election district from which he has removed until four months after such removal. No person who has been convicted, or who has confessed his guilt in open court, upon indictment, of any crime, the punishment of which now is, or may hereafter be, imprisonment in the State prison, shall be permitted to vote unless the said person shall be first restored to citizenship in the manner prescribed by law.

SEC. 3. Every person offering to vote shall be at the time a legally registered voter as herein prescribed and in the manner hereafter provided by law, and the general assembly of North Carolina shall enact general registration laws to carry into effect the provisions of this article.

SEC. 4. Every person presenting himself for registration shall be able to read and write any section of the Constitution in the English language; and, before he shall be entitled to vote, he shall have paid, on or before the 1st day of March of the year in which he proposes to vote, his poll tax, as prescribed by law, for the previous year. Poll taxes shall be a lien only on assessed property and no process shall issue to enforce the collection of the same except against assessed property.

SEC. 5. No male person, who was on January 1, 1867, or at any time prior thereto, entitled to vote under the laws of any State in the United States wherein he then resided, and no lineal descendant of any such person shall be denied the right to register and vote at any election in this State by reason of his failure to possess the educational qualification prescribed in section 4 of this article: *Provided*, he shall have registered in accordance with the terms of this section prior to December 1, 1908. The general assembly shall provide for a permanent record of all persons who register under this section on or before November 1, 1908; and all such persons shall be entitled to register and vote in all elections by the people in this State, unless disqualified under section 2 of this article: *Provided*, such persons shall have paid their poll tax as required by law.

SEC. 6. All elections by the people shall be by ballot, and all elections by the general assembly shall be viva voce.

SEC. 7. Every voter in North Carolina, except as in this article disqualified, shall be eligible to office, but before entering upon the duties of the office he shall take and subscribe the following oath: "I,—— ——, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and maintain the Constitution and laws of the United States and the Constitution and laws of North Carolina, not inconsistent therewith, and that I will faithfully discharge the duties of my office as ——————. So help me' God."

SEC. 8. The following classes of persons shall be disqualified for office: First, all persons who shall deny the being of Almighty God. Second, all persons who shall have been convicted, or confessed their guilt on indictment pending; and whether sentenced or not, or under judgment suspended, of any treason or felony, or of any other crime for which the punishment may be imprisonment in the penitentiary, since becoming citizens of the United States, or of corruption and malpractice in office; unless such person shall be restored to the rights of citizenship in a manner prescribed by law.

SEC. 2. That all of the provisions of the constitution relating to suffrage, registration, and elections, as contained in this act, amending the constitution, shall go into effect on the 1st day of July, 1902, if a majority of the qualified voters of the State so declare at the next general election.

SEC. 3. This amendment shall be submitted at the next general election to the qualified voters of the State, in the same manner and under the same rules and regulations as is provided in the law regulating general elections in this State, and in force May 1, 1899; and at said election those persons desiring to vote for such amendment shall cast a written or printed ballot with the words "for suffrage amendment" thereon, and those with a contrary opinion shall cast a written or printed ballot with the words "against suffrage amendment" thereon.

SEC. 4. The said election shall be held and the votes returned, compared, counted, and canvassed, and the result announced, under the same rules and regulations as are in force for returning, comparing, counting, and canvassing the votes for members of the general assembly May 1, 1899, and if a majority of the votes cast are in favor of the said amendment, it shall be the duty of the governor of the State to certify said amendment, under the seal of the State, to the secretary of state, who shall enroll the said amendment so certified among the permanent records of his office.

SEC. 5. This act shall be in force from and after its ratification.

In the general assembly read three times and ratified this 21st day of February, A. D. 1899.

C. A. REYNOLDS,
President of the Senate.
H. G. CONNOR,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Civil Code for Alaska.

SPEECH
OF
HON. W. S. COWHERD,
OF MISSOURI,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, May 17, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (S. 3119) to provide a civil code for Alaska—

Mr. COWHERD said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I take advantage of the rule permitting general debate in order to make a few remarks in regard to the Nicaragua Canal bill, which lately passed the House. The Representatives from the State of Missouri on this side of the Chamber—at least, all who were present on that occasion—voted against the passage of that measure. Several Republican papers since that time have taken occasion to criticise our vote, and the State convention of the Republican party, which assembled last week in Kansas City, inserted in their platform a denunciation of the Democratic members of Congress from that State because of their vote on this measure. As a matter of fact, every member of the Missouri delegation was and is now favorable to an isthmian canal, and I believe the same might be said almost without exception of every man who cast his vote against the measure that passed the House.

The question, however, on which we voted was not whether the Isthmian Canal should be built, but was the passage at that time of the particular bill then before the House. It probably has escaped the memory of some people that the Fifty-fifth Congress passed a bill providing for the appointment of a commission by the President and appropriating a million dollars to be used in making a full survey and investigation of all the different routes across the Isthmus and to report to Congress in regard to the same, and I believe the measure was broad enough and intended to cover the obtaining of options from the Government controlling the territory through which the canal would be built.

It is a fact not generally known to the public that there are four routes across the Isthmus now under consideration and investigation by the Walker commission. First, the Nicaraguan route, which is about 169 miles long, traversing territory of both Nicaragua and Costa Rica. This route will require 6 locks, the lake level being at an elevation of 100 feet. On the Atlantic side the harbor is bad, owing to the dirt and filth brought down by the San Juan River. It is probable a good harbor can be built above the mouth of the river, but this will involve very considerable expense. Much work will also have to be done on the Pacific harbor. The estimates of the cost of the work are so far apart no accurate idea of the cost can be given. The Panama route is 47 miles long, and will probably require 4 locks, the upper level being about 80 feet above the level of the sea. It presents no engineering feat that may not be overcome; it lies entirely within the jurisdiction of Colombia. A French company has completed probably about 40 per cent of the work, has built a railroad along the entire line across the Isthmus.

The objection to the route is the fact that it is complicated by a concession made to a French company, and our Government can afford to touch it only in case the French company would sell out their entire interest in all the property and the Colombian Government would give us a new concession or grant upon proper terms. There are still two routes left about which little is known. San Blas is one, 22 miles long, and this is about all that is definitely known of the route, as it has never been surveyed, and in fact it is said that no white man's foot has ever crossed the Isthmus at that point. The Darien route is 23 miles long. It ends both on the Atlantic and Pacific side in an excellent natural harbor. Neither the Darien nor the San Blas route is complicated by any concessions heretofore granted; and while they are on Colombian territory, the country is really owned and controlled by a native Indian tribe that has never been conquered, and one that never permitted a surveying party to cross its territory until the present commission negotiated a treaty with them. The present commission is making a full and complete survey of all these

routes, collecting information as to all concessions that have been granted, and will be able by the next session of Congress to give a complete and exhaustive report as to the conditions affecting all four of these routes. There are on the commission a half dozen engineers among the most skillful and learned men in their profession in the world. When they have reported the facts, Congress will be in a position to act intelligently upon this question and not until then, especially when one remembers that two of the routes across the Isthmus have never heretofore been fully surveyed or even inspected, except near the shores, by white men.

So much for the general features of the question. Now, as to the particular bill upon which we were called to vote: It was objected to, first, because it selected a special route, when neither Congress nor anyone outside of it was possessed of sufficient information at the time to say whether it was the best; second, it provided that the President should proceed to procure from the Governments of Nicaragua and Costa Rica a concession giving us control over the right of way and authorizing us to build a canal, thus selecting a route before any agreement was made with the government that owned it. This put us absolutely at the mercy of these two South American Governments. Once before, when Mr. Frelinghuysen was Secretary of State, we attempted to secure this right of way, and a treaty which was never ratified was negotiated with Nicaragua, by the terms of which we agreed to lend them $4,000,000 in cash to pay individuals for the land taken and to give the Nicaraguan Government one-third of the net earnings forever.

Had Costa Rica held out for similar terms, the right of way would have cost us $8,000,000 and two-thirds of the earnings of the canal in perpetuity. How much would they demand, if the present bill should become a law, when we come to negotiate for a concession, after Congress has already decided we must have it and nothing is left for them to do but to fix the price? In addition to this there are already two concessionaires claiming the right of way—the old Maritime Canal Company, who insist their concession has not expired, and what is known as the Cragin Company, who claim to have obtained a concession but a short time ago. Confronted with these conditions, was it good business policy to tie the Government up with a single route and instruct the President to buy the right of way?

But this was not the only objection to the bill as it stood when put upon its passage. The people of the country have heard much of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, which was designed to take the place of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty of 1850, and which aside from the formal parts is as follows:

ARTICLE I.

It is agreed that the canal may be constructed under the auspices of the Government of the United States, either directly at its own cost, or by gift or loan of money to individuals or corporations, or through subscription to or purchase of stock or shares, and that, subject to the provisions of the present convention, the said Government shall have and enjoy all the rights incident to such construction, as well as the exclusive right of providing for the regulation and management of the canal.

ARTICLE II.

The high contracting parties, desiring to preserve and maintain the "general principle" of neutralization established in Article VIII of the Clayton-Bulwer Convention, adopt as the basis of such neutralization, the following rules, substantially as embodied in the convention between Great Britain and certain other powers, signed at Constantinople, October 22, 1888, for the free navigation of the Suez Maritime Canal, that is to say:

1. The canal shall be free and open, in time of war as in time of peace, to the vessels of commerce and of war of all nations, on terms of entire equality, so that there shall be no discrimination against any nation or its citizens or subjects in respect of the conditions or charges of traffic, or otherwise.

2. The canal shall never be blockaded, nor shall any right of war be exercised nor any act of hostility be committed within it.

3. Vessels of war of a belligerent shall not revictual nor take any stores in the canal except so far as may be strictly necessary; and the transit of such vessels through the canal shall be effected with the least possible delay, in accordance with the regulations in force, and with only such intermission as may result from the necessities of the service.

Prizes shall be in all respects subject to the same rules as vessels of war of the belligerents.

4. No belligerent shall embark or disembark troops, munitions of war or warlike materials in the canal except in case of accidental hindrance of the transit, and in such case the transit shall be resumed with all possible dispatch.

5. The provisions of this article shall apply to waters adjacent to the canal, within three marine miles of either end. Vessels of war of a belligerent shall not remain in such waters longer than twenty-four hours at any one time except in case of distress, and in such case shall depart as soon as possible; but a vessel of war of one belligerent shall not depart within twenty-four hours from the departure of a vessel of war of the other belligerent.

6. The plant, establishments, buildings, and all works necessary to the construction, maintenance, and operation of the canal shall be deemed to be part thereof, for the purposes of this convention, and in time of war as in time of peace shall enjoy complete immunity from attack or injury by belligerents and from acts calculated to impair their usefulness as part of the canal.

7. No fortifications shall be erected commanding the canal or the waters adjacent. The United States, however, shall be at liberty to maintain such military police along the canal as may be necessary to protect it against lawlessness and disorder.

ARTICLE III.

The high contracting parties will, immediately upon the exchange of the ratifications of this convention, bring it to the notice of the other powers and invite them to adhere to it.

ARTICLE IV.

The present convention shall be ratified by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate thereof, and by Her Britannic Majesty; and the ratifications shall be exchanged at Washington or at London within six months from the date hereof, or earlier if possible.

In faith whereof, the respective plenipotentiaries have signed this convention and thereunto affixed their seals.

Done in duplicate at Washington the 5th day of February, in the year of Lord 1900.

JOHN HAY.
PAUNCEFOTE.

For one I believe that the isthmian canal should be built by the United States; should be owned and controlled by the United States, protected and defended by the United States; should be open to the passage of all vessels in times of peace and, when this Government is at war, should be a part of the defenses of the country, and to that end should be fortified and garrisoned. I do not believe we should put one hundred and fifty to two hundred millions of the people's money in that great enterprise and leave it to become the property in time of war of the first battle ship that can reach its mouth. It is contended that our Navy will be sufficient protection for the canal in time of war. Against this contention stands the admitted fact that one gun well placed on land is the equal, according to experts, of from three to six upon an attacking ship. Should the approaches to the canal be seized by a hostile force and fortified, we would be compelled to bring from three to six times the opposing force in order to retake the property.

Would it not be better at the outset to build and man fortifications sufficient to protect this great investment and hold this important post in the defense of our coasts? It is contended, however, that we should follow the plan England has adopted in neutralizing the Suez Canal. In comparing these two projects it must be remembered that we have held now for nearly a century the indisputable domination of the Western Hemisphere, a claim no government has made good in regard to European or Asiatic lands or waters. It must also be remembered that while England has not fortified the Suez Canal, yet, with her forts at Gibraltar and Malta, the Mediterranean is absolutely dominated by her guns, and she can in time of war or necessity close the canal at will. It is well at this point to call attention to the fact that the Hay-Pauncefote treaty submitted by the President on February 5 to the Senate is still pending before that body, and the time for ratification has but lately been extended until after the next meeting of Congress.

It is also well to remember that under the terms of that treaty the canal is to be kept free and open in times of war as well as in times of peace to the vessels of both war and commerce of all nations on terms of entire equality, giving to our enemies the same right to use our property for the purpose of attacking us that we would have for the purpose of preparing for defense; and should we attempt to prevent an attacking fleet from passing through the canal, we might, if this treaty is ratified, at once involve our country in trouble with Great Britain. The treaty further provides that the canal can not be blockaded in time of war, that our own vessels can not revictual or take stores therein, that we shall not embark or disembark troops or munitions of war in the canal or within 3 marine miles of either end, that our own vessels of war shall not remain within 3 miles of said canal in time of war for a term longer than twenty-four hours, and that no fortifications shall be erected commanding the canal or the adjacent waters.

It can not be possible that the people of the United States are willing on such terms to enter upon this great work; yet in harmony with the provisions of that proposed treaty the Nicaraguan Canal bill was amended in the House of Representatives in order that there might be no conflict with it. The clause providing that the Secretary of War should construct and fortify for defense was changed by striking out the word "fortification" and inserting the word "provisions." An amendment providing that "the Secretary should fortify, garrison, and protect" was voted down. An amendment providing "that the location should not be fixed and determined until the Isthmian Canal Commission, now engaged in surveying the various routes, had reported" was voted down, and the motion to recommit with instructions to the committee to report the bill providing that "the President is authorized to acquire control of such territory as is necessary for the building and maintaining of a canal across the Isthmus, and authorizing the Secretary of War to excavate and to construct such canal and take such steps as may be necessary to preserve the interests of the United States therein," was voted down.

Such were the measures the House refused to pass, and proceeded upon the passage of a bill tying the hands of the President and committing the country to a particular route before the commission then engaged in examining the different routes had reported, and in face of the fact that Admiral Walker, chairman of that commission, had stated that they were not prepared even to say that the Nicaraguan route was preferable; putting the country at the mercy of two South American governments to demand

any sum they pleased for right of way; providing for the expenditure of $140,000,000 of the people's money upon such terms as the United States was to bear all the burden and England reap the profits, and refusing to permit a single American gun or American soldier to come within 3 miles of the canal for defense in times of war. Against this monstrous proposition the Democratic members of the Missouri delegation recorded their votes and are willing to abide by the decision of the people they represent.

Military Academy Bill.

The most vicious legislation in the history of this Government would be the passage of the proposed subsidy bill now pending, which means taking from the Treasury the taxes of the many and applying them to the favored few.

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALBERT S. BERRY,

OF KENTUCKY.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, May 15, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 11538) making appropriations for the Military Academy—

Mr. BERRY said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This bill comes from a committee which has had serious trouble during the present session in the consideration of the Cœur d'Alene mining troubles in the State of Idaho, commonly known as the "Bull-pen outrage." I am not aware of how much time has been spent in the consideration of the bill now presented. In general terms I am for anything that shall improve the condition of the Military Academy at West Point, which has done so much through its graduates for the martial glory of our country. However, it has become a custom of this body, when in Committee of the Whole, for members to address themselves to any subject of national import, whether or no connected immediately with the subject under discussion.

I shall at this time direct a few remarks to the bill now threatening this body, and which has done so for the last twenty-five years. It only reached the acute stage during the Fifty-sixth Congress, to wit, the question of a subsidy to build up a merchant marine which I think the Republican party has destroyed in the last forty years by high protective tariff, and its indisposition to allow the American people to buy ships where they pleased and where they could procure them at the most advantageous prices, refusing to all foreign-built ships American registry. Let us for a few moments review our maritime history.

The measure now under consideration is not a new one. It represents that dominant idea of the great nations of the world, to control as large a share as possible of the trade and commerce of the high seas. History informs us that the people in ancient times who engaged in seafaring found it their greatest source of profit. In early times such traffic was in small craft—largely a coasting trade—but it has increased from one century to another, until now there are no seas unexplored, unless it be those locked in the arms of the polar ice and snow.

The history of our own country, beginning with the early settlements along the Atlantic seaboard—an endless, dangerous forest behind, the sea before—led the early comers to a life of fishing and general seafaring. Through many years this naturally engendered in the American colonists a genius for the management and construction of wooden sailing vessels. It is this same principle that makes England the greatest maritime power now, in spite of the large subsidies which other foreign nations give their shipping in an effort to compete with her. It is her natural position—a small, densely populated island, depending largely on the great world beyond her even for food, that makes it a necessity for Britannia to rule the wave.

Long before the Revolutionary war the colonies had done so much toward becoming one of the maritime nations of the world that the mother country began to look upon them as formidable rivals. Of course the success in this particular line was due in great measure to the unbounded supply of timber of which vessels were then made. After the Declaration of Independence, when America began her career as a separate nation, her shipping increased rapidly. Having the best seamen, expert workmen, and the best material, she rapidly forged to the front and became the leading shipbuilder of the world. She supplied many nations, and even England became one of her largest customers during the reign of the wooden ship.

This supremacy continued, until about 1855-56 it was at its zenith. It was at this time, when the tonnage of the world divided among the different nations gave approximately one-third to the United States, one-third to Great Britain, and the remaining third distributed among the other nations of the earth, that England repealed all restrictive navigation laws and with the new idea of free ships went into the markets of the world and bought where she could buy cheapest.

Now let us turn to the sad spectacle which presents itself of our gradual decadence from our proud position as one of the first maritime nations of the earth. The first reason which confronts us was that in the progress of civilization iron and the steam engine came to be substituted for the wooden sailing ship. As before stated, the early training of our people had made the building and management of wooden sailing craft a specialty in which they had excelled. England, seeing the possibilities of the use of iron, rapidly applied herself to developments along this line. America, with her adoptive spirit, kept pace, and in 1851 the steam tonnage of the two countries was about equal. (Wells, Our Mer. Mar., p. 49.)

At this time had America been allowed the same privileges as her competitors; had she not been hampered by all sorts of restrictive legislation, she could have kept pace with her rival in the development of a merchant marine. But the facilities of Great Britain made it possible for her to produce cheaper and better steam engines, and we, by the aforementioned restrictive laws, were prohibited from taking advantage of British skilled labor when it was the only thing that would have enabled us to keep our place among the maritime nations.

During the civil war 800,000 tons of American shipping was removed to foreign registry and our laws prohibited that such vessels should return to the American flag afterwards. This and the high tariff placed after the war on many articles entering into the construction of vessels went far toward diverting the attention of our merchants from shipbuilding and owning. Those who had until then engaged in the clipper trade around the Horn with California and elsewhere on the high seas now gave their efforts to the building of the great transcontinental railroads, and the adventurous spirit of Young America was turned from the old life on the deep to the prairie schooner, and the untold wealth of mines and wheat fields there being opened to them. At a time when cities were the mushroom growth of a night and Greater New Yorks were platted where the railroads crossed the prairie and the primeval forests, the inevitable result was the diversion of capital from shipbuilding interests, and the decadence of the merchant marine followed as the night the day.

With a view of restoring our depreciated tonnage we have before us a bill which proposes to subsidize both ships and men. This means taking from the public treasury money gathered by taxation of the many and bestowing it upon a favored few. The bill provides that there shall be paid upon the tonnage of every ship plying between a port of the United States and any foreign port a given amount, said amount being increased as the speed and capacity of the vessel varies.

This is ostensibly to build up the shipyards of the United States, presuming that foreign nations can now build cheaper and better vessels than we can. Is this a correct hypothesis? At a recent hearing before the subcommittee of labor of the Senate Mr. Cramp said (p. 20, Sen. Doc. 318, 55th Cong.,): "We secured the building of vessels for the Russian Government in competition with France, Germany, and England because we could build them at a little less than they could and in a shorter time." * * * "We also secured the construction of Japanese vessels because we were 20 per cent lower than English or German builders." Such a statement from so eminent an authority ought to convince the most incredulous that the proposed subsidy is not needed to encourage shipbuilding in this country.

Those who are urging the enactment of this bill tell us that each year we pay a sum variously estimated from $195,000,000 to $300,000,000 for freight and passage traffic carried under foreign flags. If this amount could be saved to us the wisdom of the measure might not be questioned, and the large sum to be paid in subsidies might be warranted. But is this the best way to accomplish the end in view? Would not a repeal of the existing restrictive laws and allowing American capital to invest in the best and cheapest market at once remove the need of this questionable legislation?

It seems from the preamble of the bill that one of the chief purposes of those who designed it is to take advantage of the apprehension of the American people growing out of the late war, and to secure to us auxiliary cruisers and seamen in case of war coming suddenly. The probabilities are that America has had her lesson, as the English had in the Crimean, and the French in the Franco-Prussian war, and that no future enemy will find her so unprepared.

A subsidy paid to a limited number of vessels constructed under the supervision of naval officers with a view to their rapid transformation into auxiliary cruisers in case of war might justify the

taking of money from the public Treasury, but the extension of such subsidy to every class of vessel that sails under the American flag should not be countenanced by Congress.

Great Britain, with colonies scattered around the world, requires rapid communication with them and the rest of the world, and she has given liberal compensation to vessels carrying her mails. It is said by the supporters of this bill that these mail contracts are equivalent to subsidies, yet last year England awarded the carrying of mail between Southampton and New York to the North German Lloyd instead of the Cunard Steamship Company, her own line, because it saved to her $125,000.

If Great Britain, the nation now carrying the largest portion of the commerce of the world, only subsidizes 3 per cent of her vessels, as statistics show (and that by mail contracts) would this not be a wise policy for our Government to adopt, with a view of having rapid communication with our newly acquired territories and encouraging the merchant marine at the same time? This would involve no such expenditure as is contemplated in the present bill.

Another argument urged by the majority is that the wages of officers and men in the American service greatly exceed those paid by any other maritime nation, and that it is the duty of the Government to offset such difference. This may be true in a measure, but it is fully compensated for by the fact that the greater efficiency makes smaller crews possible and the overshadowing items of cheaper fuel, cheaper food, and cheaper lubricating oil to be had in the United States.

One of the most important points toward the rehabilitation of the merchant marine is the improvement of the condition of the sailor aboard ship. To accomplish this there should be better laws to protect him against poor food and abuse, so that the young men of the country would come to look upon the life of a sailor as one to be sought after, as it was in the early part of the century. It is a well-known fact that the contract which a sailor makes under existing conditions is as if he sold himself into slavery, and the high character of the American young man revolts at the thought of a seafaring life under these conditions.

We hold that the present tariff, prohibiting as it does the natural exchange of commodities, is one of the most potent factors in the decadence of the merchant marine. It is the great principle of trade that there must be reciprocity underlying it. We can not expect the people of other nations to purchase our surplus unless we buy from them something in return.

For instance, a vessel taking a cargo of farming implements, cotton goods, etc., from New York to the Argentine Republic can not profitably return in ballast. To make the trade with that country a paying enterprise to any merchant marine our import duties must be such that said vessel can bring in return to this country the products of Argentina, such as raw hides, wool, etc. Under existing laws our tariff on such articles is practically prohibitory.

On the Western seaboard the illustration of this point is even more striking. The carrying trade there is largely done by tramp steamers, usually under the English flag. Few regular lines between San Francisco, Portland, Seattle, and the Far East can be profitably operated. We ship to them food stuffs, ties for the Siberian railroad, etc. The articles to be had in return, such as silk, matting, tea, and curios, are taxed at such a rate that the greater number of vessels must either return in ballast or go in search of other cargo, sometimes even as far as Australia for coal. To remedy this, why not reduce the tariff and "subsidize" our merchant marine by enabling them to return to our shores fully laden with first-class freight?

The stimulus given to the owning and building of ships, should this measure become a law, would, we think, be temporary in character, and when the aid was withdrawn, which it would be after ten years, and the market surfeited with ships, there would be a disastrous reaction.

This remarkable bill came to us in the first place sandwitched between numerous "whereases" in the way of argument, and the brief of its distinguished attorney, Ex-Senator Edmunds, at its conclusion. Those pressing this scheme upon our consideration are the shipowners and shipyards, the coastwise and lake trade included, all of whom were to be benefited directly or indirectly.

Mr. Griscom, who is president of the International Navigation Company, and about forty others, met January 17, 1897, at Atlantic City to perfect the method of securing the passage of this bill. He kindly gives us in his hearing before the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries the composition of this assemblage, to wit:

William P. Clyde, of New York, who is the head of the firm of William P. Clyde & Co. That firm is largely engaged in the West India and coastwise trade. Gen. Thomas W. Hyde, of Maine, president of the Bath Iron Works; Alexander R. Smith, secretary of the commerce commission of the State of New York; Charles H. Cramp, president of the Cramp Ship Building Company, of Philadelphia, known to you all; Senator George C. Perkins, of of San Francisco, Cal.; Collis P. Huntington, who is of national reputation; Samuel S. Sewall of the firm of Arthur Sewall & Co., of Bath, Me., shipbuilders and owners; H. P. Booth, president of the New York and Cuba Mail Steamship Company, known popularly as the Ward Line, a large steamship service between New York, Cuba, and Mexico; Aaron Vanderbilt, of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation; Frank J. Firth, chairman of the Lake Carriers' Association; Senator Frye; Charles H. Kelp, secretary of the Lake Carriers' Association, and Harvey D. Goulder its attorney; Senator Hanna; Theodore C. Search, president of the Associated Manufacturers of the United States; Hon. Sereno E. Payne, chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of this House; Senator Elkins; D. D. G. Mink, who is president of the Coastwise Association; Thomas Clyde, of William P. Clyde & Co., Joseph P. Grace, partner of William R. Grace & Co., who are in the South American trade, with others, made up this distinguished company who assembled at the time and place aforementioned.

Do you suppose that this gallant little band of patriots, poor but honest, including Senators and Representatives, had in view the origination of something for the benefit of the people of these United States, or would you rather say that they were prompted by the desire of gain to themselves, most of whom were shipbuilders or shipowners who would be the beneficiaries of the nine millions per annum provided for in said bill?

Mr. Griscom informs us that this bill was not prepared in the interest of any section or set of men, but in the interest of the whole country. He further says this committee took two years of very constant work, sitting more than monthly for conference, and in the intervals a very industrious and patient subcommittee labored with ex-Senator Edmunds to perfect what is now submitted to you. Do you suppose they were working "pro bono publico," or did the ex-Senator require a handsome retainer, with a more substantial fee if successful in extracting from the Treasury the enormous amount proposed? Of this let an intelligent public determine.

This session is nearing its conclusion. A great political contest is just before us, and for prudential reasons it may not be pressed at this time. Should the Republican party be again successful in November, by liberal contributions from the moneyed corporations and individuals, they will press it with renewed zeal and energy, demanding its passage for services rendered when we meet in December. It is the most pernicious form of protective tariff. Can it be possible that we, proud of our nationality and position among the nations of the earth, find it necessary to pay somebody to carry our flag upon the high seas?

Suppose I should go to Kentucky and tell the good people that I represent that the company owning the *Paris* and *St. Louis* would draw out of the Treasury, if this measure passes, for every trip they made across the Atlantic $25,800, what would they say? Every year each such vessel would receive more than $400,000 in a bonus from general taxation, provided they built a like vessel in our home shipyards costing, by reason of the protective tariff, 20 per cent more than they would in foreign shipyards. And here is where Mr. Cramp and other shipbuilders would get their pay for promoting this scheme of looting the Treasury.

If we can build war vessels as we do for other nations cheaper than they can be built elsewhere, why not the merchant vessel as well? We sell pig iron to many foreign nations. We build locomotives for England and Russia, send farming implements, etc., to all parts of the world. Our exports of manufactured goods will amount to four hundred millions this year.

During the forty years the Republicans have controlled the Government they have destroyed our merchant marine, entailing a loss at a low estimate of two hundred millions per annum, or in the four decades since 1860 of eight billion dollars, and now, instead of repealing the vicious legislation standing upon our statute books, they propose robbing the public by subsidizing a merchant marine.

We spend many millions in improving the rivers leading to the seaboard. Many more in improving harbors to be utilized only by vessels sailing under the flag of some foreign country. Take the tariff off the goods of general consumption, except for necessary revenue, thus relieving those who earn their living in the sweat of their brows. The revenue thus lessened supplement by an income tax, forcing the rich to contribute according to their ability to pay.

Let Americans buy ships where they can procure them for the least money, give them American registry, and we will not need the protecting hand of our Government to restore our equality, if not our supremacy, upon the high seas. (Applause)

In conclusion, this bill sails under the flag of the Administration. The President commends such an expenditure in his message. Secretary Gage indorses it in his report. The Commissioner of Navigation, Mr. Chamberlain, is so enthusiastically for it that I have been in some doubt as to whether he wrote ex-Senator Edmunds's argument or Senator Edmunds wrote his report—there is such a marked similarity. The constant presence of the

head of the Bureau of Navigation before the committee, furnishing the arguments promptly adopted in the report of the majority, demonstrates beyond question that the whole power of the Republican party is pressing this measure upon Congress. The beneficiaries are the shipyards and shipowners who will monopolize this bounty of nine millions a year. They will return to coming Congresses pleading this precedent and demanding still larger subsidies. The principle is vicious and unfair, founded upon paternalism of the most pronounced type, and in justice to a tax-ridden people should be defeated. [Loud applause.]

Deficiency Appropriation Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON FRANCIS M. GRIFFITH,

OF INDIANA.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, May 14, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 11537) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, and for prior years, and for other purposes—

Mr. GRIFFITH said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This is one of the numerous deficiency bills presented for our attention. I feel that I am somewhat familiar with deficiencies. In fact the greater part of my life has been a conflict with deficiencies. A strange spectacle is presented in the fact that deficiencies are growing larger and larger day after day in all the Departments, and at the same time the surplus in the Treasury is growing larger. Congress appropriates a specific sum to carry on each Department of the Government each year, but the heads of the Departments, contrary to law, expend sums largely exceeding the appropriation fixed by Congress, and for the payment of the liabilities of the Government in such cases these deficiency bills are presented.

I am not usually in favor of criticising too closely the items presented by the different Departments of Government as necessary to be paid in the ordinary course of business. Any new and unusual expenditures ought to be examined into very carefully in order to avoid the addition of new lines of expenditure which are not necessary in the efficient and economical administration of government. As a rule, I am not much in favor of deficiency bills.

I think that the heads of Departments and the committees of Congress ought to endeavor, as far as possible, to provide for all ordinary expenditures of Government; and when an appropriation bill is presented, it ought to include all that is needed, in order that we may keep track of any increase of expenditure in any of the various Departments and the reasons for such expenditure in case it is a necessary one. For many years now the expenditures of the Government have increased more rapidly than has the population.

I am not opposed to an increase in expenditure where that increase is made necessary by an increased efficiency of government. But a careless or negligent increase in expenditure without a corresponding increase in governmental benefits can not be indorsed. In looking over this appropriation bill, it is noticeable that some items amounting to less than a dollar are carefully explained, while other items running up into thousands of dollars are lumped as "contingent."

I know that the appropriation committees are very busy, and, without in any way criticising either the intention of the members of those committees or their ability, I would respectfully suggest that they should be as careful in itemizing the amounts where they run into thousands of dollars as where they are only a few cents. A lump sum appropriated for contingent expenses gives no idea whatever as to whether or not the American people are going to obtain value received for their money. It may be that if these items were fairly presented, no fault could be found with them. But if you should ask an American citizen, if he wanted to buy a "contingency" for $20,000, he would be apt to want to know what was meant by a "contingency."

We find in looking over the statements of disbursements for the past two years that a new and unusual column has been included, which is that of "Unusual and extraordinary expenditures." Under this heading are found lump sums of several million dollars. I do not charge that this money has been improperly expended, for I know nothing about what the expenditures mean. I complain only that this kind of a statement does not seem to be in accordance with the provisions of section 9 of the Constitution of the United States, which provides:

No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and regular statement and account of the receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time.

A lump appropriation and a general charge of expenditures to "general defense account" conveys no information whatever of the purposes for which money was appropriated or expended, and is consequently not within the spirit of this clause of the Constitution. The framers of the Constitution intended that the people should know the purposes for which the public money was expended, and Congress has no right to violate this clause of the Constitution, even in spirit, by withholding this information from the people. The total expenditures of the United States for the year ending July 1, 1896, were $434,678,654.

The total expenditures for the year ending July 1, 1899, were $700,093,564, an increase of $265,414,910. Of this increase $49,166,620 were outside of the War and Navy Departments, and can not be explained by the war with Spain or the Philippines. This increase during three years' time is totally out of proportion to the increase in either population or wealth of the United States. We have become reckless in our expenditures. And there seems to be a reason for this recklessness which is unworthy of us. It looks as though an effort was made to increase the expenditures as much as possible in order to avoid a decrease in taxation and to prevent a greater surplus than now exists from accumulating in the Treasury.

Notwithstanding the tremendous increase in population and wealth of the United States since 1892, the imports have fallen off from $716,213,948 to $685,441,892. The duties collected have fallen off in the same period from $216,138,916 to $202,072,050. The amount of duties collected for 1898 was only $145,000,000, or less than in any year since 1870. With a tremendous increase in governmental expenditures, we have provided by the present tariff for a tremendous decrease in Government revenues.

This decrease must be made up in some way or else the expenditures must be brought back to the basis of twenty years ago. The Republicans embraced the opportunity, when the Spanish war came up, to pass an internal-revenue tax bill, which taxed everybody except the banks and corporations, and they did it so successfully that notwithstanding the failure of the tariff law as a revenue producer and the increase of the reserve fund from $100,000,000 to $150,000,000, there is still a surplus in the United States Treasury, gathered from the people by unnecessary taxation and for which the Government has no use, the sum of $142,424,420.52.

The American people realize the fact that the United States Treasury has no use whatever for a surplus. The Republican party remembers very well that it was beaten at the polls in 1884 by reason of the fact that it had taxed the people unnecessarily and had accumulated a surplus. They are now using their utmost endeavors to dispose of this surplus by expending it upon anything that they can explain on the stump. They tried to dispose of $180,000,000 as gratuities to successful steamship lines already established, but they could not get it done.

Some disposition has to be made of this vast sum of money, and any item of expenditure which can be explained to the people by the most ingenious sophistry is gladly welcomed as tending to decrease the surplus. This would seem to be the reason that lump appropriations are made, and items of millions appear without explanation in the published statements of expenditures. The Democrats want to relieve the people of these unnecessary and burdensome taxes. They want to raise enough money to provide for the expenditures of the Government efficiently but economically administered, and they do not want any more.

Every time the sun rises and sets $2,000,000 are paid by the taxpayers to carry on the Government. Every day from the beginning to the end of the year $2,000,000 is exacted from the people—over $700,000,000 annually—a sum so large as to stagger the human mind. The daily reports from the Treasury Department show that a great surplus is accumulating, and day by day is growing larger—in short, that the people are each day compelled to pay into the Treasury more money than is required to carry on the Government even after the payment of many illegal and extravagant claims. Why should this continue? What honest excuse can be given for a failure to reduce taxation? Why should we force the people to pay more than is necessary?

Two months ago or more I had the honor to introduce a bill in the House to reduce taxation by repealing so much of the war-revenue bill as required stamps to be placed on notes, mortgages, deeds, leases, checks, receipts, bills of lading, drugs, proprietary medicines. Many bills of similar character and to reach the same result have been introduced. Petitions from nearly every county in the Union have asked Congress to give relief by reducing taxation. I will venture the statement that there is not a single member of the House, whether he be a Democrat, Republican, or Populist, that has not received numerous petitions on this subject. There is a general demand for a reduction of taxation. Why not give the relief now?

The Republican majority have turned deaf ears to the petition, and it has already been officially stated that no bill for a reduction of taxation will be allowed to come to a vote during this session. When the war-revenue bill was being considered all agreed

that it was but a temporary measure and that so soon as the war with Spain ended the war-revenue tax should cease. Such leaders of the majority as the gentleman from New York, Mr. PAYNE, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. CANNON, and our late colleague from Maine, Mr. Dingley, each in substance stated that just as soon as the war with Spain ended the war-revenue tax would be repealed. This was the promise made, and although the war with Spain has long since ended, the war taxes, like death, are still present.

The Republicans have their system of taxation, and they propose that it shall be continued even though the money has to be given away in order to prevent its accumulating in the Treasury. The Republican orators claim that the people have been taxed into prosperity, and they present some most excellent reports which, upon their face, seem to prove their position. There are some very satisfactory conditions to be gleaned from the reports of the various departments of the Government.

Our exports have greatly increased; money, as a rule, has been better distributed, and there has been more of it. A great many people have more money than they had four years ago, and there is consequently an increase in individual deposits in the banks. These are very gratifying conditions, and Democrats as well as Republicans will congratulate the people most heartily upon those conditions; but the Democratic orators, unlike their Republican brethren, will explain why these conditions came about and why they are already being changed into conditions which are by no means so satisfactory.

The present Administration, when it came into power, was widely advertised as the advance agent of prosperity. Immediately before the nominations in the spring of 1896 the panic which had unfortunately afflicted this country, as well as the countries of Europe, for three years had begun to break. It continued to break. By the 1st of January, two months before the inauguration of President McKinley, normal conditions had become very nearly restored. Under these happy circumstances the Administration came into power. There was a flurry which looked as though prosperity was after all going to be postponed. Then came the war with Spain. The Government at once required the assistance of 200,000 men. The expenditures of the Government were increased over $200,000,000 a year.

The diminution of the number of wage-earners and the sudden great increase of products needed for Government use started up the mills, renewed the confidence of the people, and the result was a boom of prosperity. That prosperity, it was thought, would continue as long as the Government was expending hundreds of millions of dollars and as long as these thousands of men were withdrawn from competition in labor circles. But it was not so much of a fight as it was supposed to be. Victory perched upon the Stars and Stripes too soon for the capital which had been invested in manufacturing supplies for the Government to be remunerative.

If the Army was disbanded and the soldiers returned to their homes and the Government was no longer a buyer, it was realized upon all hands that instead of prosperity we were facing the worst industrial panic this country had seen for many years. The result was that while the peace commission was in conference at Paris many millions of dollars were lost in the decline of industrial stocks. Something had to be done. The result was that we paid $20,000,000 for a new war in order to keep our soldiers in the field and keep the Government buying materials. It was thought that in this way the prosperity could be kept up until after the coming Presidential election. Ever since that time the Republicans have been telling the people that the Philippine war was ended while they have been demanding more troops in order to satisfy the fears of the manufacturers.

The war with the Philippines may be ended, as our generals have said, but the troops will not come home, nor will the Government quit buying supplies until after the Presidential election.

During the past year the War Department has expended over $200,000,000. One hundred thousand able-bodied men are provided for who would otherwise be competing in the labor market. To stop this expenditure and turn these men loose upon the community would be to end the prosperity.

Notwithstanding this tremendous impetus given to trade by the Philippine war and by the war in South Africa and the failure of crops abroad, the remarkable business of last year is not continuing.

Dun's Review has been quoted at length by Republicans on this floor, and I do not know a more reliable Republican document than Dun's Review. I will quote from it. On May 19, 1900, Dun's Review said editorially:

Business is not what it was a year ago, but men do not agree in defining the difference. The working force, then increasing fast, is now decreasing. Works are stopping to relieve excessive output in manufactures of paper, cotton, wool, leather, and some forms of steel, while prices are suddenly reduced for the same purpose in lead, wire, and nails. What seems to some "merely spring dullness" others think "the beginning of reaction." The remedy for one difficulty does not fit the other, and there is more need than usual for close attention to the meaning of events.

On May 12, 1900, Dun's Review said editorially:

Production stimulated by high prices rises above consumption retarded by them. The weekly output of pig iron May 1 was 293,850 tons against 280,462 April 1, while unsold stocks not held by the great steel makers increased 44,645 tons. This would indicate a daily consumption of 40,641 tons against 41,642 in January, hitherto the largest, but for the fact that considerable stocks have also accumulated in the hands of consuming concerns, of which enough to use much more than 1,000 daily are now idle. Bessemer pig at Philadelphia and Lehigh Valley No. 1 here are quoted at $22 per ton, and market wire has been reduced, in correspondence with barbed and plain. Considerable increase of business is reported, resulting from recent reductions, but demands for higher wages and also for closing of some iron works two months in the year, whether there is business or not, cause some hesitation regarding future contracts.

The Smelting and Refining Company has reduced lead $9 per ton to 4¼ cents per pound, and copper has declined an eighth to 16¾ cents for Lake, while tin is also lower at 29 cents. * * *

Shipments of boots and shoes from the East for the first week of May were smaller than in the corresponding week of every year save one since 1894. The decline in hides, which has affected nearly all country quotations at Chicago this week, and some further decline in upper leather, have not brought concessions in boots and shoes, but have strengthened the purpose of dealers to keep back orders. Accounts indicate that dealers' stocks throughout the country are unusually large, and many shops are closed, while many more have but little work ahead. Prices asked are practically as high as they were January 1, though leather averages 4 per cent lower, and hides about 10 per cent lower.

On May 5, 1900, Dun's Review said editorially:

Stocks have been weak largely because of industrials, which have continued to decline, losing $1.30 per share for the week. The railroad stocks also declined over $1 per share, but would have fallen more had not earning been remarkably encouraging.

On April 28, 1900, Dun's Review said editorially:

Four months of the new year have passed, and business does not so expand as to need the large increase of circulation which the new monetary bill has permitted, nor enough to sustain all the extraordinary advance in prices last year. The abundance of gold and of currency and the large disbursements by the Treasury in exchange of bonds have rendered rates for money unusually low for the season here, while rare industrial and speculative activity in Europe, with the war in South Africa, have tended to make money dearer abroad. So new gold from Alaska answers the loss of supply from the Transvaal, and America builds up in credits abroad a breastwork against prostration in future here, as in the past, caused by troubles in Europe.

The reaction in prices comes where it was expected least, in the industry more fully organized than any other to check competition, and in the branch which, through contracts covering rod-making and other machinery and through patents, seemed more fully controlled than any other. Reduction of $3 per ton in wire nails, barbed wire, and galvanized fence, and $18 in smooth wire showed that no control can afford to hold prices so high as to check consumption. In a week the prices of iron products have declined 5.86 per cent, and since February 7, 10.3 per cent. As the wire and nail prices have been relatively the highest, others in the iron and steel industry can not be expected to fall in like measure. But pig iron is weaker, No. 1 local coke at Chicago $23.50, and Southern pig is also lower.

Plates and bars can be obtained for about 1.8 cents in good contracts both at the East and at Pittsburg, the proposed advance in sheets to 3.40 cents has not been attempted, and the cut-nail mills, which have gained much by selling at 70 cents per keg below wire nails, will now lower prices also. The stoppage of a dozen wire and nail mills, besides rod mills at Joliet, and another of the National Steel Company, indicates some change in the actual demand. In the minor metals the only change has been in tin, which declined rather sharply to 29¼ in sympathy with lower London quotations. * * *

Shipments of boots and shoes from the East in four weeks have been 306,323 cases, against 339,498 last year, 304,061 in 1898, and less in any other year. New business bears no proportion to the present output, and the number of works which are closed or running part time is increasing. Manufacturers realize that this is a result of prices asked and of slow retail distribution and large stocks remaining on hand, but claim that lower prices can not be made without loss.

On April 21, 1900, Dun's Review said editorially:

Formal reduction of $5 per ton in prices of plates and bars and closing of mills by the American Steel and Wire Company to avoid reduction in prices have filled the week with surprises. In the stock market and in the market for steel and iron products changes have begun, the end of which can not well be foreseen.

The depression in stocks extended to railroad issues because efforts to bring about reaction, doubtless aided by the shifting of loans made necessary by the disposition of many bankers regarding industrial securities. Confidence based on the heavy business of the country and the large earnings of railroads gave good support to their stocks, which declined for the week an average of 64 cents per share. But the sensational losses of $7 per share or more in a day on some industrial stocks depressed that entire list to a point only about $2 per share above the lowest average last year, that of December 22. The decline for the most active averaged $4.52 per share, of which 82 cents was afterwards recovered. The street and gas stocks also averaged a decline of $4.43 per share.

Apart from the disturbance in speculation there has been produced a measure of distrust regarding prices that are maintained by the great combinations which may for the present tend to deter buying.

On March 31, 1900, Dun's Review said editorially:

During the first quarter of 1900 all failures of the kinds formerly included have exceeded in amount of liabilities $93,000,000. With steam railroads evidently street roads, like the Third Avenue, must be separately reported, and with banks and other financial corporations should be separately reported industrial companies, like the United States Flour Milling Company, which control many distinct works. The banking failures were 13, with $857,482 liabilities. A receiver was appointed for the Appleton publishing house, not to wind up bankrupt business, but to give it larger life and value. But setting apart these, the commercial failures remaining were much larger than last year, liabilities amounting to about $91,985,308, according to reports thus far received.

On March 10, 1900, Dun's Review said editorially:

A certain hesitation in business, with shrinkage in its volume, is not unusual or unnatural at this season. It is not necessarily disheartening, therefore, if business is no longer as large in volume as ever, but falls behind that of February or January or of the corresponding week last year. If obstacles in the way are soon removed, and if prices are so adjusted as to encourage and not to prevent transactions, the measure of prosperity realized may again surpass all records.

The obstacles are considerable. Strikes in building trades or of machinists and others at Chicago affect many industries and the wages of 50,000 hands. The remarkable rise in cotton has apparently met the expected reaction which tends for the time to repress business. A few great corporations are striving to hold prices without regard to present demand, hoping that needs of consumers may prevent reaction and renew the rise of last year. Wide differences of opinion also exist regarding the effects of monetary action by Congress.

On March 3, 1900, Dun's Review said, editorially:

Besides the 861 commercial failures for $9,931,048 which we report to-day, there were in February six banking failures for $620,121, and receivers were appointed for the United States Flour Milling Company, with $25,000,000 of stock and $15,000,000 of bonds authorized at its organization last April, and for the Third Avenue Railroad Company after liens for several millions had been placed upon the property.

This epoch of prosperity is marked by the closing of mills, the failure of small banks, the congestion of money in large banks because the avenues of safe and profitable investment are closed, forced idleness of workingmen, the stoppage of production, and the falling of prices. These indications of prosperity if much longer continued will, by next winter, call for public soup houses in every town in the United States.

The farmer may receive an increase for some articles produced by him; but when he buys barbed or smooth wire, tin or iron roofing, binding twine, or the necessaries of life that enter into his home for the support of his family, he finds that the increase of expenses far exceed the increase in his receipts.

Prosperity to the farmer, then, is an empty bubble.

When the President of the United States added to his dignity by becoming the dictator of Cuba, the emperor of Porto Rico and Luzon, and assistant sultan of the Sulu Archipelago it was generally believed that a sufficient amount of profit could be derived from these different possessions to maintain prosperity at least for a time. The result has been rather unpleasant. While it has been found possible to expend more money in the government of of Cuba and Porto Rico than was ever before expended upon similar governments, yet there are unpleasant features connected with it.

Some of the officials have helped themselves more liberally from the Treasury than was intended and have thus destroyed the right of contribution in their fellow-officials. This has brought about publicity and scandal. In fact, the Administration has been peculiarly unfortunate in the matter of scandal. The United States has not emerged from the shadows of one scandal before it has been deeply immersed in the gloom of some succeeding scandal. I do not desire to make any charges whatever against the Chief Executive, and am willing to accept the statements of the Republican papers that he is not responsible for the scandals which have been so prominent a feature of his Administration. I do not believe that the people of the United States are so much concerned about the responsibility of the President as they are about his irresponsibility.

We came into the occupancy of Cuba upon the loftiest plane of patriotism. We said to them "We will help you to stand alone; we will help you to create and maintain a free and stable form of government, of which honor, liberty, and good morals shall be the corner stones." With these lofty professions upon our lips, it was our duty to send officials there whose official life, at least, should have been above suspicion. It was our duty to have sent officials there whose example could have been followed, and who could have taught them the first lessons in free and honest government. Unfortunately the officers selected to give Cuba primary lessons in pure, faithful, and honest government began a plan of systematic looting from the first.

Cuba complained that Spain had robbed her, yet, I regret to say, some of our officials followed in the steps of Spain without interruption, and plunged shoulder deep into the Cuban treasury and took the money collected from the poverty-stricken people of that island. It was not only a crime against a helpless people, but it was a crime against the United States, for it smirched our proud professions of humanity and honesty in the eyes of all the world. All this comes from the exercise of unbridled authority; from arbitrary control; from military rule. Better by far cast aside this dream of colonial expansion, which must mean the same corruption to us that it has meant to every other nation. Get rid of the accursed thing before American honor becomes a laughing stock.

If the unfortunate, deplorable dishonesty, private and public plunder, shown by some of our officials in Cuba at our very doors, what may we expect in the far-distant Philippines?

PORTO RICO.

In the government of Porto Rico the government officials could find no law for its administration except as a Territory of the United States, but after they had officially announced that fact they received inspiration from some source which caused them to act in the directly opposite direction from that in which they had stated law and duty had compelled them to act. This has brought with it some very peculiar and distressing problems.

If the Constitution of the United States does not apply to these outlying possessions, then they are all right, as no inquiries can be made into their method of conducting the government of Porto Rico and the Philippines; but if they are within the Constitution, then the awful prospect is presented of the Government having to refund to those who paid them the millions of dollars of illegal taxes.

The question has never yet been decided directly, but every court that has decided a question at all connected with this subject has decided against the position of the Administration, and Judge Brewer, of the United States Supreme Court, in an address on imperialism before the Liberal Club, of Buffalo, seems to indicate that when the question comes before the United States Supreme Court there will be nothing left for the Administration to do except to repeal the Porto Rican law, pass a constitutional one, and refund all of the taxes that have been paid since the present unconstitutional government was established. Judge Brewer said:

It is said that the Anglo-Saxon race has manifested a capacity to govern well; that we are of that race and that therefore we could well govern the Philippine Islands as colonies. I do not question the capacity of the race well and wisely to govern others. I object to the Philippine policy because it antagonizes the principles upon which this Government was founded, which have controlled its life up to the present time, and the perfection of which has been the hope and aspiration of every true American.

Very few nations, very few individuals, live up to their high ideals, but surely the Declaration of Independence has been the ideal of our life, and we have striven to make it more and more real. Now, government by force is the very antipodes of this, and to introduce government by force over any portion of the nation is to start the second quarter of the second century of our life upon principles which are the exact opposite of those upon which we have hitherto lived. It is one thing to fail of reaching your ideal; it is an entirely different thing to deliberately turn your back upon it.

The test of government is not in the outward mechanical display of order, but in the capacity to develop the best men, and we have lived in the faith that government by the consent of the governed develops the best men. We have not let the wise rule the ignorant, the learned the unlearned, the rich the poor, but we have appealed always to "the plain people" as the ones on whose judgment to rely and upon whose shoulders should rest the burden of government.

Ideas are after all the eternal force. Human life and destiny are controlled by them. They may seem to-day of little significance, but around them gather material interests, and to-morrow their power is disclosed.

Government by consent and government by force, no matter how well the government may be administered, are two essentially antagonistic principles. Doubtless no immediate conflict will follow. We may see a large measure of prosperity; but are we not sowing the seeds which in the days to come will grow up into a harvest of trouble for our children and our children's children?

A necessity of colonial possessions is an increase in our Regular Army, and the first increase proposed is from 30,000 to 100,000 men. It is a strange commentary that at the close of the nineteenth century the head of the most arbitrary government in the civilized world, the Czar of the Russias, is inviting the nations of the world to a decrease in their arms, while this, the freest land, is proposing an increase in its. Yet such seems to be the imperative need, if we enter upon the system of colonial expansion.

Now, the great economic problem in this country is not how can a few men make more money and pile up larger fortunes, but how can the great body of the people make a fair and comfortable living? The right to work is again and again insisted upon as more important than the right to vote, and the cry of the right to work is supplemented by the cry that the state furnish work to all who can not obtain it elsewhere.

Are we likely to aid in solving this problem by bringing into our national life 10,000,000 or 12,000,000 of unskilled Malay laborers? We have shut the doors against the Chinese. Are they any worse than the Malay? Shall we introduce in this nation more cheap labor? I do not wonder at the action of the Federation of Labor in protesting against a new competition of cheap labor as well as an increase of the Army, with its consequent increase of burden and taxation on the employed laborer.

But there is money in it. After all, this is really the most potent factor in the proposed reaching out after the islands of the Orient. The wealth of Ormus and of Ind is to-day, as in the days of Milton, the expectation and the dream of many. Possession of the Orient, with its accumulated wealth of centuries, dazzles the imagination and confuses the judgment. The haze of mystery hangs over that vast domain. Wealth untold is believed to be there ready to be appropriated by any dominant power. All the nations and tribes come within Lord Salisbury's definition of dying nations, and must soon be divided between and appropriated by the living and growing nations. China is held out as a dying nation, filled with inexhaustible wealth, and why should we not share in its appropropriation? What a picture this is! The eagle of liberty standing like a buzzard to grow fat over an expected corpse.

"Ill fares the land to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates and men decay."

The Cæsars saw the spears of their victorious legions flash in the sunlight of every known land, and in their triumphant return they brought with them the accumulated wealth of all the nations they had subdued. The splendor of Imperial Rome outshone the world, but the wealth thus obtained without value given undermined the Empire, and the glory of Rome is simply a memory. Napoleon beheld the shining star of destiny; and then? Does human nature change through the centuries? We stand to-day facing the temptation which comes from the possibility of rapidly accumulated wealth. What right have we to anticipate that the same result will not follow if we pursue the same course of taking what we have not fully earned?

The problem we have sought to work out in this nation is that of government of and by and for the people. A great nation under that principle seems possible only under a Federal system, a system which relegates all matter of local interest to the several States and exercises through the National Government only those powers and functions which make for the general welfare. We have wonderfully prospered in administering such system in a compact, continental territory, each part of which has been possessed and controlled by a race capable of self-government.

This is no trifling question, and is not answered by any gush about duty and destiny. We are not the victims, but the masters of fate, and to attempt to unload upon the Almighty responsibility for that which we chose to do is not only an insult to Him, but to ordinary human intelligence.

We are told that we have become so great and powerful that the world needs us; but what the world most needs is not the touch of our power, but the blessings of our example. It needs the bright example of a free people

not disturbed by any illusions of territorial acquisition, of pecuniary gain, or military glory, but content with their possessions and striving through all the abilities, activities, and industries of their wisest and most earnest to make the life of each individual citizen happier, better, and more content.

Two visions rise before me:

One of a nation growing in population, riches, and strength; reaching out the strong hand to bring within its dominion weaker and distant races; holding them by force for the rapid wealth they may bring—with perhaps the occasional glory, success, and sacrifice of war; a wondrously luxurious life into which the fortunate few shall enter; an accumulation of magnificence which for a term will charm and dazzle, and then the shadow of the awful question whether human nature has changed, and the old law that history repeats itself has lost its force, whether the ascending splendor of imperial power is to be followed by the descending gloom of luxury, decay, and ruin.

The other of a nation where the spirit of the Pilgrim and the Huguenot remains the living and controlling force, affirming that the Declaration of Independence, the Farewell Address of the Father of His Country, and the Monroe doctrine shall ever pass into innocuous desuetude, devoting its energies to the development of the inexhaustible resources of its great continental territory; solving the problem of universal personal and political liberty, of a government by the consent of the governed, where no king, no class, and no race rules, but each individual has equal voice and power in the control of all; where wealth comes only as the compensation for honest toil of hand or brain; where public service is private duty; a nation whose supreme value to the world lies not in its power, but in its unfailing loyalty to the high ideals of its youth, its forever lifting its strong hand, not to govern, but only to protect the weak; and thus the bright shining which brightens more and more in the fadeless eternal day.

A government under a republican constitution and an imperial flag can only last until the courts are given an opportunity to bring the flag back to the Constitution. When this is done, and it will undoubtedly be done, the Porto Rican complications will be exceeding interesting. We have provided a government in Porto Rico with unlimited powers of taxation and expenditure, accountable to no one, and we have installed that government with great pomp and ceremony, with a tremendous display which was greeted by the Porto Ricans with silence and sorrow. When it is discovered that the law is unconstitutional, the taxes must be refunded, and the contracts made by the government are without binding force, then we will be the laughingstock of the civilized world. This is the condition in which we have been placed by an Administration which has tried to govern a republic on the continent and several petty empires in the Atlantic and Pacific oceans.

This game of imperialism has already cost a vast sum of money, and will continue to cost vast sums until the game is stopped by the courts. There will then be a deficiency bill which will run into the millions, and the surplus will be largely reduced. We will be called upon to pass a deficiency bill for Porto Rico, a deficiency bill for Cuba, and a deficiency bill for the Philippines.

I believe in the exercise of a proper charity, and it should begin at home.

We voted recently one sum of $2,000,000 for the "storm-swept, poverty-stricken" Porto Ricans. But if charity requires the expenditure of $2,000,000 in one island, what will it also require in the twelve hundred or more unnumbered islands of the Philippines? Verily we have an elephant on our hands.

England once had a South Sea bubble, and the bursting of that bubble will never be forgotten in English history. The United States now has a South Sea bubble, and the South Sea bubble shows signs of collapse. With it will collapse the entire fabric which has been built up during this Administration. The first thing the Administration did was to secure the passage of a tariff law which would protect the trusts and only the trusts. Every protected article was then made the basis for a trust.

This concentrated the industrial and commercial interests of the country and gave complete control of these great interests to a favored few. They then passed a financial bill which concentrated the finances of the country in the hands of the favored few who controlled the industries and the commerce. They then passed the Porto Rican bill, which concentrated all governmental interests in the new possession of the United States into the hands of those same men who controlled the finances and the industries of the country. It looked then as though the governmental aristocracy sought by the Republicans ever since the days of Alexander Hamilton was an accomplished fact. But in their greed to be rich the trusts overreached themselves, and disintegration has already set in along commercial and industrial lines.

The bankers overreached themselves, and money is a drug in the banks, because no man deems it safe to invest. They overreached themselves in the new possessions, and by reason of premature larceny upon a large scale, the control of those possessions is no longer the source of profit that it was, and there is no doubt that the favored few will lose their control of the government in the islands. The aristocracy which was built up is already beginning to topple. The entire governmental fabric designed and carried out by the Republicans bids fair to be torn down.

The people are awakening to the fact that these trusts have destroyed individual competition, and the people no longer accept them as legitimate business enterprises. The Republican party can not arrest the progress of the events which are destined to destroy the trusts. And with the trusts destroyed, the system of an aristocratic, imperialistic government will be impossible.

The Travelers' Protective Association recently had this subject under consideration. The report of the legislative committee was devoted largely to trusts and their evil effect upon trade. Concerning trusts, the report, which was unanimously adopted, says, in part:

The dark clouds of monopolies and trusts still hover over us, and since our last convention many commercial travelers have lost their positions. And, to use the language of an authorized agent of trusts, 350,000 commercial travelers have been thrown out of employment by the concentration of mercantile and commercial industries in the trust. Three million dollars daily are thus saved to the trusts by the consequent withholding of advertising patronage from country newspapers; in other words, the trusts, in these two items alone, save to themselves $6,000,000 daily.

All legislation now seems to be in the interest of the few. By the passage of the bill making gold alone the standard of value, and by which all contracts are specifically made payable in gold, and also by which the volume of our currency is absolutely under the control of the national banks, it is apparent that the settled policy of the Republican party will be subserviency to the money powers.

The policy of that party is also committed to the creation of a large standing army, and so long as power remains in the hands of that party there will be militarism.

That party is committed to the policy of reaching out for new possessions out of which to create colonies or empires to be controlled and governed by military law and subjugated by military rule, thus making the worst form of imperialism.

In mitigation for their offense they say that trade follows the flag and that we will open the door and obtain the trade of China, Japan, of the Orient. We have expended $100,000,000, to say nothing of the loss of life and of suffering, in order to secure trade amounting to less than $5,000,000 annually.

The people can not be deceived by protestations of prosperity or by figures which show vast investments in watered stocks and increases in exports of farm products to famine-stricken countries. The people will not close their eyes much longer to the vast increase in governmental expenditures without any corresponding increase in governmental benefits. The American people are patriotic. In times of necessity they object to no burden, however great. They did not object to the raising of sufficient revenue to carry on the war with Spain. They were proud of the American soldiers and sailors during the progress of that war.

But when that war ended and victory had perched upon our banners, they believed, and they had a right to believe, that the excessive expenditures would cease and the burdensome taxes would be removed. But those expenditures have increased and not diminished, those taxes still continue and are more onerous than they were before, because one by one the corporations have discovered methods by which they can escape all taxation and throw the entire burdens upon those who are least able to bear them.

The appropriation bills already passed by this Congress have been very large and give evidence that the expenditures of Government are to be still further increased, and now comes a bill which shows that these former bills, large though they were, will not appropriate sufficient funds to satisfy the purposes of the Government officials. [Applause.]

Nicaragua Canal.

SPEECH

OF

HON. DORSEY W. SHACKLEFORD,

OF MISSOURI,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, May 1, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 2538) to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans—

Mr. SHACKLEFORD said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have listened attentively to the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN]. I always listen to him with attention. His ability, his lucidity of statement, his earnestness and directness command attention. I have heard him discuss this subject before, in committee as well as in private conversation, and everywhere his utterances have given evidence of far-seeing statesmanship, lofty patriotism, and ardent devotion to the fundamental principle of American independence. Even now, as I love my country, I wish he were Secretary of State. Then we would have assurance that "God Save the Queen" should have to give place to "The Star-Spangled Banner" as our national song. But the gentleman's strong Americanism is not in accord with the sentiment of those who control his party, and I fear that he is too

credulous when he accepts the amendments proposed by the majority of the committee. I am apprehensive that these amendments are made for the purpose of reconciling the bill to a policy of joint British and American control.

I am as much in favor of the construction of the canal as is the gentleman from Iowa. I believe that such a canal, owned and controlled by us, would be a great stimulus to our trade and shipping—that it would open up to us new markets. I also believe that such a canal would be a powerful adjunct to our Navy should misfortune ever involve us in war with any of the great maritime powers. Lake Nicaragua would afford us a land-locked harbor impregnable to attack by any navy in the world.

I am in favor of the route named in this bill—not that some other might not be as good or even better, but because competent engineers have declared this feasible, and any feasible route is better than none. It can never be known that any route is the best. All that can be required is that any proposed route shall be practicable. We have the highest scientific testimony in favor of the practicability of this, and it should be adopted without waiting to make further examinations.

But, Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the great necessity for the consummation of this enterprise—notwithstanding the immense stimulus it would give to American commerce—there is one subject that lies still closer to the American heart than the construction of this or any other canal—that is the perpetuity of this Republic, which can be secured only by a firm adherence to the Monroe doctrine. Some seem to look upon the Monroe doctrine as a mere catchpenny to be inserted in political platforms with which to allure voters at the ensuing election. Others regard it as some vague principle of morals which we propose in behalf of our sister republics, but too indefinite and unimportant for us to seek to enforce. These are misconceptions. There is to us no principle more definite or more important than the Monroe doctrine. When a proposition to assert it was submitted by President Monroe to Mr. Jefferson for his advice, he said:

> The question presented is the most momentous which has ever been offered to my contemplation since that of independence. That made us a nation; this sets our compass and points the course which we are to steer through the ocean of time opening on us.

While this cardinal American principle is called the "Monroe doctrine," its conception is probably due to John Quincy Adams and its definite statement to Mr. Jefferson. Mr. Adams took the initiative. His position was that our safety, not our desire to enforce morals, not our disposition to lend a helping hand to neighboring republics, but our safety required that the management of the affairs of the American Continent should be left to American hands. His words were:

> It is not imaginable that in the present condition of the world any European nation should entertain the project of settling a colony on the northwest coast of America. That the United States should form establishments there with views of absolute territorial right and inland communication is not only to be expected but is pointed out by the finger of nature, and has been for years a subject of serious deliberation in Congress. A plan has for several sessions been before them for establishing a Territorial government on the borders of the Columbia River. It will undoubtedly be resumed at their next session, and even if then again postponed there can not be a doubt that in the course of a very few years it must be carried into effect.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> The application of colonial principles of exclusion, therefore, can not be admitted by the United States as lawful on any part of the northwest coast of America, or as belonging to any European nation. Their own (the United States) settlements there, when organized as Territorial governments, will be adapted to the freedom of their own institutions, and, as constituent parts of the Union, be subject to the principles and provisions of their own Constitution.

Mr. TERRY. That sounds very much like the "Constitution following the flag."

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Yes, sir; very much like it, though I was citing the paragraph to show Mr. Adams's view of the Monroe doctrine.

It remained, however, for the masterful genius of Mr. Jefferson to give to the Monroe doctrine its most perfect statement, which he did in a letter to Mr. Monroe in the following graphic language:

> Our first and fundamental maxim should be, never to entangle ourselves in the broils of Europe. Our second, never to suffer Europe to intermeddle with cis-Atlantic affairs. America, North and South, has a set of interests distinct from those of Europe, and peculiarly her own. She should, therefore, have a system of her own, separate and apart from that of Europe.

This, then, is the Monroe doctrine as formulated and enforced by the fathers of the Republic to secure the perpetuity of our independence, and no considerations of whatever weight should be sufficient to swerve us from its most rigid enforcement. It is the only policy which can save us from European encroachment.

But since our war with Spain the party in power has abandoned the Monroe doctrine. Republicans tell us that we must join the sisterhood of nations if we expect our share of the world's trade; that if we would enter the race for the world's commerce, we must take part in the affairs and intrigues of the world—that we must become a world power.

Mr. Chairman, we were already a world power long before the war with Spain. We became a world power when our Revolutionary fathers threw off the British yoke, and long before Dewey sailed his gallant fleet into Manila Bay we had become the strongest and most glorious world power under the sun. We attained to that high distinction by adhering to the Monroe doctrine. Diplomacy and international intrigue have no place in the affairs of a republic. We are told that we should not have won in our late struggle with that little tenth-rate power, Spain, but for the moral support given us by Great Britain. At the very moment our guns began battering against the iron sides of the Spanish navy English diplomats began to "jolly" us with the idea that we should become one of the imperial powers of the world; that we should lay aside our Monroe doctrine and engage at common purposes with "our cousins," the English, in extending our commerce by enslaving the weak people of the earth.

Lord Beresford was taken out of the British navy and sent through this country on a lecturing tour to cultivate our people into the belief that our future prosperity depended on our joining England to control the Orient. Though deceptive, it was illusory, and the idea found lodgment with many. The Administration and its coadjutors entered a coalition with the British ministry on the basis that each country was to have the moral support of the other, and that while the United States enslaved the Filipino Great Britain should subjugate the South African Republics. Our Republican friends tell us that our obligations to Great Britain for assisting us to conquer Spain entitle her to the everlasting gratitude of the American people. I dare say, Mr. Chairman, that any assistance which England may have given us in our contest with Spain has been far outweighed by our assistance in the way of moral support given her in her war against the Boers. It matters not at which end of the Capitol a resolution of sympathy for the South African Dutch is introduced, the Republican majority sends it to a committee, where it will be pigeonholed and never reported. The Republican majority will not allow us to express our sympathy for these Republics in their struggle against our monarchical ally. It will be a great diplomatic victory for Great Britain if she shall succeed in tempting us out of our isolation into the intrigues and broils of Europe.

Mr. Chairman, the traditional competitor and foe of the United States is Great Britain. From the day we gained our independence down to this hour, without one moment's intermission, she has been our relentless antagonist. No sooner had we consummated the Louisiana purchase than she began to encroach on our northwest boundary. She asserted her claim to all territory lying north of California. A long diplomatic contest ensued in which, as usual, she was successful, and we lost all that territory lying between the mouth of the Columbia River and Alaska—a vast empire in itself—and to-day at the mouth of the Columbia River England testifies her love for her American cousins by a frowning fortress, from which every gun points toward us.

Having thus gotten more than half our Oregon territory by a diplomatic steal, she moved down onto our southern boundary and commenced to appropriate to herself American territory. She seized Bay Islands, part of Honduras, and the Mosquito coast in Central America. We were not at that time in a position to offer resistance, although the seizing of this territory was a violation of the Monroe doctrine, so we resorted again to diplomacy, and the result was the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. By the terms of this treaty Great Britain was bound not to exercise sovereignty over any part of Central America, yet she steadily extended her sovereignty and built up subject colonies in clear violation of the terms of that compact, and on that very territory over which she agreed not to exercise sovereignty she keeps shotted cannon to maintain the cordial relations existing between the "Anglo-Saxon cousins."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. A sort of jug-handle business.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Yes; it is always a jug-handle business between us and Great Britain. England is our arch enemy and always has been. At this moment she is as hostile to us as she is toward the Boers. She never asserted sovereignty over that country till opportunity ripened and gave her power to carry into effect that which she had all the time intended. The Spanish-American war made it possible. Our moral support was sufficient to keep other countries neutral. She is now destroying those little Republics, and if opportunity offered, she would even more eagerly destroy ours. She has her eyes upon this continent, and her thirst for empire here is as burning as for it elsewhere. When we were in the throes of the civil war and the bonds of this glorious Union were threatened, Great Britain was first to give recognition to the Southern Confederacy. It was Great Britain that tried to steal part of our Alaskan territory. It was Great Britain that violated the Monroe doctrine in an attempt to steal part of the territory of Venezuela. The first assertion of the Monroe doctrine was against Russia, and the Muscovite heeded it. From that day to this she has never offered to violate it. We asserted it against France, Italy, and Austria. They acquiesced and have respected it ever since.

Now that we would build this great canal, what nation interferes? Russia, France, Germany—all the world refrains from meddling save our "English-speaking cousin," the Briton. He of all the world is the only one who interferes with this great enterprise which is so involved with our interests. England demands that we shall not build the canal unless she shall have joint interest with us. She demands that the canal shall not be fortified. What does that mean? It means that Great Britain knows that her superior naval strength would enable her to take possession of an unfortified canal whenever it should be to her interest to do it. So, if we should enact this bill in its present form, we should present the sorry spectacle of spending $150,000,000 to construct a canal which would be a great aid to the military operations of a nation which has always shown a hostile disposition toward us.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will you allow me to ask you a question for information?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. How does it happen that this bill was changed by striking out the words "defend" and "fortification?"

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. It is an attempt to reconcile the language of this bill with the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, pending for ratification in the other end of the Capitol. "Defend" is one of those expressive terms which means the application of force against aggression. They have stricken out "fortification" and inserted "provisions for protection." What provisions? Reliance on our good cousin Victoria to defend it for us? It might be protected by a treaty of neutrality. The changes in the bill are attempts to enable diplomats to say that it was intended to conform to the Clayton-Bulwer and Hay-Pauncefote treaties.

We are told there is no need to fortify the canal, that Great Britain is our friend and that we may trust her to live up to neutrality treaties.

Mr. Chairman, we may trust Russia, we may trust France, we may trust Germany, we may trust any nation on earth to live up to its treaties except that old robber nation, Great Britain. What has there been in her past conduct to warrant any to trust her? It has been the boast of Queen Victoria and her glorifiers that prior to the struggle with the Boers she had not in all her long reign signed a declaration of war. True, she may not have signed any declaration of war, but where is the continent or island in the sea that has not been drenched with blood during her unholy reign in attempts of that old plunderer to despoil some other country of its possessions. No better analysis of the character of our enemy—for such she is—Great Britain, can be given than the lines of her own son, Henry Labouchere:

WHERE IS THE FLAG OF ENGLAND?

And the winds of the world made answer,
North, South, and East and West;
Wherever there's wealth to covet,
Or land that can be possessed,
Wherever there are savage races
To cozen, coerce, and scare,
You shall find the vaunted ensign,
For the English flag is there.

Aye, it waves o'er the blazing hovels
Whence African victims fly,
To be shot by explosive bullets,
Or to wretchedly starve and die!
And where the beachcomer harries
The isles of the Southern sea,
At the peak of his hellish vessel
'Tis the English flag flies free.

The Maori full oft hath cursed it,
With his bitterest dying breath;
And the Arab hath hissed his hatred
As he spits at its folds in death.
The hapless fellah has feared it
On Tel-el-Kebir's parched plain,
And the Zulu's blood hath stained it
With a deep indelible stain.

It has floated o'er scenes of pillage,
It has flaunted o'er deeds of shame,
It has waved o'er the fell marauder
As he ravished with sword and flame;
It has looked upon ruthless slaughter,
And massacred dire and grim;
It has heard the shrieks of the victims
Drown even the jingo hymn.

Where is the flag of England?
Seek the land where the natives rot,
Where decay and assured extinction
Must soon be the people's lot.
Go, search for the once glad islands,
Where disease and death are rife,
And the greed of a callous commerce
Now fattens on human life!

Where is the flag of England?
Go, sail where rich galleons come
With shoddy and loaded cottons
And beer and bibles and rum.
Go, too, where brute force has triumphed
And hypocrisy makes its lair,
And your question will find its answer,
For the flag of England is there.

That is the true character of the merciless old marauder. She never made a treaty which she kept, nor encountered a people whose rights she respected. Men have been born into the world, lived to ripe old age, died, and gone to judgment since we commenced the agitation of the proposition to construct this canal, and it is now no nearer completion than at the beginning. Why? Simply because England has obstructed us. No country has interfered, save only that which Mr. McKinley calls our friend—our cousin, our Anglo-Saxon kinsman—the British Empire.

For one, Mr. Chairman, I am ready to call a halt. Let us throw aside diplomacy, which is but another name for lying, and state our policy in such plain and emphatic language that all the world will understand our position—that the governments of Europe will not be permitted to intermeddle with American affairs. I am in favor of doing this, too, Mr. Chairman, by and through the representatives of the people, not through professional diplomats, not through Secretaries of State who have been feasted and flattered in the diplomatic circles of the British Government, but through the direct representatives of the people on the floor of this House. England is aggressive, tireless, persistent, and we never have been able to hold our own with her in a diplomatic contest; but, Mr. Chairman, we have beaten her on every battlefield. Then, as true Americans, let us assert the American doctrine that we will not become entangled in any European alliance, and that under no circumstances and under no pretense, no matter what its demands or desires may be, will we allow any European country to intermeddle with American affairs. [Applause.]

Election of Senators by the People.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN H. SMALL,

OF NORTH CAROLINA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, April 12, 1900.

The House having under consideration House joint resolution No. 28, proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing for the election of Senators of the United States—

Mr. SMALL said:

Mr. SPEAKER: The present mode of electing Senators of the United States was the result of a compromise and not entirely satisfactory to anyone at the time of its adoption. It had no friends, and its apologizers only supported it on the ground that it was the best that could be done. It was opposed by the stronger States and by those who favored an aristocratic form of government, while the weaker States and those who opposed the aristocratic form of government wanted the Senators elected by the people. There were two propositions seriously debated by the aristocrats and clung to with considerable tenacity. The one was that the Senate should be the larger body, should be appointed by the President, and the Senators should hold office for life. The other was that the Senate itself should fill the vacancies in that body from a list of names to be presented to the Senate by the House of Representatives or the State legislatures.

Mr. Pinckney, in his draft of a constitution, wanted the House of Representatives to apportion the number of Senators based upon the membership of the different States in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Randolph wanted the Senators elected by the people and the Members of the House by the Senators from persons nominated by the State legislatures.

This precipitated a very warm debate. Mr. Sherman opposed the election by the people, insisting that it ought to be by the State legislatures. The people, he said, should have as little to do with the Government as possible. The people, he said, are ignorant and constantly liable to be misled.

Mr. Gerry also strongly opposed the election by the people, saying: "The evils we experience flow from the excess of democracy. The people do not want virtue, but are the dupes of pretended patriots."

Mr. Madison thought the fabric to be raised would be more stable and durable if it should rest on the solid foundation of the people themselves than if it should stand merely on the pillars of the legislatures. Upon this preliminary vote election by the people carried by a vote of 5 to 2, with 2 States divided. The matter was reconsidered, and Mr. Spaight moved that the Senators should be chosen by the legislatures. Mr. Butler feared taking too much power from the States. Mr. Wilson wanted the Senate elected by the people.

Mr. Reed opposed the election by the legislatures or by the people, wanting the Senators appointed by the President. He said:

Too much attachment is betrayed to State governments. We must look beyond their continuance. A national government must soon, of necessity, swallow them all up.

Mr. Butler made a motion to strike out of the proposed constitution all provision as to State governments, which motion, however, was not voted upon.

The question of electing Senators by legislatures was then defeated by a vote of 8 to 3. The election by the House of Representatives was defeated by a vote of 7 to 3.

After an extended committee conference, where there was a stormy debate, which has never been printed, Mr. Pinckney moved to reconsider the vote upon the question of electing the Senators by the State legislatures. Mr. Dickinson favored the proposition because he wanted the United States Senate to bear as strong a likeness as possible to the English House of Lords. He wanted the Senators chosen by reason of their wealth and rank in life, and believed the legislatures would be more apt to choose men of great wealth and aristocracy than the people would.

Mr. Wilson made a strong argument in favor of the election of the Senators by the people. Mr. Reed offered an amendment that the Senators be appointed by the President of the United States.

Mr. Gerry insisted that the commercial and moneyed interests would be more secure in the hands of the State legislature than of the people at large.

Colonel Mason thought the State legislatures ought to have some means of defending themselves against encroachments of the National Government. This was the prevailing argument, and for the purpose of protecting the States against the Federal Government the amendment requiring the Senators to be elected by the State legislatures was carried unanimously. It therefore appeared in the first report and later in the report of the committee on detail.

In the final debate Colonel Mason stated that under the section the Senate did not represent the people, but the States in their political character.

Mr. Sherman wanted the Senators to vote by States, saying:

> If they vote by States, and each State has an equal vote, there must always be a majority of States as well as a majority of the people on the side of public measures, and the Government will have decision and efficacy.

Gouverneur Morris disapproved of the plan. He said:

> What is to be the check in the Senate? None, unless it be to keep the majority of the people from injuring particular States. But particular States ought to be injured for the sake of a majority of the people in case their conduct should deserve it.

Dr. Franklin made a motion for equal representation in the United States Senate of the States. Gouverneur Morris objected to equal representation upon the ground that the Western Territory would eventually be divided up into States and that unless absolute provision were placed in the Constitution requiring the control of the Senate to remain in the Atlantic States, those States would lose the control. He was opposed to any Senate that would not be controlled forever by the Atlantic coast States.

The question of equal representation of States in the House of Representatives was defeated, but equal representation of the States in the Senate was carried.

The question then came up as to the payment of United States Senators, and the argument was made that as they were the representatives of the States they should be paid by the States. The answer to this was not that they were representatives of the Federal Government, but being given powers to control to some extent the action of the Executive they ought to be paid by the Federal Government because such a plan would be more equal and just.

A careful analysis of the belief of those men who favored the election of Senators by the legislature and the others who favored the election of Senators by the people shows that the men who wanted the bill of rights placed in the Constitution wanted Senators elected by the people, while those who were victorious in shutting the bill of rights out of the original Constitution gained a partial victory in having the Senators elected by the legislatures, but sustained a signal defeat in the equal representation of the States in the upper branch of Congress. When the question was debated in the several States, the objection was raised that the Senators ought to be elected by the people, but when the necessity for a compromise was explained to the State conventions they finally ratified the Constitution as it now reads.

It was asserted and believed that the Federal Government would assert more influence in an election by the people than in an election by a State legislature. The members of the United States Senate were to be removed as far as possible from the influence of the Federal Government. They were representatives of the States, and by States is meant the States in their political character. They were given revision of the Executive appointments upon the theory that the States as well as the people were interested. They were given power to reject treaties with foreign countries upon exactly the same principle. The States, therefore, retained control of foreign affairs by having all treaties submitted to the representatives of the States. And in their representative capacity one State was upon exactly the same footing as another State.

A single vacancy in the United States Senate destroys the fundamental principle upon which the Senate was formed. So far as the constitutional organization of the Senate is concerned, a single vacancy is just as potent in destroying the Senate as a vacancy of half the membership of that body. The suggestion was never made in any of the debates, either in the national convention or the State conventions, that there was any possibility of a legislature which had met failing to elect a United States Senator, and provision was made for vacancies which occurred when legislatures were not in session.

It never occurred to the framers of the Constitution that a vacancy was even a possibility under the provisions of the National Charter. But while there has never been a vacancy in the House of Representatives elected by the people which has not been provided for, vacancies are of frequent occurrence in the Senate. There may be disputes in the House, and frequently are, as to who had been elected; but in such cases there is always a Congressman de facto until the question of who is Congressman de jure is settled. This is not the case in the Senate.

If a legislature fails to elect, as it frequently does, the State is without equal representation in the upper branch of the National Legislature. It is a curious fact that for a number of years past there has not been a Senate which answered the requirements of the United States Constitution in having an equal representation of votes from each of the States.

This is a contingency which was not dreamed of at the time of the adoption of the Constitution; and had it been thought possible, the vote by which the Senators were to be elected by the people when the first vote was taken would have remained unchanged.

Another question which now plays a very prominent part in the choice of United States Senators was not thought of when the Constitution was adopted. The present party system of the United States was not known, and no prophet had arisen who could foretell what the future party organization would be. All who favored the election of Senators by the legislatures did so in order to remove those elections from all partisanship and to keep them absolutely free from the influence of the Federal Government. When the matter was debated in the early days of our country's history the objection was always made that to have the election of Senators placed in the hands of the people would be to invite corruption and Federal influences.

At the present time it is generally understood that frauds are rarely practiced in the election of Representatives, while it is rarely the case that Senatorial elections are free from suspicion. A careful review of the records of the United States Senate shows that fraud has very frequently been charged in the election of Senators. It is true that there has never yet been a United States Senator deprived of his seat in that body by the Senate on the ground of fraud or corruption.

One Senator—Caldwell, of Kansas—resigned, and there is at present a committee report against another Senator which has not yet been disposed of. But no Senator has ever been unseated upon the ground of fraud and corruption. There have been contests involving the question as to which of two bodies constituted the lawful legislature, and Senators have been refused seats on gubernatorial credentials, under appointments. In a large percentage of elections of United States Senators the newspapers who oppose the successful candidate openly charge fraud and bribery. This is sometimes charged by resolutions of the legislatures which elected the Senators.

One instance is known where a majority of the members of the legislature supposed to have elected a Senator protested against his retaining his seat. The United States Senate has succeeded in discovering that fraud existed in several cases and that there was corruption, but they have never yet been able to trace any knowledge of these practices to the man who was benefited by them. It has therefore become practically useless to attempt to rectify fraud or corruption in the election of a United States Senator, and it is not attempted.

In the State of Ohio there have been two Senators who have been charged with corruption by members of the legislature, who made affidavit that they had received the money, and who filed the money with the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections as proof that it had been paid. One of these Senators was exonerated, and the last case the legislature endeavored to make so plain that they passed a resolution setting forth the facts of bribery and transmitting the money to the Senate committee. The Senate committee held that there was not enough evidence to justify an investigation, and they have not investigated it. The money is still held for the benefit of anyone who claims to own it. It is therefore impossible, or nearly so, to prove a case of corruption or bribery, no matter how flagrant it may be.

It is a matter of common report that very large sums are necessary in order to secure an election to the United States Senate in a number of the States. There are a few States in which those elections are usually free from fraud and corruption. But the fact, while not susceptible of proof, has become firmly believed by the majority of American people that an absolutely honest election of a United States Senator is the exception and not the rule. I do not claim this to be true; but I do claim that this

public impression does exist, and while it exists there can not be that respect for the Senate of the United States which is absolutely necessary to the perpetuation of our State and Federal systems in harmony with each other.

Another fact of common notoriety which can be proved is that the election of Senators is not now ever free from Federal influences when the legislature of the State which elects the Senator is controlled by the same party which controls the Federal Administration.

I have in mind a recent election of a Republican United States Senator in a near-by State. There is in that State a Republican judge who has long been a sort of an idol to the people of his party. The legislators when they came to the State capitol were unanimously for this man. When they arrived there a Federal officeholder was the opposing candidate.

He was armed with letters from other Federal officeholders, and telegrams from Washington poured in to all of the legislators. The Federal officeholder was nominated after a hard fight in the caucus, and since that time nearly every one of the Republican legislators has been given a Federal office. The will of the people and the choice of the legislators was frustrated by direct Federal influences. The man whom the people wanted had never been accused of anything which would place a blemish upon his name, and the warmest friend of the man who was elected would not hesitate to acknowledge that the defeated candidate was far the superior of the two men.

It has been demonstrated in many States that the people when they go to the polls vote against fraud and corruption and for the best men for party nominees. A striking illustration of this was furnished lately in a Senatorial contest held at the primaries in a Southern State. One man, backed by wealth and by great political power, with home and foreign corporations doing their utmost to bring about his election, was opposed by a man who had nothing but faithful service and great mental ability to commend him. He had no wealthy friends to put up the money with which to meet financially the fight made against him, and he was poor himself. He thought that his duties required his presence in Washington, and he did not even go to his State in order to repair the fences which the combined wealth of his section was seeking to destroy. If there was a county in that State in which the poor but honest man did not gain a victory that county never has sent and never will send in its returns.

It is not surprising that when the Constitution was adopted the liberty of the people should have been feared. The men of wealth, and they were in those days nearly the only men of education, could not foresee what capacity the people would develop for self-government. Such men as Hamilton, Morris, and Gerry had no confidence in the integrity or ability of the masses. They shut the Bill of Rights out of the original Constitution. If it had not been for Thomas Jefferson, himself one of the landed aristocracy, this country would never have been a Republic in the true sense of that term. The States were afraid and jealous of each other, the Federalists were afraid of the States, and the States themselves were afraid of the Federalists. It was only the strong fear by the States of the Federalists which finally induced them to join together upon terms of equality in adopting the Federal Constitution.

After the Constitution was adopted Thomas Jefferson succeeded in forcing the Bill of Rights into that instrument. It was fortunate that instead of Hamilton, Gerry, and Butler the judiciary was controlled by such men as Madison and Jay, who listened with willing ears to Jefferson. Hamilton had a dream of a strong Senate, a weak House of Representatives, a President who should hold office for life, and eventually the accomplishment of what Reed wanted in the Constitutional Convention, a total elimination of the State governments.

It was a surprise to even the friends of liberty and republican government that the people did so well in the choice of their representatives. The debates in the Constitutional Convention showed a general belief that the States would at times try to encroach upon each other's rights, but no such attempt has ever been made. The State governments have worked in perfect harmony, and the people of the States have shown themselves as capable of self-government as have their representatives in the Federal Government shown themselves to take care of the interests of the nation.

Traveling from one State to another, little if any difference can be discovered in the practical workings of a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Only those men who believed that the people were incapable of self-government favored the election of United States Senators by the State legislatures. In the light of history there can certainly exist no doubt in the mind of any man that the people of the United States are capable of self-government, and that they can vote as intelligently for a Senator of the United States as can a member of a State legislature.

Up to 1892, according to an official list published by the United States Senate, 138 Senators had been appointed by governors. Several such appointments have been made since that time. During the present session California, Utah, Nebraska, Pennsylvania, and Delaware have had but one Senator. Nebraska has during the session filled its vacancy by appointment and California by calling together an extra session of the legislature. Pennsylvania had a claimant for a seat, whose claim has been denied, but Utah and Delaware have but one Senator each and no prospects of these seats being filled until the legislatures of those States shall meet again.

I have searched in vain for any instance of an office to be filled by election by the people being vacant. There may be a contest, but in such event there is no interregnum, or should not be under the Constitution. One or the other will and should hold until the question of legality shall be determined.

The people for twenty years past have demanded that the Senators be elected by popular vote. There has been no partisanship in this demand. Republican and Democratic legislatures have memorialized Congress, and Republican and Democratic members have introduced resolutions calling for this amendment to the United States Constitution. Several of these resolutions have passed Congress, so far as the House of Representatives is concerned, by overwhelming vote. As early as the Forty-eighth Congress, in the first session, there were three resolutions introduced providing for the election of Senators by the people.

In the first session of the Forty-ninth Congress five resolutions were introduced, seven numerously signed petitions were presented as well as a resolution from the New Hampshire legislature in favor of the election of Senators by the people.

In the second session of the Forty-ninth Congress four resolutions were introduced of similar import.

In the first session of the Fiftieth Congress eight resolutions were introduced, ten petitions and resolutions of the legislatures of the States of Oregon and Iowa.

In the second session of the Fiftieth Congress there were three petitions presented.

In the first session of the Fifty-first Congress ten resolutions, twenty petitions, and a petition of the Iowa legislature were presented.

In the second session of the Fifty-first Congress two resolutions, seven petitions and resolutions of the States of Indiana and Idaho were presented.

In the first session of the Fifty-second Congress twenty-five resolutions, fifty petitions and memorials from the Oregon, Wisconsin, and Kentucky legislatures were introduced.

In the second session of the Fifty-second Congress one resolution was presented.

In the first session of the Fifty-third Congress thirteen resolutions and memorials from the Minnesota and Washington legislatures were introduced.

In the second session of the Fifty-third Congress three resolutions and six petitions were presented.

In the third session of the Fifty-third Congress, two resolutions, two petitions, and memorials of the legislatures of Kansas and Minnesota were presented.

In the first session of the Fifty-fourth Congress ten resolutions and memorials of the legislatures of Idaho, Ohio, and Wyoming were presented.

In the second session of the Fifty-fourth Congress two resolutions were presented.

In the first session of the Fifty-fifth Congress six resolutions and memorials of the legislatures of Idaho, Montana, and Utah were presented.

In the second session of the Fifty-fifth Congress two resolutions and a memorial of the legislature of Florida were presented.

In the third session of the Fifty-fifth Congress three resolutions were presented and memorials from the States of Idaho, Minnesota, Nevada, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, and Washington were presented.

In 1891 the Illinois legislature took the initiative in attempting to obtain a vote of the States in order to force Congress to pass this amendment. There has not been a resolution or a petition in favor of holding the present plan.

Senator Mitchell, of Wisconsin, placed this question very clearly and tersely when he said:

> Another strong reason in favor of the change is the fact that after much discussion an enlightened public sentiment demands it. This is not a mere passing craze similar to the humors and whims that at times take possession of certain classes. An educated, enlightened public opinion has taken hold upon the subject, and the demand for the change is loud and emphatic. It is pronounced, earnest, imperative, not only among the individual voters, but the public press of the country, representing all political parties, seems to be almost a unit on the subject. The legislatures of no less than ten States, including those of Indiana, Wisconsin, and Ohio, recently memorialized Congress for change. * * * (See Fiftieth and Fifty-first Congress; also RECORD, April 22, 1890.)

In the House of Representatives at the first session of the Fifty-second Congress no less than 17 different resolutions were presented upon the subject; and at that session, January 16, 1893, one of those resolutions, proposing an amendment to the Constitution, passed the House of Representatives by more than a two-thirds vote; while in the Fifty-third Congress 3 similar amendments were presented in the Senate and 12 in the House by as many

different members; and on July 21, 1894, one of those passed the House, the vote being—yeas 141, nays 50. At the present session of the Senate, after full discussion, the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections reported favorably a joint resolution proposing this amendment.

It has been urged that the governors of States are not as a rule superior men to members of the United States Senate. It is argued from this that the people would not improve the character of the Senate. But it is not a question of whether or not intellectual men are chosen for the Senate, but of how they are chosen and for what purpose. It is a notorious fact that corruption is more apt to exist in Senatorial than in gubernatorial elections. It might be that the people would elect the same men who are elected now. It would certainly be an advantage if they were elected without corruption than for them to be elected by use of unfair and illegal means.

The question of what they are elected for goes to the very fundamental principle of the existence of the Senate. If they are elected by Federal influences, they can not serve the State as the Constitution intended they should. Experience has shown that the present method brings about elections by means of Federal influences. If the same men who are elected now should be elected by the people, instead of under the present system, the change in the Senate would be wonderful. They would then be representatives of the States as the Constitution intended they should be, while they are now subject at any time to a controlling Federal influence. To elect the Senators by the people would be in a great measure to restore the constitutional duality of government in the United States.

It is time that this duality should be restored. The people who wanted the Senators elected by the legislatures or appointed by the President were right when they said that they wanted the State governments eliminated. They did not succeed in destroying the State governments then, but they did succeed in forcing compromises under which the Federal Government would gradually absorb the State government. About the only protection left to the States against this process lies in the United States Senate as the representative of the equality and sovereignty of the States. By means of the Senate the States have the right to pass upon foreign treaties and Presidential appointments. If this right were exercised for the interest of the States, it would be sufficient to perpetuate the relation which ought to exist and which was intended to exist between the State governments and the Federal Government.

But this right is not so exercised; the United States Senate is not controlled by the States; but when the party whip is cracked with orders from the Executive Mansion, the Senators obey the whip and fall into line. This is caused largely by the fact that in too many instances the Federal power secured their election to the Senate, and they are dependent upon the Federal power for the retention of their seats in that body. If they were dependent upon their States for their tenure of office, they would act for the States and guard the interest of the States.

The encroachment of the Federal Government upon the State governments has been so gradual and insidious that it is difficult to point to any specific act which has caused the change from the relationship the States bore to the nation half a century ago. That there has been a change all thinking men must admit. The States to-day are in some respects possessed of less governmental authority than are the municipal governments brought into existence by the legislation of the States. In the case of Railroad Company *vs.* Husen the United States Supreme Court held that the statute of the State of Missouri prohibiting the transportation of Cherokee cattle across the State was unconstitutional as a regulation of commerce, although a city ordinance to the same effect has been upheld as a proper exercise of the police power.

In Chylung *vs.* Freeman the United States Supreme Court held a California statute unconstitutional which prohibited the importation of vicious Chinese. The States have not as wide a police power as have the cities. In no State of the Union can the governor of a State send the State militia to a county without being called upon by the county officials. The Federal Government has asserted its right to send its troops to quell a riot in a State against the protest of the governor who claims that his militia is sufficient. A sheriff of a county has therefore more executive authority over his county than the governor of a State has over his State. Other instances might be given where the State governments have been shorn of their power by the different branches of the Federal Government.

It is not a part of this discussion to consider which of these provisions have been right or what wrong. It must be admitted by everyone that the tendency is toward an increase of power by the Federal Government and a decrease of power in the State government. Even those who favor this tendency, so far as it has gone, must admit that in the last analysis it would destroy the Republic and create an aristocracy. I take it for granted that no member of this House would for one moment consent to this overturning of our governmental system. But it will come so gradually that nothing will occur to sound the note of warning, and almost before we know it the autonomy of the States will be destroyed.

I do not accuse any American of wishing for such a catastrophe. But the one safeguard which can prevent this consummation is tottering. The only check the States have ever had is the United States Senate; and if that becomes a body under Federal control, the States are rendered absolutely powerless. This bill does not ask that the States recover any of their lost ground; it does not place any limitation upon the powers of the Senate. It only asks that the States be allowed to vote upon the question of how the representatives of the States shall be chosen by the States. If the States do not want this change and are satisfied with the present conditions, they will defeat this amendment.

All of the States that have taken action upon the subject say that they do want the change. As it is a change only in the manner of selecting their own representatives, it seems to me that the question should properly be left to the States and that they should be allowed to vote upon the amendment. I can see no reason for opposing the submission of this matter to the votes of the States. If there is no desire upon the part of the Federal Government to usurp the powers of the States, the Federal Government has no interest whatever in the manner the States select for choosing their representatives.

It is to the interest of the Federal Government that good men should be chosen, but as the principal Federal officials are selected by vote of the people, even though through an electoral college, it would be strange if those men should distrust the ability of the people to choose proper representatives. The only logical reason that I can see for the Federal Government opposing this permission to the States of selecting their own method for choosing their own representatives is that it would curtail Federal power and increase State power. If this be true, then the purposes of the Constitution require that the change should be made at once.

The people have spoken from different sections of the country without regard to partisanship. Their voice has been unanimous in favor of the election of United States Senators by the people. Legislatures have memorialized Congress in favor of the change, and the voice of the States so far as heard has been unanimous. Do these States not know the manner in which they wish their Senators elected? Are the people all mistaken upon the same question? Men who represent the States should be selected by the States and in the manner desired by the States.

I am in favor of the substitute rather than the bill reported by the majority of the committee, because I believe that, if the election of Senators is to be restored to the States and exercised through the people of the States, the amendment should be applicable to all the States of the Union. If perchance there should be any one or more States which prefer the present mode of electing their legislatures thereof, then it might well be that this very fact would constitute the strongest reason why the Senators in such States should be elected by the people. In addition it would be incongruous and inconsistent to have Senators elected by one method in part of the States and by another method in other States, and would inevitably lead to confusion and scandal.

As I have heretofore stated, the proposed amendment to the Constitution has passed this House by an overwhelming vote upon several occasions, but it has never yet been adopted by the Senate. What conclusion are we to draw from this situation? It is this: That the House of Representatives is near to the people of the several States, while the Senate is too far removed from the people. This very fact constitutes one of the strongest reasons for the adoption of this amendment. Each of the several States possesses a representative form of government, all of whose powers are derived from the people and exercised by the people.

At present there is scarcely an official in any of the States, who exercises important public functions, who is not elected by a direct vote of the people. As Senators are representatives of the States in Congress, why should not they also be elected by the people of their States? If they were so elected, they would be responsive to public sentiment, and the fact that the majority of the members of that body do not yield to the demands of the people shows that they are indifferent to their wishes.

The fathers of this Republic builded wisely, and while it was not possible for them to foresee every change or anticipate every necessary condition which might arise as they launched the ship of state upon a pathless sea, they did, however, establish the principle that Senators should be representatives of the States in the Federal Congress, and the object of this amendment is to rehabilitate and perpetuate the theory of the framers of the Constitution.

Let us guard the exercise of the franchise; let us educate the children of the Republic for the responsible duty of citizenship, and then let us intrust the people of the States with the responsibility of government and with the election of their Senators to represent such States in the legislative department of the Federal Government. [Applause.]

Civil Code for Alaska.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOSHUA S. SALMON,

OF NEW JERSEY,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, May 17, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (S. 3419) making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes—

Mr. SALMON said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: In the discussion of this measure there is one portion of it to which I desire to call the attention of the House, and that is that portion which claims to form for the Territory of Alaska a government. I believe that our Territories should all have a Territorial form of government and that as soon as the populations of the Territories are sufficient, they should be formed, organized into, and admitted as States into the Union.

I am stronger of that belief than I have been heretofore because of the sentiment which has been advanced here upon this floor during the present session of Congress—a sentiment that I believe to be too preposterous to be held by any lover of constitutional government. It is that sentiment which holds that this Congress may legislate for the people of the Territories unrestricted and unlimited by the Constitution, and limited only by its own conscience. I do not hold to that view and construction of the Constitution, and I am strongly opposed to that construction.

If you read the discussions which took place during the framing of the Constitution, you will see all through them that it was proposed to legislate not only for the thirteen States that were then organized but for the Territories outside of the limits of those States. In the report of the subcommittee of that convention that presented articles of Constitution for consideration you will find this language:

> New States lawfully constituted or established within the limit of the United States may be admitted by the Legislature into this Government, but to such admission the consent of two-thirds of the members present in each House shall be necessary. If the new States are raised within the limit of the present States, the consent of the legislatures of those States shall be also necessary to its admission. If the admission be consented to, the new State shall be admitted on the same terms with the original States, but the Legislature may make conditions with the new States concerning the public debt which shall then be subsisting.

The words "limit of the United States" and the words "limit of the present States" mark two different boundaries.

This was the language submitted for consideration, and while the language in our Constitution varies a little, it does not take from it the sense in which the term "United States" was used.

The language finally adopted, and which is found in section 3 of Article IV of the Constitution, is as follows:

> New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the consent of the legislatures of the States concerned as well as of the Congress.

This language indicates that the formation or erection of States was to be from other States or parts thereof, but that the admission of States to this Union was to be from territory outside the limits of the organized States. You will see by the very language used here that the term "United States" was intended to take in territory outside of the organized States. From that time on it has always been understood that the term "United States" included the entire domain of this Republic and was not confined to the territorial limits of the organized States.

Not until this Congress advanced the contrary idea was there a different understanding of that name when used to designate our country. And for what purpose was that construction advanced? It was advanced to meet a proposition; it was advanced to meet the conditions that have arisen with reference to the Philippine Islands, not with reference to Porto Rico, as that had no force in the consideration of the question.

The strong discussion on the Porto Rican bill arose partly from the carpetbag form of government which the bill provided for the people of Porto Rico, but principally from the imposition of the tax on products of that island brought to the States and upon products of the States taken to Porto Rico in violation, as is claimed by this side of the House, of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution, which says:

> The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

The bill as originally prepared and introduced contained no such obnoxious provision. It was prepared evidently with respect for the provision of the Constitution which I have recited as the same was interpreted by the President when he wrote his message to this Congress, in which he said, in speaking of the laws necessary to be passed for Porto Rico, that "our plain duty is to abolish all customs tariffs between the United States and Porto Rico and give her products free access to our markets." It was afterwards that the bill was changed and this provision for tariff duties was inserted. The rate first fixed upon was 25 per cent of the Dingley rates, and the bill was afterwards amended, making the rate 15 per cent of the Dingley tariff.

If we consider this provision only with reference to the burden imposed upon the Porto Rican people, the reduction of the rate must be admitted to be the more generous, but the principle remains the same, and it is the principle in this case that is odious rather than the amount of the burden. It was not a necessity that this 15 per cent tariff should be added there. It was only to prepare the way for the legislation that is anticipated for the Philippine Islands. I maintain, Mr. Chairman, that if we can not control the territory the annexation of which we have in view without violating the Constitution we should not hold that territory. If we must dispense with one or the other, I say hold to the Constitution and dispense with those islands.

It is our Constitution, with its benign obligations and restrictions, that makes us proud of our country. The sun may shine as brightly, the air may be as balmy, and the soil may yield as bountifully in other lands as in our own; but with the immortal Declaration of Independence as the proclaimer of our principles and our Constitution as the Magna Charta of our liberties, there is no land on all of God's earth where brightness is so bright or beauty is so beautiful as in our own America. Destroy these and the gloom of discouragement and decay will settle over our land, the pride of our millions will change to chagrin, and the courage, independence, and progressiveness of our people will be turned to subserviency and indifference.

In the third section of Article IV of the Constitution we find this language:

> The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States or of any particular State.

It seems that it is upon this clause that the preposterous doctrine I am now combating is based. I hold, Mr. Chairman, that the language I have just read, properly construed, does not refer to the people of a Territory, but only to the property of the United States in that Territory; that Congress may make such needful rules and regulations for the disposition of that property as it sees fit and as has been customary to do in all times past. You can not properly construe this language unless you pay due regard to the words "or other property," showing by the words themselves and the connection in which they are used that territory was referred to as property of the United States and not as a community of people to be governed by law. The limitations of the Constitution do not apply to the manner or the quantity or the terms upon which property of the United States, whether territory or other, may be disposed of or regulated.

The limitations and restrictions contained in the Constitution all pertain to the rights or liberties of the people. The power given to Congress to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises affects the rights and liberties of the people and, therefore, the restriction that all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform; the power to establish a rule of naturalization and laws of bankruptcy affects the rights of the people; therefore the restriction that they must be uniform.

That word "uniform," so liberally used by the framers of the Constitution, shows that their motto was "Equal rights to all; special privileges to none," a motto so wantonly dragged in the dust in these times of high civilization when selfishness is more indulged and cultivated than any other human trait.

The restrictions found in section 9 of Article I of the Constitution are that—

> The privilege of the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended, etc.;
> No bill of attainder or ex post facto law shall be passed;
> No capitation, or other direct, tax shall be laid, unless in proportion to the census or enumeration hereinbefore directed to be taken;
> No tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any State;
> No preference shall be given by any regulation of commerce or revenue to the ports of one State over those of another;
> No title of nobility shall be granted by the United States.

All these pertain to the rights or liberties of the people and are restrictions upon the Congress in legislating for the people. There are other restrictions upon the powers of the States to legislate, but the restrictions I have mentioned limit both national and State legislation.

The words "States now existing" in the first clause of section 9, Article I, and the words "territory or other property belonging to the United States" in the second clause of section 3, Article IV of the Constitution, which I have quoted, show clearly that the framers of the Constitution contemplated the existence of territory belonging to the United States and the forming of new States

therefrom. Can it be presumed that they overlooked the necessity of some legislation which must be enacted by Congress for the territory until it should be sufficiently populated to be formed into States and admitted into the Union? That would be underestimating the great talent in that convention. The State governments were confined to the territorial limits of their respective State and the National Government was coextensive with the entire country, both States and Territories; and until the territory was formed into States the burden of legislating for it devolved upon Congress.

In the case of American Insurance Company *vs.* Canter (1 Peters, United States Supreme Court Reports, page 511) Chief Justice Marshall, in delivering the opinion of the court, says:

> Perhaps the power of governing a territory belonging to the United States which has not, by becoming a State, acquired the means of self-government may result necessarily from the facts that it is not within the jurisdiction of any particular State and is within the power and jurisdiction of the United States. The right to govern may be the inevitable consequence of the right to acquire territory. Whichever may be the source whence the power is derived, the possession of it is unquestionable.

There is no question as to the right and power of Congress to enact such legislation as may be needed by the people of our Territories until they are prepared to be admitted as States, but Congress must always observe and be limited by the Constitution whether legislating for the people of the States or of the Territories. No proposition is clearer to my mind than this, and to contend otherwise is showing little regard for the Constitution and little love for constitutional government. To contend that Congress can legislate for United States territory or territory belonging to the United States, unlimited and unrestricted by the Constitution, is to favor imperialism indeed. Republican members of this House—not all of them, thank Providence—contend that Congress in legislating for our Territories is limited only by the conscience of its members; that the Constitution has no power over such legislation.

What can be more imperialistic than such a sentiment? We see illustrations of that principle in the mob that drags its pleading and possibly innocent victim to the selected tree and hangs him regardless of his appeals and his rights; we see that principle exhibited in the imprisonment of men in the Cœur d'Alene bull pen in Idaho for no crime other than that they ask to work; it it was in obedience to that principle that England placed burdens upon our forefathers that they could not bear and which gave rise to the sentiment: "Give me liberty or give me death." It was that principle and that alone against which our fathers rebelled, and it was to rid themselves of a government which was limited only by the consciences of the King and Parliament of England.

It is a greater reflection upon our own intelligence than upon theirs to contend that those able men, fresh from the hardships and terrors of a seven years' war, waged for no other cause than that the King and legislative power of England, unlimited and unrestricted, except by their own consciences, imposed upon the people of this country burdens and abuses which they could no longer endure, should inadvertently or intentionally provide for the same diabolical uses to be imposed by Congress upon the people of our Territories. Such a contention, Mr. Chairman, certainly can have but few real adherents.

It must be remembered that there were men in the convention that framed our Constitution who were opposed to the theory of a national government composed of a multiplicity of States, with each State having sovereign authority to govern within its own territorial limits, and who insisted that there should be one general government over the entire country; and this view of government was not ignored in the final construction of the Constitution. Alexander Hamilton, who was undoubtedly as anxious to establish a government that would secure to the people the greatest amount of liberty and equality as any of them, was the most strenuous advocate of the theory of centralized government. In the paper setting forth his propositions for constitutional provisions which he submitted to the convention not one of the limitations or restrictions on the National Legislature which I have mentioned and which are contained in the Constitution is suggested. In Madison's report of the debates which took place in the convention, with reference to Hamilton, he says:

> The extent of the country to be governed discouraged him. The expense of a general government was also formidable, unless there were such a diminution of expense on the side of the State governments as the case would admit. If they were extinguished, he was persuaded that great economy might be obtained by substituting a general government. He did not mean, however, to shock the public opinion by proposing such a measure. * * * This view of the subject almost led him to despair that a republican government could be established over so great an extent. He was sensible at the same time that it would be unwise to propose one of any other form. In his private opinion he had no scruple in declaring, supported as he was by the opinion of so many of the wise and good, that the British Government was the best in the world and that he doubted much whether anything short of it would do in America.

While Hamilton held these views as to a centralized government being better and stronger, he recognized the fact that it was useless to urge the adoption of such a government, taking England as a model, and said he did not mean, however, to shock the public opinion by proposing such a measure.

The people of this country had had enough of government limited and restricted only by the discretion or conscience of the legislative and executive authorities, and they were wholly determined to place upon these agencies of government such limitations and restraints as would best secure to the people equal rights and the greatest freedom.

The Declaration of Independence sets forth the evils and abuses that may be imposed by government unrestricted by constitutional limitations. The people of these colonies had felt the tortures of these abuses and were forming a government where such abuses could not be possible. They had just before declared to the world that they held these truths to be self-evident:

> That all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

These were truths never recognized by the British Government and not regarded by that Government to-day. And yet there are men in this Congress who laud that Government, with all its unlimited and tyrannical power exercised in the destruction of free government and the subjugation of independent peoples.

Let others think as they will, I do not believe that any man who holds to such views has any love for constitutional government or a decent regard for the rights of others.

If all men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with the rights to life, liberty, and the pursuits of happiness, then the Porto Ricans, the Filipinos, the Irish, and the Boers are as much entitled to those blessings as ourselves; and our Constitution was framed to secure to all who come under the broad mantle of our Government the equal protection of these sacred rights.

As I have before said, Mr. Chairman, the providing of revenues for Porto Rico was only a pretext for the adoption of this monstrous doctrine that Congress can legislate for territory of the United States outside the limits of the organized States without regard for the limitations or restrictions contained in our Constitution, and limited only by the consciences of its members.

The straits in which we are placed in order to hold the Philippine Islands have given rise to these strange notions of our Constitution. The mercenary incentive to hold and spoliate those islands has driven men to contemn and argue away the Constitution and set up the hypocritical cant that the conscience of the American people, and especially the Anglo-Saxon portion of it, will not permit injustice to be done. In other words, "that the King can do no wrong;" that if we give back to the people a good portion of what we take from them they have no cause to complain. What is liberty? What is freedom? Is it that I may do as I please and you do as I direct? That is the doctrine of the British Government and that seems to be the kind of freedom favored by members of this House.

I have confined myself, Mr. Chairman, to combating the principle that has been expressed and acted upon by this Congress in legislating for our territory, that in enacting such legislation Congress is not governed by the Constitution and need not regard its limitations or restrictions; and if I have failed to show the error of that sentiment, it is because I have been unable to set forth the reasons for the faith that is within me.

I believe we should give to Alaska a Territorial government framed under our Constitution and regardful of every provision, limitation, and restriction therein contained. [Loud applause.]

Bimetallism, and Why the United States Can Establish the Same at the Ratio of 16 to 1.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHAFROTH,

OF COLORADO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, March 13, 1900.

The House having under consideration the conference report upon H. R. 1, entitled "A bill to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes"—

Mr. SHAFROTH said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I will not attempt to discuss the details of the bill agreed upon by the conferees, as my objection to it is fundamental.

According to my ideas, the bill is based upon an entirely erroneous theory of finance. It is predicated upon the proposition, that we should diminish the foundation upon which all paper money and credits rest, and increase the superstructure resting upon that foundation. In other words, it diminishes the foundation of gold and silver to gold alone as redemption money, and at the same time, it provides for an increase in the superstructure, by the issuance of credit money, in the shape of bank notes, all of which become redeemable ultimately in gold alone by the Government.

The difficulties of nations, in matters of finance, as with individuals, arise from assuming too many obligations. After credits are extended too much, there must come a day of liquidation.

While they are being extended every industry and business thrives, but when redemptions are demanded the most severe depression and panics occur. Such a system of currency can not be sound or safe. It may work smoothly for a while, and it may even increase prices for a time, but when the day of liquidation comes, the magnitude of the disaster is bound to be in the exact proportion of the credits extended.

A properly drawn financial measure, in my judgment, should be framed upon the reverse of that policy; it should broaden and enlarge the base upon which credits are built. Instead of treating silver as token money, which at the pleasure of the Secretary of the Treasury is redeemable in gold, it should make it basic money in the same way that France to-day makes it basic money. By so doing, the base upon which we build the superstructure of credit is enlarged, and consequently we make a safer system, one which would produce greater certainty of prosperity and less danger of financial panics.

Mr. FOWLER. Would you be in favor of substituting gold and silver for the use of checks?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Certainly not.

Mr. FOWLER. That is your credit money.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, no.

Mr. FOWLER. Ninety-nine per cent of all credits in the world are in checks, drafts, and bills of exchange.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, that is not true at all, and I can demonstrate it to you in a minute. You take the clearing-house reports of the city of New York, and they show that 95 per cent of the business is done in checks, and the balance, 5 per cent, is settled in cash. That is among institutions that are created for the very purpose of saving cash transactions.

It is true that 5 per cent is all that it takes to settle balances among these institutions; but how much must it take in transactions between customers and retail establishments, and among the people? As to the retail transactions, there has been a report made by Mr. Eckels, Comptroller of the Currency. In 1894 he sent to the national banks of the country notices for them to give the amounts in cash and checks deposited in their banks.

The returns from the banks showed that 42 per cent of the commerce of the retail houses in the United States was done in cash and the rest in checks.

Now, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. FOWLER. Just there. You do not mean to say that that was silver and gold?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I mean to say silver, gold, and United States notes. It took 42 per cent in those, and necessarily the balance was in checks and drafts.

Mr. FOWLER. What portion of it was gold and silver? Now, you have just stated to the House that you are in favor of substituting gold and silver, actual coin, for all this credit money.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, the gentleman misunderstands the position I take. I say the ideal monetary system would be gold and silver, if there were enough gold and silver in existence to act as a circulating medium, but there is evidently, as I shall attempt to show, an absolute shortage in the precious metals, and for that reason——

Mr. BELL. When you speak of gold and silver, do you not include silver and gold certificates?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes; the certificates are not credit money; they are representative money. Gold and silver coins are lodged in the Treasury covering them, and consequently they can not be considered as credit money. Credit money is that which is based upon the general credit of the Government or based on the credit of some bank. But I wish to return to the line of my argument.

IS THE SILVER QUESTION SETTLED?

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans, by the enactment of this legislation, profess to believe that they have settled the silver question. It is true, they have done their utmost to debase one of the precious metals of the world, and one that is the product of our own country. But, sir, they have not destroyed it, and nothing but its total annihilation as money can prevent the recurring agitation of this question.

As long as there are creditors and debtors in the world; as long as it is a recognized principle of political economy, that the quantity of basic money affects prices of all commodities and property, just so long will the financial question remain a vital issue in American politics.

Sir, there is still in the world nearly $4,000,000,000 of silver acting as basic money, and relieving the strain on gold. The gold standard of value can not be attained until all that money is annihilated. The existence of that silver money as surely affects the value of gold, as the existence of corn affects the value of wheat, and the existence of beef affects the value of pork.

No nation on the face of the globe except the United States by this measure has authorized its Treasury officers in their discretion to redeem its silver money in gold. No nation except Great Britain and its colony Canada has the pure gold standard. Every other nation on earth has a legal-tender silver coin, which acts as its own redeemer.

I recognize that in order to attain the gold standard of value, it will not only be essential to redeem silver money in gold, but it will be necessary to destroy silver as a money metal.

The next financial legislation, therefore, that will be attempted by the capitalistic class will be the total annihilation of silver as money. It again will cause a conflict between the creditor, who desires to remove the cheapening effect upon gold by the existence of silver money, and the debtor, whose interest it is to retain that effect on gold.

When once the policy of redeeming silver coins in gold is thoroughly established, the creditor will then begin the agitation for the destruction of the full legal-tender silver coins throughout the world. Then a battle will ensue, which will likely last as long and be as fierce, as the one which followed the closing of the mints to silver by our legislation in 1873.

It will be contended, that since the silver is redeemable in gold, it has become simply a promise to pay gold; that as a promise to pay can be printed upon paper by the Government for almost nothing, it is foolish for the Government to have $500,000,000 invested in a currency redeemable in gold.

It will be further contended that as silver coins can be made at less than one-half the par value of the same, it is dangerous to have a circulating medium which can be so perfectly and cheaply counterfeited.

With these arguments they will seek to retire every silver dollar, and then dump them upon the markets of the world for sale as bullion.

This movement to annihilate silver as money is started by this bill, in authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to redeem silver dollars in gold, and when consummated it will produce fearful results and frightful disasters.

By destroying silver as money, you make gold bear all the burdens of commerce and credit, which have been borne by gold and silver together. That, of necessity, other things being equal, will greatly increase the burden upon gold.

Increasing the burden upon gold means increasing the value of gold; and that means increasing the purchasing power of gold. As gold is the material out of which you make your standard money, it means the increase in the value of your standard money. As all your credit money and bonds, promissory notes, and other obligations, public and private, become payable ultimately in standard money, it means the increase in the purchasing power of all such obligations.

The increase of the purchasing power of the dollar, means that more can be bought with it, and that means that the seller of products must yield up more in order to get the dollar. That means he must sell at a less price. If the $4,000,000,000 of silver in the world are to be wiped out and the $4,600,000,000 of gold made to do the work of both moneys, then, according to the principle of supply and demand, there must be a great increase in value of gold. It must be borne in mind, that there are two things that affect prices: First, supply of and demand for each commodity; second, the supply of and demand for that thing which measures all commodities, namely, standard money.

ELEVATION OF PRICES DUE TO INCREASED BASIC MONEY.

It is true there has been increased prices in the last three years caused by the increased production of gold, by Spain removing its demands on gold in going to a silver basis, by Russia opening her war chest of gold, by famines in India and Russia, and by the extraordinary demands made upon products by the Spanish-American and South African wars, but the increase has not been as great as many people claim. It has been principally in articles manufactured by trusts and monopolies. The rise in trust articles is detrimental to the masses instead of a benefit. The Sauerbeck tables are the best index as to the rise of prices. They represent 45 of the principal commodities used by man, which constitute 80 per cent of the world's commerce. I ask to insert those tables in my remarks.

Mr. Sauerbeck's index numbers, to which is added the annual average price of silver in London, and to which is added index numbers of the same forty-five commodities, taking as their base the average prices of 1873, and a table showing the increase of the purchasing power of a dollar, taking the average prices of 1873 as the base.

Year.	Sauerbeck's index numbers of 45 principal commodities, taking average price of 1867–1877 as their base = 100.	Index numbers of same 45 principal commodities, taking the average price of 1873 as their base = 100.	Table showing increase of purchasing power of a dollar, taking the average prices of 1873 as the base = 100.	Sauerbeck's index numbers of silver, taking the price 1867–1877 of 60.84*d.* = 100.	Annual average price of silver in London.
					Pence.
1873	111	100	$1.00	.....	58⅛
1874	102	92	1.09	95.8	56¼
1875	96	86	1.16	93.3	56¼
1876	95	85	1.18	86.7	52¼
1877	94	84	1.19	90.2	54¼
1878	87	78	1.28	86.4	52⅞
1879	83	75	1.33	84.2	51¼
1880	88	79	1.27	85.9	52¼
1881	85	76	1.31	85	51⅛
1882	84	75	1.33	84.9	51⅛
1883	82	74	1.35	83.1	50⅜
1884	76	68	1.47	83.3	50⅛
1885	72	65	1.54	79.9	48⅛
1886	69	62	1.61	74.3	45⅛
1887	68	61	1.64	73	44⅜
1888	70	63	1.59	70.4	42⅝
1889	72	65	1.54	70.2	42⅛
1890	73	65	1.54	78.4	47⅛
1891	72	65	1.54	74.1	45⅛
1892	68	61	1.64	65.4	39⅜
1893	68	61	1.64	58.6	35⅛
1894	63	57	1.75	47.6	28⅝
1895	62	55.8	1.78	49	29⅜
1896	61	54.9	1.82	50.5	30⅜
1897	62	55.8	1.79	45.3	27⅛
1898	64	57.6	1.74	44.3	26⅝
1899	68	61.2	1.63	45.1	27⅛

The tables show that in the past four years there has been an increase of 7 points in the price of the world's staple commodities, but it also shows that the average of those prices is still only 61 per cent of the prices of 1873, when the first movement against silver began.

This upward movement is a clear demonstration of the correctness of the principle contended for by the friends of silver in 1896. We contended that in order to have better times, we must have more basic money. That principle is as true now as it was then. Some more basic money has come through the increased production of gold, and the operation of our laws providing for the free coinage of that metal. It demonstrates our contention, that the fall of prices from 1873 to 1897 was the result of an inadequate supply of basic money, which the free coinage of silver would have supplied. To authorize the free coinage of silver now, would be to add still more basic money to that of the world, and restore the prices of commodities and property to those which existed in 1873.

INCREASED GOLD OUTPUT DOES NOT RELIEVE THE NECESSITY FOR SILVER.

The production of gold for the year 1899, it is true, was nearly as much as the production of both gold and silver for the year 1891, but the man who thinks that fact, does away with the necessity for silver money, confuses the annual production of gold with the world's stock of gold. It is the world's stock of basic money that affects prices. According to Ernest Seyd, an eminent statistician of England, and John Sherman, ex-Secretary of the Treasury, the total gold stock in 1876 was $3,500,000,000. According to the last annual report of Mr. Gage, the present Secretary of the Treasury, it is $4,631,700,000, which shows an increase of $1,131,700,000 in twenty-four years, or only $47,000,000 a year, while the production during that period was three times that amount. At that rate it would take nearly seventy-five years to supplant with gold the silver money of the world. According to the Director of the Mint, the total production of gold from 1860 to 1898, inclusive, was $5,082,935,800, yet the total amount of the stock of gold for monetary uses, now in the world is only $4,631,700,000. What, then, has become of the vast amount of gold mined for four thousand years previous to 1860? Unquestionably lost in the arts and in the Orient, and wasted by abrasion. But even if the present great annual yield of gold should continue, it must be remembered that more than half of it goes into the arts or is lost for monetary purposes, which leaves only $157,000,000 for monetary uses. That is only 3 per cent of the entire stock of gold, and that increase is no more than the legitimate demands of commerce require. The amount used in the arts varies with conditions. In prosperous times it increases enormously, amounting often to the entire annual production, and in depressed times it attains the minimum. The average consumption of gold for nonmonetary purposes for long periods is about 70 per cent.

Men of course may guess that the world's supply of gold will increase; but is it safe to found a financial system that affects prices of all commodities and property upon guesses?

The annual production of gold, although it is large, is not likely to continue for a long series of years.

Mr. HILL. Why? It has steadily increased for a hundred years; why should it not steadily increase?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will be pleased to answer that question. There never has been a phenomenal discovery of gold or silver but for periods of time it has increased, and for like periods of time it has decreased. It arises from the existence at intervals of a speculative fever among people to mine. There is something in a gold-mining excitement which produces that effect upon the mind which may properly be termed magical. All of this gold that is produced to-day is not mined at a profit. There are millions and millions of dollars of gold added to the world's stock of that metal, which is produced at a loss. I may have a mine and work it at a loss for years. I do not abandon the mine. I continue to work it. Why? Because I am in hopes that I will reach a lode that will make it pay. That is the reason.

Consequently a large part of this gold that is being placed on the market to-day is the result of losses on the part of the people.

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. How much?

Mr. SHAFROTH. It is impossible to tell.

Mr. FOWLER. Is nature going to change?

Mr. SHAFROTH. There are times when mining is exhilarated and when it is depressed, and such times make a great variation in the production of gold and silver.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman permit me an interruption?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes, sir.

Mr. HILL. Have not you in your own State mines which are being worked to-day, under new processes and methods, that ten or even five years ago would not have been profitable?

Mr. SHAFROTH. There is no question but there is a tendency to cheapen the process, but that does not produce more than the legitimate demands of commerce require, and notwithstanding that, there are many mines that are not paying to-day.

Mr. HILL. Does not the gentleman think that there will be processes by which they can be worked at a profit?

Mr. SHAFROTH. No one can foretell that. Mines give out. The rich mines are invariably the mines that do not last. I have heard it said by a gentleman, one of the largest smelting men in the United States, that he never knew a rich silver mine to produce for a period longer than five years. Gold mines are the same way—the rich one has a vein that is usually small, or else is worked so low that the difficulties and cost of working it become too great to make it profitable.

VARYING PRODUCTION OF GOLD AND SILVER.

We have simply to look at the history of the world to see that when there has been great activity in mining it has invariably been followed by depression. The production of gold in the United States in 1853 was $65,000,000, which has never yet been equaled, and it declined then until 1883, when it was only $30,000,000. The world produced in 1860 $134,000,000, and then there was almost a steady decline until 1883, when it was $95,000,000. The great discoveries of 1849 in California were followed by great alarm in Europe. People got frightened over it. They said, "This metal, gold, is found in too large quantities; we must not have a standard of any such metal;" and consequently Germany, Holland, and Austria demonetized gold and immediately adopted a single silver standard. What has followed? California to-day does not produce one-third as much gold as it did in the fifties, nothwithstanding the cheap methods of mining. It is not produced because it does not now exist there in the quantities it did. To-day we are getting out of California about fifteen millions a year, when in the fifties she produced between fifty and sixty millions a year.

Now, take Nevada. Some time after the California discoveries the great Comstock lode of Nevada was discovered, the most wonderful discovery of the world up to that time. Silver, it seemed, was to be shoveled out and turned into commerce to be made into money. Men then began to talk about what silver would be worth, and the prediction was made openly, that the Comstock mine alone would produce five hundred millions each year. Has it verified it? Has there been even a shadow of truth in that prediction? Yet, as a result of the Comstock discovery, the movement to demonetize silver was begun, and most of the European countries, as well as our own, in which the product was found, closed their mints to the free coinage of that metal. We find upon examination that the production of Nevada is not more than one-twentieth part of what it produced in the year 1873.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we cannot expect but that the same results will follow. In every instance it has done so in the past, and it is likely to do so in the future. The general tendency, for a very long series of years, is toward increased production, but that is absolutely necessary to keep pace with commerce, and is totally inadequate to supplant the existing world's stock of silver, or

prevent the disastrous results of decreasing production for years, at intervals.

BIMETALLISM.

In my judgement the only safe monetary system is that which has stood the experience of centuries, namely, bimetallism. While the production of gold increases and decreases, and silver does the same, yet silver generally increases when gold decreases, and vice versa. Hence the two together have a very steady production, and they increase no more than the legitimate demands of trade require.

Bimetallism is the equal treatment of gold and silver. It can only be established by open mints, which cause the coinage to automatically respond to the demands of commerce. The bimetallic value of commodities and property, is that which is attained by the use, as redemption money, of both the gold and silver of the world, instead of the gold alone.

A BIMETALLIC STANDARD OF VALUE NOT A BIMETALLIC CURRENCY IN EACH NATION.

There is great confusion in the minds of many people between a bimetallic standard of value, and a bimetallic circulating medium. Many people think, that you can not have a bimetallic standard of value, unless in each country gold and silver circulate side by side. It is quite immaterial and unimportant, as far as measuring values is concerned, whether gold and silver circulate in each nation.

You can have a bimetallic standard of value, without silver circulating in a gold-standard country, or gold circulating in a silver-standard country. If one-half of the nations of the world in commercial importance were to adopt the single gold standard, and not permit silver coin to circulate in those countries, and if the other half of the nations in commercial importance were to adopt a single silver standard, and not permit gold coin to circulate in those countries, the world, nevertheless, would have the bimetallic standard of value, and the parity between the metals would be established, because, there would be an equal demand, created upon an equal quantity of metals, which would produce an equal price. You can readily see that though the silver did not circulate in the gold countries, it would be doing service in another part of the world as primary money, and consequently would be relieving the strain upon gold, just as much as if it circulated side by side with the gold, in that gold-standard country.

A great many people believe in bimetallism, but do not believe that the United States can establish it alone at 16 to 1.

Did you ever look into the statistics relative to the wealth, productive power, and commerce of this nation? If you have, I do not see how you can doubt the ability of this Republic to establish bimetallism.

I wish now to discuss the proposition that the United States has the power to establish bimetallism at the ratio of 16 to 1.

In the discussion of this proposition I wish to examine—

First. As to the relative production of silver and gold.

Second. As to the supply of silver in the world available for coinage.

Third. As to the demands which the United States, as a Government, can make upon silver.

Fourth. As to the power of the people of the United States contrasted with that of the people of the balance of the world.

Fifth. As to the demands for silver which the people of this country must make under free coinage.

Sixth. As to the pivotal position this nation occupies among the gold and silver standard nations of the world.

I. RELATIVE PRODUCTION OF SILVER AND GOLD.

Mr. Speaker, the coinage ratio between silver and gold is fixed at 16 to 1, because that is the proportion, as near as can be ascertained, in which these metals are found in the earth. It is therefore the ratio of nature.

Although the production of one metal will exceed that of the other for a number of years, yet in a long series of years, it will be found, that almost exactly sixteen times as much silver in weight is produced as gold; hence 16 ounces of silver ought to have the same value as 1 ounce of gold.

The total production of silver from 1701 to 1898, inclusive, amounted to 6,555,295,581 ounces. The total production of gold for the same period was 406,367,495 ounces. Divide the silver by the gold, and it will be found that there has been mined in that period of two hundred years for every ounce of gold 16¼ ounces of silver.

Mr. Speaker, it is easier to-day for the United States to establish the parity in value of the metals, at the ratio of 16 to 1, than it has been at any time since the closing of the India mints in 1893.

The gain in production of gold over silver, in recent years, makes it easier now to establish bimetallism, than when the output of silver was greater than gold.

In 1893 the world produced 165,472,621 ounces of silver and 7,618,811 ounces of gold, or twenty-one and seven-tenths times as many ounces of silver as gold. The tendency of such a production was, therefore, to make it more difficult to establish the parity in value of 16 ounces of silver to 1 of gold.

The gold-standard advocates at that time claimed we could never establish bimetallism, because the relative production of silver was much greater than gold. In 1898 there was produced only 11.9 ounces of silver to each ounce of gold. In 1899, according to the preliminary estimate of the Director of the Mint, the world produced 165,295,000 ounces of silver and 15,239,477 ounces of gold, or only ten and eight-tenths times as much silver as gold. The tendency of such production, according to the principle of relative supply, is unquestionably to make it much easier to establish the parity of these metals at 16 to 1, than when the production existed as in 1893.

II. SUPPLY OF SILVER IN THE WORLD AVAILABLE FOR COINAGE.

Mr. Speaker, in order to show what great influence a powerful nation can exert, in establishing the equal value of the metals at the ratio of 16 to 1, an important fact to be borne in mind is that there is now, and always has been, a shortage in the precious metals. This is demonstrated by the fact, that governments, either through their treasury departments, or their banking institutions, have been compelled, by reason of the lack of gold and silver currency, and consequently of fully covered paper money, to issue a substitute therefor, in the form of uncovered paper currency, called credit money. No nation would undertake the issuing of money based upon the general credit of the government, or permit banking institutions to issue such money, if there were not an imperative necessity for a greater circulating medium. The necessity for that greater circulating medium is admitted in this bill, as it authorizes a large increase in bank currency.

Consequently, the total amount of such uncovered or credit money in the world, indicates the existing shortage of metallic money. We know that there is in existence in the world at the present time, according to the last report of the Secretary of the Treasury, $2,836,300,000 of such uncovered or credit money. With such an enormous shortage in the precious metals, you can readily see, that a powerful nation would have much greater influence in establishing their parity of value, than if there was an abundance or an oversupply of the same.

It is conceded on all sides, that if the United States can make a greater demand upon silver, than there is silver available for coinage in the world, the parity of value between the metals will be established. In other words, if we can make a greater demand at the mint rate than there is silver to supply that demand, then the mint rate will be established. The question, then, must be determined by the greatness of the demand which the United States can create for that metal. Let us, then, analyze that power.

The gold-standard men tell us that if a law is passed opening our mints to the free coinage of silver, immediately gold will go to a premium, and that if it goes to a premium of even 1 per cent, under the Gresham law it will leave the country. I do not believe that any such thing will occur, for the reason that speculation will foresee the enormous demand that this Government can make upon silver, and therefore gold will not go to a premium. But I want to assume, for the purpose of this argument, that gold will leave the country upon the enactment of a free-coinage law, because by such supposition we can more clearly estimate the enormous demands this Government can make upon silver, and the consequent increase in the value of silver, and more clearly estimate the increase of the supply of gold to gold-standard countries, and the consequent decrease in the value of gold. If we are to test the strength of this Government as to these demands, we must assume the conditions for the making of the same.

Mr. Speaker, it is estimated by the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Gage, in his statement of March 1, 1900, that there exists in the United States $1,025,825,162 of gold coin—an enormous amount. What effect would the withdrawal of that gold coin from the United States produce? There would be instantly created thereby a demand for $1,025,000,000 of silver coin or silver certificates to take its place. From where would the supply of silver come to satisfy such an enormous demand? You must remember, what is conceded, that if the demand which the Government can make is greater than the supply, it will establish the parity of the metals in value.

There are but four sources from which it is possible that any silver can come.

1. The first source is from silver bullion.

We know that there is no large quantity of silver bullion in existence in the world. The reason we know it is that no man can point to where any considerable quantity is located. We know to the fraction of a dollar the quantity of gold coin and silver coin, that are in all the banks in the world, and also of the gold bullion that exists in the form of bars; and if there were any considerable amount of silver bullion in the shape of bars, it could not be concealed. The sharp eyes of the reporters of the gold-standard newspapers would soon bring it to light as a great sensation.

The challenge has been made in the United States Senate, time and again, to show where there is more than $25,000,000 of silver bullion in existence in the world, outside of the United States Treasury, and no gold-standard man has ever attempted to point out where even such a quantity of silver bullion exists.

The reason there is no great quantity of silver bullion in existence, is because it has not been profitable to keep silver in the form of bullion. Silver has been going down in price year after year ever since 1873, and consequently the man who has attempted to hoard or store silver bullion has lost not only by the lower price of silver itself, but also the interest on the amount he invested in the bullion. The truth is that as soon as silver bullion leaves the smelter, it goes almost immediately into subsidiary coinage and into the arts. Therefore, we could not expect this predicted supply of silver to come from silver bullion now in existence. In fact, we could not expect more than $25,000,000 to come from such a source, and that of course is a mere "drop in the bucket" compared to the enormous demand for $1,025,000,000, which would be created by the displacement of gold.

2. The second source from which it is said we must expect a large supply of silver is from the arts. But the man who makes such a statement ignores one fact, which will absolutely prevent any silver coming from the arts. He ignores the fact, that the cost of skilled workmanship upon the silver articles, adds such value to the articles, as makes them worth more than the coinage value of the silver contained therein. It must be remembered that the cost of workmanship in the proportioning of the metals, in the molding, the polishing, the gilding, the carving, and other ornamentation of the article, must be very great, and the man would be an idiot who would coin into dollars, something that is worth more in the shape of a work of art. As man is guided by self-interest, it seems clear that not any of this pretended supply of silver would come from the arts. Not even any considerable part of the worn silver articles would be coined, because of the sentimental associations connected therewith.

3. The third source from which it is said we will have the flood of silver is from the countries of Europe. There is a great quantity of silver in the form of coins existing in Europe. It is said that they are of the value in our money of $1,500,000,000, but the man who says that these coins will come to this country, in the event that we open our mints to the free coinage of silver, is either ignorant of or ignores one important fact—that is, that the coins of Europe are in circulation upon a gold valuation, just like our silver dollars in this country are now in circulation upon a gold valuation. What would you think of the man, who would take a United States silver dollar to our mint as soon as it was opened to free coinage, and have it coined into another dollar? The dollar he has now is upon a gold valuation, and by minting it again he could not make it any more valuable. So the holder of European coins that are circulating upon a gold valuation could gain nothing by having them stamped at our mints. In fact, he would lose enormously by the transaction.

The ratio at which coins are in circulation in Europe, is 15½ to 1, which makes the coinage value of silver in Europe $1.33 an ounce, whereas in this country the ratio is 16 to 1, which makes the coinage value of silver $1.29 an ounce. The man holding European coins would lose not only the freight and insurance in bringing those coins to this country, but also would lose 4 cents on each ounce of silver coins that he brings. Those Europeans may not be so intelligent and bright as are the Americans, but they know enough not to lose 4 cents on each ounce of coins they import to us. Thus it is clear that silver coins in circulation in Europe would not be brought to our mints.

4. The fourth source from which they say we must expect a flood of silver is from the silver-standard countries. They are China, Mexico, Siam, Straits Settlements, Central and some South American States, Persia, Tripoli, Spain, Japan, and India, constituting at least one-fourth of the nations of the world in commercial importance. Japan has adopted a gold standard, but upon the silver valuation, and is therefore still on a silver basis. India has the gold standard in name, but its circulation is silver. In those countries silver circulates at its commercial value, namely, about 50 cents on the dollar, except in India, where it circulates at the value of about 63 cents on the dollar. Consequently at first thought, one might believe that silver would come from those countries to our mints. In order to determine whether any silver would come from those nations, it is important that their condition and need of a circulating medium should be understood.

CONDITION OF GOLD AND SILVER COUNTRIES UPON CLOSING OF THE INDIA MINTS.

Mr. Speaker, if I knew but one fact—namely, the condition of gold and silver standard countries of the world for the five years following the panic of 1893—I would know that the cause of the depression in the United States for that period was due to the gold standard; that it was due to the greatly increased demands made upon gold in 1892 and 1893; by the closing of the India mints to the free coinage of silver and the attempt to establish the gold standard in that country; by the large purchases of gold for the war chest of Russia; by the effort of Austria to resume specie payments in gold, and by the offer of our Government to redeem in gold all the Treasury notes issued in payment of silver bullion under the Sherman Act. Every gold-standard country in the world, whether situate on this continent or the other, whether in the Northern Hemisphere or the Southern Hemisphere, upon the closing of the India mints was in the throes of a financial panic, having the same trend of falling prices that prevailed in this country, and that fact existed irrespective as to whether in those countries there was a high tariff or a low tariff.

On the other hand, every silver-standard country in the world, whether situated upon this side of the waters or the other, whether north or south of the equator, and whether it has a high or a low tariff, is to-day, and has been for the past seven years, compared to its former condition, enjoying a marvelous degree of prosperity.

By this statement I am not saying that the Mexican is equal to the American, and I must say that the man who uses the statement "Do you want to Mexicanize America?" does not know the meaning or import of an argument. We could with equal propriety say, "Do you want to Turkeyize America?" for Turkey has the gold standard, and I am willing to contrast the civilization of Mexico at any time with that of Turkey; and I am willing, further, to contrast the wages paid in Mexico with not only those paid in Turkey, but also those paid in any European nation. I might further say, "Do you want to Egyptianize America?"—for Egypt has the gold standard. "Do you want the civilization of the Portuguese?"—for they have the gold standard.

The truth is there are many things that determine the civilization of a nation, the most important of any being climate; and I apprehend that there is no danger of bringing the climate of Mexico to the United States. But these silver-standard nations, compared to their former condition of seven years past, are marvelously advanced. In the last seven years the exports of Mexico have increased more than 100 per cent. The number of manufactures in Japan and Mexico have more than trebled, and the railroad building in every silver-standard country has been increasing enormously.

SILVER-STANDARD COUNTRIES NEED MORE MONEY.

These silver-standard countries, by reason of the increase in their commerce and manufactures, are in need more and more of a greater circulating medium, and consequently, it becomes pertinent to inquire, whether nations having such need for increase of money can easily yield up any quantity of silver they have now, for the purpose of bringing it to our mints for coinage into American dollars.

When we look into the monetary statistics of those countries, we are struck with the fact, that they have entirely too small a circulating medium in silver and gold for their own use, to be able to part with any of their money. Mexico has a circulating medium of but $9.12 per capita, Japan but $1.75 per capita, China but $1.96 per capita, India but $2.07 per capita, the Central American states but $3.65, and the South American states but $2.67 per capita in silver and gold, while we in the United States have a total circulation, according to the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury, of $26 per capita, of which over $21 are in gold and silver, and France has a circulating medium of over $36 for each inhabitant. Is it possible that those silver-standard countries, with a shortage of circulating medium now, would be willing to part with that circulating medium, in order to flood the United States with silver? Why, if Mexico should send all of her silver here, it would be but a bagatelle. The total circulating medium of Mexico in 1898 was but $103,000,000, and that is only about one-tenth part of the demand caused by the withdrawal of the $1,025,000,000 of gold.

Mr. Speaker, some people talk of this flood of silver as if it would be disastrous to the nation should it occur. No nation was ever injured by its people having an abundance of the precious metals, and instead of being a detriment, it would produce the greatest era of prosperity in the history of this country. Some people think that as soon as a foreigner brought silver to the United States mint and had it coined, there would be some American with gold chasing him, in order to get him to exchange the silver for a gold dollar. I apprehend that the American people are intelligent, and that they are not going to exchange a gold for a silver dollar, unless it is to their advantage to do so. When a foreigner brings his silver to our mints and has it coined into dollars, what is he going to do with his money?

You know that a foreign coin will not circulate in this country; neither will a United States silver dollar circulate in a foreign country; consequently it will do him no good to take the silver dollars back to his own country. The only thing that he can do with them is to buy something that we have for sale, and we are not going to sell him any more of our products, than we think his silver dollar is worth. I am willing to put the shrewdness of the Yankee against that of any other people in the world. Consequently, this flood of silver, which is held up as such a great "bogy man," even if possible, would turn out to be one of the greatest blessings that could possibly happen to this country.

So it seems to me to be clear that these silver-standard countries, in view of the small circulating medium they now have, and of the immense upward impetus in their commerce and manufacturing industries, could not part with any considerable amount

of their circulating medium to dump into the United States, and therefore I do not think we could have any flood of silver. The supply of silver in each nation is no more than its commerce requires, and hence there is no great amount in the world available for coinage.

III. DEMANDS WHICH THE GOVERNMENT CAN MAKE FOR SILVER.

But suppose these silver-standard countries could take from their own circulating mediums, the enormous sum of $1,025,000,000, bring it to the United States, and thus supply the demand caused by the withdrawal of gold! The man who thinks that the powers of the United States are exhausted does not know the strength of this Government.

There are in existence $346,681,016 of credit money, called United States notes, or greenbacks, the existence of every dollar of which is due to the fact that we have not enough circulating medium without those notes. Every dollar of those notes could be retired by the substitution of the silver dollar or the silver certificate, and thus there would be a demand which the Government could create for $346,000,000 more of silver.

I am free to say that if the law providing for the free coinage of silver were passed to-day, under President McKinley's Administration, with the Secretary of the Treasury discriminating against silver as he has in the past, this Government could not establish the parity of the metals. But under an Administration, that would use the powers of the Government for the purpose of establishing the parity of the metals, I have no doubt of the ability of this nation to establish that parity.

But these are not all the powers of our Government. There are in existence $249,516,228 of national-bank notes. The only excuse for their existence, is the fact, that they are absolutely needed as a circulating medium. Every dollar of that credit money could be retired, and silver or silver certificates substituted in its place. Thus there can be created by this Government, a demand for the enormous sum of $1,622,022,406 of silver, all at once if desired, without increasing the circulating medium one dollar. It seem to me, in view of that great demand, there can be no reasonable doubt of the ability of this Government to establish the parity of the metals.

We have had an experience which should teach everyone the power of this nation. In 1890 Congress passed the Sherman Act, which provided for the purchase of only 4,500,000 ounces of silver per month. Under a demand for simply that amount of silver that metal rose in price higher and higher until it reached $1.21¼ per ounce; within 8 points of par, not only at the mint in Philadelphia and on the exchange at New York, but in London, in Calcutta, and in every other market in the world. If such a small demand raised the price of silver to such a height under a limited coinage act, it seems to me clear that the instantaneous demand for $1,622,022,408, or 300 times as much, would certainly establish the parity of the metals. If we should increase our circulating medium to correspond with that of France, namely, $36 per capita, we would make a demand for $770,000,000 more of silver, or a total demand for $2,390,000,000 of silver. That amount is more than three times as much as there is silver in the world that could possibly come to our mints.

IV. POWER OF THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES CONTRASTED WITH THAT OF THE PEOPLE OF THE WORLD.

Mr. Speaker, great as the Government is, there is something still greater, and that is the people of the United States. We are the greatest people on earth. We are the greatest producers and consumers on the face of the globe. Our 77,000,000 people are equal to 700,000,000 of the average of the balance of the world.

It is strange, but nevertheless true, that many Americans do not appreciate the great power and wealth of this country, and it is remarkable that in order to prove our high position among the nations we have to quote from foreign authorities.

Mr. Mulhall, an eminent statistician of England, a few years ago, in an article in the North American Review, analyzed the effective force and power of this country, and made the startling statement, that in power and effective force the United States was nearly equal to Great Britain, France, and Germany combined.

He said:

If we take a survey of mankind in ancient or modern times as regards the physical, mechanical, and intellectual forces of nations, we find nothing to compare with the United States.

Professor Francois, a French economist, in an article in an economic paper of Paris, about five years ago, stated that the wealth and power of the United States was one-fourth of that of the world; that the wealth in 1890 was $62,600,000,000, while that of the entire world was $291,580,000,000. The estimate of the wealth of this country for 1900 is $87,000,000,000, which is between one-third and one-half of that of the balance of all the nations.

There is no nation which can compare with ours. It is only by comparison with groups of nations, or with the balance of the world, that the greatness of these United States is shown.

Mr. Speaker, a comparison of the statistics concerning the commercial, agricultural, mining, and manufacturing industries of this country will conclusively show, that in commercial importance, we are between one-fourth and one-third of the entire world, or between one-third and one-half of the balance of the world.

No better test can be found, as to the amount of commerce done by a nation, than the number of tons of freight carried by its railroads. The foreign trade of every nation, consisting only of its surplus products, must be small compared to the business of the nation itself. It is said that one railroad in the United States—the Pennsylvania—carries more freight than that which constitutes all our foreign trade.

The total railroad mileage of the United States is nearly half as much as that of the entire world, there being 184,428 miles of railroad, exclusive of side trackage, in the United States, as against 443,136 miles for the entire world, or 258,708 miles for the balance of the world.

The value of railroads in the United States in 1897 was $11,775,000,000, while that of the balance of the world was $23,755,000,000.

The tons of freight carried by the railroads of the United States are about one-half of those carried by the railroads of the world. According to the Mulhall-Harper tables, the United States carried in 1897 742,000,000 tons of freight, as against 1,733,000,000 tons carried by the world, or 991,000,000 tons carried by the balance of the world. The number of tons carried by the United States in 1898 was 879,006,307. The fairest test is the freight carried per 100 miles. The average haul in the rest of the world is less than 100 miles. The tons of freight carried 100 miles in the United States in 1899 was 1,236,672,571. These figures present the startling fact that the United States carries more freight than all the rest of the world.

The expenditures of the railroads of the United States are $775,000,000, against $1,535,000,000 for the entire world, or $760,000,000 for the balance of the world. Our expenses for transporting freight were more than that of the rest of the world.

The receipts of the railroads of the United States are $1,025,000,000, as against the total receipts for the world of $2,515,000,000.

The steam power of the United States, according to Mr. Mulhall, is nearly one-third of that of the entire world, or between one-third and one-half of that of the balance of the world, being 18,030,000 horsepower, as against 66,100,000 horsepower for all the world.

The carrying power of vessels used in lake and river traffic in 1890 in the United States was 9,800,000 tons, which was one-fifth of the carrying power of the world on the high seas. Even on the high seas in 1896 we carried 19.8 per cent of all the world's commerce in tonnage—that is, 4,770,000 tons out of 24,090,000 tons for the world—and our carrying power that year on the high seas was 11,850,000 tons out of 63,200,000 tons for the world. The navigable waterways and canals of this country are 51,820 miles, while those of the earth are 170,550 miles. Add the tons of freight carried on ocean, lakes, canals, and rivers to those carried by railroads, and it will show that the United States transports by water and rail, nearly as many tons as are carried by the rest of the world.

The United States in 1899 produced 10,677,000 bales of cotton, of 494 pounds each, out of a total production of the world of 12,343,000 bales, or five-sixth of the world's cotton.

This nation in 1899 consumed 3,553,000 bales of cotton, of 500 pounds each, of the entire consumption of the world of 13,932,000 bales, or about one-fourth.

The production of corn in the United States is more than four-fifths of that of the whole world, being in 1899 2,200,000,000 bushels, as against 2,611,000,000 for the world, or four times as much as that produced by the rest of the world.

The production of wheat in this country is between one fourth and one-fifth of that of the entire world, being in 1899 675,149,000 bushels as against 2,921,045,000 for all the world, and in 1899 547,304,000 as against 2,725,407,000 for all nations.

The total production of grain in the United States in 1899 was half as much as that of the rest of the world, being 3,640,826,000 bushels, while that of the entire world was 11,003,227,000 bushels, or 7,362,401,000 bushels for the balance of the world.

According to the recent edition of Mulhall's Dictionary of Statistics we have 16,600,000 horses out of 64,700,000 in the world; 46,500,000 cattle out of 200,000,000 in the world; 40,600,000 hogs out of 97,000,000 in the world; milch cows, 15,940,000 out of 62,100,000 for the world.

According to Mr. Mulhall's Dictionary of Statistics our product is as follows:

	Quantity.	World's product.
Fish ..... tons..	880,000	3,070,000
Beef ..... do...	2,190,000	7,205,000
Pork ..... do...	2,170,000	4,479,000
Butter and cheese ..... do...	610,000	2,600,000
Oysters ..... number..	3,500,000,000	4,429,000,000
Hay ..... tons..	42,000,000	159,000,000
Straw ..... do...	60,000,000	127,000,000
Tallow ..... do...	880,000	2,617,000
Tobacco ..... do...	180,000	780,000
Quicksilver ..... flasks..	36,104	105,644
Paper ..... tons..	1,200,000	2,600,000

Mr. Mulhall says:

It appears that the United States produce one-fourth of the food of Christendom.

The hardware manufactures of the United States in 1896 were of the value of $1,145,000,000, as against $3,020,000,000 for the entire world.

Nearly one-third of the pig iron of the world is produced by this nation, in 1898 being 11,962,000 tons out of a total production of 36,570,000 tons for the entire world. Our production in 1899 was 13,620,703 tons.

We produce more than one-third of the total steel in the world, in 1898 being 8,932,857 tons, out of the world's production of 24,060,500 tons.

The copper product of the United States is more than half of that of the entire world, being 239,241 tons in 1898, against 434,329 tons for the world, or over 44,000 tons more than all the rest of the world.

The production of coal in the United States for the year 1899 was 230,888,973 tons, while that of the entire world was about 680,000,000 tons, more than one-half as much as that of the balance of the globe.

The coal fields of the United States comprise nearly half of those of the world, being 194,000 square miles, as against 471,800 square miles.

We produced 103,514 tons of zinc in 1898, while all the world produced 467,749 tons.

We produce 170,000 tons of lead, while the world produces 680,000 tons.

We produce more than half of all the petroleum of the world, being in 1898, 2,543,859,402 gallons, while that of all the world was about 5,000,000,000 gallons.

The forest products of this nation are nearly one-third that of the balance of the world, being annually 9,300,000,000 cubic feet of lumber, against 32,460,000,000 for the world.

Our forest lands are 699,500,000 acres, while those of all the earth are 1,308,000,000 acres.

The meat supply of the world for 1896 was 15,200,000 tons, of which the United States contributed 4,500,000 tons, or nearly one-third.

The United States produces about one-fourth of the gold of the world, the product in 1898 being $64,463,000, as against $287,428,600 for the world.

The silver production of this country is more than one-third of that of the entire world, being in 1898 $70,334,000, coinage value, as against $213,715,400, coinage value, for the world.

Our total product of minerals for 1898 was $797,820,720.

The amount of life insurance in force in this country is $14,125,548,072, as against $5,923,168,549 for the balance of the world.

The length of the world's telegraph system in 1899 was 4,900,921 miles, of which there was 2,516,548 miles in America.

The number of newspapers in the United States in 1899 was 22,056, as against 50,000 for the entire world.

The number of copies of monthly publications in the United States in 1890 was 230,000,000, while that of the world was 813,000,000.

The number of post-offices in the United States in 1895 were 71,258, while there were 225,354 in the world. There are now 75,000 in this country.

The number of letters, postal cards, papers, book packets, etc., sent through the mail annually is about 11,688,000,000 in the United States, as against 27,010,000,000 in the entire world. The people of the United States send nearly half as much mail matter as all of the world.

The number of telephones in the United States is 900,000, as against 1,402,100 in the entire world.

Considerable investigation has been made in recent years, as to the mechanical force that a man is capable of exerting, and of the comparative energy of the men of each nation. The adult laborer, it is estimated, each day expends in energy sufficient strength to lift 300 tons 1 foot. That power of a man is recognized as the unit, and is called a "foot-ton."

It is calculated that the power of a horse is ten times that of a man. If everything were done by hand, the mechanical power of nations, compared to each other, would be nearly in the proportion of their population. But on account of the forces that Americans have produced by their inventive genius, the power that we exert is almost incomprehensible.

Mr. Mulhall has applied this foot-ton principle in ascertaining the comparative strength of nations. He estimates that in 1895 the working energy of the United States was 129,306,000,000 foot-tons daily, or 1,940 foot-tons daily per capita. In other words, the forces used in this nation for each individual are 1,940 times as much as could be exerted by a man without the aid of tools or machinery. That daily force of the United States is sufficient to lift 600,000 pounds 24,489,772 miles each day, or, eliminating the resistance of the air, sufficient to send that weight around the world nearly 1,000 times each day.

When we compare the mechanical force of this nation with that of the rest of the world, it shows that in strength we are nearly equal to one-half the balance of the world. That force is—

	Foot-tons daily.
In the United States	129,306,000,000
In Great Britain	56,100,000,000
In Germany	45,580,000,000
In France	34,580,000,000
In Austria	22,510,000,000
In Italy	11,390,000,000
In Spain	10,640,000,000
In the balance of the world about	120,000,000,000
Total for the world	430,106,000,000

Mr. Speaker, great as these figures may show our country to be, our manufacturing industries are still greater.

The products of manufactories in the United States, according to Mr. Mulhall, are one-third as much as those of the balance of the world, being annually $9,900,000,000, while those of the entire world are $28,550,000,000.

Ex-Speaker Reed, in a speech before this body on February 1, 1894, referring to the manufacturing interests of this country, said:

I do not vouch, nor can anyone vouch for these figures, but the proportion of one-third to two-thirds nobody can forcibly dispute. We produce one-third and the rest of the world, England included, two-thirds. The population of the world is 1,500,000,000, of which we have 70,000,000, which leaves 1,430,000,000 for the rest of mankind. We use all our manufactures or the equivalent of them. Hence we are equal to one-half the whole globe outside of ourselves, England included, and compared as a market with the rest of the world our population is equal to 700,000,000.

With such an array of facts and figures, who can doubt that this nation, in commerce, mining, manufactures, and agriculture, is equal to at least one-fourth if not one-third of all the nations of the world? With such a power and such a force, is it possible that we are too weak to establish a financial policy of our own?

V. DEMANDS FOR SILVER WHICH THE PEOPLE OF THIS COUNTRY MUST MAKE UNDER FREE COINAGE.

Mr. Speaker, it has been estimated that there are between $20,000,000,000 and $30,000,000,000 of long-time indebtedness, consisting of national, State, county, city, and corporation bonds, and individual promissory notes, owed in this nation. Over one-half of this is payable in lawful money of the United States.

Under free coinage, silver dollars become legal tender for the payment of all that ten or fifteen billions of debt. It is a principle recognized in all political economies, that if one dollar is cheaper than another, all the obligations payable in lawful money will be paid in the cheaper dollar. Thus if silver should ever go to a discount compared to gold, there would be that enormous demand created for silver by the debtors, who owe the $10,000,000,000 or the $15,000,000,000. With such an enormous demand upon the limited quantity of silver available for coinage, is it possible that anyone would part with silver at an appreciable discount? You must remember, that this silver dollar is not only a legal tender for the discharge of State, county, and city taxes, which aggregate about $500,000,000 a year; it is a legal tender for the payment of all import duties, internal-revenue duties, and postage dues of the National Government, and you must remember that the National Government raises by those duties the enormous sum of $500,000,000 a year.

The premiums contracted to be paid in lawful money each year in the United States upon life-insurance policies are $339,280,913, and upon fire-insurance policies are $161,730,957.

The total amount of life insurance in force in the United States on January 1, 1899, all of which was payable in lawful money, was $14,125,548,072.

The total amount of fire insurance in force in the United States on January 1, 1898, was $16,500,000,000, all payable in lawful money.

According to the report of the Comptroller of the Currency for the year 1899, the amount of deposits, payable in lawful money, in our—

Savings banks is	$2,182,006,424
National banks is	2,522,157,509
State banks and private banks is	1,228,995,324
Loan and trust companies is	835,499,034
Total deposits in all banks, June 30, 1899	6,768,658,331

The amount of loans, consisting mostly of thirty, sixty, and ninety day paper, all of which is payable in lawful money, in favor of our—

Savings banks is	$1,099,593,589
National banks is	2,567,954,980
State banks and private banks is	902,311,088
Loan and trust companies is	599,031,033
Total short-time paper outstanding on June 30, 1899	5,167,895,610

The total amount payable on shares in building associations is $450,067,594. The amounts agreed to be paid in lawful money, at periods of from one to five years, on contracts for construction of buildings, railroads, ships, canals, and other improvements in the United States must aggregate several billions of dollars.

The desire on the part of all the people and corporations, owing these enormous amounts, to pay in the cheaper money would make such a tremendous demand upon silver, should it go to a discount

of even 1 per cent, as to immediately restore its parity with gold. No one would part with silver dollars or silver certificates at a discount, when he could utilize them at par for so many purposes, and to such enormous extent.

WHY MEXICO DOES NOT ESTABLISH PARITY OF METALS.

Our gold friends tell us that the mint is open to the free coinage of silver in Mexico, and ask, Why does not that establish the parity of the metals? They talk of Mexico as if it were a gigantic power. Do you know that the commerce of Mexico is not equal to that of the State of Illinois; and would you expect the State of Illinois, unaided by the rest of the States in the Union, to establish the parity of the metals? The reason Mexico does not establish the parity of the metals, is because it is not sufficiently powerful in commerce to do so; but when you compare Mexico with the United States, you compare a pigmy to a giant. You must remember that this great nation is composed of forty-five great States, and that an act of Congress is simply an international agreement in itself, among those forty-five great States.

VI. THE PIVOTAL POSITION THIS NATION OCCUPIES AMONG THE GOLD AND SILVER STANDARD COUNTRIES OF THE WORLD.

Mr. Speaker, in determining what a powerful effect such a nation as the United States would have in establishing the parity of the metals, you must take into consideration the pivotal position, which it occupies as to the monetary systems of the world. The silver-standard nations, which make their demands upon silver alone for currency, constitute one-fourth of the nations of the world in commercial importance. The world is then divided into nations, one-fourth of which are upon the silver standard, and three-fourths of which are upon the gold standard. This is stating it very strongly in favor of the gold-standard nations, as many are upon an irredeemable paper currency and have the gold standard only in name, and most of them have large quantities of silver, which they still treat as basic money, and thereby relieve the strain on gold. The United States alone, as I have stated, constitutes in wealth, commerce, and power at least one-fourth of the world.

Let that power of the United States be transferred from gold to silver, and you immediately have the world divided into equal parts, one half the nations in commercial importance making their demands upon silver, and the other half in commercial importance making their demands upon gold; and thus we have an equal demand upon equal metals, which, according to the principle of supply and demand, must make an equal price.

It is a fact, which no one denies, that there is now going on in the Orient, where silver is the only money used, a great development in commerce. It is bound to multiply in the near future, as the era of railroad building there is at hand. The nations of the world are in a desperate struggle among themselves to capture that trade. The small circulating medium in each of those eastern countries is bound to expand as trade enlarges, and within the next five years it is likely that the demands for silver from those countries will be enormous.

A FREE-COINAGE LAW WOULD MAKE CAPITALISTS HELP ELEVATE THE VALUE OF SILVER.

It must be borne in mind also, in determining what great influence a powerful nation like the United States will have in establishing the parity of the metals, that although the people of the United States are nearly equally divided upon the question of opening our mints to the free coinage of silver, 7,000,000 having voted for President McKinley, and 6,500,000 having voted for Mr. Bryan, the minute that a free coinage act is passed, all of this difference of opinion will vanish, and we will have a united nation and a united people, using all their powers to establish the equal value of the metals.

Why is this true? Because all of the capitalists in the country have obligations that are payable in lawful money, the United States bonds themselves held by national banks being payable in coin; and when silver under free coinage becomes lawful money, with full legal-tender powers to discharge those obligations, immediately it becomes the interest of those capitalists and banks to elevate the price of silver, to make the purchasing power of the silver dollar just as great as they now desire the purchasing power of the gold dollar to become, and hence the minute a free-coinage law is passed that minute you will have all the power of Wall street exercised to its utmost to elevate the price of silver. It has been the history of depreciated currencies, that no class of people have exercised such a wonderful influence and power in elevating such depressed currencies to par with coin, as have the capitalistic class, and therefore the wealth and power of the entire nation would never permit silver to go to a discount.

I therefore conclude that on account of the present great relative production of gold to silver; on account of the fact that there is now a shortage in the precious metals to the enormous extent of $2,800,000,000; on account of the limited quantity of silver in the world that could be brought to our mints; on account of the enormous demand which the Government and the people of this nation can make upon the silver of the world; on account of the pivotal position in the world, which the United States in commerce holds, being able, by throwing its influence from the gold to the silver side of this controversy, to equally divide the nations in commercial importance in their demands upon the precious metals, thus making an equal demand upon equal quantities of metal, and thereby producing an equal price, it seems to me that the United States could as certainly produce an equality in value of the metals, as it is possible to foretell any future event.

It must be remembered that when you elevate silver to the value of gold, you do not have to elevate the silver that is contained in our own currency, as that is already upon a gold valuation. You do not have to elevate the great mass of silver coins in Europe, because they are upon a gold valuation. You do not have to elevate the silver in the arts, because that silver, by reason of the cost of workmanship, is now worth more than the coinage value of silver. The only silver in the world that must be elevated in price is simply the quantity of silver in the silver-standard countries, which those nations will assist in elevating by their own increasing demands upon it as primary money.

It seems to me, therefore, conclusive, Mr. Speaker, that my proposition is proven, namely, that the United States, by reason of its great power, by reason of its pivotal position among the nations of the earth, could establish bimetallism at the ratio of 16 to 1.

COULD BIMETALLISM BE MAINTAINED?

Mr. Speaker, it is also contended by our opponents that bimetallism could not be maintained, because in a year or two after silver reached $1.29 an ounce, its production would be so great as to overcome the demands of this nation. That reasoning, as to increase of production, would be true as to wheat, corn, or other products where the amount that can be raised is unlimited, but it does not apply to silver.

The variation between the amount of silver produced, when its price is high and low, is very small. Why? Because the greater portion of silver is extracted from ore that contains both gold and silver. When more than half of the value of the ore is from the gold, it is called a gold mine, with silver as a by-product, and vice versa. These ores will be mined, even if silver should go to 10 cents an ounce, because they would be worked for the gold therein; and if silver were $1.29 an ounce, those mines could not produce very much more. It must be remembered that under bimetallism the purchasing power of gold and silver is correlative. As the value of silver increases, the purchasing power of gold declines; hence the net value of the ore remains about the same.

It is the low-grade mines, which yield the greater part of both gold and silver, because they are so numerous, and it takes generations to exhaust them. It is true there are some mines that produce silver without any gold, but they are very few compared to the number that contain both gold and silver. They are generally very rich and easily exhausted. Their product bears no greater relation to the total silver produced, than the free gold contained in placer claims, bears to the total production of gold. Hence there is no danger that in the long run there will be any great variation between the quantity of silver and gold produced.

Eliminating the amount that goes into the arts and is hoarded or lost in the Orient, the annual production of neither gold nor silver has ever exceeded 3 per cent of the world's stock of the same, and it is not likely that such proportion will ever be exceeded.

I therefore conclude that the establishment and maintenance of bimetallism by the United States is practical; that it is a much safer system of finance than the upbuilding of credits on the narrower, varying base of gold alone, and that it would produce an era of permanent prosperity unequaled in the history of the world. [Applause.]

Trusts.

I submit that every trust engaged in interstate commerce is either the outgrowth of some Congressional legislation, or of Federal permission or toleration or privilege in cases where Congress has failed to enact, under existing constitutional provisions, prohibitory legislation.

SPEECH

OF

HON. HENRY D. CLAYTON,

OF ALABAMA.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, May 31, 1900.

The House having under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 138) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States—

Mr. CLAYTON of Alabama said:

Mr. SPEAKER: In the closing hours of the first session of the Fifty-sixth Congress an unusual and remarkable spectacle is presented to the country by the Republican majority of this House. Several days ago a resolution was passed here fixing the 6th day of

June as the time for adjournment, and now great haste is made by our Republican friends to pass some sort of anti-trust legislation. For three years the Republican party has been in possession of the executive branch of the Government and of both Houses of Congress. The Republican party has been able by virtue of this fact to enact any legislation that agreed with the wishes of its leaders. Now, the country will naturally inquire, Why has so important a matter as legislation looking to the suppression or destruction of criminal combines, oppressive and iniquitous trusts, been so long delayed?

The purpose of this proposed amendment of the Constitution which we now have before us, and the bill for the amendment of the existing anti-trust law which will come up, under the rule adopted, immediately after the disposition of this resolution, is transparent. Everybody sees through the movement. No one is deceived, and many of our Republican friends can not refrain from laughing at the amusing side of the political game they are now playing. A Presidential election is well-nigh at hand. The country is arraigning the dominant party for neglect of duty, in that it has failed to enact legislation against monopolies and trusts. The Republicans have not met the popular demand on this great question, but at this late hour have proposed these two measures, which were never designed to become laws.

Nobody believes that this resolution, or the bill to which I have adverted, will pass at this session. Your object is to go before the country in the coming campaign and say, "We made an effort to have the Constitution amended," and if this resolution should fail you will say that the Democrats are responsible for Republican failure; and if one or both measures should pass here, they will lodge in the Senate, and then you intend to say that we have one or both of these measures pending in the Senate to be acted on favorably at the next session. I believe, and I think all candid men believe, that neither one of these measures will pass the Senate—certainly that this amendment to the Constitution will never be submitted to the States.

There is another unusual feature in the present proceedings of the House. The Committee on Rules reported one rule bringing before the House for consideration both of these measures. But it is useless to criticise so absolute and, I may say, so tyrannical a committee. It can and does, by direction of the Speaker, control proceedings of the House.

It is affirmed and denied that trusts have increased prices. If they do increase prices there can be no question about the right and duty of the Government to protect the people against them. The proposition that they do not increase prices rests entirely upon assertion, while the contrary position is sustained by all of the facts.

It might be said that any increase of price during the years 1897 and 1898 was due to the war with Spain, but whatever increase has been caused by that war must have been created prior to the year 1899. The following are the fluctuations of leading products controlled by trusts during the year 1899 as reported by the Journal of Commerce and Commercial Bulletin, a strictly nonpolitical paper:

The linseed oil trust raised the price from 41 cents on January 7 to 50 cents on December 30.

The menhaden trust raised the price on menhaden oil from 23 cents on January 7 to 27½ cents on December 30.

The Standard Oil Company raised the price on petroleum from $7.50 on January 7 to $9.90 on December 30.

The sugar trust raised the price on granulated sugar from 4.94 cents on January 7 to 5½ cents on December 30.

The chemical trust raised the price of ipecac from $2.50 per pound on January 7 to $3.65 per pound on December 30. The same trust raised the price of camphor from 33½ cents on January 7 to 51½ cents on December 30. The same trust raised the price of quinine from 21 cents on January 7 to 30 cents on December 30. The same trust raised the price of sal soda from 62½ cents on January 7 to 70 cents on December 30.

The leather trust raised the price of leather from 20 cents on January 7 to 25½ cents on December 30.

The calico trust raised the price of calico from 2⅜ cents on January 7 to 3½ cents on December 30 for print cloths, and from 4 cents to 4½ cents on indigo prints.

The jeans trust raised the price on jean cashmere from 27½ cents on January 7 to 40 cents on December 30.

The jute trust raised the price on jute hemp from 2¾ cents on January 7 to 3⅝ cents on December 30.

The copper trust raised the price of copper from 13½ cents on January 7 to 16½ cents on December 30.

The lead trust raised the price of pig lead from $3.95 on January 7 to $4.65 on December 30.

The tin-plate trust raised the price on tin plate from $3 a box on January 7 to $5.25 on December 30.

The cement trust raised the price of Rosendale from 75 cents on January 6 to 95 cents on December 29. They raised the price during the same period on Portland cement from $1.95 to $2.25.

Dun's Review for January 13, 1900, gives the following increase of prices in some of the lines controlled by the trusts:

The nail trust increased the price of nails from $1.10 on January 4, 1899, to $2.50 on January 3, 1900. The same trust increased the price of wire nails from $1.35 to $3.20 during the same period.

The Structural Iron Company increased the price of structural angles from $1.15 on January 4, 1899, to $2.25 on January 3, 1900.

The coal trust increased the price of anthracite coal from $3.75 on January 4, 1899, to $4.20 on January 3, 1900.

The glass trust increased the price of glass from $2.57 on January 4, 1899, to $2.89 on January 3, 1900.

The rubber trust increased the price of rubber from 94 cents on January 4, 1899, to $1.45 on January 3, 1900.

The prices of boots and shoes, controlled by the leather trust, shows an increase during the year 1899 on men's grain shoes from 97 cents to $1.12; on Creedmore splits, from 95 cents to $1.10; and a like increase on all grades of boots and shoes.

All lines of building material, iron, steel, woolen goods, leather, and other lines controlled by industrial trusts, although showing a great increase in price during the years 1897 and 1898, showed even a greater increase during the year 1899.

The only prices to fall were those of farm products. The Year-Book of the Department of Agriculture for 1899, which has just been issued, shows that the farm products and farm animals in 1899, although vastly increased in quantity since 1890, had fallen off in value to the extent of $706,969,971. This only counts as farm products corn, wheat, oats, barley, rye, buckwheat, potatoes, hay, and cotton. The cotton year of 1898, ending September 1, 1899, is used. If the farm products of 1899 had brought the same prices as did the same products in 1890 they would have brought more than they did by the sum of $2,609,437,584.

The farmers raised 1,013,000,000 more bushels of produce in 1899 than they did in 1890, and yet this produce was worth $205,000,000 less than was the smaller crop of 1890. This only calculates the cereals.

The farmers of the United States are paying 33⅓ per cent more for all they consume than they were when the present Administration went into power on March 4, 1897, and have lost during the present Administration nearly $2,000,000,000 by the decline in prices of farm products. In this calculation the statistics of 1897, the first year of the present Administration, are used.

The wheat in the farmers' hands in 1897 was valued at $428,547,121. The wheat in the farmers' hands in 1899 was valued at $319,545,259. The farmers lost $109,000,000 in the value of wheat alone, and yet the yield of wheat was increased.

The value of the cotton crop in 1897 was $319,000,000, and had fallen off $14,000,000 the next year, while the crop of 1899 is not yet calculated.

The average price of wheat in 1897 was 80.8 cents a bushel, while in 1899 it was only 58.4 cents a bushel.

These are the figures given by the Republican Secretary of Agriculture, and it can not be said that they were concocted for a Democratic campaign argument.

All parties admit that trade monopolies, trusts, and combinations in restraint of trade in order to destroy competition or to increase prices ought to be suppressed or destroyed. There may be a difference of opinion as to the remedies to be applied, but those remedies ever since the days of Blackstone have been drastic and in the nature of criminal punishment.

It is impossible to believe that the Republican party is sincere in any effort to suppress these monopolies and combinations which are so oppressive to the people. They never existed under Democratic rule, but were born in this country under the Republican system of internal taxation, and that not being sufficient to give life to enough of them to satisfy the demands of the monopolists the McKinley tariff law was so constructed as to give them a new impetus, and a number of them were formed under the operation of that Republican measure.

The Democrats when in power brought about a revision of the tariff law, and under the Wilson law several of the trusts went out of existence and others were not formed. The Republican party again came into power, again revised the revenue laws under the dictation of the trusts, and within twelve months after the Dingley law was passed more trusts were organized than had ever before existed in the entire history of the United States. That the Republican party was not opposed to these combinations is shown by the fact that more than one-half of their Cabinet officers were publicly charged with being themselves violators of the law against trusts and of being attorneys and directors of these illegal corporations. The leaders of the party have from the first attempted to explain that there are no trusts in the United States, but that all the large aggregations of capital are merely harbingers of prosperity.

The proposed amendment of the Constitution is in the following language:

ARTICLE XVI.

SECTION 1. All powers conferred by this article shall extend to the several States, the Territories, the District of Columbia, and all the territory under the sovereignty and subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

SEC. 2. Congress shall have power to define, regulate, control, prohibit, or dissolve trusts, monopolies, or combinations, whether existing in the form of a corporation or otherwise.

The several States may continue to exercise such power in any manner not in conflict with the laws of the United States.

SEC. 3. Congress shall have power to enforce the provisions of this article by appropriate legislation.

The minority of this House have endeavored to amend this resolution in accordance with the suggestion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY], referred to in his remarks this morning. And the Democrats will ask that the resolution be amended in accordance with the suggestion of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY]; but a Republican Speaker, sustained by a Republican majority here, will not permit the improvement or amendment of the resolution. It is to be offered in its present objectionable form so that Democrats may not be permitted to vote for a proposition to amend the Constitution. There are objections to this resolution in its present form. Such an amendment to the Constitution would deprive the States of rights which they ought not to and will never surrender. Such an amendment is too far-reaching.

It would give Congress the sole right, if it so chose, to define what is a trust, combine, or monopoly, or what is not a trust, combine, or monopoly, and the States could in no wise define differently, however oppressive and criminal might be the combines or monopolies covered or protected by the Congressional definition. It is no answer to say that the several States "may continue to exercise such power in any manner not in conflict with the laws of the United States," for if Congress should legislate under this proposed amendment it would deprive the States of the right to legislate except "in any manner not in conflict with the laws of the United States." If the trusts should control Congress, then the States would be shorn of all power. No State could punish its own conspirators who entered into an illegal trade combination against the interests of her own people. If power be conferred upon Congress to declare certain combinations or conspiracies illegal, Congress could likewise declare that certain other combinations or conspiracies were not illegal. In other words, it could license the carrying on of illegal combinations in restraint of trade and oppressive to the public where the States now have power to deal with the combinations and conspirators.

But, Mr. Speaker, if the amendments suggested by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY] or by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] were adopted, I would vote for the resolution. I do not think the proposed amendment necessary. And I do not believe it possible for it to ever pass Congress, or, if it did pass Congress, that it is possible for it to meet with the favor of the States. I would vote for it because the amendments to it would deprive it of possible harm to the respective States and their people. These amendments would preserve to the States control of domestic conspiracies and intra-state commerce and affairs.

The question of trusts, monopolies, and contracts in restraint of trade is not a new one, and it is only of late years that it has been hedged about by the serious difficulties which now beset the subject upon every hand. The early commentators upon the common law, from Blackstone down, had a well-defined idea of this matter, and classed all such combinations as "crimes against trade."

There are two ways of treating a combination formed for the purpose of preventing competition, or whose operations have the effect of preventing competition, and those ways rest upon entirely different principles. The one is by a civil proceeding invoking the extraordinary remedies of courts of law or equity in order to dissolve such combinations or prevent them from transacting business. Such a proceeding is distinctly a civil one and as such must be supported by the constitutional rules relating to the regulation of commerce.

As long as these combinations are treated as instruments of commerce the right to regulate them must rest upon the right to regulate commerce. But under the common-law rule, which has never been changed by any statute and has never been doubted by any court, these offenses are criminal in their nature and their regulation does not fall under any rule as to the regulation of commerce, but comes strictly within the local right of the States to regulate their own internal police affairs. It is no more necessary for the States to have the right to regulate commerce in order to punish crimes against commerce than it is for them to have the right to issue money in order to punish crimes against the issuance of money. No State has the right to coin money or to issue evidences of indebtedness to circulate as money, and yet every State has the right to punish the crime of counterfeiting or of passing counterfeit money. It has the right whether or not those guilty are citizens of the State or of some other State.

Money is a means of commerce, and indirectly a law regulating the coinage or passing of money is a regulation of commerce. No lawyer will doubt the right of the States to prevent the circulation of counterfeit money, and it would have that right even though the statutes of the United States failed to make it a criminal offense. It has that right independently of the action of Congress and yet not concurrently with Congress. In fact, a criminal offense may constitute two distinct and separate offenses—one under the Federal law and one under the State law—and a conviction for one of these offenses does not constitute a bar to a prosecution for the other offense. The same principle applies to laws passed for the purpose of punishing offenses against trade and commerce. Even though the States have no right to regulate commerce where such legislation affects the subject of interstate commerce, yet they can regulate crimes against trade, even though the instruments of commerce are used as the instruments of such crimes.

This is not a mere offense which is malum prohibitum under the common acceptation of that term. It has been treated as a crime for centuries and in every civilized country. The idea that a man living in the State of New York can commit crime in the State of Pennsylvania through agencies established in that State and render the State of Pennsylvania powerless to prevent or punish crimes within its borders because such crimes are committed by a nonresident through resident agents in connection with commercial transactions involves an absurdity.

The common law to-day, as has always been the case, treats civil contracts involving crime against trade as absolutely void. Can a matter which is not the subject of a contract, because such a contract would be void as against public policy, be considered as a part of the subject of legitimate interstate commerce? Can a contract prohibited by the laws of commerce and made for the purpose of destroying commerce be set up as a defense upon the theory that it is protected by a constitutional provision regulating commerce? That constitutional provision was intended for the upbuilding of commerce and not for a defense upon the part of those who seek to destroy it.

A regulation of commerce is one thing; a protection of the property rights of citizens is quite another thing. This protection of property rights in every phase of the criminal law goes so far as to protect a man against conspiracy, intimidation, and fraud while pursuing any legitimate vocation. It has been recognized by the law writers from the time of Justinian to the present day that the rights of the individual in his occupation are legitimately the subject of state protection against monopolies and combinations formed for the purpose of preventing free competition. And this rule, like any other rule relating to criminal intent, goes so far that the purpose will be presumed from the natural effect.

If the sale of goods, no matter how innocent in themselves the goods may be, has the effect of injuring the free competition in goods of like nature, it is not only the right but the duty of the States to stop such sales. The sale of gunpowder, while not directly in point, is so in its underlying principle. There is nothing harmful to the public about gunpowder in small quantities, but the writers universally recognize the right of States and municipal corporations to regulate the sale of gunpowder and the manner of its handling in order to prevent any possibility of its injuring the property of others. No one has ever claimed that the question of the regulation of commerce had anything to do with this matter. It rests upon an entirely different principle. It rests upon the same principle upon which rests the right of the State to protect its citizens against the results of unlawful monopolies or contracts in restraint of trade.

It does not make any difference where the gunpowder comes from, nor who sells it. The article itself is regulated because it might prove injurious to the property of others. The same is true of the product of a monopoly. If that product were not injurious to the rights of others, then there could be no legitimate reason for controlling the subject at all. If that product is injurious to the rights of others and their property in their business, then the sale can be regulated upon the same principle which underlies the sale of other property likely to be injurious. The gunpowder laws rest upon the theory that the rights of property must be protected; inspection laws rest upon the theory that health must be protected; laws against crimes against trade rest upon the theory that people must be protected in their occupations through which they acquire property and promote wealth. The same principle underlies all trade. There is no question whatever that regulations concerning the sale of gunpowder or other dangerous materials, and regulations concerning inspection are wholly distinct from any regulations of commerce, and laws aimed against crimes against trade rest upon identically the same principle.

If any difference of opinion should exist concerning the jurisdiction of courts under such statutes as to the punishment of offenders, it would be a very easy matter for Congress to set all such doubts at rest. While it is a general rule of law that legislative authority can not be delegated, yet there is an exception to that rule, which is that the execution of the law can be delegated. The rule applies with as much force to the legislatures of the States as it does to the Federal Legislature, and yet in every State legislative powers are delegated to every municipal corporation.

Congress has delegated powers to the courts of the several States to determine Federal questions. Such powers have uniformly been upheld by the courts. All that is necessary is for Congress to delegate to the courts of the different States jurisdiction over persons and acts under the laws against crimes against commerce where the same affect commerce between the States.

If the laws are defective, as is claimed, it would be a comparatively easy matter for Congress to control this subject through its taxing power, and control it effectually. When the United States Supreme Court declared the last income-tax law to be unconstitutional, it expressly reserved the question of graduated occupation taxes. A graduated occupation tax would shut up every trust or criminal corporate combination in the United States if properly arranged. A graduated occupation tax rests upon sound principle. The man who has but $10,000 invested in business has a right to be protected against the destruction of his business by the man with $10,000,000. The man with $10,000,000, having been most greatly benefited and being most greatly protected by the Government, should pay for that increase of benefits and protection.

If a graduated occupation tax was so arranged that business would be profitable with moderate capital and would become unprofitable when capitalized to such an extent that it would control production or consumption, there would be no trusts. There is no question about the constitutionality of such a measure. If it be true that Congress can not control the question of trusts and monopolies under the commerce laws, it is certainly true that Congress can control that question under the taxing clause. Congress has built up the trusts without any provision authorizing it to do so, and built them up under the taxing power, and Congress can regulate them or prohibit them under the same power.

There was no question of constitutionality raised when the anti-trust amendment was introduced to the Dingley law as a revenue measure. The Republicans on this floor who now want a constitutional amendment, as they claim, against trusts, because the commerce clause, they claim, is not strong enough to support such a law, recognized then that an anti-trust amendment to the revenue bill would destroy the trusts, and consequently voted the amendment down. There was not one word said about the unconstitutionality of controlling the trusts through the power of taxation. If the Republican members of this House have an honest desire to control the trusts, their desire can be gratified without any constitutional amendment.

The Republican system, on which the trusts have been built up, has reduced the duty collected per capita from $5.23 under the Morrill tariff to $1.96 under the Dingley law, and has increased the public expense from $4.15 under the Morrill tariff to $7.97 under the Dingley law. In order to foster the trusts the customs revenues of the country have been cut down to so low a figure by reason of the excessive tariff rates, designed to be prohibitive and not for revenue, that they pay but a small percentage of the expenses of government. The result is an onerous system of internal taxation of which the people are growing very weary. Now, if Congress, through a graduated occupation tax, will compel these men for whose benefit the revenues of the country have been decreased, to supply the deficiency, the trusts will be regulated and the men who receive the benefits of our revenue system will stand their proportion of the losses sustained through it. If there is an honest desire upon the part of the Republicans to prevent the trusts from paralyzing industrial and commercial interests of the country, they will repeal the war taxes and pass a graduated occupation tax.

The proposed amendment places the power to "define" trusts in Congress. It places the power to "regulate" all trusts in Congress. This amendment places the power to "prohibit" in Congress. It places the power to "dissolve" in Congress. These powers, just as the powers conferred by other sections of the Constitution, are necessarily exclusive. The section then goes on to say that the States can exercise any powers not in conflict with these. Under this provision the States would have the right to do everything except to "define, regulate, prohibit, or dissolve trusts, monopolies, or combinations." These powers, being delegated to Congress, are necessarily exclusive.

Thirty-one of the States already have laws against trusts, and every one of them which has become the subject of judicial inquiry has been sustained. The effect of this amendment would be to nullify all of these laws and leave the trusts absolutely free and untrammeled until Congress should see fit to regulate them. The American people have no guaranty that this regulation would be at all displeasing to the trusts themselves. It would not be if the same men were in control of Congress as were there when the amendment to the revenue law was defeated. The amendment, it will be noted, does not require Congress to prohibit trusts. Congress could carry out the purposes of this amendment by only defining them. It could carry out the purposes of the amendment by a license which would perpetuate them, or it could carry out its purposes by providing a means for dissolving them when they violated the provisions of their charters.

None of these laws would be opposed by the trusts themselves, and any one of them would be a carrying out of the provisions of this amendment. This amendment, if adopted, would have the effect of making the States powerless and bringing the influence of thousands of millions of capital to bear upon Congress to perpetuate the trusts, and that influence might be very potent. The probabilities are, that the adoption of this amendment would be a complete surrender to the trusts of everything that they do not now control, and a legal sanction for their continued control of that which they now only hold as violators of law.

No lawyer requires a definition of trusts. They have been defined by every law writer since the time of Lord Coke. A trust combination is an illegal combination, and contracts for forming such a combination are absolutely void. A regulation of trusts could therefore be made to mean to legalize what is now unlawful. A prohibition of trusts would add very little to the present law upon the subject, as they are now prohibited by Congress and by thirty-one of the States. A dissolution of trusts could not be accomplished in any case where it is not possible now. If a corporation conducts its business in an illegal manner and for an illegal purpose, which it does if it is a trust, its charter can be forfeited and the trust dissolved as the law now stands. An adoption of this amendment would gain nothing and lose much.

The reasons given by the majority of the committee for advocating this amendment can be very briefly stated: That Congress now only has jurisdiction so far as interstate commerce is concerned and the States only have jurisdiction so far as internal commerce is concerned within the limits of the State. The remedy is to take away the rights of the State and leave trade conspiracies free and untrammeled until Congress shall see fit to act, and then to leave the whole subject to the discretion of a body which for years has been the only friend the trusts ever had in the civilized world.

The most singular feature of this entire matter is that every law that has been passed by Congress or the States has been upheld by the courts. There has not been a single man convicted under any law of Congress or the States who has escaped punishment. Whenever the courts have been called upon to pass upon these laws they have sustained them. The trouble seems to be that the officers to whom are intrusted the duties of instituting prosecutions object to the law and decline to bring prosecutions under it.

In an editorial the American Law Review, in its March–April number, 1900, explains the difficulties in the way of enforcing the anti-trust law. The American Law Review is not a partisan publication nor a political one. The editors, Seymour D. Thompson, of St. Louis, and Leonard A. Jones, of Boston, are both law writers of established authority, and have both written books upon the law of corporations which have been cited by the courts throughout the country. There could scarcely be two men in an editorial capacity on a law journal who would be more familiar with the subject of trusts. The following is the editorial:

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL ON TRUSTS AND COMBINATIONS IN RESTRAINT OF TRADE.

On the day following that on which the Supreme Court of the United States rendered its decision affirming the court of appeals for the Sixth circuit in the Addystone Pipe Company case, Attorney-General Griggs sent his annual report to Congress, reviewing the work of the Department of Justice during the year 1899. He says that application is occasionally made to the Department to have legal proceedings brought in the name of the United States against corporations or combinations of companies that are alleged to be engaged in forming or maintaining monopolies or agreements in restraint of trade. He ought to have added that such applications have been frequently made in perfectly plain cases, by distinguished persons, both to him and to his predecessor, Judge McKenna, and that the letters in which they were made were not even answered.

"Such actions," the Attorney-General says, "can be maintained only when the offense comes within the scope of the Federal statute. The only Federal legislation against combinations in restraint of trade is contained in the so-called Sherman Act of July 2, 1890.

"It will be observed that this statute is directed only at combinations or monopolies in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations. It does not pretend to go into other branches of business or commerce, or attempt in any way to interfere with those transactions which are carried on exclusively within the confines of a State, or which do not amount to what, under the decisions of the United States Supreme Court, is understood by the term 'interstate commerce.'

"The Federal Government has no constitutional right to supervise, direct, or interfere with the transaction of ordinary business by the people of the several States, unless such business relates directly, and not incidentally, to interstate commerce; and such has been the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States."

The Attorney-General discusses this subject at some length, quoting freely from the decisions of the courts sustaining his position. In conclusion he says:

"In all cases where the facts presented to the Attorney-General were capable of legal proof and have established satisfactorily such an agreement or combination in restraint of interstate commerce as is contemplated by the Sherman Act, legal proceedings have been taken by him in the name of the United States either to dissolve the combination or to punish the offenders by indictment."

The last paragraph of the Attorney-General's report we take leave to qualify. We know the contrary to be the fact, so far as his predecessor was concerned in an important case and in the same case so far as he is concerned. When the office was held by Judge McKenna, Hon. Nathan Frank, who was personally acquainted with the Attorney-General and who had served with him on at least one committee in Congress, wrote to him requesting him to instruct the United States district attorney for the eastern district of Missouri to bring a proceeding in equity under the act of Congress of 1890, known

as the Sherman anti-trust law, to restrain the Associated Press from maintaining its monopolistic feature, whereby its so-called "local board"—that is to say, the proprietors of newspapers whom it served in any particular town—could exclude any other newspaper from receiving its service, even by the dissent of a single one of them. This letter was never answered. Subsequently Hon. Franklin Bartlett, counsel for the Sun Printing and Publishing Association, the publisher of the New York Sun, made a similar application to the present Attorney-General, and his letter was never answered.

The position of the Attorney-General, as stated in his report, is based, as he says, upon interference with "the transaction of ordinary business." The same is the difficulty with the majority of the committee. If this is an interference with the transaction of ordinary business, then Congress has nothing to do with it and ought not to have, even under a constitutional amendment. The Attorney-General can see no difference between ordinary business and an act which was a crime at common law and has remained a crime for centuries. If larceny were treated as a matter of ordinary business, it would be very difficult to deal with it. If these crimes against trade are treated as matters of ordinary business, then it is impossible to stop them. If the Attorney-General would quit treating these illegal acts as affairs of ordinary business and treat them as serious offenses, which the law declares them to be, the trouble of enforcing the law would be at an end.

In the entire discussion of this question by the majority of the committee these trusts are treated as a part of a legitimate commerce instead of as crimes against commerce. Discuss any crime upon the same basis, and no crime would ever be punished.

The distinction between regulation of commerce and regulation of offenses against commerce is not only borne out by reason, but by adjudicated authorities. (Robbins *vs.* Taxing Dt., 120 U. S., 489.)

A State may enact laws which in practice operate to affect commerce among the States, as by providing, in the legitimate exercise of its police power and general jurisdiction, for the security and comfort of persons and the protection of property; by establishing and regulating channels for commercial facilities; by the passage of inspection laws and laws to restrict the sale of articles injurious to health and morals; by the imposition of taxes upon avocations within its borders not interfering with foreign or interstate commerce or employment, or with business exercised under authority of the Constitution of the United States, and the imposition of taxes on all property within the State, mingled with and forming part of the great mass of property therein.

It is an established principle that the only way in which commerce between the States—that is, legitimate commerce—can be legitimately affected by State laws is when, by virtue of its police power and its jurisdiction over persons and property within its limits, a State provides for the security of the lives, limbs, health, and comfort of persons and the protection of property. (Bowman *vs.* Chicago Railway, 125 U. S., 465.)

Speaking of the police power of the State as to the introduction of articles "unfit for human use or consumption," the court said:

> Such articles are not merchantable; they are not legitimate subjects of trade and commerce. They may be highly outlawed as intrinsically and directly the immediate sources and causes of destruction to human health and life. The self-protecting power of each State, therefore, may be rightfully exerted against their introduction, and such exercises of power can not be considered regulations of commerce prohibited by the Constitution.
>
> The articles of monopoly are also outlawed by the act of 1890, and are subject to seizure as confiscated. (City of New York *vs.* Miln, 11 Peters, 103.)

Whilst a State is acting within the scope of its legitimate power as to the end to be attained it may use whatever means, being appropriate to the end, it may think fit, although they may be the same or so nearly the same as scarcely to be distinguished from those adopted by Congress acting under a different power, subject only to this limitation, that in the event of collision the law of the State must yield to the law of Congress. (Citing Gibbons *vs.* Ogden, 9 Wheat., 203, and Brown *vs.* Maryland, 12 Wheat., 419.)

A State has the same undeniable and unlimited jurisdiction over all persons, when that jurisdiction is not surrendered or restrained by the Constitution of the United States. It is not only the right but the bounden and solemn duty of a State to advance the safety, happiness, and prosperity of its people and to provide for its general welfare by any and every act of legislation which it may deem conducive to these ends, where the power over the particular subject or the manner of its exercise is not surrendered or restrained by the Constitution of the United States. All those powers which regulate merely municipal legislation, or which may be more properly called internal police, are not surrendered or restrained, and consequently in relation to these the authority of a State is complete, unqualified, and exclusive.

It is at all times difficult to define any subject with precision and accuracy. If this be so in general, it is emphatically so in relation to a subject so diversified and various as the present case. If the court were to attempt it, they would say that every law comes within the description of a regulation of police which concerns the welfare of the whole people of a State or any individual within it; whether it relates to their rights or their duties; whether it respects them as men or as citizens of the State in their public or private relations, whether it relates to the rights of persons or of property of the whole people of a State, or of any individual within it, and whose operation is within the territorial limits of the State and upon the persons and things within its jurisdiction. An example of the application of these principles is the right of a State to punish persons who commit offenses against its criminal laws within its territory. (Georgia Banking Company *vs.* Smith, 128 M. S., 179.)

It has been adjudged by this court in numerous instances that the legislature of a State has the power to prescribe the charges of a railroad company for the carriage of persons and merchandise, within its limits, in the absence of any provision in the charter of the company constituting a contract vesting in it authority over those matters, subject to the limitation that the carriage is not required without reward, or upon conditions amounting to the taking of property for public use without just compensation, and that what is done does not amount to a regulation of foreign or interstate commerce. (Citing 116 U. S., 331; 125 U. S., 680; 94 U. S., 113.)

So long as the use continues, the power of regulation remains, and the regulation may extend not merely to provisions for the security of passengers and freight against accidents, and for the convenience of the public, but also to prevent extortion by unreasonable charges and favoritism by unjust discriminations. This is not a new doctrine, but old doctrine, always asserted whenever property or business is, by reason of special privileges received from the Government, the better to secure the purposes to which the property is dedicated or devoted affected by a public use. When such use exists the business becomes subject to legislative control in all respects necessary to protect the public against danger, injustice, and oppression. (Munn *vs.* Illinois, 96 U. S., 113.)

Where warehouses are situated and their business is carried on exclusively within a State, the State may, as a matter of domestic concern, prescribe regulations for them, notwithstanding they are used as instruments by those engaged in interstate as well as in State commerce; and until Congress acts in reference to their interstate relations such regulations can be enforced, even though they may indirectly operate upon commerce beyond the immediate jurisdiction of the State. (Louisville and Nashville Railroad Company *vs.* Kentucky, 161 U. S., 678.)

Whatever is contrary to public policy or inimical to the public interests is subject to the police power of the State and is within legislative control, and in the exertion of such power the legislature is vested with a large discretion, which if exercised bona fide, for the protection of the public is beyond the reach of judicial inquiry.

The formation of trusts was an offense at common law, and must be considered as an offense and not merely as a regulation of commerce. The right to the free and unrestricted conduct of trade is a fundamental one and not a matter of ordinary civil regulation.

All combinations which have for their object the injurious affection of public interests are indictable. Thus, for several to conspire to stimulate dishonestly the price of commodities upon the market. Rex *vs.* De Berenger (3 M. and S., 67), Rex *vs.* Aspenwall (12 B., Div. 730), Rex *vs.* Norris (2 Kenyon, 300), Rex *vs.* Hilbers (2 Chit. R., 163), sustain this doctrine as to raising the price of oil or salt.

At common law forestalling the market, engrossing, and monopoly were indictable offenses.

And combinations to raise prices of provisions, etc., were severely punished with fine, imprisonment, the pillory, maiming, perpetual infamy, and sometimes banishment. (Blackstone's Commentaries, Book IV, page 159, Cooley's edition.)

Said Mr. Justice Field (111 U. S., page 757):

> Among these inalienable rights, as proclaimed in that great document, is the right of men to pursue their happiness, by which is meant the right to pursue any lawful business or vocation in any manner not inconsistent with the equal rights of others, which may increase their prosperity or develop their faculties, so as to give to them their highest enjoyment.
>
> The common business and callings of life, the ordinary trades and pursuits, which are innocuous in themselves and have been followed in all communities from time immemorial, must, therefore, be free in this country to all alike upon the conditions. The right to pursue them without let or hindrance, except that which is applied to all persons of the same age, sex, and condition, is a distinguishing privilege of citizens of the United States and an essential element of that freedom which they claim as their birthright.

Said Mr. Justice Bradley (same case, page 762):

> The right to follow any of the common occupations of life is an inalienable right. It was formulated as such under the phrase "pursuit of happiness" in the Declaration of Independence, which commenced with the fundamental proposition that "all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." This right is a large ingredient in the civil liberty of the citizen.

When the subject is treated as one of criminal law, the power of the States is ample and the State statutes have been uniformly upheld, as the following cases will demonstrate:

In New Jersey it was held that where the members of a manufacturers' association produce nearly the whole quantity of an article necessary to the comfort and health of the community, and have agreed to make their prices such as the majority of the

members shall prescribe, a scheme to buy and combine into one company the plants of a majority of the members, obtain the control of prices at which all the members shall sell, put the vendors under a covenant not to compete, and thus secure the ability to dictate the prices which the public must pay for the productions of all the members of the association, is an effort to create a monopoly in an article of general necessity and is against public policy. The covenants to restrain competition, though they may be several as between the vendors and the vendee, will be considered as part of a single plan to secure a monopoly. If they are executory, a court of equity will not enforce them. (New Jersey chancery court, 39 Atl. R., 923.)

Monopoly of any lawful trade is against public policy, it not being essential that such trade should be in the necessities of life. (People *vs.* Duke et al., 44 New York Supp., 336.)

A combination to control the price and production of a certain article may be illegal though its manufacture is protected by patents. (47 New York Supp., 462.)

A combination is not protected because organized as a corporation under a State statute. (18 New York Supp., 224.)

Anti-trust act of 1889 in Kansas sustained. (Barton *vs.* Mulvane, 59 Kans., 313.)

Act of 1891 of Illinois sustained, prohibiting pools, trusts, and combinations. (155 Ill., 166.)

In Ohio in the Standard Oil Company case the statute was sustained. (30 N. E. R., 279.)

In Indiana in the Natural Gas and Oil Company case the statute was sustained. (53 N. E. R., 1089.)

Texas acts of 1889 and 1895 sustained by Texas court of appeals. (44 S. W. Rep., 236.)

Considered from the standpoint of commerce and not from that of criminal law, the jurisdiction of the State could not be so exercised as to injuriously affect interstate commerce, but even under that construction the difficulty is more apparent than real. Congress could delegate any necessary authority to punish offenses against interstate commerce. This was directly done by the Wilson Act. The following case is in point: Morgan, etc., Company *vs.* Board of Health, 118 U. S., 455.

The system of quarantine established by statutes of Louisiana is a rightful exercise of the police power for the protection of health which is not forbidden by the Constitution of the United States. While some of the rules of that system may amount to regulations of commerce with foreign nations or among the States, though not so designed, they belong to that class which the States may establish until Congress acts in the matter by covering the same ground or forbidding State laws.

Congress, so far from doing either of these things, has, by the act of 1799 and previous laws and by the recent act of 1878, adopted the laws of the States on that subject and forbidden all interference with their enforcement. (Bowman *vs.* Chicago, etc., Railroad Company, 125 U. S., 465.)

A State can not, for the purpose of protecting its people from the evils of intemperance, enact laws which regulate—that is, prescribe rules for—commerce between its people and those of other States of the Union unless the consent of Congress, express or implied, is first obtained. (United States *vs.* Jones, 109 U. S., 513.)

The power of eminent domain belongs both to the States and to the United States.

And the Government of the United States may delegate to a tribunal, created under the laws of the State, the power to fix the amount of compensation to be paid by the United States for private property taken thereby in the exercise of the right of eminent domain, or it may, if it pleases, create a special tribunal for that purpose. (Citing 91 U. S., 367; In re Spickler, 43 Fed. Rep., 653.)

Act of Congress of 1890, known as the Wilson bill, declaring that intoxicating liquors shall, on arrival in a State, be subject to the police powers of the State, simply defines the times when imported intoxicating liquors shall become subject to State control, and is therefore not unconstitutional as being a delegation to the States of the power to regulate interstate commerce. On the passage by Congress of the Wilson bill, which subjects to State police laws all imported liquors as soon as they pass within the boundaries of the State, it became unlawful to sell such liquors in Iowa without a reenactment of the prohibitory liquor law. (In re Van Vliet, 43 Fed. Rep., 761.)

The said act (Wilson law) is a legitimate exercise of the power to regulate interstate commerce. (In re Rahrer, 140 U. S., 545.)

The Wilson law was sustained as to liquor in original packages subject to the local State laws under the police power.

The States now have power to control this subject under criminal laws and Congress has power to control it under its authority over interstate commerce. These offenses against commerce were known at the time the Constitution was adopted, and it is not reasonable that the framers of that instrument would have intended that Congress should not have power to protect commerce against destruction. The power to regulate carries with it by implication all necessary powers. This position is sustained by the following authority: Prigg *vs.* Pennsylvania (16 Peters, 542).

Congress has on various occasions exercised powers which were necessary and proper as means to carry into effect rights expressly given and duties expressly enjoined by the Constitution. The end being required, it has been deemed a just and necessary implication that the means to accomplish it are given also; or, in other words, that the power flows as a necessary means to accomplish the ends.

The legislation of Congress, if constitutional, must supersede all State legislation upon the same subject, and by necessary implication prohibit it. For if Congress has a constitutional power to regulate a particular subject and does actually regulate it in a given manner and in a certain form, it can not be that the State legislatures have a right to interfere. Where Congress has exclusive power over a subject it is not competent for State legislation to add to the provisions of Congress on that subject.

Wherever Congress exercises a concurrent power it is made in effect an exclusive power. There are, it is true, cases of concurrent power on which both Federal and State legislation may act at the same time and where the latter is not suspended by the action of the former. Thus the exercise of the taxing power by Congress does not suspend the concurrent power of the States, because, although the same power, it is exercised on different objects or for different purposes; but where the power acts on the same subject-matter to accomplish the same end the State power is necessarily suspended.

Congress acted under this clause of the Constitution in 1890, and passed a law against trusts. This law has been universally upheld. Among the authorities are the following: Addystone P. & S. Co. *vs.* United States (175 U. S., 211—no dissent); statement. Combination of companies in Cincinnati, Louisville, Bessemer, Anniston, South Pittsburg, Chattanooga; syllabus.

Under the grant of power to Congress contained in section 8 of Article I of the Constitution, "to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States, and with Indian tribes," that body may enact such legislation as shall declare void and prohibit the performance of any contract between individuals or corporations where the natural and direct effect of such a contract shall be, when carried out, to directly, and not as a mere incident to other and innocent purposes, regulate to any extent interstate or foreign commerce.

The provision in the Constitution regarding the liberty of the citizen is to some extent limited by the commerce clause; and the power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce comprises the right to enact a law prohibiting the citizen from entering into those private contracts which directly and substantially and not merely indirectly, remotely, incidentally, and collaterally regulate, to a greater or less degree, commerce among the States.

Interstate commerce consists of intercourse and traffic between the citizens or inhabitants of different States, and includes not only the transportation of persons and property and the navigation of public waters, but also the purchase, sale, and exchange of commodities.

The power to regulate interstate commerce and to prescribe the rules by which it shall be governed is vested in Congress, and when that body has enacted a statute such as the act of July 2, 1890, any agreement or combination which directly operates not alone upon the manufacture but upon the sale, transportation, and delivery of an article of interstate commerce by preventing or restricting its sale, thereby regulates interstate commerce to that extent and thus trenches upon the power of the National Legislature and violates the statute. (Held that the agreement in this case was an unlawful combination.)

When the direct, immediate, and intended effect of a contract or combination among dealers in a commodity is the enhancement of its price, it amounts to a restraint of trade in the commodity, even though contracts to buy it at the enhanced price are being made. (United States *vs.* Trans-Missouri Freight Association, 166 U. S., 290.)

This case sustains fully the act of 1890 (July 2), and the court held that—

The prohibitory provisions of the act apply to all contracts in restraint of interstate or foreign trade or commerce without exception or limitation, and are not confined to those in which the restraint is unreasonable.

In order to maintain this suit (for injuction) the Government is not obliged to show that the agreement in question was entered into for the purpose of restraining trade or commerce, if such restraint is its necessary effect.

This agreement, though legal when made, became illegal on the passage of the act of July 2, 1890, and acts done under it after that statute became operative were done in violation of it.

The fourth section of the act invests the Government with full power and authority to bring such a suit as this; and if the facts alleged are proved, an injunction should issue.

Under the act of 1890 a contract between railroad companies in restraint of commerce is prohibited, even though the contract is entered into between competing railroads only for the purpose of thereby affecting traffic for the transportation of persons and property. The prohibitory provisions of the act apply to all contracts in restraint of interstate or foreign trade or commerce without exception or limitation and are not confined to those in which the restraint is unreasonable. In order to maintain a suit the Government is not obliged to show that the agreement in question was entered into for the purpose of restraining trade or commerce if such restraint is its necessary effect. (United States *vs.* Joint Traffic Association, 171 U. S., 505.)

Congress, with regard to interstate commerce and in the course

of regulating it in the case of railroad corporations, has the power to say that no contract or combination shall be legal which shall restrain trade and commerce by shutting out competition.

The following decisions have also been rendered:

Held, that a combination among manufacturers of spring-tooth harrows by which each manufacturer assigns to a corporation organized for the purpose the patents under which he is operating and takes back an exclusive license to make and sell the same style of harrows previously made by him and no other, all the parties being bound to sell at uniform prices, is an unlawful combination for the enhancement of prices and in restraint of trade. (National Harrow Company vs. Hench, 76 Fed. R. (Pa.), 667, citing 68 Pa. St., 173; 119 N. Y., 46; 161 Pa. St., 473.)

In a suit to restrain alleged violations of the law of 1890 against trusts and monopolies affecting interstate commerce the existence of an illegal combination among the defendants is to be determined not alone from what appears on the face of the preamble, rules, and by-laws of their association, but from the entire situation and the practical working and results of their methods of doing business as disclosed by the evidence.

The act of Congress is aimed against all restraints of interstate commerce, and its purpose is to permit commerce between the States to flow in its natural channels, unrestricted by any combinations, contracts, conspiracies, or monopolies whatsoever. The reasonableness of the restrictions in a given case is immaterial.

The fact that the place of business of an association is located upon both sides of the line dividing two States is in itself of no material importance in determining whether the business transacted by it is commerce between the States. (United States vs. Hopkins, 82 Fed. R., 529 Kans.)

Numerous manufacturers, under various United States patents of float spring-tooth harrows, agreed to organize a corporation, to assign to it all the patents thus owned or thereafter to be acquired, and the good will of their business, and not to be interested in the manufacture or sale of such harrows except as agents or licensees of the corporation; that the corporation should license them to manufacture and sell, for their own account, subject to uniform terms and conditions, their respective makes, and should not itself manufacture or sell; that each licensee should pay $1 for each such harrow manufactured and sold by him and should receive paid-up stock in return for the patents and good will.

Those who entered the agreement represented 70 per cent of the total manufacture and sales of the United States. The corporation was formed and the assignments made. The licenses issued also bound the licensors not to cut prices, not to sell other float spring-tooth harrows except under the licenses, and provided unliquidated damages for every breach. Held, that the arrangement was an unlawful combination in restraint of trade. (National Harrow Company vs. Hench, United States circuit court of appeals, Pennsylvania, 83 Fed. R., 36.)

Under the anti-trust law of 1890 (United States), a contract or combination which imposes any restraints whatever upon interstate commerce is unlawful; and it is immaterial whether or not the restraint is a fair and reasonable one, or whether it has actually resulted in increasing the price of the commodity dealt in.

Where coal is brought from other States and foreign countries by importers and dealers, who, by a combination with a local coal dealers' association, regulate the retail prices arbitrarily and provide against free competition, such combination is one in restraint of interstate commerce in the meaning of the act of 1890. (United States vs. Coal Dealers, etc., Association, Cal., 85 Fed. R., 252.)

There have been two decisions of the United States Supreme Court which are quoted as sustaining a contrary view—the Knight case (156 U. S., 1), which held only that the mere manufacture of an article could not constitute the gravamen of the offense, which is certainly a correct view, and the case of Leisy vs. Hardin (135 U. S., 10) which, it has been wrongly asserted, decided against the power of a State to pass anti-trust laws, but which was expressly limited and restricted by the case of Plumley vs. Massachusetts, which says:

The judiciary of the United States should not strike down a legislative enactment of a State, especially if it has direct connection with the social order, the health, and the morals of its people, unless such legislation plainly and palpably violates some right granted or secured by the national Constitution or encroaches upon the authority delegated to the United States for the attainment of objects of national concern.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of remedies now possessed by Congress under the Constitution for the suppression of these trust evils. The bill which bears the name of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LITTLEFIELD] is an admission on its face that Congress has power to legislate for the destruction of these illegal combinations. Recent history confirms the power of Congress to deal with these and like enemies of the public.

Congress has power to tax corporations or associations engaged in interstate commerce. The corporations or associations can be fully regulated, and "regulate" in its application to interstate commerce means, according to the Supreme Court in the cases already cited, that it has full power and control over them, and the "power to tax" means, according to a number of decisions of the same court, the power to destroy.

Congress can deny the use of the mails to corporations or associations engaged in interstate commerce whose conduct or products are controlled by illegal or oppressive combinations. An act of Congress destroyed the Louisiana State Lottery. A fraud order issued by the Post-Office Department stops the business of every swindler who uses the mails in furtherance of his corrupt schemes.

Congress can provide for the suspension of import duties upon all articles where the domestic manufacturers have entered into a trust. The President is already, under the Dingley law and the reciprocity feature of it, empowered to suspend the tariff or customs duties when reciprocity requires. If the Government can extend this great favor to foreigners, it certainly has the power to permit the foreigner to bring in his goods duty free so that the American people can be protected against the conspiracies and oppressions of the home manufacturer. How long would the paper trust exist if the material for the manufacture of paper could be brought into the country duty free?

Congress has required publicity to be given to the business of national-banking corporations. Has it not an equal power over corporations engaged in interstate commerce? "Regulate" is a broad term and embraces everything short of absolute prohibition.

It is best that all corporations or associations engaged purely in interstate commerce should be left to the control of the States. The States can certainly control their domestic corporations and associations, and Congress can permit the States to prescribe terms upon which foreign corporations may engage in business within the limits of the State. Congress can control corporations engaged in interstate commerce. The State government and the Federal Government have ample power to control and to destroy trade conspiracies and oppressions. I am not willing to see that power of the State to punish domestic conspirators surrendered to the Federal Government. Let me cite the provisions of the Constitution of the United States relating to this subject:

To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes. (Article I, section 8 (3).)

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States. (Article I, section 8 (1).)

To establish post-offices and post roads. (Article I, section 8 (7).)

Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole number of free persons, including those bound to service for a term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three-fifths of all other persons. (Article I, section 2 (3).)

No capitation or other direct tax shall be laid, unless in proportion to the census or enumeration hereinbefore directed to be taken. (Article I, section 9 (4).)

No tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any State. (Article I, section 9 (5).)

No preference shall be given by any regulation of commerce or revenue to the ports of one State over those of another; nor shall vessels bound to, or from, one State be obliged to enter, clear, or pay duties in another. (Article I, section 9 (6).)

No person shall be * * * deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. (Amendment V.)

The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States. (Article IV, section 2 (1).)

These enumerated powers and these limitations have been construed in many cases by the Supreme Court of the United States. The exclusive power of Congress over interstate commerce has been often defined. The exclusive power of the States over intrastate commerce has always been recognized.

WHAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT MAY DO.

Congress has exclusive control over interstate commerce. In dealing with the subject the United States are but one country. (Robbins vs. Taxing District, 120 U. S., 489, 494.)

The power of Congress over interstate commerce is not only exclusive, but unlimited. (Addyston P. & S. Co. vs. United States, 175 U. S., 211; Leisy vs. Harden, 135 U. S., 100.)

The power of Congress to regulate interstate and foreign commerce is full. (Gibbons vs. Ogden, 9 Wheat., 1.)

Control of Congress over the mails is complete. (Ex parte Jackson, 96 U. S., 727; In re Ragier, 143 U. S., 110.)

The power of Congress to suspend customs duties is fully recognized, as is done under the reciprocity clause of the Dingley law.

The power of Congress to prescribe regulations for publicity or the like for national banks is recognized.

Any combination which restrains interstate commerce is illegal under the anti-trust law and may be enjoined by the United States. (United States vs. Trans-Mo. Freight Assn., 166 U. S., 290; United States vs. Joint Traffic Assn., 171 U. S., 505.)

Trusts or corporations like the Standard Oil Company could not exist if Congress would pass a proper law to prevent freight discriminations and rebates.

Congress ought to provide for the revocation of patents where a patent right is used to aid a criminal conspiracy against trade.

The case of Addystone P. & S. Co. vs. U. S., supra, decides that the power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce is not limited or affected by any reasons that induced the repose of the power in Congress; that the power is not limited or restricted by the guaranty that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; and that under the anti-trust law any

combination which directly restrains interstate commerce or destroys competition in interstate commerce is illegal.

In other words, the power of Congress over individuals and over combinations engaged in interstate commerce is ample to control interstate commerce and prevent detriment to the public. Congress can protect the people from monopolistic combines without any amendment to the Constitution. The Knight case I have cited clearly shows what powers are reserved to the State, and the Addystone case clearly shows what powers are conferred upon the Federal Government.

WHAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT MAY NOT DO.

The Federal Government can not suppress or destroy purely intrastate enterprises or corporations not engaged in interstate commerce or in some other business over which Congress has been given authority by the Constitution of the United States. It has been held that the power of Congress does not extend to a combination of an article of manufacture in a State, because mere manufacture is not trade or commerce, and the article manufactured does not become a part of interstate commerce until it has started for another State, and therefore monopolies in the manufacture of a necessary of life are not covered by the anti-trust law. (United States *vs.* Knight Company, 156 U. S., 1.)

A combination affecting interstate commerce but not restraining it and not excluding competition is not within the purview of the anti-trust law. (Anderson *vs.* United States, 171 U. S., 604.)

THE POWER OF THE STATE.

Under its police power the State is permitted to legislate for local purposes affecting the health, moral safety, or convenience of its people, but such legislation does not directly or reasonably affect interstate commerce.

A State can enact local pilotage laws (Cooley *vs.* Board of Wardens, 12 Howe, 299); quarantine laws (Morgan Steamship Company *vs.* Louisiana, 118 U. S., 455); harbor-improvement laws (County, etc., *vs.* Kimball, 102 U. S., 699); laws forbidding the heating of cars with stoves (New York, etc., R. *vs.* New York, 165 U. S., 628); laws forbidding the running of freight trains on Sunday (Hennington *vs.* Georgia, 163 U. S., 299); laws relating to delivery of telegrams (Western Union Telegraph Company *vs.* James, 162 U. S., 650); laws to prevent frauds in the sale of oleomargarine (Plumley *vs.* Massachusetts, 155 U. S., 461); inspection laws (Patapsco G. Co. *vs.* North Carolina, 171 U. S., 345).

POWERS DENIED TO A STATE.

A State can not exclude foreign corporations engaged in interstate commerce; held as to telegraph lines in the postal service of the United States. (Pennsylvania Telegraph Company *vs.* Western Union Telegraph Company, 96 U. S., 1.)

A State can not tax a corporation upon its interstate commerce. (Brown *vs.* Maryland, 12 Wheaton, 419.)

A State can not fix a rate for carrying interstate commerce. (W., etc., Rwy. *vs.* Illinois, 118 U. S., 557.)

A State can not exclude intoxicating liquors shipped in the original package from other States. (Scott *vs.* Donald, 165 U. S., 58; Bowman *vs.* C. & N. W. Rwy., 125 U. S., 465.)

Mr. Speaker, much confusion has arisen on account of a misunderstanding of the various decisions of the Supreme Court affecting the control of intrastate and interstate commerce. I have read the report of the Judiciary Committee, presented with the pending resolution. I have heard the long and able speech of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY], and it seems to me that both the report and his speech have had the effect, whether designedly so or not, to still further confuse the subject. It seems to me that our Republican friends have used most of their efforts in this debate to show that Congress is without power to control monopolistic combinations. It is strange that Republicans should assert the want of power on the part of the Federal Government to do almost anything.

The average Republican believes in a strong central government, and believes in so construing the Constitution of the United States as to confer almost unlimited powers upon the Federal Government. No canon of strict construction of the Constitution hampers the average Republican or hinders him from voting for measures that call upon the Federal Government for the exercise of more power. Why, then, do our Republican brethren here argue that the Federal Government is so limited, so devoid of power, so impotent under the Constitution? Is it because they are serving their masters, the trusts and monopolies? Is this an effort to fool the American people? It seems to me that their object is not to destroy trusts and monopolies, but to manufacture excuses for campaign purposes only.

An attempt has been made to class legitimate trades unions with the trusts. A mere organization for self-protection is not a trust and is not contrary to good government. The chairman of the Judiciary Committee will endeavor by a point of order to prevent an expression upon an amendment that the Littlefield bill shall not apply to trades unions after the Republican Committee on Judiciary have refused to make the amendment. Unable to prevent the consideration of the amendment, the Republicans will vote for it, for they dare not vote against that Democratic amendment demanded by organized labor.

The necessity for such a distinction is shown by the case of United States *vs.* Debs, reported in 64 Federal Reporter, page 724.

There has always been an effort upon the part of the Republicans to protect capital against the just demands of labor, and to hold organized labor responsible for the individual acts of laborers. Trades unions, as such, are formed only for the mutual protection of the workingmen, and that protection is absolutely essential to their well-being.

You can not treat labor as a mere commodity. You can not separate the laborer from his labor. It is not only a commodity, but a personality as well. The laborers band together under the natural instinct of self-preservation, and history has shown that it is absolutely impossible for their just rights to be protected without such organization. There was a time in England and in other European countries when labor combinations were classed under the law with monopolistic combinations. The result was that the laborers refused to submit to being classed as mere chattels, and it has been estimated that nineteen hundred of them were killed in the Sheffield and Manchester riots alone.

The following is a brief account of the conditions prevailing, as given in Webb's History of Trades-Unionism (page 63):

> Toward the end of the last century (eighteenth) at any rate free bargaining between the capitalist and his workmen became the sole method of fixing wages. Then it was that the gross injustice of prohibiting combinations of journeymen became apparent [in England]. "A single master," said Lord Jeffrey, "was at liberty at any time to turn off the whole of his workmen at once—100 or 1,000 in number—if they would not accept the wages he chose to to offer." But it was made an offense for the whole of the workmen to leave the master at once if he refused to give the wages they chose to require.
>
> It is true that the law forbade combinations of employers as well as combinations of journeymen. But even if it had been impartially carried out, there would still have remained the inequality due to the fact that in the new system of industry a single employer was himself equivalent to a very numerous combination. But the hand of justice was not impartial. The "tacit but constant" combination of employers to depress wages, to which Adam Smith refers, could not be reached by the law. Nor was there any disposition on the part of the magistrates or the judges to find the masters guilty even in cases of flagrant or avowed combination.
>
> No one prosecuted the master cutlers who, in 1814, openly formed the Sheffield Mercantile and Manufacturing Union, having for its main rule that no merchant or manufacturer should pay higher prices for any article of Sheffield make than were current in the preceding year, with a penalty of £100 for each contravention of this illegal agreement. During the whole epoch of repression, whilst thousands of journeymen suffered for the crime of combination, there is absolutely no case on record in which an employer was punished for the same offense. * * * Could an accurate account be given of proceedings of hearings before magistrates, trials at sessions, and in the court of King's bench, the gross injustice, the foul invective, and terrible punishments inflicted would not, after a few years have passed away, be credited on any but the best evidence.

In the United States injunctions have been issued under the most flimsy pretexts; men have been hauled up for contempt for not obeying these injunctions and have been imprisoned without the opportunity for a trial. It has not been found difficult without any criminal statute whatever to punish all supposed offenses committed by workingmen, even remotely affecting interstate commerce, and yet, with a criminal statute, the administrative officers of the Government insist that they can not reach more grave offenses committed by capitalists.

If the States should have the cooperation of Congress and there was an honest attempt upon the part of the Federal officials to control illegal combinations and monopolies, no difficulty would be found in securing the means by which to accomplish such a purpose.

I submit that every trust engaged in interstate commerce is either the outgrowth of some Congressional legislation or of Federal permission or toleration or privilege in cases where Congress has failed to enact, under existing constitutional provisions, prohibitory legislation.

APPENDIX I.

[From the New York Sun.]

THE ANTI-TRUST AMENDMENT.

When we say plainly that this is the most dishonest and therefore the most discreditable piece of work achieved during the present session by the leaders of Republican policy in the House we are not speaking of the merits of the proposed amendment. Its revolutionary character, the sweeping change it would effect in the entire system of our institutions, the bestowal upon Congress of an unlimited and arbitrary power over all private business in all the States, and without regard to State lines or State rights, need not even be discussed.

There is no more prospect of its adoption by a two-thirds vote of both House and Senate and of its ratification by the legislatures of three-fourths of the forty-five States than there is of the adoption of a constitutional amendment vesting in the Federal Government the direct management of all the myriad industries of this land.

The dishonesty of the performance lies in the fact that there was no expectation on the part of the author of this resolution, or of the Republicans on the Judiciary Committee who favorably reported it, or of the Republicans in the House who were willing to vote for it that the proposed sixteenth amendment will ever amount to more than a campaign trick of the cheapest and unworthiest description.

APPENDIX II.

[From the Washington Post.]

WHAT WAS THE RESPONSE?

The President, in his annual message to Congress on the 5th of December, 1899, referred to one of the questions that had for two years been "justly provoking public discussion" in these words:

"Combinations of capital organized into trusts to control the conditions of trade among our citizens, to stifle competition, limit production, and determine the prices of products used and consumed by the people are justly provoking public discussion and should early claim the attention of the Congress. * * * It is universally conceded that combinations which engross or control the market of any particular kind of merchandise or commodity necessary to the general community, by suppressing natural and ordinary competition, whereby prices are unduly enhanced to the general consumer, are obnoxious not only to the common law but also to the public welfare. There must be a remedy for the evils involved in such organizations."

That message was sent to a Congress in complete political accord with the President. It was sent six months ago. What response has been made to it? What has been done or attempted to check all or any of those "combinations of capital organized into trusts to control the conditions of trade among our citizens, to stifle competition, limit production, and determine the prices of products used and consumed by the people?"

Nothing has been done; nothing has been seriously attempted. The amendment farce failed in the House, where it was expected to fail. Had it gone to the Senate, it would have died there. It was never anything but a transparent sham. The anti-trust bill is laid up in the Senate according to the prearranged programme, and no one expects it ever to go through that body without such reconstruction as will utilize little, if any, of the original material.

And that is the record as to so-called anti-trust legislation by the Fifty-sixth Congress up to date. That is the sum total of the response to the President's message sent to Congress six months ago. Trusts that are robbing the people under the shelter of tariff schedules not required for the protection of labor or for revenue; trusts that have been overcapitalized to the extent of hundreds of millions; trusts that are exacting exorbitant prices in order to pay dividends on fictitious capital; trusts whose pictures are drawn by the President in the words quoted above, still have license to plunder and are protected in that business.

Protection and Prosperity—Free Trade and Adversity.

The Farmer, the Workingman, the Manufacturer, and the Business Man have Shared in Their Joys and Sorrows—A Review of the Protective and Low-Tariff Periods of Our History from 1790 to 1900, and a Discussion of Effect upon These Great Classes of Our Population.

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES H. GROSVENOR,

OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, June 4, 1900.

The House having under consideration the bill (H. R. 11538) making appropriations for the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901—

Mr. GROSVENOR said:

Mr. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the order of the House which gave authority on the general debate on this bill to print remarks in the RECORD, I avail myself of this opportunity to speak a few words on protection and prosperity.

Results, not theories, are what the voter—be he farmer, toiler in the factory, manufacturer, or business man—wants.

There are two ways of determining the effect of great measures or systems—first and most important, by taking a bird's-eye view of the commerce and finances of the entire nation during its entire history. The method ordinarily followed in attempting this is to examine our historical records and newspaper accounts of conditions in the various years in which low or protective tariffs have been in operation.

PROTECTION VS. LOW TARIFF, 1790 TO 1900.

In addition to this, however, it is practicable to present in a single table all the net results of protection versus low tariff in the United States from the adoption of the Constitution down to the present time, as indicated by the prosperity of our commerce and finances. A table (No. 1) printed on another page shows the total imports and exports and excess of imports or exports in each year from 1790 to 1900, and another table (No. 2) shows the receipts and expenditures and excess of receipts or expenditures of the Government in each year from 1790 to 1900; and with each of these tables is a statement showing the years in which low or protective tariffs, respectively, have been in operation. Following these are other tables showing the condition of our home industries under low and protective tariffs, respectively, and all of these I propose to discuss briefly.

TARIFFS AND COMMERCE.

A study of Tables Nos. 1 and 2 shows that protective tariffs have been in operation in the United States during practically one-half of the one hundred and ten years since the adoption of the Constitution. In Tables Nos. 3, 4, 5, and 6 will be found the workings of the low and protective tariffs, respectively, grouped.

It will be seen that during the fifty-nine years of low tariff there were but ten years in which the exports were as great as the imports, and that during the entire fifty-nine years of the operation of low tariffs the net excess of imports over exports was $515,000,000. A study of the commerce of the protective tariff years shows that exports exceeded imports in twenty-seven of the fifty-two protective years, and that the net excess of exports over imports during that time was two and a half billion dollars.

To put it in a single sentence, low tariffs, in fifty-nine years of operation, show a net excess of imports of $515,000,000, and protective tariffs, in fifty-two years of operation, show a net excess of exports of $2,500,000,000. Thus the protective tariffs of fifty-two years have paid the commercial debts of the fifty-nine years of low tariffs, amounting to half a billion dollars, and, in addition, placed two and a half billion dollars to the credit of our export trade.

EXCESS OF EXPORTS DURING THREE YEARS OF THE M'KINLEY ADMINISTRATION.

Another striking example of the growth of our export trade under protective tariff is found in the fact that the excess of exports over imports in the first three years of President McKinley's term, from March 1, 1897, to March 1, 1900, was nearly four times as much as the entire excess of exports over imports from 1790 to the date of his inauguration, March 4, 1897, the accurate figures being:

Excess of exports over imports from 1790 to March 1, 1897.....	$383,028,497
Excess of exports over imports from March 1, 1897, to March 1, 1900.	1,483,537,049

The relative effect of low and protective tariffs, respectively, on the revenues of the Government are also readily seen by a study of the tables already mentioned.

TARIFFS AND REVENUE.

Table 5, entitled "Tariffs and revenues, 1790 to 1900," shows the deficit or surplus, respectively, in revenues in each of the low and protective tariff years. An examination of this table will show that all protective-tariff years, with the exception of those in which expenditures were extremely heavy on account of war, show a surplus revenue, while twenty-four of the fifty-eight low-tariff years show a deficit, only three of that number being at all affected by wars. Practically every protective-tariff year, except those in which war conditions caused abnormal expenditures, shows a surplus, and it was under protection and Republican rule that the enormous interest-bearing debt of the United States was reduced from $2,221,000,000, at the end of the war (1865), to $585,000,000, when a Democratic President and low-tariff Congress took control of the Government; and before Democratic rule and low tariff had ceased to exist, the interest-bearing debt had increased to $847,365,000, as will be seen by Table No. 7.

SECTION NO. 1.—A DISCUSSION OF THE EFFECT OF HIGH AND LOW TARIFFS UPON THE GENERAL BUSINESS CONDITIONS OF THE COUNTRY; WITH STATISTICAL EVIDENCE ATTACHED.

As to the effect of the tariff upon the material prosperity of the country, the study is almost necessarily confined to later periods, because the census reports of the first half of the period, considered in the tables already referred to, are not sufficiently elaborate to show in detail the growth of manufactures.

GROWTH IN TEXTILE INDUSTRIES UNDER PROTECTION.

It is practicable, however, to consider the condition of the textile industries at the middle of the century and by decennial periods thereafter and thus determine the condition which they had reached under the almost constant low tariff which prevailed prior to 1850 and the growth during that further low-tariff period from 1830 to 1860, and to compare those conditions and growths with the protective period which has been constant since 1860, with the single three years' interruption from August 30, 1894, to July 24, 1897.

The growth in number of establishments, employees, capital invested, and value of products of the wool, cotton, and silk manufacturing establishments and the dyeing and finishing works at each census year from 1850 to 1890 is equally striking. The value of the products of these four great groups amounted in 1850, after the long period of low tariff, to only $128,000,000 and the number of employees to only 146,897; and during the ten years of uninterrupted low tariff from 1850 to 1860 the value of the products had only reached $214,000,000, an increase of $86,000,000, and the number of employees had increased to 194,000, an increase of 48,000. The wages paid in these four industries in 1860, the last year under low tariff, amounted to but $40,000,000.

In the next decade the number of employees had increased to 275,000, with a growth of more than 100 per cent in wages and of 42 per cent in number of employees. At the next decennial census, that of 1880, the number of employees was 384,000, an increase of more than 100,000; wages were $105,000,000, an increase of nearly $20,000,000, and the value of products, $532,000,000, or more than double those of the last year under low tariff. By 1890, still another decade of constant protection, the wages paid had increased to $175,000,000, an increase of $70,000,000 paid to labor, while the number of employees had increased to 511,000 and the value of products had increased to $722,000,000, or three and a half times that of the year 1860, which terminated the long low-tariff period.

GROWTH IN PROSPERITY, UNDER PROTECTION AND SOUND MONEY, SINCE THE "CRIME" OF 1873.

Another table (No. 8), prepared from official data, was presented by Secretary Gage at Chicago and Philadelphia, in addresses to great gatherings of those interested in the development of our productions and commerce, and was afterwards published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an evidence of the growth of prosperity under protection and sound money. It shows that, while population has doubled during that period, all the other material interests have increased with far greater rapidity than population. Salaries paid in public schools, newspapers published, post-offices in existence and receipts of the Post-Office Department, telegraph messages sent, railways in operation, tonnage of vessels engaged in commerce on the Great Lakes, wheat produced and exported, cotton produced, manufactured, and exported, coal, iron, and steel produced and exported, exports of manufactures, exports of the products of agriculture, money in circulation, total and per capita deposits in savings banks, and number of depositors—all show a growth greatly in excess of that of population.

COMPARISON OF CONDITIONS UNDER THE M'KINLEY, WILSON, AND DINGLEY TARIFFS.

To come down to a later period in the study of the general effect of low and protective tariffs, attention is called to the showing made in Table No. 9, which states the imports, exports, money in circulation, prices, and many other facts, as shown by the records of the Department of Agriculture, Treasury Department, Interstate Commerce Commission, and other branches of the Government service in the protective-tariff year 1892, the low-tariff years 1895 and 1896, and the protective-tariff year 1899. It will be found that in regard to every one of the 125 items of this table in the low-tariff years 1895 and 1896 conditions were far less favorable than those in 1892, the last year under President Harrison and the McKinley tariff, and in 1899, under President McKinley and the Dingley tariff.

BUSINESS FAILURES UNDER THREE TARIFFS.

Laying aside the question of general conditions and taking up that of the various classes of our citizens and business conditions as shown by official records, the study is equally interesting and convincing as to the value of protection. Let us take, first, general business conditions during a long term of years as shown by the records of the Government and by accepted authorities in business lines. No better general index of commercial conditions is attainable than that showing failures and liabilities in each year for a long term of years, and this is presented in Table No. 10. This table is prepared by Dun's Review, a generally accepted authority, which was widely quoted by Democrats and Populists in 1896 by way of sustaining their theories which were then presented to the public.

This table shows that the number of failures in the calendar year 1892, the last year under President Harrison, was 10,344, and in 1893, the first year under a Democratic President, was 15,242, an increase of practically 50 per cent; and in 1896, the last year of Democratic rule, was again 15,088. The amount of liabilities in 1892, the last year under President Harrison, was $114,000,000, and the amount in 1893, the first Democratic year, was $346,000,000, or more than three times as much as in the last Republican year; and that of 1896, the last Democratic and low-tariff year, was $226,000,000, while in 1897, the first year under President McKinley, the liabilities dropped to $154,000,000, and in 1899 the liabilities had fallen to but $90,000,000, or about one-fourth those of 1893; and the total number of failures was but 9,337, against more than 15,000 in the last year of Democracy.

BUSINESS ACTIVITY UNDER THREE TARIFFS.

Take, again, the Table No. 11, showing clearing-house returns of the United States in each year from 1880 to 1899. They are an index of the activity of business. It will be seen that the clearing-house returns of the entire country amounted to $60,000,000,000 in 1892, the last Republican year, and had dropped to $45,000,000,000 in 1894, the year in which the low-tariff law was enacted, and were less than $52,000,000,000 in 1896; while in 1898, the first full year under the Dingley tariff, they were $65,000,000,000, and in 1899 were within a fraction of $89,000,000,000, or practically double those of the year in which the Wilson low-tariff law was enacted.

FREIGHT CARRIED ON RAILWAYS.

Take, again, the record of the railways of the United States, that accurate register of commercial activity, as shown by Table No. 12. The freight carried shows in 1894, the year in which the low-tariff law was enacted, a drop of 83,000,000 tons, or more than 10 per cent of the entire business as compared with the year in which a Democratic President was inaugurated, and 1898, under McKinley and the Dingley law, shows an increase of 124,000,000 tons as compared with 1897, the year in which the Wilson low-tariff act was repealed, and an increase of 230,000,000 tons over the year in which the Wilson law was enacted. Meantime the net earnings dropped from an average of $2,000 per mile during several preceding years to $1,800 per mile during the entire low-tariff period, and in 1898 again passed the $2,000 per mile line, being for that year $2,111 as the average earnings per mile of the railroads of the United States.

EARNINGS OF RAILWAY EMPLOYEES.

The effect of this depression upon the employees under the low tariff is shown in Table No. 13, by which it will be seen that the number of men employed by railways fell in 1894, the year of the enactment of the Wilson law, nearly 100,000 below the number employed in 1893, while the earnings also showed a marked decrease. In 1898, the first full year under the Dingley tariff, the number of employees was, in round terms, 100,000 greater than in 1894, and the amount paid in wages $50,000,000 greater than in 1895, while the year 1899 showed an increase of 149,000 employees over 1894 and $75,000,000 increase in the wages paid, as compared with 1894 or 1895.

BUSINESS BY TELEGRAPH.

Another evidence of the effect of the low-tariff period upon business is found in Table No. 14, which shows the number of telegraph messages sent over the lines of the Western Union Telegraph Company only from 1868 to 1899. It will be seen that the number dropped from 66,000,000 in 1893, the year of the inauguration of a Democratic and low-tariff President and Congress, to 58,000,000 in 1894, the year in which the Dingley law was enacted, and that during the entire low-tariff period from 1894 to 1897 the number remained stationary, at 58,000,000, increasing in 1898, however, to more than 62,000,000.

DECREASE OF MORTGAGES.

On the question of mortgages, of which we heard so much in 1896, Table No. 15 shows, for the single State of Nebraska, that the value of mortgages filed in 1897, the first year under President McKinley, and the year in which the protective-tariff law was enacted, amounted to but $15,630,721, against $34,601,318 in 1893, the first year under a Democratic President and low-tariff Congress, and $31,690,054 the year in which the low-tariff law was enacted, while the value of the mortgages released in 1898, the first full year under the protective tariff, was $27,498,070 against $18,213,882 in 1896, the year of Mr. Bryan's nomination.

PATENTS, LAND SALES, AND HOMESTEAD ENTRIES.

Still other evidences of general business activity or depression during the protective and low-tariff years are found in the business transacted by the various Government offices. Table No. 16 shows the receipts of the Patent Office from 1890 to 1899. They fell from $1,268,000 in 1892 to $1,183,000 in 1894, and $1,195,000 in 1895, increasing, however, to $1,343,000 in 1897, the year of the enactment of the Dingley law.

Another table (No. 17) shows the money received from the disposal of public lands by the General Land Office. These receipts fell from more than $4,000,000 in 1892 and 1893 to $1,847,000 in 1896, and $1,596,000 in the fiscal year 1897, all of which was under the low tariff, while in 1898, the first fiscal year under the Dingley tariff, they had increased to $2,144,000, and in 1899 to $2,594,000.

Still another table (No. 18), which indicates the number of final homestead entries made at the General Land Office, shows that the total number in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, practically all of which was under President Harrison, was 24,204, and the number of acres granted, 3,477,231. In the fiscal year 1894 the number fell to 20,544, and in 1896 to 20,099, with a total number of acres of 2,790,242, increasing to 22,261 in number and an acreage of 3,095,017 in the fiscal year 1898.

THE POSTAL BAROMETER OF BUSINESS.

Another table (No. 19), showing business conditions, is one quoted by the Postmaster-General in his recent annual report, in which he says:

The course of the postal revenues furnishes an unerring barometer of the business conditions of the country.

He then quotes the receipts, expenditures, and deficits of the Post-Office Department from 1893 to 1899, showing that the receipts in 1894, notwithstanding the steady growth in population, actually fell below those of the fiscal year 1893, practically all of which was under President Harrison, and that during the entire Democratic and low-tariff period the growth in receipts was but very small, the total receipts in the year ending June 30, 1893, being $75,896,923, and in the year ending June 30, 1897, $82,665,462, an increase in the four years of less than $7,000,000, while in the two years from June 30, 1897, to June 30, 1899, the increase was more than $12,000,000, the receipts for the fiscal year 1899 being $95,021,384. The deficit of the Department, which, in the fiscal year 1893, the last year under President Harrison, was $5,177,171, amounted, in the year ending June 30, 1897, all of which was under the low tariff, to $11,411,779, and dropped again under protection and the business activity which accompanied it to $6,610,776 in the year 1899.

BANK DEPOSITS.

Another measure of general business conditions is found by an examination of the deposits in savings and other banks of the

United States. A table, No. 20, shows the aggregate deposits in all classes of banks in the United States on or about June 30 in each year from 1892 to 1899. It shows that the deposits in national banks fell from $1,771,000,000 in 1892, President Harrison's last year, to $1,574,000,000 in 1893, a reduction of $200,000,000, and that in the last year of the Democratic term they were but $1,666,000,000, increasing to $1,760,000,000 in 1897, $2,073,000,000 in 1898, and $2,605,000,000 in 1899—an increase of more than a billion dollars in 1899 as compared with 1893.

State banks also show an equally remarkable record, their total deposits in 1899 being almost double those of 1894. Loan and trust companies show in 1899 deposits amounting to $885,000,000, against $471,000,000 in 1894. Savings banks show a reduction of $31,000,000 in their deposits in 1894 as compared with June 30, 1893, while those of June 30, 1899, are $310,000,000 greater than for June 30, 1894. Taking the record of all classes of banks—national, State, loan and trust companies, savings banks, and private banks—the total deposits on June 30, 1899, were $6,853,381,000, against $4,667,930,328 in 1894, the year of the enactment of the Wilson law, an increase of more than $2,000,000,000, or almost 50 per cent, and practically all of this increase occurred after the election of President McKinley and a protective-tariff Congress.

A table, No. 21, shows the details of savings banks, and another, No. 22, compares the savings banks of the United States with those of the other principal countries of the world. It will be seen by this last-mentioned table that the average deposit in the United States is larger than that of any other country, and the total deposits double those of any other country named in the list. Details of the conditions of the banks and deposits in banks in each State in 1896 and 1899, also shown by a table, No. 23, present interesting facts in reference to the growth of business interests and deposits in banks in all parts of the country in 1899 as compared with 1896, the year of the last Presidential campaign.

MONEY IN CIRCULATION UNDER LOW AND PROTECTIVE TARIFFS.

Another recent evidence of the effect of low and protective tariffs on the money in circulation is shown in Tables Nos. 25 and 26, which show the amount of money of various classes in circulation in the United States for a term of years, the first of these extending back to the beginning of the protective period—1860—and the second extending back to 1870, which precedes the "crime" of 1873. They show the steady growth in the amount of money in circulation up to and including 1892, the last year under President Harrison, then a steady fall until 1896, and again an increase up to the present time.

The per capita money in circulation in 1892, the last year under President Harrison, was $24.44. By 1896 it had dropped to $21.10, and in spite of the prediction that it could not increase without the free and unlimited coinage of silver and the retention of a low tariff, it has, under McKinley, the protective tariff, and the gold standard, increased to $26.58 per capita on May 1, 1900, an increase of 20 per cent in the per capita circulation, of 25 per cent in the total money in circulation, and of 64 per cent in the gold and gold certificates in circulation; the total of the gold and gold certificates on July 1, 1896, the date of Mr. Bryan's nomination, being $197,000,000, and on May 1, 1900, $814,000,000, while the total money on July 1, 1896, was $1,306,434,936, and on May 1, 1900, $2,060,523,463—and all without the "free and unlimited coinage of silver." The second table, No. 25, shows the per capita gold and silver, gold certificates, silver certificates, and other classes of money in circulation in each year from 1870 down to May 1, 1900. It will be seen that there has been a marked increase in every class of currency in circulation, comparing May 1, 1900, with July 1, 1896.

TABLE No. 1.—*Total value of imports and exports into and from the United States from October 1, 1789, to June 30, 1900 (May and June, 1900, estimated).*

[From Commerce and Navigation of the United States, 1899.]

Administration.	Fiscal year.	Merchandise.				Fiscal year.	Tariffs.
		Imports.	Exports.	Excess of imports.	Excess of exports.		
	1790	$23,000,000	$20,205,156	$2,794,844		1790	
	1791	29,200,000	19,012,941	10,187,959		1791	
Washington (Apr. 30, 1789, to Mar. 4, 1797).	1792	31,500,000	20,753,093	10,743,902		1792	
	1793	31,100,000	26,109,572	4,990,428		1793	
	1794	34,600,000	31,043,725	1,553,275		1794	
	1795	63,750,268	47,980,872	21,765,394		1795	
	1796	81,435,154	58,574,625	22,861,530		1796	
	1797	75,372,405	51,294,710	24,084,696		1797	
John Adams (Mar. 4, 1797, to Mar. 4, 1801).	1798	68,551,700	61,327,411	7,224,289		1798	
	1799	79,039,143	78,635,522	403,623		1799	
	1800	91,252,768	70,971,780	20,280,988		1800	
	1801	111,363,511	96,020,513	15,342,998		1801	Formative period.
	1802	76,333,323	77,957,144	4,376,189		1802	
Jefferson (Mar. 4, 1801, to Mar. 4, 1809).	1803	64,056,656	55,860,033	8,866,633		1803	
	1804	85,000,000	77,699,074	7,300,926		1804	
	1805	120,000,000	95,566,021	25,033,979		1805	
	1806	129,410,000	101,536,963	27,873,037		1806	
	1807	138,500,000	108,345,150	30,155,850		1807	
	1808	56,990,000	22,430,960	34,559,040		1808	
	1809	59,400,000	52,203,253	7,196,767		1809	
	1810	85,400,000	66,757,970	18,642,030		1810	
	1811	53,400,000	61,316,832		$7,916,832	1811	
Madison (Mar. 4, 1809, to Mar. 4, 1817).	1812	77,030,000	38,527,236	38,502,764		1812	
	1813	22,005,000	27,853,017		5,851,017	1813	
	1814	12,965,000	6,927,441	6,037,559		1814	Protective tariff (July 1, 1812, to June 30, 1816).
	1815	113,041,274	52,537,753	60,483,521		1815	
	1816	147,103,000	81,920,052	65,182,948		1816	
	1817	99,250,000	87,671,569	11,578,431		1817	
	1818	121,750,000	93,281,133	28,468,867		1818	
	1819	87,125,000	70,142,521	16,982,479		1819	
	1820	74,450,000	69,691,669	4,758,331		1820	Low tariff (June 30, 1816, to June 30, 1824).
Monroe (Mar. 4, 1817, to Mar. 4, 1825).	1821	64,520,834	64,596,323		75,489	1821	
	1822	79,871,095	61,350,101	18,521,594		1822	
	1823	72,481,271	68,326,049	4,155,222		1823	
	1824	72,169,172	63,972,105	8,197,067		1824	
	1825	90,189,310	90,738,333		549,023	1825	
	1826	79,093,511	72,890,789	5,202,722		1826	
J. Q. Adams (Mar. 4, 1825, to Mar. 4, 1829).	1827	71,332,938	74,309,947		2,977,009	1827	
	1828	81,020,083	64,021,210	16,998,873		1828	
	1829	67,088,915	67,434,651		345,736	1829	Protective tariff (June 30, 1824, to Mar. 3, 1833).
	1830	62,720,956	71,670,735		8,949,779	1830	
	1831	95,385,179	72,295,652	23,089,527		1831	
	1832	93,121,702	81,520,900	13,601,190		1832	
	1833	101,047,943	87,528,732	13,519,211		1833	
	1834	108,010,700	102,290,215	6,349,485		1834	
	1835	135,764,205	115,215,802	21,548,403		1835	
	1836	176,579,154	124,338,704	52,240,450		1836	
	1837	130,472,803	111,443,127	19,029,676		1837	
Van Buren (Mar. 4, 1837, to Mar. 4, 1841).	1838	95,970,288	104,978,570		9,008,282	1838	Low tariff (Mar. 3, 1833, to Aug. 30, 1842).
	1839	156,496,956	112,251,673	44,245,283		1839	
	1840	98,258,706	123,668,932		25,410,226	1840	
	1841	122,957,544	111,817,471	11,140,073		1841	
W. H. Harrison-Tyler (Mar. 4, 1841, to Mar. 4, 1845).	1842	96,075,071	99,877,995		3,802,924	1842	
	1843	42,433,404	82,825,629		40,392,225	1843	
	1844	102,004,606	105,745,832		3,141,226	1844	Protective tariff (Aug. 30, 1842, to Dec. 1, 1846).
	1845	113,184,323	106,040,111	7,144,211		1845	
Polk (Mar. 4, 1845, to Mar. 4, 1849).	1846	117,914,065	109,583,248	8,330,817		1846	
	1847	122,424,349	150,741,598		34,317,249	1847	Low tariffs (Dec. 1, 1846, to Apr. 1, 1861).
	1848	148,636,644	138,190,515	10,448,129		1848	

TABLE No. 1.—*Total value of imports and exports into and from United States from October 1, 1789, to June 30, 1900 (May and June, 1900, estimated)*—Continued.

Administration.	Fiscal year.	Merchandise. Imports.	Exports.	Excess of imports.	Excess of exports.	Fiscal year.	Tariffs.
Taylor-Fillmore (Mar. 4, 1849, to Mar. 4, 1853).	1849	$141,203,199	$140,351,172	$855,027		1849	
	1850	173,509,523	144,375,726	29,133,800		1850	
	1851	210,771,429	188,915,259	21,856,170		1851	
	1852	207,440,398	166,984,231	40,456,167		1852	
Pierce (Mar. 4, 1853, to Mar. 4, 1857).	1853	263,777,265	203,489,282	60,287,983		1853	
	1854	297,803,794	237,043,764	60,760,030		1854	Low tariffs (Dec. 1, 1846, to Apr. 1, 1861).
	1855	257,808,708	218,909,503	38,899,205		1855	
	1856	310,432,310	281,219,423	29,212,887		1856	
Buchanan (Mar. 4, 1857, to Mar. 4, 1861).	1857	348,428,342	293,823,760	54,604,582		1857	
	1858	263,368,654	272,011,274		$8,672,620	1858	
	1859	331,333,341	292,902,051	38,431,290		1859	
	1860	353,616,119	333,576,057	20,040,062		1860	
Lincoln-Johnson (Mar. 4, 1861, to Mar. 4, 1869).	1861	289,310,542	219,553,853	69,756,700		1861	
	1862	189,356,677	190,670,501		1,313,824	1862	
	1863	243,335,815	203,964,447	39,371,368		1863	
	1864	316,447,283	158,837,988	157,609,295		1864	
	1865	238,745,589	166,029,303	72,716,277		1865	
	1866	464,812,066	348,859,522	85,952,544		1866	
	1867	395,761,090	294,506,141	101,254,955		1867	
	1868	357,436,440	281,952,899	75,483,541		1868	
	1869	417,506,370	286,117,697	131,388,682		1869	
Grant (Mar. 4, 1869, to Mar. 4, 1877).	1870	435,958,408	392,771,768	43,186,640		1870	
	1871	520,223,684	442,820,178	77,403,506		1871	
	1872	626,595,077	444,177,586	182,417,491		1872	
	1873	642,136,110	522,479,922	119,656,288		1873	
	1874	567,406,342	586,283,040		18,876,698	1874	
	1875	533,005,436	513,442,711	19,562,725		1875	
	1876	460,741,190	540,384,671		79,643,481	1876	
Hayes (Mar. 4, 1877, to Mar. 4, 1881).	1877	451,323,126	602,475,220		151,152,094	1877	Protective tariffs (Apr. 1, 1861, to Aug. 28, 1894).
	1878	437,051,552	694,865,786		257,814,234	1878	
	1879	445,777,775	710,439,441		264,661,666	1879	
	1880	667,954,746	835,638,658		167,683,912	1880	
Garfield-Arthur (Mar. 4, 1881, to Mar. 4, 1885).	1881	642,664,628	902,377,346		259,712,718	1881	
	1882	724,639,574	750,542,257		25,902,683	1882	
	1883	723,180,914	823,889,402		100,658,488	1883	
	1884	667,697,693	740,513,609		72,815,916	1884	
Cleveland (Mar. 4, 1885, to Mar. 4, 1889).	1885	577,527,329	742,189,755		164,662,426	1885	
	1886	635,433,136	679,524,830		44,088,694	1886	
	1887	692,319,768	716,183,211		23,863,443	1887	
	1888	723,957,114	695,954,507	28,002,607		1888	
	1889	745,131,652	742,401,375	2,730,277		1889	
Benjamin Harrison (Mar. 4, 1889, to Mar. 4, 1893).	1890	789,310,409	857,828,684		68,518,275	1890	
	1891	844,916,196	884,480,810		39,564,614	1891	
	1892	827,402,462	1,030,278,148		202,875,686	1892	
	1893	866,400,922	847,635,194	18,735,728		1893	
Cleveland (Mar. 4, 1893, to Mar. 4, 1897).	1894	654,994,622	892,140,572		237,145,950	1894	
	1895	731,969,965	807,538,165		75,568,200	1895	
	1896	779,724,674	882,006,938		102,282,264	1896	Low tariff (Aug. 28, 1894, to July 24, 1897).
	1897	764,730,412	1,050,993,555		286,263,144	1897	
McKinley (Mar. 4, 1897, to June 3, 1900.)	1898	616,049,654	1,231,482,230		615,432,576	1898	Protective tariff (July 24, 1897, to June 3, 1900).
	1899	697,148,489	1,227,023,302		529,874,813	1899	
	1900*	860,000,000	1,400,000,000		540,000,000	1900	
Total		31,537,109,976	33,579,226,287		2,042,116,311		

* May and June estimated.

TABLE No. 2.—*Receipts and expenditures of the United States Government from 1791 to 1900.*

[From official reports of the United States Government, 1899.]

Administration.	Year ending—	Total net ordinary receipts.	Total net ordinary expenditures.	Excess of receipts.	Excess of expenditures.	Year ending—	Tariffs.
	Dec. 31—					Dec. 31—	
Washington (Apr. 30, 1789, to Mar. 4, 1797).	1791	$4,409,951.19	$3,007,452.55	$1,312,498.64		1791	
	1792	3,669,960.31	8,269,869.75		$4,599,909.44	1792	
	1793	4,652,923.14	3,846,929.90	805,993.24		1793	
	1794	5,431,904.87	6,297,822.04		865,917.17	1794	
	1795	6,114,534.59	7,509,600.78		1,195,066.19	1795	
John Adams (Mar. 4, 1797, to Mar. 4, 1801).	1796	8,377,529.05	5,790,650.83	2,586,878.82		1796	
	1797	8,688,780.99	6,008,627.25	2,680,153.74		1797	
	1798	7,900,495.80	7,607,586.32	292,909.48		1798	
	1799	7,546,813.31	9,295,818.13		1,749,004.82	1799	Formative period of tariffs.
	1800	10,848,749.10	10,813,971.01	34,778.09		1800	
Jefferson (Mar. 4, 1801, to Mar. 4, 1809).	1801	12,935,330.95	9,393,499.96	3,541,830.99		1801	
	1802	14,995,703.95	7,976,252.07	7,019,541.88		1802	
	1803	11,064,007.63	7,952,286.60	3,111,811.03		1803	
	1804	11,826,307.38	8,637,907.65	3,188,399.73		1804	
	1805	13,500,693.20	9,014,348.84	4,546,344.36		1805	
	1806	15,550,931.07	9,449,177.62	6,110,753.45		1806	
	1807	16,398,019.26	8,354,151.37	8,043,867.89		1807	
	1808	17,060,661.90	9,061,413.08	7,999,248.85		1808	
Madison (Mar. 4, 1809, to Mar. 4, 1817).	1809	7,773,473.12	10,280,747.04		2,507,273.92	1809	
	1810	9,384,214.28	8,474,753.37	909,460.91		1810	
	1811	14,422,634.09	8,178,040.43	6,244,593.66		1811	
	1812	9,801,132.76	20,280,771.27		10,479,638.51	1812	Protective tariff (July 1, 1812, to June 30, 1816).
	1813	14,340,409.95	31,681,852.14		17,341,442.19	1813	
	1814	11,181,625.16	34,720,925.42		23,539,300.26	1814	
	1815	15,696,916.82	32,943,661.24		17,246,744.42	1815	
	1816	47,676,955.66	31,196,355.92	16,480,629.74		1816	
Monroe (Mar. 4, 1817, to Mar. 4, 1825).	1817	33,099,049.74	19,984,892.47	13,108,157.27		1817	
	1818	21,585,171.04	20,018,627.81	1,566,543.23		1818	
	1819	24,603,374.37	21,512,004.09	3,091,370.37		1819	
	1820	17,840,669.55	18,285,534.89		444,865.34	1820	Low tariff (June 30, 1816, to June 30, 1824).
	1821	14,573,379.72	15,849,552.86		1,276,173.14	1821	
	1822	20,232,427.94	15,009,432.30	5,231,995.64		1822	
	1823	20,540,666.26	14,706,629.99	5,834,036.27		1823	
	1824	19,381,212.79	20,273,702.64		892,489.85	1824	

TABLE No. 2.—*Receipts and expenditures of the United States Government from 1791 to 1900*—Continued.

Administration.	Year ending—	Total net ordinary receipts.	Total net ordinary expenditures.	Excess of receipts.	Excess of expenditures.	Year ending—	Tariffs.
	Dec. 31—					Dec. 31—	
	1825	$21,840,858.02	$15,857,217.34	$5,983,640.68		1825	
J. Q. Adams) Mar. 4, 1825, to Mar. 4, 1829).	1826	25,260,434.21	17,037,859.22	8,222,574.99		1826	
	1827	22,966,363.96	16,139,167.16	6,827,196.80		1827	
	1828	24,763,929.23	16,394,842.05	8,369,087.18		1828	
	1829	24,827,627.38	15,184,053.63	9,643,573.75		1829	Protective tariff (June 30, 1824, to March 3, 1833).
	1830	24,844,116.51	15,142,108.26	9,702,008.25		1830	
	1831	28,526,820.82	15,237,816.64	13,289,004.18		1831	
Jackson (Mar. 4, 1829, to Mar. 4, 1837).	1832	31,867,450.66	17,288,950.27	14,578,500.39		1832	
	1833	33,948,426.25	23,017,551.98	10,930,874.27		1833	
	1834	21,791,935.55	18,627,570.23	3,164,365.32		1834	
	1835	35,430,087.10	17,572,813.36	17,857,273.74		1835	
	1836	50,826,796.08	30,868,164.04	19,958,632.04		1836	
	1837	24,954,153.04	37,243,214.24		$12,289,061.20	1837	Low tariff (Mar. 3, 1833, to Aug. 30, 1842).
	1838	26,302,561.74	33,864,714.56		7,562,152.82	1838	
Van Buren (Mar. 4, 1837, to Mar. 4, 1841).	1839	31,482,749.61	26,896,782.62	4,585,966.99		1839	
	1840	19,480,115.33	24,314,518.19		4,834,402.86	1840	
	1841	16,860,160.27	23,481,817.84		9,621,657.57	1841	
	1842	19,976,197.25	25,134,886.44		5,158,689.19	1842	
W. H. Harrison-Tyler (Mar. 4, 1841, to Mar. 4, 1845).	6 months to June 30, 1843.	8,231,001.26	11,780,092.51		3,549,791.25	6 months to June 30, 1843.	Protective tariff (Aug. 30, 1842, to Dec. 1, 1846).
	June 30—					June 30—	
	1844	29,320,707.78	22,483,560.14	6,837,147.64		1844	
	1845	29,970,105.80	22,935,827.79	7,034,278.01		1845	
	1846	29,699,967.74	27,261,182.86	2,498,784.88		1846	
Polk (Mar. 4, 1845, to Mar. 4, 1849).	1847	26,467,403.16	54,920,784.09		28,453,380.93	1847	
	1848	35,698,699.21	47,618,220.65		11,919,521.44	1848	
	1849	30,721,077.50	43,499,078.39		12,778,000.89	1849	
	1850	43,592,888.88	40,948,383.12	2,644,505.76		1850	
Taylor-Fillmore (Mar. 4, 1849, to Mar. 4, 1853).	1851	52,555,039.33	47,751,478.41	4,803,560.92		1851	
	1852	49,846,815.60	44,390,252.36	5,456,563.24		1852	
	1853	61,587,031.68	47,743,989.09	13,843,042.59		1853	Low tariffs (Dec. 1, 1846, to Apr. 1, 1861.
	1854	73,800,341.40	55,038,455.11	18,761,886.29		1854	
Pierce (Mar. 4, 1853, to Mar. 4, 1857).	1855	65,350,574.68	58,630,662.71	6,719,911.97		1855	
	1856	74,056,699.24	68,726,350.01	5,330,349.23		1856	
	1857	68,965,312.57	67,634,408.93	1,330,903.64		1857	
	1858	46,655,365.96	73,982,492.84		27,327,126.88	1858	
Buchanan (Mar. 4, 1857, to Mar. 4, 1861).	1859	52,777,107.92	68,993,599.77		16,216,491.85	1859	
	1860	56,054,599.83	63,875,875.65		7,821,275.82	1860	
	1861	41,476,299.49	66,650,213.08		25,173,913.59	1861	
	1862	51,919,261.09	469,570,241.05		417,650,980.56	1862	
	1863	112,094,945.51	718,734,276.18		606,639,330.67	1863	
	1864	243,412,971.20	864,969,100.83		621,556,129.63	1864	
Lincoln-Johnson (Mar. 4, 1861, to Mar. 4, 1869).	1865	322,031,158.19	1,295,099,289.58		973,068,131.39	1865	
	1866	519,949,564.38	519,022,356.34	927,208.04		1866	
	1867	462,846,679.92	346,729,325.78	116,117,354.14		1867	
	1868	376,434,453.82	370,339,133.82	6,095,320.00		1868	
	1869	357,188,256.09	321,190,597.75	35,997,658.34		1869	
	1870	395,959,833.87	293,657,005.15	102,302,828.72		1870	
	1871	374,431,104.94	283,160,393.51	91,270,711.43		1871	
	1872	364,694,229.91	270,559,695.91	94,134,534.00		1872	
Grant (Mar. 4, 1869, to Mar. 4, 1877).	1873	322,177,673.78	285,239,325.34	36,938,348.44		1873	
	1874	299,941,090.84	301,238,800.21		1,297,709.37	1874	
	1875	284,020,771.41	274,623,392.84	9,397,378.57		1875	
	1876	290,066,584.70	265,101,084.59	24,965,500.11		1876	
	1877	281,000,642.00	241,334,474.86	39,666,167.14		1877	Protective tariffs (Apr. 1, 1861, to Aug. 28, 1894).
	1878	257,446,776.40	236,964,326.80	20,482,449.60		1878	
Hayes (Mar. 4, 1877, to Mar. 4, 1881).	1879	272,322,136.83	266,947,883.53	5,374,253.30		1879	
	1880	333,526,500.98	264,847,637.36	68,678,863.62		1880	
	1881	360,782,292.57	259,651,638.81	101,130,653.76		1881	
	1882	403,525,250.28	257,981,439.57	145,543,810.71		1882	
Garfield-Arthur (Mar. 4, 1881, to Mar. 4, 1885).	1883	398,287,581.95	265,408,137.54	132,879,444.41		1883	
	1884	348,519,869.92	244,120,244.33	104,399,625.59		1884	
	1885	323,690,706.38	260,226,931.11	63,463,775.27		1885	
	1886	336,430,727.06	242,483,138.50	93,956,588.56		1886	
	1887	371,403,277.66	267,932,179.97	103,471,097.69		1887	
Cleveland (Mar. 4, 1885, to Mar. 4, 1889).	1888	379,266,074.76	259,653,958.67	119,612,116.09		1888	
	1889	387,050,058.84	281,996,615.60	105,053,443.24		1889	
	1890	403,080,982.63	297,736,486.60	105,344,496.03		1890	
Benjamin Harrison (Mar. 4, 1889, to Mar. 4, 1893).	1891	392,612,447.31	355,372,684.74	37,239,762.57		1891	
	1892	354,937,784.24	345,023,330.58	9,914,453.66		1892	
	1893	385,819,628.78	383,477,954.49	2,341,674.29		1893	
	1894	297,722,019.25	367,525,279.83		69,803,260.58	1894	
Cleveland (Mar. 4, 1893, to Mar. 4, 1897).	1895	313,390,075.11	356,195,298.29		42,805,223.18	1895	Low tariff, Aug. 28, 1894, to July 24, 1897.
	1896	326,976,200.38	352,179,446.08		25,203,245.70	1896	
	1897	347,721,705.16	365,774,159.57		18,052,454.41	1897	
McKinley (Mar. 4, 1897, to June 30, 1900).	1898	405,321,335.60	443,368,582.80		38,047,247.20	1898	Protective tariff, July 24, 1897, to June 30, 1900.
	1899	515,960,620.18	605,072,179.85		89,111,559.67	1899	
	1900*	562,719,169.00	494,570,024.00	68,149,145.00		1900	

*June estimated.

TARIFFS AND TRADE BALANCES, 1790–1900.

TABLE No. 3.—*Years in which low tariffs and protective tariffs, respectively, have been in operation in the United States, showing the excess of imports or exports in each year and the total excess of imports or exports under each system.*

[Compiled from official statements of the Treasury Bureau of Statistics.]

Fiscal year.	Low tariffs.		Fiscal year.	Protective tariffs.	
	Excess of imports.	Excess of exports.		Excess of imports.	Excess of exports.
1790	$2,794,844		1813		$5,851,017
1791	10,187,959		1814	$6,037,559	
1792	10,746,902		1815	60,483,521	
1793	4,930,428		1816	65,182,948	
1794	1,556,275		1825		549,023
1795	21,766,396		1826	5,202,723	
1796	22,861,539		1827		2,977,009
1797	24,084,696		1828	16,998,873	
1798	7,224,289		1829		345,736
1799	403,636		1830		8,949,776

TABLE No. 3.—*Years in which low tariffs and protective tariffs, respectively, have been in operation in the United States, etc.*—Continued.

Fiscal year.	Low tariffs.		Fiscal year.	Protective tariffs.	
	Excess of imports.	Excess of exports.		Excess of imports.	Excess of exports.
1800	$20,280,968		1831	$23,589,527	
1801	18,342,998		1832	13,601,159	
1802	4,376,189		1833	13,519,211	
1803	8,866,633		1843		$40,202,225
1804	7,300,926		1844		3,141,236
1805	25,033,979		1845	7,144,211	
1806	27,873,037		1846*	4,165,406	
1807	20,156,850		1862	39,371,368	1,813,834
1808	34,559,040		1863	157,009,295	
1809	7,196,767		1864	72,716,277	
1810	18,642,080		1865	85,953,544	
1811		$7,916,832	1866	101,254,955	
1812	38,502,764		1867	75,483,541	
1817	11,578,431		1868	131,388,632	

TABLE No. 3.—*Years in which low tariffs and protective tariffs, respectively have been in operation in the United States, etc.*—Continued.

Fiscal year.	Low tariffs. Excess of imports.	Low tariffs. Excess of exports.	Fiscal year.	Protective tariffs. Excess of imports.	Protective tariffs. Excess of exports.
1818	$23,468,867		1869	$43,186,640	
1819	16,982,479		1870	77,403,500	
1820	4,758,331		1871	182,417,461	
1821		$75,489	1872	119,656,288	
1821	18,521,594		1873		
1822	4,155,328		1874	19,562,725	$18,876,608
1823	3,197,067		1875		
1824	6,349,485		1876		79,643,481
1834	21,548,493		1877		151,152,094
1835	52,240,450		1878		257,814,234
1836	19,029,676		1879		284,661,666
1837		9,008,282	1880		167,683,912
1838	44,245,283		1881		259,712,718
1839		25,410,226	1882		25,902,683
1840	11,140,073		1883		100,658,488
1841		3,802,924	1884		72,815,916
1842	4,165,408		1885		164,662,426
1843*		34,317,249	1886		44,088,694
1847	10,448,129		1887		23,863,443
1848	855,027		1888	28,002,607	
1849	29,133,800		1889	2,730,297	
1850	21,853,170		1890		68,518,275
1851	40,596,167		1891		39,564,614
1852	60,287,983		1892		202,875,686
1853	60,760,030		1893	18,735,728	
1854	38,899,206		1894		237,145,950
1855	29,212,887		1898		615,432,676
1856	54,004,582		1899		529,874,813
1857		8,672,620	1900†		540,000,000
1858	38,431,290				
1859	20,040,062				
1860	69,756,709				
1861		75,568,200			
1895		102,882,204			
1896		286,263,144			
1897					
Total..	1,068,292,161	553,917,230	Total..	1,371,397,063	3,928,468,806

*Half year. †May and June estimated.

Net excess of imports under low tariffs..... $515,064,931
Net excess of exports under protective tariffs..... 2,557,071,243

PROTECTIVE TARIFFS, 1790 TO 1900.

TABLE No. 4.—*Showing the effect of protective tariffs upon the foreign commerce and finances of the United States, as indicated by the excess of exports and a surplus revenue in the years of their operation.*

NOTE.—The deficits in the years 1813-1815 are due to abnormal expenditures in the war of 1812; those of 1862-1865, to the war of the rebellion; those of 1898-99, to the Spanish-American war; that of 1894, to the panic following the inauguration of a Democratic President and low-tariff legislation.

[Compiled from official statements of the Treasury Bureau of Statistics.]

Fiscal year.	Commercial effect. Excess of imports over exports.	Commercial effect. Excess of exports over imports.	Financial effect. Deficit or surplus in the net ordinary receipts and expenditures of the Government. Deficit.	Surplus.
1813		$5,851,017	$17,341,442	
1814	$6,037,559		23,539,300	War period.
1815	60,483,521		17,246,744	
1816	65,182,948			$16,480,630
1825		549,023		5,983,640
1826	5,302,722			8,222,575
1827		2,077,000		6,827,198
1828	16,908,873			8,309,087
1829		345,736		9,643,574
1830		8,949,779		9,702,008
1831	21,580,527			13,280,004
1832	13,601,159			14,578,500
1833	13,519,211			10,980,874
1843		40,302,225	3,549,791	
1844		8,141,290		6,837,148
1845	7,144,211			7,004,278
1846 (half year)	4,165,408			1,219,392
1862		1,313,824	417,650,981	
1863	39,371,008		606,630,331	War period.
1864	157,009,295		621,556,130	
1865	72,716,277		973,068,131	
1866	85,952,544			927,208
1867	101,254,955			116,317,354
1868	75,483,541			6,095,320
1869	131,388,682			35,997,658
1870	43,186,640			102,302,829
1871	77,403,500			91,270,711
1872	182,417,491			94,137,534
1873	119,656,288			36,938,348
1874		18,876,608	1,297,709	
1875	19,562,725			9,397,379
1876		79,643,481		24,965,500
1877		151,152,094		39,666,167
1878		257,814,234		20,482,449

TABLE No. 4.—*Showing the effect of protective tariffs upon the foreign commerce and finances of the United States, etc.*—Continued.

Fiscal year.	Commercial effect. Excess of imports over exports.	Commercial effect. Excess of exports over imports.	Financial effect. Deficit or surplus in the net ordinary receipts and expenditures of the Government. Deficit.	Surplus.
1879		$264,661,666		$5,374,253
1880		167,683,912		68,678,864
1881		259,712,718		101,130,058
1882		25,902,683		145,543,811
1883		100,658,488		122,870,444
1884		72,815,916		104,393,626
1885		164,662,426		63,463,775
1886		44,088,694		93,956,589
1887		23,863,443		103,471,098
1888	$28,002,607			119,612,116
1889	2,730,277			105,053,443
1890		68,518,275		105,344,446
1891		39,564,614		37,239,763
1892		202,875,686		9,914,454
1893	18,735,728			2,341,674
1894		237,145,950	$69,803,261	
1898		615,432,676	38,047,247	War period.
1899		529,874,813	89,111,560	
1900*		540,000,000		

*May and June estimated.

TARIFFS AND REVENUES, 1790 TO 1900.

TABLE No. 5.—*Years in which low tariffs and protective tariffs, respectively, have been in operation in the United States, showing the excess of expenditures or receipts of the Government in each year.*

[Compiled from official statements of the Treasury Bureau of Statistics.]

Low tariffs. Fiscal year—	Deficit.	Surplus.	Protective tariffs. Fiscal year—	Deficit.	Surplus.
1791		$1,312,499	1813	$17,341,442	
1792	$4,599,909		1814	23,539,300	War period.
1793		805,993	1815	17,246,744	
1794	865,917		1816		$16,480,630
1795	1,195,066		1825		5,983,640
1796		2,586,879	1830		8,222,575
1797		2,080,154	1827		6,827,198
1798		202,909	1828		6,309,087
1799	1,749,004		1829		9,643,574
1800		34,778	1830		9,702,008
1801		3,541,831	1831		13,289,004
1802		7,019,542	1832		14,578,500
1803		3,111,811	1833		10,930,874
1804		3,188,399	1843	3,549,791	
1805		4,546,344	1844		6,837,148
1806		6,110,733	1845		7,004,278
1807		8,043,868	1846 (half year)		1,214,392
1808		7,009,249	1862	417,650,981	
1809	2,507,273		1863	606,630,331	War period.
1810		909,461	1864	621,556,130	
1811		6,244,594	1865	973,068,131	
1812	10,479,658		1866		927,208
1817		13,108,157	1867		116,317,354
1818		1,506,543	1868		6,095,320
1819		3,091,370	1869		35,997,658
1820	444,685		1870		102,302,829
1821	1,276,173		1871		91,270,711
1822		5,231,966	1872		94,137,534
1823		5,834,036	1873		36,938,348
1824	602,489		1874	1,297,709	
1834		3,104,365	1875		9,397,379
1835		17,857,274	1876		24,965,500
1836		19,958,692	1877		39,666,167
1837	12,289,061		1878		20,482,449
1838	7,562,152		1879		5,374,253
1839		4,585,967	1880		68,678,864
1840	4,834,402		1881		101,130,058
1841	9,621,657		1882		145,543,811
1842	5,158,089		1883		132,879,444
1846 (half year)		1,219,392	1884		104,393,626
1847	28,453,381		1885		63,463,775
1848	11,919,521	War period.	1886		93,956,589
1849	12,778,001		1887		103,471,098
1850		2,644,506	1888		119,612,116
1851		4,803,561	1889		105,053,443
1852		5,456,563	1890		105,344,446
1853		13,843,043	1891		37,239,763
1854		18,761,886	1892		9,914,454
1855		6,714,912	1893		2,341,674
1856		5,330,434	1894	69,803,261	
1857		1,330,904	1898	38,047,247	War period.
1858	27,327,126		1899	89,111,560	
1859	16,216,492		1900		
1860	7,821,276				
1861	25,173,914				
1895	42,805,223				
1896	25,203,246				
1897	18,052,455				

LOW TARIFFS, 1790 TO 1900.

TABLE NO. 6.—*Showing the effect of low tariffs upon the foreign commerce and finances of the United States as indicated by the net excess of imports and net deficit in revenues during the period of their operation.*

[Compiled from official statements of the Treasury Bureau of Statistics.]

Fiscal year.	Commercial effect.		Financial effect.	
	Excess of imports over exports.	Excess of exports over imports.	Deficit or surplus in the net ordinary receipts and expenditures of the Government.	
			Deficit.	Surplus.
1790	$2,794,844			
1791	10,187,959			$1,312,499
1792	10,746,902		$4,599,900	
1793	4,990,428			805,936
1794	1,556,275		865,917	
1795	21,766,396		1,195,066	
1796	22,861,539			2,586,879
1797	24,084,696			2,680,154
1798	7,224,289			222,909
1799	403,626		1,749,004	
1800	20,280,988			34,778
1801	18,342,998			3,541,831
1802	4,376,189			7,019,542
1803	8,866,633			3,111,811
1804	7,300,926			3,188,399
1805	25,033,979			4,546,344
1806	27,373,037			6,110,753
1807	30,156,850			8,043,868
1808	34,559,040			7,999,249
1809	7,196,767		2,507,273	
1810	18,642,090			900,461
1811		$7,916,832		6,244,594
1812	38,502,704		10,479,698	
1817	11,578,431			13,108,157
1818	28,468,867			1,509,543
1819	16,982,479			3,091,370
1820	4,758,331		444,685	
1821		75,489	1,276,173	
1822				$5,231,996
1823				5,834,096
1824			$892,489	
1834				3,164,365
1835				17,857,274
1836				19,968,632
1837			12,289,061	
1838		$9,008,282	7,562,152	
1839		44,245,283		4,585,967
1840		25,410,226	4,834,402	
1841	11,140,073		9,621,657	
1842		3,802,924	5,158,689	
1846 (half year)	4,165,408			1,279,392
1847		34,317,249	28,453,381	
1848	10,448,129		11,919,521	War period.
1849	855,027		12,778,001	
1850	29,133,800			2,644,506
1851	21,856,170			4,803,561
1852	40,566,167			5,456,563
1853	60,287,983			13,863,043
1854	60,760,030			18,761,886
1855	38,899,205			6,714,912
1856	29,212,887			5,330,434
1857	54,604,582			1,330,904
1858		8,672,620	27,327,120	
1859	38,431,290		16,216,492	
1860	20,040,062		7,821,276	
1861	69,756,709		25,173,914	
1895		75,568,200	42,805,223	
1896		102,882,264	25,233,246	
1897		236,263,144	18,052,455	

TABLE NO. 6.—*Showing the effect of low tariffs upon the foreign commerce and finances of the United States, etc.*—Continued.

TABLE NO. 7.—*Analysis of the principal of the public debt of the United States.*

[From the Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1899.]

Year ended—	Total interest-bearing debt.	Annual interest charge.	Debt on which interest has ceased.	Debt bearing no interest.*	Outstanding principal.	Cash in the Treasury.	Principal of debt, less cash in Treasury.	Population of the United States.	Debt per capita.	Interest per capita.
1865—Aug. 31	$2,381,530,294	$150,977,697	$1,503,020	$461,616,311	$2,844,649,626	$88,218,055	$2,756,431,571	35,228,000	$78.25	$4.29
1866—July 1	2,332,331,207	140,068,196	935,082	439,969,874	2,773,236,173	187,200,009	2,636,036,163	35,469,000	74.32	4.12
1867	2,248,067,387	138,892,451	1,840,615	428,218,101	2,678,226,103	169,974,892	2,508,151,211	36,211,000	69.26	3.84
1868	2,202,088,727	128,459,598	1,197,340	408,401,782	2,611,687,851	130,834,437	2,480,853,413	36,973,000	67.10	3.48
1869	2,162,090,522	125,523,998	5,290,181	421,151,510	2,588,452,213	155,680,340	2,432,771,873	37,756,000	64.43	3.32
1870	2,046,455,722	118,784,960	3,708,641	430,508,004	2,480,672,427	149,502,471	2,331,169,956	38,558,371	60.46	3.08
1871	1,934,696,750	111,949,330	1,948,902	416,565,680	2,353,211,332	106,217,263	2,246,994,068	39,555,000	56.81	2.83
1872	1,814,794,100	103,988,463	7,926,797	430,530,431	2,253,251,328	103,470,798	2,149,780,530	40,595,000	52.96	2.56
1873	1,710,483,950	98,049,804	51,929,710	472,069,332	2,234,482,993	129,020,932	2,105,462,068	41,676,000	50.52	2.35
1874	1,738,930,750	98,796,004	3,216,590	509,543,128	2,251,690,468	147,541,314	2,104,149,153	42,796,000	49.17	2.31
1875	1,722,676,300	96,855,690	11,425,820	498,182,411	2,232,284,531	142,243,361	2,090,041,170	43,951,000	47.53	2.20
1876	1,710,695,450	96,104,289	3,902,420	465,807,196	2,180,395,067	119,469,726	2,060,925,340	45,137,000	45.66	2.11
1877	1,711,888,500	93,160,643	16,648,860	476,764,061	2,205,301,302	186,025,960	2,019,275,431	46,353,000	43.56	2.01
1878	1,794,735,650	94,654,472	5,594,560	455,875,082	2,256,205,802	256,823,612	1,999,382,280	47,598,000	42.01	1.99
1879	1,797,643,700	83,773,778	37,015,630	410,835,741	2,245,495,072	249,080,167	1,996,414,905	48,866,000	40.85	1.71
1880	1,723,993,100	79,633,981	7,621,455	388,800,815	2,120,415,370	201,088,622	1,919,326,747	50,155,783	38.27	1.59
1881	1,639,567,750	75,018,695	6,723,865	422,721,954	2,069,013,569	249,363,415	1,819,650,154	51,316,000	35.46	1.46
1882	1,463,810,400	67,360,110	16,200,805	438,241,788	1,918,312,994	243,289,519	1,675,023,474	52,495,000	31.91	1.09
1883	1,338,229,150	61,436,709	7,831,415	538,111,162	1,884,171,728	345,389,902	1,538,781,825	53,693,000	28.66	.98
1884	1,226,803,850	47,926,432	19,656,205	584,308,868	1,830,528,923	301,985,928	1,438,542,995	54,911,000	26.20	.87
1885	1,196,150,950	47,014,133	4,100,995	663,712,927	1,863,964,873	488,612,429	1,375,352,443	56,148,000	24.50	.84
1886	1,146,014,100	45,510,096	9,704,445	619,344,468	1,775,063,013	492,917,173	1,282,145,840	57,404,000	22.34	.79
1887	1,021,602,350	41,780,529	6,115,165	629,795,077	1,657,602,592	482,433,917	1,175,168,675	58,680,000	20.03	.71
1888	950,522,500	38,991,935	2,496,095	739,840,389	1,692,858,984	629,854,089	1,063,004,894	59,974,000	17.72	.65
1889	829,853,990	33,752,354	1,911,485	787,287,446	1,619,052,922	643,113,172	975,939,750	61,289,000	15.92	.53
1890	725,313,110	29,417,603	1,815,805	825,011,289	1,552,140,204	661,355,834	890,784,370	62,622,250	14.22	.47
1891	610,529,120	23,615,735	1,614,705	933,852,766	1,545,996,591	694,083,839	851,912,751	64,002,000	13.32	.37
1892	585,029,330	22,893,863	2,785,875	1,000,648,939	1,588,464,144	746,937,681	841,526,463	65,403,000	12.86	.35
1893	585,037,100	22,894,194	2,094,080	958,854,525	1,545,985,696	707,016,210	838,969,475	66,826,000	12.55	.34
1894†	635,041,890	25,394,385	1,851,240	995,360,506	1,632,253,636	732,940,256	899,313,380	68,275,000	13.17	.37
1895†	716,202,060	29,140,792	1,721,590	958,197,332	1,676,120,983	774,448,016	901,672,966	69,753,000	12.93	.42
1896†	847,363,890	34,287,265	1,636,890	920,839,543	1,769,840,323	814,543,069	955,297,253	71,263,000	13.41	.48
1897†	847,365,130	34,387,315	1,346,880	968,960,655	1,817,672,665	831,016,579	986,656,086	72,807,000	13.55	.47
1898	847,367,470	34,387,408	1,262,680	947,901,845	1,796,531,995	769,446,503	1,027,085,492	74,389,000	13.81	.46
1899	1,046,048,750	40,347,872	1,218,300	944,660,256	1,991,927,306	836,607,071	1,155,320,235	76,011,000	15.20	.53

*The column of "Debt bearing no interest" includes certificates issued against gold, silver, and currency deposited in the Treasury.
†Democratic and low-tariff years.

TABLE NO. 8.—*Progress of the United States as shown by great factors entering into national development.*

[Prepared by the Secretary of the Treasury from official records of the Government.]

	1870.	1880.	1890.	1895.	1899.	Per cent of increase or decrease, 1870–1899.
Population	38,558,371	50,155,783	62,622,250	69,878,000	76,148,000	+ 100
Salaries paid in public schools.....dollars..	37,832,556	55,942,972	91,836,484	113,872,388	123,809,412	+ 227
Newspapers and periodicals published	5,871	11,314	16,930	19,530	21,178	+ 261
Post-offices in existence	28,492	42,989	62,401	70,064	75,000	+ 163
Receipts of Post-Office Department.....dollars..	19,772,221	33,315,479	60,882,097	76,983,128	95,021,394	+ 380
Telegraph messages sent	9,157,646	29,215,509	63,358,762	70,801,207	76,805,175	+ 739
Railways in operation.....miles..	52,922	93,262	166,654	181,085	†186,810	+ 253
Tons of freight carried 1 mile	No data.	*39,302,209,249	79,192,985,125	88,567,770,801	†114,500,173,191	+ 192
Average freight rate per ton mile .....cents..	1.94	1.17	0.93	0.84	0.75	− 61

TABLE No. 8.—*Progress of the United States as shown by great factors entering into national development*—Continued.

	1870.	1880.	1890.	1895.	1899.	Per cent of increase or decrease, 1870–1899.
Tonnage of vessels passing through Sault Ste. Marie Canal	690,826	1,734,890	8,454,435	16,806,781	21,958,347	+ 3,079
Wheat produced, bushels	235,884,700	498,549,868	399,262,000	467,102,947	547,303,843	+ 132
Corn produced, do	1,094,255,000	1,717,434,593	1,489,970,000	2,151,138,580	2,078,143,933	+ 89
Cotton produced, pounds	1,451,401,357	2,771,797,156	3,627,365,183	5,036,964,469	5,793,689,282	+ 299
Cotton (domestic) taken by mills, bales	857,000	1,795,000	2,325,000	2,871,000	3,632,000	+ 324
Coal produced, tons	32,883,000	63,822,830	140,866,931	172,426,396	†193,405,955	+ 488
Petroleum, gallons	185,262,672	836,394,132	1,466,867,546	2,072,469,672	†2,325,297,780	+ 1,155
Pig iron produced, tons	1,665,179	3,835,191	9,202,703	9,446,308	†11,773,934	+ 607
Steel produced, do	68,750	1,247,335	4,277,071	6,114,834	†8,962,857	+ 12,893
Imports of manufactures of iron and steel, dollars	32,665,454	71,266,690	41,679,501	23,048,515	12,100,440	− 63
Exports of manufactures of iron and steel, do	11,002,902	14,716,524	25,542,208	32,009,989	93,716,031	+ 752
Imports of raw silk for manufacturing, pounds	583,589	2,562,236	7,347,909	8,495,839	11,236,846	+ 1,825
Imports of crude rubber for manufacturing, do	9,624,098	16,826,099	33,842,374	39,741,607	51,063,066	+ 431
Exports of manufactures, dollars	68,279,764	102,856,015	151,102,376	183,595,743	338,667,794	+ 396
Exports of agricultural products, do	361,188,483	675,961,091	629,820,808	553,210,026	784,999,000	+ 117
Total exports, do	392,771,768	835,638,658	857,828,684	807,538,165	1,227,023,302	+ 212
Total imports, do	435,958,408	667,954,746	789,310,409	731,969,665	697,148,489	+ 60
Total money in circulation, do	675,212,794	973,382,228	1,429,251,270	1,601,968,473	1,904,071,881	+ 182
Per capita money in circulation, do	17.50				25	+ 43
Deposits in savings banks, do	549,874,358	819,106,973	1,524,844,506	1,810,507,023	2,230,366,954	+ 327
Number of depositors in savings banks	1,630,846	2,335,582	4,258,893	4,875,519	5,687,818	+ 248
American vessels, domestic trade	2,729,707	2,715,224	3,477,802	3,797,773	4,015,992	+ 47
American vessels, foreign trade	1,516,800	1,852,810	946,695	838,187	848,246	− 44
American vessels, Great Lakes only	684,704	605,102	1,063,063	1,241,450	1,446,348	+ 111

*1882. †1898.

TABLE No. 9.—*Statement of imports, exports, money in circulation, prices, etc., in the years 1892, 1895, 1896, and 1899, respectively.*

[Compiled from the Statistical Abstract of the United States, issued by the Treasury Department in 1900; the publications of the Department of Labor, March, 1900, and official reports of the Interstate Commerce Commission.]

Articles.	1892.	1895.	1896.	1899.
Exports of merchandise	$1,030,278,148	$807,538,165	$882,606,938	$1,227,023,302
Imports of merchandise	$ 27,402,462	$731,969,965	$779,724,674	$697,148,489
Excess of exports	$ 02,875,686	$75,568,200	$102,882,264	$529,874,813
Imports for consumption, per capita	$12.44	$10.48	$10.66	$9.02
Exports per capita	$15.53	$11.37	$12.11	$15.84
Exports of—				
Agricultural products	$ 08,328,232	$553,210,026	$560,879,297	$784,999,087
Breadstuffs	$ 99,363,117	$114,604,780	$141,356,993	$273,999,000
Wheat, bushels	157,280,351	76,102,704	60,650,080	139,432,815
Wheat and flour	$230,761,415	$95,457,591	$91,735,085	$177,563,039
Oats	$3,842,559	$300,793	$3,497,611	$9,787,540
Rye	$11,432,100	$5,340	$445,075	$5,936,078
Corn, bushels	75,451,849	27,091,137	99,992,835	174,080,094
Corn meal	$919,961	$648,844	$654,121	$1,775,868
Provisions	$141,240,834	$135,250,579	$133,377,549	$175,508,008
Average prices, New York market:				
Wheat, No. 2 red winter, per bushel, cents	90.8	60.9	78.1	79.0
Corn, No. 2 mixed, per bushel, do	54.0	47.7	34.0	41.3
Oats, per bushel, do	30.3	28.9	23.3	30.7
Exports of—				
Bacon, pounds	507,919,830	452,549,976	425,352,187	562,651,480
Lard	$53,201,621	$36,821,508	$33,580,851	$42,208,465
Butter	$2,445,879	$915,531	$2,937,203	$3,263,951
Seeds	$6,252,282	$2,849,145	$1,592,017	$5,079,306
Wheat retained for home consumption, bushels per capita	5.91	4.54	4.78	5.95
Value of farm animals	$2,461,755,698	$1,819,446,306	$1,727,925,084	$1,997,010,407
Sheep:				
Number of, in United States	44,038,365	42,294,064	38,298,783	50,114,453
Value of, in United States	$116,121,280	$96,685,767	$95,167,735	$107,697,530
Average value per head	$2.60	$1.57	$1.70	$2.75
Sheep exported	$161,105	$2,630,626	$3,076,384	$853,555
Mutton exported	$9,422	$47,832	$31,793	$29,427
Wool produced in United States, pounds	294,000,000	309,784,000	272,474,708	274,191,330
Wool imported, do	148,670,552	200,033,906	230,911,473	76,736,209
Per cent of wool consumption supplied by foreign wool	33.1	40	45.9	19.2
Imports of articles, crude, for use in manufacturing	$197,840,559	$187,482,743	$201,850,498	$218,110,941
Imports of—				
Fiber for manufacturing	$19,124,094	$13,218,061	$12,870,694	$20,300,003
Crude rubber for manufacturing	$19,718,216	$18,353,121	$16,603,020	$31,707,630
Hides and skins for manufacturing	$26,850,218	$26,122,942	$30,520,177	$41,988,043
Raw silk for manufacturing	$25,059,325	$22,626,056	$25,763,428	$32,479,627
Exports of manufactures	$159,510,937	$183,595,743	$228,571,178	$338,675,558
Per cent which manufactures form of total exports	15.61	23.14	26.48	28.13
Exports of iron and steel	$28,800,930	$32,000,989	$41,160,877	$93,716,031
Pig iron produced, tons	9,157,000	9,446,308	8,623,127	13,620,703
Furnaces in blast, number	253	242	150	289
Steel rails manufactured, tons	1,208,936	1,017,098	1,300,325	1,077,922
Tin plate manufactured, pounds	13,646,719	193,801,073	307,228,621	701,371,484
Tin plate imported, do	422,176,202	508,036,938	385,138,985	108,484,826
Tin plate imported	$12,315,562	$12,144,080	$8,950,656	$2,613,584
Crude steel manufactured, tons	4,927,581	6,114,834	5,281,689	*8,932,856
Coal mined in United States, do	181,780,871	189,661,302	195,361,200	258,539,650
Exports of merchandise to—				
Cuba	$17,953,570	$12,807,661	$7,530,880	$18,616,377
Porto Rico	$2,856,003	$1,833,544	$2,102,094	$2,685,848
Hawaii	$5,781,628	$3,723,057	$3,985,707	$9,305,470
Philippines	$80,914	$119,255	$162,446	$404,193
All Oceania	$15,572,767	$13,101,231	$17,197,229	$29,875,015
China	$5,063,497	$3,693,840	$6,921,933	$14,493,440
All Asia	$19,590,350	$17,325,057	$25,630,029	$48,360,161
Money in circulation	$1,601,347,187	$1,601,968,473	$1,508,434,966	$1,904,071,881
Money in circulation per capita	$24.44	$22.93	$21.10	$25
Gold in Treasury	$255,700,511	$156,618,062	$144,692,900	$283,760,334
Gold and gold certificates in circulation	$549,662,443	$528,019,270	$497,103,183	$712,303,960
Receipts from customs	$177,452,964	$131,818,530	$152,158,617	$206,128,481
Exchanges of clearing houses in United States	$60,883,572,438	$50,975,155,046	$51,935,651,733	$88,901,661,776
Railways constructed, miles	4,441	1,650	1,704	4,500
Net earnings of railways per mile	$2.06	$1.80	$1.84	$2.11
Per cent of expense to earnings	69.80	70.40	70.40	68.1
Freight carried 1 mile, tons	84,413,197,130	56,567,770,801	93,885,853,634	*114,506,173,191

TABLE No. 9.—*Statement of imports, exports, money in circulation, prices, etc., in the years 1892, 1895, 1896, and 1899, respectively*—Continued.

Articles.	1892.	1895.	1896.	1899.
Average receipts per ton mile	$0.94	$0.84	$0.82	*$0.76
Dividends paid by railways	$93,862,412	$81,085,774	$81,528,154	$94,937,536
Persons employed by railways	821,000	785,034	826,025	874,558
Wages and salaries paid to railway employees	$440,318,900	$445,508,261	$463,824,531	*$495,055,618
Telegraph messages sent	71,722,589	70,801,207	72,221,893	77,356,508
Business failures:				
Number	10,844	13,197	15,068	9,337
Liabilities	$114,044,167	$173,196,060	$226,096,834	$90,879,889
Value of silver, per fine ounce.....cents	87.1	65.4	67.5	60.1
WHOLESALE PRICES IN NEW YORK MARKET, JULY 1.				
Wheat flour, per barrel	$5.10	$4.85	$4.40	$4.50
Rye flour, per barrel	3.84	3.19	2.92	3.28
Lard, per pound	.07	.063	.036	.049
Codfish, boned, per pound	.11	.09	.095	.10
Butter, creamery, Western extra, per pound	.20	.16	.14	.175
Cheese, New York extra, per pound	.0875	.0825	.07	.085
Apples, evaporated, per pound	.05	.065	.055	.085
Beef, on hoof, good, per 100 pounds	3.45	3.45	3.25	4.65
Beef, salt, family, per barrel	9.75	10.50	8.50	9.00
Pork, salt, mess, per barrel	11.25	13.25	8.00	8.75
Bacon, short-rib sides, per pound	.083	.068	.043	.052
Salt, fine, per barrel	.65	.65	.65	.65
Cornstarch, per pound	.056	.056	.054	.054
Sugar:				
Centrifugal, 96 per cent test, per pound	.031	.032	.035	.045
Fair refining, 89 per cent test, per pound	.027	.028	.030	.040
Granulated, per pound	.042	.043	.046	.052
Shoes:				
Women's solid leather, grain, per pair	.85	.85	.85	.85
Men's brogan, per pair	1.025	1.05	1.00	.95
Men's calf, bal., per pair	2.40	2.40	2.40	2.24
Calico, Cocheco prints, per yard	.065	.055	.05	.05
Carpets, ingrain, 2-ply Lowell, per yard	.503	.41	.413	.429
Cotton thread, 6-cord, 200 yards, J. & P. Coats, per spool	.0313	.0318	.0311	.0311
Denims, Amoskeag, per yard	.115	.0975	.095	.0925
Ginghams, Amoskeag, per yard	.065	.0475	.0425	.05
Print cloths, Metacomet, per yard	.0337	.03287	.0249	.0275
Suitings, wool, indigo, per yard	1.70	1.25	1.25	1.25
Sheetings, 4-4 Atlantic, per yard	.058	.050	.052	.047
Shirtings, bleached, 4-4:				
Fruit of the Loom, per yard	.079	.065	.061	.063
"Hope," per yard	.064	.059	.057	.054
Lonsdale, per yard	.080	.068	.061	.063
New York Mills, per yard	.097	.085	.09	.087
Tickings, Amoskeag ACA, per yard	.115	.105	.10	.0925
Cotton-warp alpaca, N. Y. Hamilton, per yard	.0725	.065	.065	.065
Candles, best adamantine, per pound	.12	.12	.12	.12
Coal:				
Anthracite—				
Pea, per ton	2.75	2.85	2.85	2.50
Stove, per ton	4.35	3.90	4.10	3.85
Bituminous, per gross ton	3.15	2.75	2.90	2.20
Matches, parlor, per gross	4.75	4.75	4.75	3.75
Manila hemp, per pound	.065	.0425	.0425	.0875
Rope:				
Manila, per pound	.1075	.0675	.0675	.0975
Tarred, American, per pound	.0875	.0875	.0875	.0875
Pig iron, Bessemer, at Pittsburg, per gross ton	14.09	14.14	19.12	20.45
Steel billets, at Pittsburg, per gross ton	23.29	21.06	19.50	33.80
Scythes, per dozen	3.60	3.60	3.60	4.00
Shovels, Ames, No. 2, cast steel, per dozen	7.87	7.45	7.93	8.69
Lard, prime, contract, per pound	.0769	.065	.0467	.0557
Beef, extra mess, per barrel	6.86	6.69	7.51	9.26
Coffee, Brazil, fair to prime, per pound	.158	.178	.151	.074
Average October price of Ohio fleece wool:				
Fine, per pound	.29	.16	.18	.31
Coarse, per pound	.29	.19	.18	.29

*1898.

TABLE No. 10.—*Commercial failures and average of liabilities, 1876–1899.*

[From Dun's Review, New York.]

Calendar year.	Total for the year.				
	Number of failures.	Number of business concerns.	Per cent of failures.	Amount of liabilities.	Average liabilities.
1876	9,092	.....	.....	$191,117,786	$21,020
1877	8,872	.....	.....	190,669,936	21,491
1878	10,478	.....	.....	234,383,132	22,369
1879	6,658	702,157	0.95	98,149,053	14,741
1880	4,735	746,823	.63	65,752,000	13,886
1881	5,582	781,069	.71	81,155,932	14,530
1882	6,738	822,356	.82	101,547,564	15,070
1883	9,184	863,993	1.06	172,874,172	18,823
1884	10,968	904,759	1.21	226,343,427	20,632
1885	10,637	919,990	1.16	124,220,321	11,678
1886	9,834	969,841	1.01	114,644,119	11,651
1887	9,634	994,281	.90	167,560,944	17,392
1888	10,679	1,046,602	1.02	123,829,978	11,595
1889	10,882	1,051,140	1.04	148,784,357	13,672
1890	10,907	1,110,590	.98	189,856,984	17,406
1891	12,273	1,142,951	1.07	189,868,038	15,471
1892	10,344	1,172,705	.88	114,044,167	11 025
1893*	15,242	1,190,113	1.28	346,779,889	29,751
1894*	13,885	1,114,174	1.25	172,992,856	12,458
1895*	13,197	1,209,282	1.09	173,196,060	13,124
1896*	15,088	1,151,579	1.31	226,096,834	14,992
1897	13,351	1,058,521	1.26	154,332,071	11,559
1898	12,186	1,105,830	1.10	130,692,899	10,722
1899	9,337	1,147,595	.81	90,879,889	9,733

*Democratic and low-tariff period.

TABLE No. 11.—*Clearing-house returns of the United States.*

[From the Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1899.]

Year.	New York clearing houses.	Clearing houses of the United States.
1880	$37,182,128,621	(*)
1881	48,565,818,212	(*)
1882	46,552,846,161	(*)
1883	40,203,165,258	(*)
1884	34,092,037,338	(*)
1885	25,250,791,440	(*)
1886	33,374,682,216	$48,211,643,771
1887	34,872,848,786	52,126,704,488
1888	30,863,686,609	48,750,886,813
1889	34,796,465,529	53,501,411,510
1890	37,000,086,572	58,845,279,505
1891	34,053,698,770	57,208,737,938
1892	36,279,905,236	60,883,572,438
1893†	*34,421,380,870*	*56,880,682,455*
1894†	*24,230,145,368*	*45,028,496,746*
1895†	*28,264,379,126*	*50,976,155,046*
1896†	*29,350,894,884*	*51,935,651,733*
1897	31,337,760,948	54,179,545,030
1898	39,853,413,948	65,924,820,769
1899	57,368,230,771	88,909,661,776

*No data.
†Democratic and low-tariff years.

TABLE No. 12.—*Railways in the United States, their capital stock and dividends, debt and rate of interest paid, passengers and freight carried and rates received per mile for same, earnings per mile of road, and percentage of expenses to earnings, from 1883 to 1898.*

[Compiled from Poor's Railway Manual.]

Year.	Length of lines.	Capital stock.	Dividends, per cent of stock.	Funded debt.	Interest, per cent of bonds and debt.	Passengers carried.	Average receipts per passenger per mile.	Freight carried.	Average receipts per ton per mile.	Earnings per mile of railroad in operation.		Percentage of expenses to earnings.
										Gross.	Net.	
	Miles.						*Cents.*	*Tons.*	*Cents.*			
1883	120,519	$3,675,793,383	2.77	$3,479,411,914	4.58	312,686,641	2.42	400,453,439	1.22	$7,405	$2,679	63.82
1884	125,119	3,726,655,041	2.48	3,647,312,772	4.54	334,570,706	2.36	399,074,749	1.13	6,663	2,318	65.21
1885	127,689	3,778,609,737	2.02	3,740,255,066	4.65	*351,427,688	2.20	437,040,099	1.06	6,265	2,185	65.12
1886	133,565	3,956,377,498	2.04	3,853,748,330	4.53	382,284,972	2.19	482,245,254	1.04	6,570	2,376	63.84
1887	147,953	4,146,958,214	2.18	4,155,628,116	4.54	428,225,513	2.28	552,074,752	1.03	6,861	2,444	64.45
1888	154,222	4,392,287,224	1.77	4,585,471,523	4.20	451,353,655	2.25	590,857,353	.98	6,540	2,045	68.72
1889	159,934	4,447,103,600	1.81	4,784,173,271	4.23	494,808,421	2.17	619,165,630	.97	6,455	2,068	67.95
1890	163,359	4,590,471,560	1.80	5,055,225,025	4.13	520,439,082	2.17	691,344,437	.93	6,822	2,162	68.33
1891	167,846	4,751,750,498	1.85	5,180,227,024	4.14	556,015,802	2.18	704,398,609	.93	6,852	2,136	68.83
1892	171,805	4,863,119,073	1.93	5,406,955,004	4.16	575,769,678	2.17	730,605,011	.94	6,852	2,068	69.82
1893	175,442	5,021,576,551	1.88	5,510,225,528	4.14	597,056,539	2.07	757,464,480	.89	6,963	2,069	70.29
1894*	*178,054*	*5,087,604,717*	*1.64*	*5,605,775,764*	*4.04*	*569,660,216*	*2.03*	*674,714,747*	*.86*	*6,054*	*1,803*	*70.22*
1895*	*179,321*	*5,181,373,599*	*1.58*	*5,648,659,436*	*4.09*	*529,756,259*	*2.07*	*755,799,883*	*.84*	*6,097*	*1,804*	*70.41*
1896*	*181,394*	*5,373,187,619*	*1.58*	*5,461,856,793*	*4.33*	*535,120,756*	*2.03*	*773,868,716*	*.83*	*6,223*	*1,840*	*70.43*
1897*	*183,557*	*5,602,964,449*	*1.49*	*5,534,432,592*	*4.06*	*504,106,525*	*2.03*	*788,385,448*	*.80*	*6,288*	*1,884*	*69.74*
1898	184,804	5,581,522,858	1.70	5,635,363,504	4.03	514,982,888	1.99	912,979,853	.76	6,771	2,111	68.16

* Democratic and low-tariff years.

TABLE No. 13.—*Number of railway employees in the United States and amount of compensation received by them during the years ending June 30, 1893 to 1899.*

[From reports of the Interstate Commerce Commission.]

Year.	Number of employees.	Amount of compensation.
1892	821,415	*$440,318,909
1893	873,602	*472,919,821
1894†	*779,608*	*447,293,639*
1895†	*735,034*	*445,508,261*
1896†	*836,620*	*463,324,531*
1897†	*823,476*	*465,601,581*
1898	874,558	495,055,618
1899	928,924	522,967,806

*92 per cent of mileage. †Democratic and low-tariff years.

TABLE No. 14.—*Mileage of lines and wires, number of offices, and traffic of the Western Union Telegraph Company from 1868 to 1899.*

[From the Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1899.]

Year ending June 30—	Miles of line.	Miles of wire.	Number of offices.	Number of messages sent.	Average per message.	
					Toll.	Cost.
					Cents.	*Cents.*
1868	50,183	97,594	3,219	6,404,595	104.7	63.4
1869	52,009	104,584	3,607	7,934,933	99.3	54.2
1870	54,109	112,191	3,972	9,157,646	75.5	51.2
1871	56,632	121,151	4,606	10,646,077	69.5	45.7
1872	62,033	137,190	5,237	12,444,499	66.2	43.8
1873	65,757	154,472	5,740	14,456,832	62.5	43.4
1874	71,585	175,735	6,188	16,329,256	54.9	39.5
1875	72,833	179,490	6,565	17,153,710	54.0	35.2
1876	73,532	183,832	7,072	18,729,567	50.9	33.5
1877	76,955	194,323	7,500	21,158,941	43.6	29.8
1878	81,002	206,202	8,014	23,918,804	38.9	25.0
1879	82,987	211,566	8,534	25,070,106	38.6	25.2
1880	85,645	233,534	9,077	29,215,509	38.5	25.4
1881	110,340	327,171	10,737	32,500,000	38.4	25.6
1882	131,060	374,308	12,008	38,842,247	38.2	25.8
1883	144,204	432,726	12,917	41,181,177	38.0	26.0
1884	145,007	450,571	13,761	42,076,220	36.5	25.2
1885	147,500	462,283	14,184	42,006,583	32.1	24.9
1886	151,822	480,607	15,142	43,289,807	31.3	25.4
1887	156,814	524,641	15,658	47,394,530	30.4	23.0
1888	171,375	616,248	17,241	51,463,955	31.2	23.2
1889	178,754	647,697	18,470	54,108,326	31.2	22.4
1890	183,917	678,997	19,382	55,878,702	32.4	22.7
1891	187,981	715,501	20,098	59,148,343	32.5	23.2
1892	189,576	739,105	20,700	62,387,296	31.6	22.3
1893	189,936	709,201	21,078	66,591,858	31.2	22.7
1894*	*190,303*	*790,793*	*21,166*	*58,632,237*	*30.5*	*23.3*
1895*	*189,714*	*802,651*	*21,360*	*58,307,315*	*30.7*	*23.3*
1896*	*189,918*	*826,939*	*21,725*	*58,760,444*	*30.9*	*24.0*
1897*	*190,614*	*841,002*	*21,769*	*58,151,684*	*30.5*	*24.3*
1898	189,847	874,490	22,210	62,173,749	30.1	24.7
1899	189,856	904,636	22,285	61,398,157	30.8	25.1

*Democratic and low-tariff years.

NEBRASKA MORTGAGES.

That the prosperity which followed the election of Mr. McKinley, the restoration of a protective tariff, and the rejection of the silver proposition has been such as to enable people to reduce their indebtedness is evidenced by the following table, showing the mortgages filed and released in each year from 1892 to 1898 in Mr. Bryan's own State, Nebraska. It will be observed that in each year prior to 1896 the mortgages filed far exceeded those released, while in 1897 and 1898 the mortgages released exceeded those filed from 25 to 33 per cent. These conditions are Nebraska's refutation of Bryanism and its doctrines. They are the farmer's reply to demagogism, which attempted to mislead him in 1896 and wants to do it again in coming campaigns.

The following table shows the mortgages filed and released in Nebraska in each year from 1893 to 1898:

TABLE No. 15.—*Mortgages filed and released in Nebraska from 1893 to 1898.*

Year.	Filed.	Released.
1893	$34,601,318	$26,178,745
1894	31,690,054	26,438,090
1895	25,753,364	22,648,917
1896	16,474,646	18,213,382
1897	15,630,721	22,215,759
1898	21,303,855	27,498,070

TABLE No. 16.—*Receipts of the Patent Office from 1890 to 1899.*

Fiscal year ended June 30—	Receipts.
1890	$1,347,203.21
1891	1,302,704.53
1892	1,238,727.35
1893	1,288,899.07
1894	1,183,523.18
1895	1,195,557.07
1896	1,307,000.30
1897	1,343,779.44
1898	1,253,948.44
1899	1,209,554.00

TABLE No. 17.—*Statement showing, by fiscal years, the amount of money received for public lands sold, and fees and commissions collected on public lands disposed of otherwise than for cash, from July 1, 1886, to June 30, 1899; also the aggregate receipts from sales and fees and commissions during said period.*

Fiscal year.	Total cash sales.	Total amount fees and commissions.	Total receipts from disposal of public lands.
1887	$9,246,321.33	$1,537,600.39	$10,783,921.72
1888	11,203,071.95	1,498,000.05	12,701,072.00
1889	8,018,254.50	1,251,971.23	9,270,225.73
1890	6,349,174.24	1,121,696.07	7,470,870.31
1891	4,160,099.07	944,938.65	5,105,037.72
1892	3,322,865.01	1,064,805.26	4,387,670.27
1893	3,193,280.64	998,184.65	4,191,465.29
1894	1,653,080.71	1,021,205.08	2,674,285.79
1895	1,116,090.07	750,710.59	1,866,800.66
1896	1,053,905.59	793,557.82	1,847,463.41
1897	917,911.19	678,469.55	1,596,380.74
1898	1,291,076.10	853,265.50	2,144,341.60
1899	1,703,988.32	890,702.17	2,594,690.49

TABLE No. 18.—*Statement of the number and area of final homestead entries made from the passage of the homestead act (May 20, 1862) to June 30, 1898.*

Fiscal year ending June 30—	Number.	Acres.
1881	177,314	21,198,368.82
1882	17,174	2,219,427.10
1883	18,998	2,504,414.51
1884	21,843	2,945,574.73
1885	22,006	3,032,679.11
1886	19,356	2,663,531.83
1887	19,866	2,749,037.48
1888	22,413	3,175,400.44
1889	25,549	3,681,708.80
1890	28,080	4,060,592.77
1891	27,686	3,954,587.77
1892	22,822	3,259,897.07
1893	24,204	3,477,231.63
1894	20,544	2,929,947.41
1895	20,922	2,980,809.30
1896	20,099	2,790,242.55
1897	20,115	2,778,404.20
1898	22,281	3,095,017.75
Total	551,332	73,491,873.47

POSTAL REVENUES.

The course of the postal revenues furnishes an unerring barometer of the business conditions of the country. This is made plain in reviewing the figures during the bad and the good times respectively of the past few years.

TABLE No. 19.—*Postal revenues an unerring barometer of business conditions.*

[From Report of the Postmaster-General, 1900.]

Year.	Receipts.	Expenditures.	Deficit.
1893	$75,896,933.16	$81,074,104.90	$5,177,171.74
1894	75,080,479.04	84,324,414.15	9,243,935.11
1895	76,983,128.19	86,790,172.82	9,807,044.63
1896	82,499,208.40	90,626,296.84	8,127,088.44
1897	82,665,402.73	94,077,242.38	11,411,779.65
1898	89,012,618.55	98,033,523.61	9,020,905.06
1899	95,021,384.17	101,632,160.93	6,610,776.75

The volume of receipts was nearly stationary for the first three years, notwithstanding the growth of population, but for the last three years, with the return of prosperity and business activity, the revenues show a great and steady gain. The annual deficit, which mounted up in large ratio, reaching an increase of 78 per cent in 1894, is again rapidly declining. The expenditures show a regular increment year by year, varying not much from $3,000,000. This is inevitable with the extension of the service, unless there are directions in which retrenchment could be enforced without crippling the work. But in prosperous times the increase of revenues more than keeps pace with the increase of disbursements and steadily advances the service toward a sounder basis.

TABLE No. 20.—*Aggregate deposits of national and all other banks on or about June 30, in the years 1890 to 1899, inclusive.**

[Compiled in the office of the Comptroller of the Currency.]

Year.	In national banks.	In State banks.	In loan and trust companies.	In savings banks.	In private banks.	Total bank deposits.
1890	$1,555,168,377	$553,054,584	$336,456,492	$1,550,023,956	$99,721,667	$4,094,425,076
1891	1,565,615,007	556,637,012	355,330,080	1,654,826,142	94,959,727	4,227,367,968
1892	1,771,424,036	648,513,809	411,659,906	1,758,329,618	93,091,148	4,683,018,009
1893	1,574,342,018	706,865,643	486,244,079	1,808,800,262	68,552,696	4,644,804,698
1894	1,694,516,227	658,107,494	471,298,816	1,777,983,242	66,074,549	4,667,930,328
1895	1,752,219,712	712,410,423	546,652,057	1,844,357,798	81,824,932	4,937,465,522
1896	1,686,651,190	695,659,914	586,468,156	1,935,466,468	59,116,378	4,963,362,100
1897	1,788,672,081	723,640,705	566,922,205	1,963,413,564	50,278,243	5,112,926,888
1898	2,078,931,409	912,365,406	662,138,397	2,028,208,409	62,085,084	5,743,728,705
1899	2,605,706,227	1,164,902,968	835,683,715	2,182,024,383	64,974,392	6,853,381,685

*Any variations between this statement and similar returns in Report of the Comptroller of the Currency in 1899 are due to the fact that the latter returns were confined to individual deposits.

TABLE No. 21.—*Number of savings banks in the United States, number of depositors, amount of savings deposits, average amount due each depositor in the years 1820, 1825, 1830, 1835, 1840, and 1845 to 1899, and average per capita in the United States in the years given.*

[Compiled in the office of the Comptroller of the Currency.]

Year.	Number of banks.	Number of depositors.	Deposits.	Average due each depositor.	Average per capita in the United States.
1820	10	8,635	$1,138,576	$131.86	$0.12
1825	15	16,931	2,537,082	149.84	.23
1830	36	38,085	6,973,904	183.09	.54
1835	52	60,058	10,613,726	176.72	.72
1840	61	78,701	14,051,520	178.54	.82
1845	70	145,206	24,506,677	168.77	1.23
1846	74	158,709	27,374,355	172.48	1.33
1847	76	187,739	31,827,479	168.46	1.50
1848	83	199,764	33,087,488	165.63	1.52
1849	90	217,518	36,073,924	165.90	1.60
1850	108	251,354	43,431,120	172.78	1.87
1851	126	277,148	50,457,918	182.06	2.10
1852	141	308,863	59,467,453	192.54	2.40
1853	159	365,538	72,313,096	197.82	2.82
1854	190	396,173	77,823,906	196.44	2.94
1855	215	431,602	84,290,076	195.29	3.09
1856	222	487,986	95,598,230	195.90	3.40
1857	231	490,428	98,512,968	200.87	3.41
1858	245	538,840	108,438,287	201.24	3.64
1859	259	622,556	128,657,901	206.66	4.21
1860	278	693,870	149,277,504	215.13	4.75
1861	285	694,487	146,720,882	211.27	4.58
1862	289	757,943	169,434,540	215.03	5.18
1863	293	887,006	206,235,202	232.48	6.18
1864	305	976,025	236,280,401	242.08	6.94
1865	317	980,844	242,619,393	247.35	6.98
1866	336	1,067,031	282,455,794	264.70	7.96
1867	371	1,188,202	337,009,452	283.63	9.31
1868	406	1,310,144	392,781,813	299.80	10.62
1869	476	1,466,084	457,675,050	312.04	12.12
1870	517	1,630,846	549,874,358	337.17	14.26
1871	577	1,902,047	650,745,442	342.13	16.45
1872	647	1,992,925	735,046,805	368.82	18.11
1873	669	2,185,832	802,363,609	367.07	19.25
1874	693	2,295,401	864,556,902	376.98	20.20
1875	771	2,350,864	924,037,304	393.50	21.24
1876	781	2,388,630	941,350,235	397.43	20.86
1877	675	2,395,314	866,218,306	361.63	18.69
1878	663	2,400,785	879,897,425	366.50	18.49
1879	639	2,398,707	802,490,296	353.72	16.42
1880	629	2,335,582	819,106,973	350.71	16.33
1881	629	2,528,749	891,961,142	352.73	17.38
1882	639	2,710,354	966,797,081	356.70	18.42

TABLE No. 21.—*Number of savings banks in the United States, etc.*—Continued.

Year.	Number of banks.	Number of depositors.	Deposits.	Average due each depositor.	Average per capita in the United States.
1883	630	2,876,438	$1,024,856,787	$356.29	$19.09
1884	636	3,015,151	1,073,294,955	355.96	19.55
1885	646	3,071,495	1,096,172,147	356.56	19.51
1886	638	3,158,960	1,141,530,578	361.36	19.89
1887	664	3,418,013	1,235,247,371	361.39	21.05
1888	801	3,838,201	1,364,196,550	355.41	22.75
1889	849	4,021,523	1,425,230,349	354.40	23.25
1890	921	4,258,893	1,524,844,506	358.03	24.35
1891	1,011	4,533,217	1,623,079,749	358.04	25.29
1892	1,059	4,781,005	1,712,769,026	358.20	26.11
1893	1,060	4,830,509	1,785,150,957	369.55	26.63
1894	1,024	4,777,697	1,747,961,280	365.86	25.53
1895	1,017	4,875,519	1,810,597,023	371.36	25.88
1896	988	5,005,494	1,907,158,277	376.50	26.68
1897	980	5,201,133	1,939,376,035	372.88	26.56
1898	979	5,385,746	2,005,631,298	353.54	27.67
1899	987	5,687,818	2,230,366,954	392.13	29.24

TABLE No. 22.—*Depositors, amount of deposits, and average deposit in all savings banks, population of the countries, percentage of population who are depositors, and average deposit per inhabitant, 1895.*

[From reports of the Comptroller of the Currency.]

Country.	Number of depositors.	Deposits.	Average deposit.	Deposit per inhabitant.
Austria	3,924,902	$658,921,580	$167.88	$26.35
Belgium	1,145,408	113,500,080	99.09	16.59
France	8,986,651	829,783,735	92.33	21.84
Hungary	905,397	226,151,760	227.19	12.56
Italy	4,137,906	551,330,100	80.07	11.01
Netherlands	740,024	43,073,460	58.20	10.13
Norway	540,053	60,533,905	112.08	30.26
Prussia	6,255,507	969,757,555	150.23	29.37
Sweden	1,460,858	98,170,720	67.20	19.63
United Kingdom	7,969,826	815,686,750	102.35	21.47
Australasia	894,879	130,485,880	145.81	31.07
Canada	175,500	57,578,975	327.97	10.97
Cape Colony	50,161	8,490,920	169.21	5.31
Crown colonies, other	114,491	12,275,455	107.22	6.14
United States	4,875,519	1,844,357,798	378.31	26.73
Total	45,796,767	6,604,546,473	144.21	11.31

TABLE No. 23.—*Population and capital of the national banks of the States and Territories, and the per capita of deposits in the national, State, savings, and private banks and loan and trust companies in 1896 and 1899, respectively.*

[From official tables prepared by the Comptroller of the Currency.]

State or Territory.	Population.		Capital of all banks.		Average capital per capita of all banks.		Average per capita of capital.									
							National banks.		State banks.		Loan and trust companies.		Savings banks.		Private banks.	
	1896.	1899.	1896.	1899.	1896.	1899.	1896.	1899.	1896.	1899.	1896.	1899.	1896.	1899.	1896.	1899.
Maine	669,000	694,000	$95,864,085	$109,658,043	$143.29	$158.00	$45.88	$49.62	.....	.....	$8.73	$13.45	$88.68	$94.23	.....	.....
New Hampshire	393,000	396,000	84,526,263	76,164,861	215.08	192.34	41.85	46.45	.....	$4.35	.....	.....	173.23	142.06	.....	.....
Vermont	334,000	337,000	52,600,095	58,971,631	157.66	174.99	53.34	58.17	.....	.....	.....	.....	104.32	116.82	.....	.....
Massachusetts	2,600,000	2,745,000	887,749,827	1,054,225,483	341.44	384.05	120.59	136.13	.....	.....	41.55	50.39	179.30	197.53	.....	.....
Rhode Island	391,000	418,000	145,304,110	151,771,262	371.62	363.09	117.21	115.59	$4.64	4.38	64.02	65.76	185.75	177.36	.....	.....
Connecticut	835,000	875,000	235,685,671	270,490,712	282.25	309.13	80.31	87.21	9.76	11.97	9.58	11.23	182.60	198.72	.....	.....
New York	6,691,000	7,175,000	2,001,552,506	2,664,243,526	299.15	371.32	86.18	118.95	37.91	44.76	57.33	78.67	116.98	128.65	$0.75	$0.29
New Jersey	1,821,000	1,890,000	152,024,811	202,736,505	83.48	107.26	43.12	50.50	5.52	6.19	11.06	20.28	23.98	30.29	.....	.....
Pennsylvania	6,014,000	6,115,000	672,441,271	887,857,875	111.81	145.20	60.61	77.49	9.08	13.83	26.87	34.83	13.84	17.45	1.41	1.60
Delaware	182,000	188,000	11,980,719	21,765,375	65.82	115.77	42.68	48.21	8.44	11.88	9.59	27.77	5.11	27.91	.....	.....
Maryland	1,120,000	1,275,000	116,432,536	146,226,944	103.96	114.69	53.56	55.72	3.69	6.99	.26	5.95	46.18	45.62	.27	.41
District of Columbia	284,000	300,000	27,789,545	41,195,757	97.85	137.32	65.49	83.34	.....	.....	31.24	53.98	1.12	.....	.....	.....
Virginia	1,765,000	1,780,000	45,235,885	56,329,530	25.63	31.66	12.37	14.89	13.26	16.76	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
West Virginia	852,000	905,000	26,760,258	37,185,867	31.40	38.54	13.70	16.91	17.39	21.28	.....	.....	.31	.35	.....	.....
North Carolina	1,745,000	1,855,000	16,787,621	20,851,143	9.62	11.24	4.92	6.20	3.40	4.31	.....	.....	.59	.73	.71	.....
South Carolina	1,242,000	1,335,000	15,769,162	12,497,271	12.70	9.36	5.35	6.08	3.07	.54	.....	.....	4.28	1.81	.....	.93
Georgia	2,020,000	2,240,000	20,381,555	48,156,150	10.09	21.50	6.12	6.54	3.79	14.96	.....	.....	.13	.....	.05	.....
Florida	490,000	520,000	8,146,929	11,012,541	16.62	21.18	12.73	14.82	3.89	6.36	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Alabama	1,660,000	1,730,000	12,231,713	17,005,905	7.37	9.83	6.25	7.88	.09	1.95	.....	.....	.....	.....	.43	.....
Mississippi	1,370,000	1,540,000	14,490,964	19,295,042	10.57	12.53	2.56	2.93	8.01	9.60	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Louisiana	1,228,000	1,310,000	36,364,792	45,275,932	29.61	34.56	18.24	19.96	8.53	11.67	.....	.....	2.84	2.93	.....	.....
Texas	2,550,000	2,985,000	63,311,227	76,014,773	24.83	25.47	22.15	24.02	.....	.....	.54	.....	.....	.....	2.17	1.45
Arkansas	1,325,000	1,435,000	6,433,235	9,646,668	4.86	6.73	2.72	2.95	2.14	3.78	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Kentucky	2,010,000	2,220,000	81,498,358	89,713,611	40.54	40.41	16.54	17.69	24.00	22.72	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Tennessee	1,915,000	1,950,000	36,989,379	45,044,833	19.31	23.10	13.56	15.82	4.97	5.56	.....	.....	.78	1.72	.....	.....
Ohio	3,987,000	4,500,000	255,988,085	343,643,894	64.21	76.36	40.09	45.08	12.77	19.25	.....	1.32	9.53	9.33	1.82	1.38
Indiana	2,340,000	2,635,000	83,990,477	110,270,208	35.89	41.85	22.26	27.27	6.54	7.84	.....	1.99	1.89	2.24	4.18	2.51
Illinois	4,305,000	4,785,000	308,040,811	423,149,794	71.55	88.43	39.50	47.67	8.08	38.38	1.02	.....	15.01	.....	2.85	2.38
Michigan	2,396,000	2,585,000	139,766,152	177,831,974	58.33	74.56	22.56	26.39	34.84	46.48	6.11	.....	.....	.....	.93	1.69
Wisconsin	1,986,000	2,150,000	94,212,445	131,956,063	47.44	61.37	25.37	32.57	17.88	23.83	.....	.....	.10	.20	3.49	4.77
Iowa	2,087,000	2,212,000	122,287,165	167,367,739	58.59	75.66	20.48	26.09	12.79	18.22	.60	.....	17.94	26.14	4.63	5.21
Minnesota	1,717,000	1,850,000	104,009,961	112,971,677	60.57	61.07	29.88	31.67	19.61	18.33	2.75	2.56	6.30	6.44	1.51	2.07
Missouri	3,020,000	3,320,000	176,863,765	203,227,674	58.56	61.21	19.37	27.57	31.55	31.42	3.27	.....	.....	.....	2.11	2.23
Kansas	1,350,000	1,380,000	52,173,001	66,930,891	38.65	48.50	20.12	25.02	18.53	23.48	5.53	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Nebraska	1,532,000	1,410,000	54,867,361	70,421,445	35.81	49.94	20.20	28.75	15.61	21.19	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
North Dakota	340,000	258,000	10,830,396	13,378,203	31.85	51.85	20.44	26.17	11.41	25.68	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
South Dakota	560,000	405,000	12,449,111	16,908,348	22.23	41.75	11.31	17.43	5.76	24.32	.....	.....	.....	.....	5.16	.....
Washington	575,000	475,000	16,101,297	28,990,655	28.00	61.03	22.92	45.87	2.49	15.16	.....	.....	.....	.....	2.59	.....
Oregon	360,000	455,000	15,113,258	18,955,002	41.98	41.66	33.16	33.24	4.53	8.42	.....	.....	4.29	.....	.....	.....
California	1,432,000	1,535,000	288,176,610	333,107,881	201.24	214.22	19.17	30.59	77.83	78.90	.....	.....	102.45	103.11	1.79	1.63
Montana	230,000	240,000	23,615,782	19,207,397	102.67	80.03	86.79	60.94	6.19	19.09	.....	.....	8.00	.....	1.69	.....
Idaho	135,000	180,000	3,260,800	4,679,756	24.15	26.00	21.33	21.94	.....	4.06	.....	.....	.....	.....	2.82	.....
Wyoming	95,000	91,000	3,990,213	5,832,260	42.00	64.09	30.41	43.25	2.84	6.83	.....	.....	.....	.....	8.65	14.01
Nevada	44,000	45,000	1,015,016	1,915,422	23.07	42.57	5.40	11.57	.....	31.00	.....	.....	.....	.....	17.67	.....
Utah	275,000	282,000	11,539,207	15,543,933	41.96	55.12	20.08	22.90	7.96	21.90	.....	.....	13.92	10.32	.....	.....
Colorado	595,000	527,000	40,420,587	54,187,208	67.93	102.82	56.30	87.29	9.59	15.00	.....	.....	.....	.....	2.04	.56
Arizona	69,000	83,000	2,345,339	4,351,877	33.99	52.43	19.27	32.51	14.72	19.92	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
New Mexico	177,000	230,000	3,320,612	5,157,827	18.76	22.43	15.61	16.04	3.15	6.39	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Oklahoma	150,000	285,000	1,787,734	5,554,238	8.58	19.49	5.24	5.76	3.34	13.73	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Indian Territory	205,000	215,000	1,408,091	3,304,438	6.87	15.37	5.96	13.88	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.92	1.49
Alaska	.....	40,000	.....	117,204	.....	2.92	.....	2.92	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total	71,468,000	76,266,000	6,695,486,521	8,512,300,108	93.69	111.61	37.14	45.59	14.44	19.81	10.95	13.71	29.91	31.40	1.25	1.10

TABLE No. 24.—*Money in circulation in the United States, 1860 to 1900, showing kinds and amount per capita.*

[From official reports of the Comptroller of the Currency.]

July 1—	Gold and gold certificates.	Silver and silver certificates.†	Other.	Total circulation.	Circulation per capita.
1860	$228,304,775		$207,102,477	$435,407,252	$13.85
1861	246,400,000		202,005,767	448,405,767	13.98
1862	$20,000,000	$5,000,000	309,697,744	334,697,744	10.23
1863	20,000,000	20,884,382	554,509,656	595,394,038	17.84
1864	20,000,000	24,132,501	625,508,977	669,641,478	19.67
1865	20,000,000	26,728,755	667,974,240	714,702,995	20.57
1866	20,000,000	29,687,063	623,801,181	673,488,244	18.99
1867	20,000,000	31,306,294	610,685,775	661,992,069	18.28
1868	20,000,000	33,999,352	626,104,309	680,103,661	18.39
1869	20,000,000	35,442,239	609,010,652	664,452,891	17.60
1870	20,000,000	39,379,282	615,833,512	675,212,794	17.50
1871	20,000,000	39,446,305	656,442,700	715,889,005	18.10
1872	20,000,000	41,402,929	676,906,620	738,309,549	18.19
1873	20,000,000	43,076,005	688,805,804	751,881,809	18.04
1874	20,000,000	43,233,582	712,849,449	776,083,031	18.13
1875	20,000,000	42,904,570	691,197,377	754,101,947	17.16
1876	29,000,000	58,993,973	648,615,415	727,609,388	16.12
1877	20,000,000	63,126,514	639,188,369	722,314,883	15.58
1878	20,000,000	76,502,378	632,630,256	729,132,634	15.32
1879	425,785,182	69,797,503	623,049,108	818,631,793	16.75
1880	233,659,670	74,411,914	665,310,635	973,382,228	19.41
1881	321,072,397	115,292,505	677,873,217	1,114,238,119	21.71
1882	363,280,945	133,289,859	677,720,215	1,174,290,419	22.37
1883	404,460,895	154,746,435	671,096,306	1,230,305,696	22.91
1884	411,770,843	182,778,019	649,377,107	1,243,925,969	22.65
1885	468,398,141	184,320,836	639,849,638	1,292,568,615	23.02
1886	434,263,950	186,958,838	631,477,737	1,252,700,525	21.82
1887	467,766,118	246,250,603	603,522,422	1,317,539,143	22.45
1888	512,208,683	306,649,307	553,312,820	1,372,170,870	22.88
1889	493,611,797	363,090,028	523,659,824	1,380,361,649	22.52
1890	505,089,782	407,867,574	516,393,914	1,429,251,270	22.82
1891	527,382,232	464,630,069	505,428,406	1,497,440,707	23.41
1892	549,602,443	545,063,323	506,621,421	1,601,347,187	24.44
*1893**	*501,177,853*	*590,079,001*	*505,444,399*	*1,596,701,245*	*23.85*
*1894**	*563,316,579*	*573,747,784*	*525,744,345*	*1,660,808,708*	*24.33*

TABLE No. 24.—*Money in circulation in the United States, etc.*—Continued.

July 1—	Gold and gold certificates.	Silver and silver certificates.	Other.	Total circulation.	Circulation per capita.
*1895**	*$583,019,270*	*$547,902,167*	*$536,047,036*	*$1,601,968,473*	*$22.93*
*1896**	*497,103,183*	*538,023,793*	*471,307,990*	*1,506,434,966*	*21.10*
*1897**	*554,875,027*	*552,875,519*	*532,458,973*	*1,640,209,519*	*22.49*
1898	693,762,052	610,972,833	533,125,010	1,837,859,895	24.66
1899	712,303,969	625,245,631	566,432,281	1,904,071,881	25.00
1900, May 1	814,093,155	632,319,520	614,142,788	2,060,525,463	26.58

* Democratic and low-tariff years.
† From July 1, 1891, Treasury notes of 1890 are included.

NOTE.—1862 to 1878, inclusive, specie on Pacific coast estimated at $20,000,000 gold, $5,000,000 silver.

TABLE No. 25.—*Per capita money circulation, 1870 to 1900.*

[From official reports of the Comptroller of the Currency.]

Year.	Gold.	Silver dollars.	Fractional silver.	Gold certificates.	Silver certificates.	United States notes.	Fractional currency.	Treasury notes of 1890.	Currency certificates.	National-bank notes.	State-bank notes.	Total.
1870	$0.65	.....	.....	.....	.....	$8.43	$0.89	.....	.....	$7.48	$0.05	$17.50
1871	.63	.....	.....	.....	.....	8.67	.87	.....	.....	7.88	.05	18.10
1872	.62	.....	.....	.....	.....	8.53	.90	.....	.....	8.10	.04	18.19
1873	.60	.....	.....	.....	.....	7.61	.91	.....	$0.76	8.13	.03	18.04
1874	.58	.....	.....	.....	.....	7.32	.90	.....	1.35	7.95	.03	18.13
1875	.57	.....	.....	.....	.....	6.64	.86	.....	1.32	7.75	.02	17.16
1876	.56	.....	$0.47	.....	.....	6.62	.79	.....	.72	7.00	.02	16.12
1877	.54	.....	.82	.....	.....	6.13	.44	.....	1.15	6.50	.....	15.58
1878	.53	$0.02	1.13	.....	.....	5.77	.34	.....	.97	6.56	.....	15.32
1879	2.26	.16	1.26	$0.31	$0.01	5.57	.....	.....	.60	6.58	.....	16.75
1880	4.50	.40	.97	.16	.12	6.25	.....	.....	.28	6.73	.....	19.41

TABLE No. 25.—*Per capita money circulation, 1870 to 1900*—Continued.

Year.	Gold.	Silver dollars.	Fractional silver.	Gold certificates.	Silver certificates	United States notes.	Fractional currency.	Treasury notes of 1890.	Currency certificates.	National-bank notes.	State-bank notes.	Total.
1881..	$6.14	$0.57	$0.91	$0.11	$0.76	$6.17	.....	.....	$0.23	$6.82	.....	$21.71
1882..	6.82	.62	.88	.10	1.04	5.95	.....	.....	.25	6.71	.....	22.37
1883..	6.42	.66	.87	1.11	1.35	5.78	.....	.....	.24	6.48	.....	22.91
1884..	6.20	.74	.83	1.30	1.76	5.58	.....	.....	.22	6.02	.....	22.65
1885..	6.09	.69	.78	2.26	1.81	5.37	.....	.....	.53	5.49	.....	23.02
1886..	6.24	.92	.80	1.32	1.54	5.32	.....	.....	.32	5.36	.....	21.82
1887..	6.42	.94	.83	1.55	2.42	5.42	.....	.....	.15	4.72	.....	22.45
1888..	6.52	.93	.84	2.02	3.35	4.89	.....	.....	.24	4.09	.....	22.88
1889..	6.16	.89	.84	1.91	4.19	4.88	.....	.....	.28	3.37	.....	22.52
1890..	5.97	.90	.86	2.09	4.76	5.15	.....	.....	.19	2.90	.....	22.82
1891..	6.37	.92	.91	1.88	4.80	5.02	.....	$0.63	.34	2.54	.....	23.41
1892..	6.25	.87	.96	2.16	4.99	4.75	.....	1.50	.46	2.56	.....	24.50
1893..	6.11	.85	.98	1.38	4.89	4.77	.....	2.11	.18	2.02	.....	23.89
1894..	7.26	.77	.86	.97	4.79	3.91	.....	1.97	.87	2.93	.....	24.33
1895..	6.87	.74	.86	.69	4.58	3.80	.....	1.66	.79	2.97	.....	22.96
1896..	6.37	.73	.85	.59	4.63	3.14	.....	1.33	.45	3.01	.....	21.10
1897..	7.09	.71	.82	.51	4.91	3.87	.....	1.14	.84	3.09	.....	22.49
1898..	8.83	.78	.86	.48	5.24	3.82	.....	1.32	.34	2.97	.....	24.66
1899..	8.93	.81	.91	.43	5.28	4.05	.....	1.21	.26	3.12	.....	25.00
1900*.	7.95	.88	.97	2.54	5.25	4.22	.....	1.05	.94	3.61	.....	26.58

*To May 1.

NOTE.—The apparent decrease in the per capita of gold coin in circulation in 1900 is due to the large increase of gold certificates, which increased from 43 cents per capita in 1899 to $2.58 per capita in 1900.

SECTION No. II.—A DISCUSSION OF THE EFFECT OF HIGH AND LOW TARIFFS UPON THE MANUFACTURERS AND WORKINGMEN OF THE COUNTRY; WITH STATISTICAL EVIDENCE ATTACHED.

Let us next consider the effect of the protective system upon our manufacturing industries. The most satisfactory way of measuring the growth of these various industries is through the census figures. These, however, are gathered but once in ten years, and the latest details of this character, therefore, relate to conditions in the year 1890. This material has been so thoroughly discussed from time to time that the facts relative to the wonderful progress in manufacturing, as shown by the decennial inquiries, are already well known to the people.

The census of 1890 showed the number of employees in the manufacturing industries of the United States in that year to be 4,712,622, against 2,732,595 in 1880, an increase of 1,980,000, or nearly 75 per cent, and the wages in 1890 were $2,283,216,529, against $947,953,795, an increase of $1,335,000,000, or 141 per cent. It is particularly interesting to note that the per cent of increase in wages paid in 1890 was nearly double the per cent of increase in number of persons employed, thus showing an average increase in the individual earnings of employees during the decade, as well as a great increase in the number employed, while the value of the products manufactured was in 1890 $9,327,437,283, against $5,369,579,199 in 1880—an increase of $3,957,858,084, or nearly 75 per cent. The population during the same period increased 25 per cent, while manufactures increased 75 per cent, thus indicating that the manufacturers were in 1890 supplying a much larger proportion of the consumption of the people of the United States than in 1880. During the same time importations of articles manufactured ready for consumption increased nearly $24,000,000, or 17.5 per cent, while population was increasing 25 per cent and domestic manufactures 75 per cent, thus indicating that during the decade for which we have accurate figures of both domestic manufactures and imports the manufacturers of the United States rapidly increased the proportion which they were supplying of the home consumption of manufactured goods.

GROWTH OF MANUFACTURES, 1890 TO 1900.

There are three methods by which it is practicable to measure in some degree the growth of domestic manufactures in the decade just ending, and for which there are as yet no census figures. One of these is to study the increase in the importation of the classes of raw material which manufacturers must use. While our manufacturers naturally utilize home materials as far as practicable in their industries, there are certain materials which they require which are not produced at home, while in others the supply from home production is not sufficient to meet their requirements. In crude rubber and silk, for instance, all of the materials utilized must be imported, while in the vegetable fibers, such as hemp, flax, and certain high grades of cotton, hides and skins, and other articles of this class, they are compelled to draw a part of their supplies from abroad. By following the course of importation of these "manufacturers' materials," or, to use the technical term of the Bureau of Statistics of the Treasury Department, "articles in a crude condition, which enter into the various processes of domestic industry" it is practicable to measure in some degree the activities of our manufacturers since 1890.

INCREASED IMPORTS OF MANUFACTURERS' MATERIALS.

A table (No. 1) printed on another page shows the importation of this class of manufacturers' materials, the importation of manufactured goods, and the exportation of manufactured goods. It will be seen from an examination of this table that manufacturers' materials imported in 1890 amounted to $178,435,512, or 23 per cent of the total importations, while in the fiscal year 1900 the importations of this same class amounted to $310,000,000 and formed 35.8 per cent of the total importations. It is thus apparent that our manufacturers are to-day drawing from abroad fully twice as much material for use in manufacturing as they did a decade ago, since the actual value is nearly double that of 1890, while it is a well-known fact that prices of manufacturers' materials are now much less than those of a decade ago and that a given number of dollars now represents a larger quantity than at that time. It is also gratifying to note that this class of material, that required by manufacturers, now forms nearly 36 per cent of the total imports, against 23 per cent in 1890.

INCREASED EXPORTS OF MANUFACTURES.

Still another evidence of the activity of manufacturers is found in a column of the same table (No. 1), where the values of manufactures exported is shown. In the fiscal year 1890 exports of domestic manufactures amounted to but $151,000,000 and in the fiscal year 1900 to $425,000,000—an increase of nearly 200 per cent.

DECREASED IMPORTS OF MANUFACTURES.

Meantime, importation of manufactures has been greatly reduced, having been, in 1890, $346,678,654, and forming 44.8 per cent of the total imports, while in 1899 it was but $259,862,721 and formed but 37.9 per cent of the total imports.

Thus, in the study of imports of manufacturers' materials and the imports and exports of manufactured goods all the available data show a phenomenal increase in our manufacturing industries during the decade 1890–1900, in which we must depend chiefly upon these data in determining the growth of manufactures. A study of the period shows, first, an increase of nearly 100 per cent in imports of manufacturers' materials; second, an increase of nearly 200 per cent in the exports of manufactured goods, and third, a decrease of 25 per cent in the imports of manufactured goods; while manufacturers' materials form every year a larger proportion of the total imports, and manufactured goods form every year a smaller proportion of the imports; and, on the other hand, manufactured goods form every year a larger proportion of the total exports.

EFFECT OF WILSON TARIFF ON MANUFACTURERS AND THEIR EMPLOYEES.

Before leaving this statement, which shows the imports of manufacturers' materials and the imports and exports of finished manufactures, it is proper to call attention to the disastrous effect of the low tariff of 1894–1897 upon the manufacturing industries as measured by the imports of raw materials and the imports and exports of finished products. It will be seen that, despite the claim of the supporters of the Wilson law, that their measure would especially benefit manufacturers by giving them free raw material, the importation of raw material in the years ending June 30, 1895, 1896, 1897, all of which were under the low tariff, averaged less than those of the fiscal year 1893, all of which was under the McKinley protective tariff and most of it under President Harrison, and that the years ending June 30, 1899 and 1900, under the Dingley law, show a larger importation than that of any year under the Wilson low tariff, the importation of raw material in the year 1900 being 50 per cent greater than the annual average importation of raw material under the Wilson law, and the share which raw material formed of the total imports was, in the year 1900, 36 per cent, against an average of 26 per cent during the entire period that the Wilson law was in operation.

In exports of manufactures the increase under Dingley protection over that of Wilson low tariff, with its enforced idleness of factories, is equally striking. The exports of manufactures in the three fiscal years during which the Wilson law was in operation averaged $230,000,000 per annum, while for the year 1900, as already indicated, they were $425,000,000, an increase of 61 per cent. Still another important indication of the prosperity or depression of manufactures under protection and low tariffs, respectively, is found in a comparison of the imports of manufactures with the exports of manufactures. A comparison of the figures in the import and export columns of manufactures in Table No. 1 shows that the exports of manufactures exceeded the imports of manufactures in the fiscal year 1898, both of which were under the Dingley tariff law, while in preceding years imports of manufactures had always exceeded exports of that class of merchandise,

the reversed condition being due to the steady reduction of imports and the steady increase of exports of manufactured goods.

Some indication of the growth in exports of manufactures by great classes is found in Table No. 2, which shows the exports of manufactures of iron and steel, copper, agricultural implements, leather and its manufactures, etc., in the fiscal year 1897, the last year under the Wilson law, compared with the fiscal years 1898–1900, all of which were under the Dingley law and all of which show a marked increase in exports of manufactures as compared with the last year of the Wilson law. A further study of the growth of exports of manufactures during a longer period is found in Table No. 3, which shows the exports of principal manufactured articles in 1868, 1878, 1898, and 1899.

Still another table, No. 4, shows the exports of the principal manufactures in each year from 1890 to 1899, and gives an opportunity to study the relative growth under low and protective tariffs, respectively. The fiscal years 1890 to 1894 were under protective tariffs; those of 1895 to 1897 under a low tariff, and those of 1898 and 1899 were again under a protective tariff.

An opportunity for comparison of the imports and exports of manufactures in each year from 1888 to 1899 is given by Table No. 5, which shows that the exports of manufactures have more than trebled during that period, while imports of manufactures have fallen off 20 per cent.

OUR GROWTH IN MANUFACTURING COMPARED WITH THAT OF FREE-TRADE ENGLAND, AS INDICATED BY COAL CONSUMPTION.

Three great industries—coal, iron, and tin plate—have made especial progress under the development of our manufacturing system, coal production being of itself a measure of the development of manufacturing, since coal enters so largely into that industry. Table No. 6 shows the growth in coal production in free-trade Great Britain compared with that of the protection countries—United States, Germany, and France; also the total coal production of the world and the per cent supplied by the United States at quinquennial periods from 1868 to 1898.

It will be seen by an examination of this table that the coal production of the United Kingdom during the thirty years under consideration, during all of which time that country has been under a low tariff, only increased from 115,000,000 tons to 226,000,000 tons, or a little less than 100 per cent, while Germany, which adopted a protective tariff about the middle of the period under consideration, has increased her coal outpnt from 36,000,000 tons to 144,000,000 tons—a growth of 300 per cent. France, also a protection country, increased her output from 14,697,686 tons in 1868 to 35,748,644 tons in 1898, an increase of 150 per cent, while the United States, which has been constantly under a protective tariff law during that period (with the exception of three years), increased her output from 31,648,960 tons in 1868 to 258,539,650 tons in 1899—an increase of over 700 per cent. It must be remembered, in addition to this, that the United States has consumed in her factories, on her railways, and among her people practically all of this enormous increase, our exports of coal averaging less than 3 per cent of our total production, while Great Britain has been for years a large exporter of coal.

EFFECT OF THE WILSON LOW TARIFF ON THE COAL INDUSTRY AND ON LABOR EMPLOYED AT THE MINES.

Another table, No. 7, shows the details of coal production in the United States from 1880 to 1899, indicating the quantity mined, value of the product, the price per ton at the mines, the number of employees, and the average number of days in which they were employed in each year, the imports and exports of coal and the per cent of the world's production supplied by the United States.

An examination of this table will show the effect of the low-tariff period upon the coal production and coal producers—the workingmen in the mines of the United States numbering a half million toilers. The production in 1894, the year in which the low tariff was enacted, fell to 170,000,000 tons as against 182,000,000 in the preceding year, and the value of the product fell from $208,000,000 in 1893 to $186,000,000 in 1894, a loss in a single year of $22,000,000 in this one article in which labor forms so important a part of its value.

A study of the number of men employed at the mines shows little change during the low-tariff period; but an examination of the column showing the number of days in which they were active discloses the effect of the low tariff upon the laboring men in that great industry. In 1891, under protection and the activity of the great industries of the country, the average number of days in which the men in the coal mines of the United States were employed was 232. In 1893, the year in which a low-tariff President and Congress came into power, the number of days in which the miners were employed dropped to 201, and in 1894 dropped again to 178; while in 1897, the last year of the Wilson tariff, the number was but 179, a reduction of 20 per cent in the time in which they were employed as compared with 1891. The figures for 1898 show a marked increase in the number of days employed and an increase of 38,000 men as compared with 1893; while it is apparent that the figures for 1899 will, when completed, show a much larger increase, since the product in 1899 was 39,000,000 tons greater than in 1898, and 85,000,000 greater than in 1894, an increase of nearly 20 per cent in production and 25 per cent in value of the product.

The growth in the production of iron and steel in the United States from 1880 to 1899 is shown in a table (No. 8). Pig-iron production in the United States has increased from 3,835,191 tons in 1880 to 13,620,703 tons in 1899, which year placed the United States at the head of the iron and steel producing nations of the world. An examination of this table will show the effect of the Democratic low-tariff period—1893–1896—upon this great industry. The pig-iron production of 1892 was 9,157,000 tons. In 1893, the year of the inauguration of Democracy and low tariff, it fell to 7,124,000 tons; in 1894 to 6,657,000 tons, and in 1896 was but 8,623,000 tons. The year 1897, in which protection was again adopted, showed an increase to 9,652,680 tons, and in 1899 an increase to 13,620,703 tons. Thus the fall from the last year of President Harrison to 1894, the year in which the low tariff was enacted, was 2,499,622 tons, or 27 per cent, while the increase of 1899 over 1896, the last full year under a low tariff, was 4,997,576 tons, or 57 per cent.

DEVELOPMENT OF IRON AND STEEL MANUFACTURE UNDER PROTECTION—INCREASED PRODUCTION AND LOWER PRICES.

The reduction of prices noted in the column showing the price of steel rails during the period under consideration is also extremely suggestive, answering, as it does, the assertion that sufficient competition to keep prices at a minimum can only be obtained by a low tariff. It will be seen from an examination of this column that the average annual price of steel rails during the period of protection from 1880 to 1893 fell from $67.50, in 1880, to $28.12, in 1893. In 1894, the year in which the low tariff was adopted, there was a fall of $4 per ton, but the price returned to $28 in 1896—dropping to $18.75 in 1897, the year in which the protective tariff was again adopted, $17.62 in 1898, and returned in 1899 to $28.12, the figure at which it stood in 1893 and 1896.

Another illustration of the tremendous growth of our iron and steel industry during this long protection period is found in the columns of this table, showing the imports and exports of manufactures of iron and steel in each year from 1880 to 1898. It will be seen that under this long period of protection and the development of the manufacturing industries which accompanied it, the imports of iron and steel fell from $71,266,699 to $13,100,440, and that the manufacturers, besides supplying the enormous addition to the home market which this reduced importation implies, also increased their exportation of iron and steel manufactures from $14,716,524 in 1880 to $93,716,031 in 1899, and in the year 1900 the total will amount to $120,000,000, or more than eight times that of 1880.

OUR GROWTH IN IRON AND STEEL MANUFACTURING, COMPARED WITH THAT OF FREE-TRADE ENGLAND.

The relative growth of the iron and steel industries in the protection and nonprotection countries, respectively, is another illustration of the advantages of the protective system. A table (No. 9) shows the production of pig iron in free-trade Great Britain and protection United States, Germany, France, and Russia in each year since 1870. It will be seen that Great Britain, whose fame as a producer of iron and steel is world-wide, has only increased her output during that time from 5,963,515 tons in 1870 to 9,305,319 tons in 1899, an increase of 56 per cent, while France, under a protective tariff, has increased her output during the same time from 1,178,114 tons to 2,567,388 tons, an increase of 117 per cent, and Russia, also a protection country, has increased her output from 359,531 tons in 1870 to 2,223,469 in 1898, an increase of 520 per cent. Germany, under vigorous protection, has increased her output of pig iron from 1,391,124 tons in 1870 to 8,142,017 tons in 1899, an increase of 485 per cent, while the United States, with a thoroughly protective tariff, increased her output from 1,665,179 tons in 1870 to 13,620,703 tons in 1899, a gain of 11,956,000 tons, or 718 per cent.

Attention is also called to the table (No. 10) which shows the relative production of Bessemer steel ingots and rails in the United States and in Great Britain since 1868, in which it will be seen that the growth in the United States has been enormous as compared with that of free-trade Great Britain, the increase in ingots in the United States being from 7,589 tons in 1868 to 7,586,354 tons in 1899, while that of Great Britain increased from 110,000 tons in 1868 to 1,825,074 in 1899. In Bessemer steel rails the growth in production has been equally striking. Still another table (No. 11) compares the production of crude steel of all kinds in the United States and in Great Britain from 1875 to 1899, showing that the increase in the United States has been from 198,796 tons in 1873 to 10,639,857 tons in 1899, while that of Great Britain was from 653,500 tons in 1873 to 5,000,000 tons in 1899.

TIN PLATE—HOME MANUFACTURES INCREASED, IMPORTS DECREASED, AND PRICES REDUCED BY PROTECTION.

Still another striking evidence of the growth of our manufactures under protection is found in the facts presented by a table, No. 12, which shows imports, home manufactures, and prices of tin plate in the United States under the protection established by the McKinley law. Importation of tin plate, before the establishment of the protective duty, ranged in the vicinity of 650,000,000 pounds, the amount of money sent annually abroad for this article being over $20,000,000. The McKinley law, which went into effect October 1, 1890, placed a thoroughly protective duty on tin plate, of which there were no manufactures in this country at that time. By 1892 the production amounted to over 13,000,000 pounds, by 1894 to 139,000,000 pounds, by 1896 to 307,000,000 pounds, by 1898 to 681,000,000 pounds, and in 1899 to 791,000,000, or more than was ever imported in a single year except that of 1891, in which there was an excessive importation in order to evade the duties established by the McKinley Act. Meantime importations have fallen until they amounted to but 108,000,000 pounds in 1899, and the amount of money sent abroad for this article was but $2,613,000, against $21,222,653 in 1889.

RECENT INCREASE IN PRICE OF TIN PLATE MUCH LESS THAN IN THAT OF THE RAW MATERIAL USED.

An examination of the column in Table No. 12 showing the price of Bessemer steel plates in the New York markets since the establishment of the industry in the United States also reveals some interesting facts. It shows that the price in 1893, the second year of production under the protective tariff, was $5.04 per box; that it fell steadily year by year until it reached $3.52 per box in 1896, a reduction of 30 per cent. In 1899 the average price was $4.51 per box, and on April 20, 1900, $4.84 per box. This increase from $3.52 per box in 1896 to $4.85 in 1900 has been the subject of much criticism, and led to a charge that the increase was an arbitrary one caused by combinations of the tin-plate manufacturers of the country. An examination of the accompanying columns, however, which show the prices of tin and steel billets, the chief constituents of tin plate, discloses some interesting facts. It will be seen that Straits tin increased from 13.3 cents per pound in New York in 1896 to 31 cents in 1900, the period in which the advance in tin plate occurred, while the price of steel billets increased from $15.08 per ton in 1897 to $37 on April 20, 1900, thus showing an increase of more than 125 per cent in the articles entering into the manufacture of tin plate, while the advance in the price of the finished article was but 38 per cent.

The growth of the cotton manufacturing industry, which has already been referred to, is also illustrated by a table (No. 13), which shows the cotton production and manufacture in the United States, the reduction in imports, and increase in domestic manufactures and exports from 1883 to 1899. It will be seen that the number of bales taken by Northern mills increased from 1,759,000 in 1883 to 2,217,000 in 1899, and those of Southern mills from 313,000 in 1883 to 1,415,000 in 1899, making a total increase from 2,072,000 to 3,632,000 during the time under consideration. Meantime the exportations of manufactures of cotton increased from $13,721,605 in 1883 to $23,566,914 in 1899, and imports fell from $38,026,044 in 1883 to $32,054,434 in 1899. An important fact as to the effect of the low tariff upon the manufacturing industries is shown by a study of the consumption of cotton by the mills of the United States year by year during that part of the period under consideration. In 1892, the last year under President Harrison, the number of bales taken by the mills of the United States was 2,856,000. In 1893 the number dropped to 2,375,000 and in 1894 to 2,291,000. In 1896 the number was 2,505,000, and in 1898, the first full year under the Dingley protective tariff, it increased to 3,465,000, and in 1899 was 3,632,000, an increase of 60 per cent in 1899 as compared with 1894.

TABLE No. 1.—*Manufactured articles imported into and exported from the United States and imports of raw materials used by manufacturers in each year from 1883 to 1900.*

[Prepared by the Treasury, Bureau of Statistics.]

Year ending June 30—	Manufacturers' materials imported. Value.	Manufacturers' materials imported. Per cent of total imports.	Manufactures imported. Value.	Manufactures imported. Per cent of total imports.	Manufactures exported. Value.	Manufactures exported. Per cent of total exports.
1883	$140,165,775	21.29	$337,264,528	46.12	$134,228,063	16.69
1884	138,496,741	20.75	304,352,393	45.59	136,372,867	18.81
1885	119,609,342	20.64	265,704,352	45.84	147,187,527	20.25
1886	144,052,022	23.04	285,050,564	45.60	136,541,978	20.50
1887	165,931,692	24.28	306,030,440	44.78	136,735,105	19.45
1888	168,029,649	23.59	324,823,601	45.61	130,300,087	19.05
1889	172,134,716	23.22	328,629,989	44.33	138,675,507	18.99
1890	$178,435,512	23.06	$346,678,654	44.81	$151,102,376	17.87
1891	195,917,620	22.93	368,225,181	43.09	168,927,315	19.37
1892	197,840,369	24.32	316,092,469	38.85	159,510,937	15.70
1893	218,310,959	25.85	356,806,396	42.26	158,023,118	1.902
1894	126,643,273	19.89	234,139,173	36.78	183,728,808	21.14
1895	187,482,743	25.64	317,257,176	43.39	183,595,743	23.14
1896	201,850,498	26.57	328,937,528	43.29	228,571,178	26.48
1897	207,268,155	26.26	327,324,920	41.47	277,285,391	26.87
1898	188,940,718	32.16	227,467,249	38.74	290,697,354	24.02
1899	218,110,941	31.82	259,862,751	37.91	339,592,146	28.21
1900*	310,000,000	35.80	.....	.....	425,000,000	30.61

*May and June estimated.

TABLE No. 2.—*Increased exportations.*

Certainly the manufacturers and the millions who are benefited by their prosperity, have no cause of dissatisfaction with the Dingley law, since the exportation of manufactures has increased under it while the importation of manufactures was decreasing. The following figures show the exportation of the leading manufactures from the United States in the first and second years of the Dingley law, compared with the last year of the Wilson law:

Exportations.	Wilson law, fiscal year 1897.	Dingley law. Fiscal year 1898.	Dingley law. Fiscal year 1899.
Flax, hemp, and jute manufactures	$2,216,184	$2,557,465	$3,093,102
Cars, carriages	2,946,710	3,424,419	4,106,284
Paper, and manufactures of	3,333,163	5,494,564	5,477,884
Agricultural implements	5,240,686	7,609,732	12,432,197
Leather, and manufactures of	19,161,446	21,113,640	23,466,985
Cotton-seed oil ..... gallons	27,198,882	49,230,784	50,627,219
Copper, and manufactures of	31,621,125	32,180,872	35,983,529
Iron and steel manufactures	57,497,872	70,406,885	93,715,951
Paraffine wax ..... pounds	126,365,128	154,628,400	174,844,701
Mineral oil, refined ..... gallons	835,798,999	900,978,875	805,956,345

Exports of manufactures from the United States.

1889	$138,675,507
1890	151,102,376
1891	168,927,315
1892	158,510,937
1893	158,023,118
1894	183,728,808
1895	183,595,743
1896	228,571,178
1897	227,285,391
1898	290,697,354
1899	338,667,794
1900	425,000,000

It will be seen from these figures that the exports of manufactures have increased nearly $100,000,000 in the fiscal year just ended, and are to-day nearly double those of the year in which McKinley was elected.

TABLE No. 3.—*Domestic exports of principal manufactures during the years ending June 30, 1868, 1878, 1888, 1898, and 1899.*

[From official statements of the Treasury Bureau of Statistics.]

Articles.	1868.	1878.	1888.	1898.	1899.
Iron and steel	$10,950,275	$16,053,571	$17,763,034	$70,406,885	$93,716,031
Refined mineral oils	20,020,016	43,564,869	41,260,401	51,782,316	51,070,216
Copper, and manufactures of	479,488	2,329,901	3,812,798	32,180,872	35,983,529
Leather, and manufactures of	1,414,372	8,080,030	9,583,411	21,113,640	23,466,985
Cotton manufactures	4,871,054	11,438,660	13,013,189	17,024,092	23,566,914
Chemicals, etc	2,757,730	3,414,694	5,633,972	9,441,763	10,995,289
Wood manufactures	2,088,154	3,903,823	4,752,571	9,098,219	9,715,285
Cycles	.....	.....	.....	6,846,529	5,753,880
Agricultural implements	673,381	2,575,198	2,645,187	7,609,732	12,432,197
Paraffin	47,396	155,998	2,168,247	6,030,292	6,804,684
Paper, and manufactures of	524,188	1,066,994	1,073,561	5,494,564	5,477,884
Tobacco manufactures	3,179,164	3,681,317	3,578,457	4,818,493	5,178,998
Fertilizers	35,632	1,211,769	1,255,028	4,359,834	6,964,365
Scientific instruments	13,549	27,929	714,514	2,770,803	4,399,180
Books, maps, etc	349,993	586,355	1,734,571	2,434,325	2,656,136
Flax, etc., manufactures	686,997	1,591,756	1,391,216	2,557,465	3,093,102
Sugar and molasses	348,579	4,920,094	3,255,679	2,111,658	2,953,888
Carriages and horse cars	404,072	979,003	1,381,291	1,946,231	2,562,273

TABLE No. 4.—*Value of exports from the United States of the principal articles of domestic manufacture, during the years ending June 30, 1890–1899, arranged in order of magnitude in 1890.*

[From official statements of the Treasury Bureau of Statistics.]

Articles.	1890.	1891.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.	1897.	1898.	1899.
Iron and steel, and manufactures of, not including iron ore	$25,542,208	$28,909,614	$28,800,930	$30,106,482	$29,220,264	$32,000,989	$41,160,877	$57,497,872	$70,406,885	$93,716,031
Oil, mineral, refined	44,658,854	46,150,282	39,704,152	37,574,067	37,083,891	41,498,372	56,261,567	56,463,185	51,782,316	51,070,276
Copper, manufactures of	2,349,392	4,614,597	7,226,302	4,525,573	19,697,140	14,468,703	19,720,104	31,621,125	32,180,872	35,983,529
Cotton, manufactures of	9,999,277	13,604,857	13,226,277	11,809,355	14,340,886	13,789,810	16,837,396	21,037,678	17,024,092	23,566,914
Leather, and manufactures of	12,438,847	13,278,847	12,084,781	11,912,154	14,283,429	15,614,407	20,242,756	19,161,446	21,113,640	23,466,985
Agricultural implements	3,859,184	3,219,130	3,794,983	4,657,333	5,027,915	5,413,075	5,176,775	5,240,686	7,609,732	12,432,197
Chemicals, drugs, dyes, and medicines	5,424,279	5,406,781	5,691,582	5,766,425	7,400,953	8,189,142	9,063,358	9,787,578	9,441,763	10,995,289
Wood, manufactures of	6,509,645	5,967,322	6,062,789	6,058,896	6,773,724	6,249,807	7,426,475	8,592,416	9,098,219	9,715,285
Fertilizers	1,618,681	2,182,274	2,657,120	3,927,343	5,698,445	5,741,262	4,400,593	5,005,929	4,359,834	6,964,365
Paraffin and paraffin wax	2,408,709	3,714,649	3,965,263	4,515,534	3,820,656	3,569,614	4,403,841	4,957,096	6,030,202	6,804,684
Cycles, and parts of							1,898,012	7,005,323	6,846,529	5,753,880
Paper, and manufactures of	1,226,685	1,299,169	1,382,251	1,540,886	1,906,634	2,185,257	2,713,875	3,333,163	5,494,564	5,477,884
Tobacco, and manufactures of	3,876,045	4,186,713	4,099,380	4,050,555	3,849,996	3,963,165	4,380,361	5,025,817	4,818,493	5,178,998
Instruments and apparatus for scientific purposes	1,429,785	1,575,444	1,388,117	1,345,631	1,534,277	1,912,717	2,522,217	3,054,453	2,770,803	4,399,180
Flax, hemp, and jute, manufactures of	2,094,807	1,504,740	1,998,653	1,778,746	1,712,744	1,722,559	1,868,601	2,216,184	2,557,465	3,093,102
Books, maps, engravings, and other printed matter	1,886,094	1,820,470	1,943,228	1,808,873	2,020,046	2,316,217	2,338,722	2,647,548	2,434,325	2,656,126
Spirits	1,633,110	1,887,431	2,401,117	2,724,057	5,676,936	2,991,686	1,730,804	1,941,703	1,850,353	2,495,612
India rubber and gutta-percha, manufactures of	1,090,307	1,236,443	1,416,067	1,609,403	1,461,842	1,505,142	1,858,556	1,807,145	2,057,713	2,321,141
Starch	378,115	475,817	612,531	707,093	727,011	366,800	885,198	1,665,926	1,371,549	2,292,943
Cars, passenger and freight, for steam railroads	2,689,698	2,885,260	1,320,265	969,871	1,700,521	868,378	1,002,940	990,950	1,738,581	2,058,496
Carriages and horse cars, and parts of	2,056,980	2,015,870	1,944,170	1,605,801	1,649,154	1,514,336	1,884,658	1,935,760	1,685,838	2,047,778
Wool, manufactures of	437,479	519,198	367,737	320,055	774,580	670,226	913,609	947,808	1,089,632	2,047,407
Malt liquors	654,408	672,243	657,934	605,538	548,979	558,770	659,875	723,949	585,579	1,888,124
Clocks and watches, and parts of	1,695,136	1,580,164	1,229,616	1,204,181	1,302,813	1,204,005	1,460,375	1,770,402	1,727,469	1,863,431

The following table shows the value of imports and exports of manufactures each fiscal year from 1888 to 1900; the imports covering only those entered for consumption.

TABLE No. 5.—*Imports and exports of manufactures.*

[From official statements of the Treasury, Bureau of Statistics.]

Year ending June 30—	Imports of manufactures for consumption.	Domestic exports of manufactures.
1888	$324,823,601	$130,300,087
1889	328,629,989	138,675,507
1890	346,678,654	151,102,376
1891	368,225,181	168,927,315
1892	316,092,469	158,510,937
1893	356,866,396	158,023,118
1894	234,139,173	183,728,808
1895	317,257,176	183,595,743
1896	328,937,528	228,571,178
1897	327,324,920	277,285,391
1898	226,250,092	290,697,354
1899	250,862,751	338,675,558
1900*		425,000,000

*May and June estimated.

TABLE No. 6.—*Growth in coal production in free-trade Great Britain, compared with that of the protection countries, United States, Germany, and France; also the total coal production of the world and the per cent supplied by the United States at quinquennial periods from 1868 to 1898, in tons of 2,000 pounds.*

[From reports of United States Geological Survey.]

Year.	United States.	Great Britain.	Germany.	France.	Total production.	Per cent supplied by United States.
1868	31,648,909	115,518,096	36,249,233	14,697,236	220,561,535	14.35
1870	36,806,560	123,682,935	37,488,312	14,530,716	238,653,228	15.42
1875	52,288,320	149,303,263	52,703,970	18,694,916	308,459,666	16.95
1880	71,481,569	164,605,738	65,177,634	21,346,124	364,737,495	19.60
1885	110,957,522	178,473,588	81,227,255	21,510,359	447,581,529	24.79
1890	157,770,963	203,408,003	98,398,500	28,756,638	563,693,432	27.99
1895	193,117,530	212,330,725	114,561,318	30,877,922	644,177,076	29.98
1898*	258,539,650	226,301,058	144,283,196	35,748,644	731,534,602	30.70

*For United States, 1899; for all others, 1898.

TABLE No. 7.—*Coal production in the United States from 1880 to 1899, showing the relative value of coal produced in the United States in protection and low tariff years, and relative employment of men at the mines in each of those years.*

[Figures of production from reports of United States Geological Survey; of commerce from reports of Bureau of Statistics.]

Year.	Coal mined in United States.	Value of the product.	Average price per ton at mines.	Number of employees.	Average number of days active.	Imports for consumption.	Exports.	Per cent of world's production supplied by United States.
	Tons of 2,000 pounds.					*Tons of 2,240 pounds.*	*Tons of 2,240 pounds.*	
1880	71,481,569	$95,640,396				471,826	615,260	19.60
1881	85,881,030	124,342,380				654,170	653,246	21.87
1882	103,285,789	146,632,581				795,758	868,062	24.58
1883	115,212,125	159,494,865				646,531	1,020,864	25.55
1884	119,735,051	143,768,578				750,443	1,295,305	26.57
1885	110,957,522	159,019,596				773,453	1,271,942	24.79
1886	113,680,027	154,600,176				813,696	1,211,844	25.22
1887	130,650,211	182,498,737				833,423	1,531,850	27.14
1888	148,659,407	190,881,012				1,109,740	1,830,604	28.52
1889	141,229,613	160,226,323	$1.13			1,022,026	1,792,783	28.56
1890	157,770,963	176,804,573	1.12	318,204	216	835,116	2,075,265	27.99
1891	168,566,668	191,133,135	.994	205,803	223	1,400,920	2,477,120	28.69
1892	179,329,071	207,566,381	1.16	341,943	212	1,208,262	2,497,508	30.22
1893	182,202,774	208,438,696	1.14	363,309	201	1,136,761	3,657,878	31.30
1894	170,741,526	186,141,564	1.09	376,206	178	1,322,782	3,636,341	27.97
1895	193,117,530	197,799,043	1.02	382,879	185	1,353,360	3,682,693	29.98
1896	191,966,357	196,640,166	1.02	386,656	185	1,313,137	3,626,202	28.93
1897	200,221,665	198,869,178	.99	397,701	179	1,300,669	3,698,031	28.75
1898	219,974,667	208,000,850	.95	401,221	190	1,280,219	4,503,405	30.07
1899	258,539,650	259,435,412				1,393,640	5,752,150	*31.01

*Estimated.

TABLE No. 8.—*Twenty years of production of iron and steel in the United States under the protective system, showing decrease in prices to home consumers, reduction in importations, and increase in exportations.*

[From official reports of Treasury, Bureau of Statistics.]

Year.	Pig iron produced in United States.	Crude steel produced in United States.	Per cent of domestic iron used in home industries.	Price of steel rails per ton.	Imports of manufactures of iron and steel.	Exports of manufactures of iron and steel.
	Tons.	*Tons.*				
1880	3,835,191	1,247,335	78.44	$67.50	$71,286,699	$14,716,524
1881	4,144,254	1,588,314	90.23	61.13	60,604,477	16,608,767
1882	4,623,323	1,736,602	89.36	48.50	67,976,897	20,748,206
1883	4,595,510	1,673,535	91.44	37.75	58,495,246	22,826,528
1884	4,097,868	1,550,879	94.20	30.75	40,147,053	21,909,681
1885	4,044,526	1,711,920	96.43	28.50	33,610,093	16,592,155
1886	5,683,329	2,502,503	93.92	34.50	37,534,078	15,745,569
1887	6,417,148	3,339,071	93.13	37.08	49,203,164	15,958,502
1888	6,489,738	2,899,440	95.17	29.83	48,992,757	17,763,034
1889	7,603,642	3,385,732	97.35	29.25	42,377,793	21,156,077
1890	9,202,703	4,277,071	98.10	31.75	41,679,501	25,542,208
1891	8,279,870	3,904,240	99.01	29.92	53,544,372	28,909,614
1892	9,157,000	4,927,581	99.12	30.00	28,928,103	28,800,930
*1893**	*7,124,502*	*4,019,995*	*99.64*	*28.12*	*34,987,974*	*30,106,482*
*1894**	*6,657,388*	*4,412,032*	*99.79*	*24.00*	*20,925,769*	*29,230,264*
*1895**	*9,446,308*	*6,114,834*	*99.07*	*24.33*	*23,048,515*	*32,000,989*
*1896**	*8,623,127*	*5,281,689*	*99.74*	*28.00*	*25,338,105*	*41,160,877*
1897	9,652,680	7,156,957	99.66	18.75	16,094,557	57,497,872
1898	11,773,934	8,932,857	99.80	17.62	12,626,431	70,406,885
1899	13,620,703	10,639,857	99.85	28.12	12,100,440	93,716,031

*Democratic and low-tariff years.

TABLE No. 9.—*Production of pig iron in the United States, United Kingdom, Germany, France, and Russia, 1870 to 1899.*

[From the American Iron and Steel Association report.]

Year.	United States.	Great Britain.	Germany.*	France.	Russia.†
	Gross tons.	*Gross tons.*	*Metric tons.*	*Metric tons.*	*Metric tons.*
1870	1,665,179	5,963,515	1,391,124	1,178,114	359,531
1871	1,706,793	6,627,179	1,563,682	859,641	359,253
1872	2,548,713	6,741,929	1,988,395	1,217,838	300,253
1873	2,560,963	6,566,451	2,240,575	1,381,626	384,221
1874	2,401,202	5,991,408	1,906,253	1,415,897	380,219
1875	2,023,735	6,365,462	2,029,389	1,448,272	427,182
1876	1,868,961	6,555,997	1,846,345	1,435,212	441,433
1877	2,066,594	6,608,664	1,932,725	1,506,827	398,238
1878	2,301,215	6,381,051	2,147,641	1,521,274	417,239
1879	2,741,853	5,995,337	2,226,587	1,400,286	432,636
1880	3,835,191	7,749,233	2,729,038	1,725,293	448,411
1881	4,144,254	8,144,449	2,914,009	1,886,350	469,476
1882	4,623,323	8,586,680	3,380,806	2,039,067	462,530
1883	4,595,510	8,529,300	3,469,719	2,089,420	481,679
1884	4,097,868	7,811,727	3,609,612	1,871,537	509,519
1885	4,044,526	7,415,469	3,687,434	1,630,648	527,536
1886	5,683,329	7,009,754	3,528,658	1,516,574	532,104
1887	6,417,148	7,559,518	4,023,953	1,567,622	612,447
1888	6,489,738	7,998,969	4,337,121	1,663,349	683,315
1889	7,603,642	8,322,824	4,524,558	1,733,964	740,067
1890	9,202,703	7,934,214	4,658,451	1,902,196	926,482
1891	8,279,870	7,406,064	4,641,217	1,897,387	1,004,923
1892	9,157,000	6,709,255	4,937,461	2,057,258	1,071,813
1893	7,124,502	6,976,990	4,986,003	2,003,096	1,148,937
1894	6,657,388	7,427,342	5,380,038	2,069,714	1,332,505
1895	9,446,308	7,703,459	5,465,414	2,003,868	1,452,380
1896	8,623,127	8,659,681	6,372,575	2,339,537	1,612,069
1897	9,652,680	8,796,465	6,881,466	2,484,191	1,868,671
1898	11,773,934	8,609,719	7,312,766	2,525,075	2,222,469
1899	13,620,703	‡ 9,305,319	§ 8,142,017	§ 2,567,388	.....

* Including Luxemburg.
† Includes Finland.
‡ British Iron Trade Association.
§ Provisional.

TABLE No. 10.—*Comparative production of Bessemer steel ingots and rails in the United States and Great Britain.*

[From reports of American Iron and Steel Association.]

Year.	United States.		Great Britain.	
	Ingots.	Rails.	Ingots.	Rails.
	Gross tons.	*Gross tons.*	*Gross tons.*	*Gross tons.*
1868	7,580	6,451	110,000	.....
1869	10,714	8,616	160,000	.....

TABLE No. 10.—*Comparative production of Bessemer steel ingots and rails in the United States and Great Britain*—Continued.

Year.	United States.		Great Britain.	
	Ingots.	Rails.	Ingots.	Rails.
	Gross tons.	*Gross tons.*	*Gross tons.*	*Gross tons.*
1870	37,500	30,357	215,000	.....
1871	40,179	34,152	329,000	.....
1872	107,239	83,991	410,000	.....
1873	152,368	115,192	496,000	.....
1874	171,369	129,414	540,000	.....
1875	335,283	259,699	620,000	.....
1876	469,639	368,269	700,000	400,000
1877	500,524	385,805	750,000	508,400
1878	653,773	491,427	807,527	622,390
1879	829,430	610,682	834,511	520,231
1880	1,074,202	852,196	1,044,382	732,910
1881	1,574,247	1,187,770	1,441,719	1,023,740
1882	1,514,687	1,284,067	1,673,649	1,235,785
1883	1,477,345	1,148,709	1,553,380	1,097,174
1884	1,375,531	996,983	1,299,676	784,968
1885	1,519,430	959,471	1,304,127	706,583
1886	2,269,190	1,574,703	1,570,530	730,343
1887	2,936,033	2,101,904	2,089,403	1,021,847
1888	2,511,161	1,396,277	2,032,794	979,083
1889	2,930,204	1,510,057	2,140,791	943,048
1890	3,688,871	1,867,837	2,014,843	1,019,606
1891	3,247,417	1,293,053	1,642,005	662,676
1892	4,168,435	1,537,588	1,500,810	535,836
1893	3,215,686	1,129,400	1,493,454	579,386
1894	3,571,313	1,016,013	1,535,384	598,530
1895	4,909,128	1,299,628	1,535,225	604,338
1896	3,919,906	1,116,958	1,815,842	817,476
1897	5,475,315	1,644,520	1,884,155	921,131
1898	6,609,017	1,976,702	1,759,386	751,591
1899	7,580,354	2,270,585	1,825,074	838,148

TABLE No. 11.—*Comparative production of all kinds of steel in the United States and Great Britain.*

[From reports of American Iron and Steel Association.]

Year.	United States.	Great Britain.	Year.	United States.	Great Britain.
	Gross tons.	*Gross tons.*		*Gross tons.*	*Gross tons.*
1873	198,796	653,500	1887	3,339,071	3,150,507
1874	215,727	710,500	1888	2,899,440	3,405,536
1875	389,799	788,000	1889	3,385,732	3,669,960
1876	533,191	908,000	1890	4,277,071	3,679,043
1877	569,618	967,000	1891	3,904,240	3,256,543
1878	731,977	1,063,027	1892	4,927,581	3,019,640
1879	935,273	1,089,511	1893	4,019,995	3,049,763
1880	1,247,335	1,375,382	1894	4,412,032	3,210,702
1881	1,588,314	1,859,719	1895	6,114,834	3,389,962
1882	1,736,602	2,189,649	1896	5,281,689	4,233,397
1883	1,673,535	2,088,880	1897	7,156,957	4,585,961
1884	1,550,879	1,854,926	1898	8,932,857	4,665,986
1885	1,711,920	1,968,045	1899	10,639,857	5,000,000
1886	2,502,503	2,344,670			

TABLE No. 12.—*Tin plate; its importation, home manufacture, and prices since the adoption of the McKinley law; also the prices of the materials used in its manufacture.*

[From official reports of Treasury Bureau of Statistics.]

Year.	Imports.		Home manufacture.	Price in New York of Bessemer steel plates per box of 100 pounds.	Price of Straits tin per pound.	Price of steel billets per ton.
	Pounds.	Value.				
			Pounds.		*Cents.*	
1889	735,779,988	$21,222,653	.....	.....	.....	.....
1890	680,060,925	20,928,150	.....	.....	.....	.....
1891	1,036,489,074	35,746,920	.....	$4.83	20.17	$25.32
1892	422,176,202	12,315,502	13,646,719	4.86	20.35	23.63
1893	628,425,902	17,565,640	99,819,202	5.04	19.91	20.44
1894	454,160,920	11,909,518	139,223,467	4.51	18.05	16.58
1895	508,038,938	12,144,080	193,801,073	3.60	14.09	18.48
1896	385,138,983	8,950,656	307,228,021	3.52	13.30	18.83
1897	230,073,681	5,344,638	446,982,053	3.72	13.52	15.08
1898	171,662,945	3,800,148	681,674,028	3.90	15.42	15.31
1899	108,484,823	2,613,564	791,371,484	4.51	28.20	31.12
1900, Apr. 20	.....	.....	.....	4.84	31.00	37.00

NOTE.—The increase in price of tin plate from 1896 to April 20, 1900, was 38 per cent; that of the tin and steel entering into its manufacture 125 per cent.

TABLE No. 13.—*Cotton production and manufacturing in the United States, showing reduction in imports and increase in domestic manufacture and exports.*

[From official reports of Treasury Bureau of Statistics.]

Year.	Total commercial crop.	Taken for home consumption.			Raw cotton imported.	Exports of manufactures of cotton.	Imports of manufactures of cotton.
		By Northern mills.	By Southern mills.	Total.			
	Bales.	*Bales.*	*Bales.*	*Bales.*	*Pounds.*		
1880	6,460,000	1,759,000	313,000	2,072,000	4,081,945	$13,721,605	$38,036,044
1884	5,713,000	1,537,000	340,000	1,877,000	7,019,492	11,885,211	29,074,626
1885	5,706,000	1,437,000	316,000	1,753,000	5,115,680	11,836,591	27,197,241
1886	6,575,000	1,781,000	381,000	2,162,000	5,072,334	13,959,934	29,709,236
1887	6,490,000	1,687,000	401,000	2,088,000	2,924,531	14,929,342	28,940,353

TABLE No. 13.—*Cotton production and manufacturing in the United States, etc.*—Continued.

Year.	Total commercial crop.	Taken for home consumption.			Raw cotton imported.	Exports of manufactures of cotton.	Imports of manufactures of cotton.
		By Northern mills.	By Southern mills.	Total.			
	Bales.	*Bales.*	*Bales.*	*Bales.*	*Pounds.*		
1888	7,047,000	1,805,000	456,000	3,261,000	5,497,592	$13,013,189	$28,917,709
1889	6,939,000	1,790,000	480,000	2,270,000	7,973,099	10,212,644	26,805,942
1890	7,297,000	1,780,000	545,000	2,325,000	8,606,049	9,999,277	29,918,055
1891	8,674,000	2,027,000	613,000	2,640,000	20,908,817	13,604,857	29,712,624
1892	9,018,000	2,172,000	684,000	2,856,000	28,663,769	12,226,277	28,323,841
1893	6,664,000	1,652,000	723,000	2,375,000	43,367,932	11,809,355	33,560,293
1894	7,532,000	1,580,000	711,000	2,291,000	27,705,949	14,340,886	32,346,547
1895	9,837,000	2,019,000	852,000	2,871,000	49,332,022	13,789,810	33,196,625
1896	7,147,000	1,605,000	900,000	2,505,000	55,350,520	16,837,396	32,437,504
1897	8,706,000	1,793,000	999,000	2,792,000	51,898,926	21,037,678	34,429,363
1898	11,216,000	2,211,000	1,254,000	3,465,000	52,060,363	17,024,002	27,267,300
1899	11,256,000	2,217,000	1,415,000	3,632,000	50,158,158	23,566,914	32,054,434

SECTION No. III.—A DISCUSSION OF THE EFFECT OF HIGH AND LOW TARIFFS UPON THE FARMERS OF THE COUNTRY; WITH STATISTICAL EVIDENCE ATTACHED.

The farmer has shared with the business man, the manufacturer and his workmen, the railways and their employees, and the various classes of our citizens, in the general prosperity following the return to protection. His markets have increased both at home and abroad, and with this increase have come advanced prices for what he sells and advanced value of that which he retains. Not only do the figures of exports show a marked increase in his receipts from abroad, but in the home market, by far the most important to him, prices have advanced, consumption and demand increased, and with these has come prosperity to this greatest class of producers.

A table, No. 1, which is given on another page, gives the rates of duty on the principal farm products under each tariff since 1883. It will be seen that on all farm products the rate of duty was reduced by the Wilson tariff, and in most cases that of the McKinley tariff was restored by the Dingley tariff. This increase has had its effect in checking the importation of manufactured articles of farm production, and thus has saved to the farmers a large share of the home market.

DECREASED IMPORTATION OF FARM PRODUCTS UNDER THE M'KINLEY AND DINGLEY LAWS.

A table, No. 2, prepared by the Department of Agriculture, shows the imports of agricultural products from 1894 to 1899. It will be seen that there was a marked decrease in the importation of farm products immediately following the repeal of the Wilson law, which occurred in July, 1897, the imports of the year ending June 30, 1897, having thus come entirely under the Wilson Act. The total imports of agricultural products, as classified by the Department of Agriculture, was, in the fiscal year 1897, $400,871,868; in 1898, under the Dingley law, it dropped to $314,291,796, and in 1899 was $355,514,881. This gives an average reduction of over $60,000,000 a year in agricultural imports in 1898 and 1899 as compared with 1897.

A SINGLE EXAMPLE.

Many single instances might be cited to show the reduction in individual classes of articles, but as a single example will be all that is required for this purpose, the comparatively unimportant item of eggs is selected. An examination of the import figures of the Bureau of Statistics, given in Table 3, shows that prior to the enactment of the McKinley law, which placed a duty upon eggs entering the United States from abroad, the valuation of the importations ranged from two million to two and a half million dollars per annum, being in the fiscal year 1889 $2,418,926 and in the year 1890 $2,074,912. Immediately following the enactment of that law the importations fell to less than any former figure, and in the year 1894, the last year of the McKinley law, amounted to only $199,536, or but 10 per cent of the average in the years preceding its enactment. The Wilson law, however, reduced the duty on eggs from 5 cents to 3 cents per dozen, and in 1895, the first year of its operation, the importations increased to $324,133 in value, following the general depression in 1896–1897. The Dingley law restored the rate of duty to 5 cents per dozen, and in 1898 the value of importations again dropped to $8,078, and in the fiscal year of 1900 averaged about $1,700 per month, or a trifle above $20,000 per year, as against an average of over $2,000,000 per annum before a duty was placed against this article of foreign production.

IMPROVEMENT OF THE HOME MARKET UNDER PROTECTION.

It is in the improvement of the home market, however, that the farmer's chief benefit from protection is found. With general prosperity in manufacturing, in mining, in transportation, and in all lines of business, the consumption among all classes of consumers is increased, while with the decreased activity, silent mills and factories, employees on half pay or without earnings, the decrease in consumption is very great and the farmer thus becomes the chief sufferer. This fact is clearly shown by Table No. 4, taken from the Statistical Abstract, which shows the amount of certain articles retained for consumption for each individual in the United States for various years from 1868 to 1898. This table, which has been published for a long term of years, is a generally accepted authority on matters of this character. A single example, that of wheat, will be sufficient to illustrate the effect of the depression or prosperity accompanying low or protective tariffs upon home consumption.

Prior to the election of 1892, and the depression which immediately followed it, the amount of wheat retained for consumption was about 6 bushels per capita. On some occasions it exceeded that figure, being in 1883 and 1885 more than 6¼ bushels per capita, and seldom falling below 5¼ bushels. In the year 1893, however, during the depression which immediately followed the election of a Democratic President and a free-trade Congress, the per capita wheat consumption fell to 4.85 bushels, in 1894 to 3.41 bushels, and in 1897 was 3.88 bushels. No year in the entire term covered by this table shows so small a consumption of wheat per capita as does either of these years 1894 and 1897, for it should be kept in mind that the Wilson tariff was not repealed until after the close of the fiscal year 1897. Immediately following the repeal of that act there was a marked increase in the per capita consumption, and in 1899 it had again about reached its normal figure, being for that year 5.95 bushels per capita.

Another example may be found in the amount of cotton retained for consumption under protective and low tariffs, respectively. In the years 1891 and 1892 the amount of domestic cotton retained for consumption was, respectively, 22 and 24 pounds per capita, while in 1893 it fell to 17 pounds per capita. In 1894 it was 16 pounds, and in 1896 and 1897, 18¼ pounds, increasing, however, in 1898, under protection, to 25.2 pounds, and in 1899 to 27.1 pounds, or 50 per cent more than the average during the entire Democratic free-trade term from 1893 to 1897.

VALUE OF FARM PRODUCTS UNDER LOW AND PROTECTIVE TARIFFS, RESPECTIVELY.

It is not necessary to multiply illustrations to show the reduced consuming power of our people under the depression which accompanied low tariffs, but some figures, published in the Statistical Abstract and others prepared by the Department of Agriculture, showing the value of crops and of farm animals in each year during a long term of years, indicate something of the tremendous losses to the farmer which accompanied and was the legitimate fruit of the low-tariff experiment of 1893–1897.

SHEEP AND WOOL VALUES REDUCED.

Take first the single item of wool. The Wilson law, as is well known, gave the country in the item of wool an example of the effect of genuine Simon Pure Democratic free trade. It was to the free-trade mind the one redeeming feature of that act whose feeble attempts at retaining a shadow of protection was denounced as an evidence of "party perfidy and dishonor." Under that act importations of foreign wool, which had never but once reached so much as 150,000,000 pounds, were in its very first year more than 200,000,000 pounds, and in its closing year exceeded 350,000,000 pounds. As a consequence, wool fell nearly 50 per cent in value, the October price of washed clothing Ohio fleece wool, medium, dropping from 33 cents per pound in 1892 to 19 cents in 1896, but increasing to 29 cents in 1897, immediately following the restoration of the protective tariff under the Dingley law, and to 33.5 cents in the month of October, 1899, as shown by a table, No. 5, which gives also the imports of wool during a long term of years.

Another table, No. 6, which is compiled from the Statistical Abstract of the United States, gives the home production of wool, the average price per pound, the per cent which the foreign product forms of the total wool consumption in the United States, the number of sheep on farms and their value, also the value of import of wool and wool manufactures in each year from 1875 to 1899. An examination of this table shows that foreign wool,

which, under protective tariffs, formed from 16 to 33 per cent of the domestic consumption, increased to 40 per cent in 1845, 46 per cent in 1896, and 57 per cent in 1897. As a consequence of this increased importation of foreign wools and the accompanying reduction of nearly one-half in price the number and value of sheep on farms was greatly reduced, the number of sheep on farms in 1893 being 47,273,553, and their value $125,909,264. By 1896 the number had fallen to 38,208,783 and the value to $35,167,735, the actual value having thus been reduced one-half, meaning a loss in sheep alone of more than $60,000,000 to the farmer, while the annual loss in his wool clip during that time was correspondingly reduced. Another effect of the rates of duty on wool and woolens is shown by the columns stating the value of imports of wool and manufactures of wool. The value of the foreign wool imported prior to 1893 had not for many years reached so much as $20,000,000; but in 1895 it had exceeded $25,000,000; in 1896 exceeded $32,000,000, and in 1897, the last year of the existence of the Wilson law, was $53,243,191, while imports of woolen goods, which in 1892 amounted to $35,000,000, were in 1896 $53,000,000, and in the fiscal year 1897 $49,000,000.

VALUE OF FARM ANIMALS REDUCED BY LOW TARIFF, BUT RESTORED BY PROTECTION.

It is not in sheep alone that the value of farm animals was affected by the low-tariff law and the depression which accompanied it. Another table, No. 7, shows the value of the various classes of farm animals as reported by the Department of Agriculture in each year from 1870 to 1900. It shows that the value of horses on farms fell from more than $1,500,000,000 on January 1, 1892, to $500,000,000 in 1896 and $452,000,000 on January 1, 1897, a loss of $540,000,000 in this one item during the five years under consideration. In mules the value fell from $175,000,000 in 1892 to $92,000,000 in 1897; swine, from $241,000,000 in 1892 to $166,000,000 in 1897, and of all farm animals the value fell from $2,461,755,698 on January 1, 1892, to $1,655,414,612 on January 1, 1897, a loss of $806,341,086, while the figures for January 1, 1900, show that the two-billion-dollar line has again been crossed by the restoration of values accompanying the Dingley protective tariff and the prosperity which it brought to the farmer by increased home consumption as well as increased foreign markets. The American Agriculturist, a well-known publication, in a recent number, says that the livestock of the country in 1900 is worth $700,000,000 more than it was during the years of depression under the low-tariff act.

VALUE OF CROPS FELL UNDER LOW TARIFF—RESTORED BY PROTECTION.

Nor is it in farm animals alone, however, that the farmer was the loser under low tariff, or the gainer again under protection. Another table (No. 8), also prepared by the Department of Agriculture, shows a value of various articles of farm production, such as corn, wheat, oats, rye, barley, tobacco, cotton, potatoes, etc., in each year from 1866 to 1899. As has already been pointed out, much of the value of farm crops is due to the home demand, and this home demand is determined by the earnings and consequent purchasing power of individuals, and their earnings and purchasing power are in turn dependent upon the prosperity and activity of manufactures and business generally.

It will be seen by an examination of this table that the value of the corn production in the United States fell from $642,000,000 in 1892 to $491,000,000 in 1896; that of wheat from $513,000,000 in 1891 to $225,000,000 in 1894 and $237,000,000 in 1895, returning to $428,000,000 in 1897; oats fell in value from $209,000,000 in 1892 to $132,000,000 in 1896; rye, from $15,000,000 in 1892 to less than $10,000,000 in 1896; barley, from $45,000,000 in 1891 to $22,000,000 in 1896; tobacco, from $47,000,000 in 1892 to $27,000,000 in 1895; cotton, from $326,000,000 in 1892 to $260,000,000 in 1896, and potatoes, from $103,000,000 in 1892 to $72,000,000 in 1896, while in all these cases the figures for later years show a marked increase in values over those under the Wilson Act.

TESTIMONY OF A WELL-KNOWN AGRICULTURAL AUTHORITY.

On this general question of the value of crops the American Agriculturist says that—

> The value of staple crops in 1899 was valued at $400,000,000 more than under the low-tariff depression, and other crops aggregated an increase of more than $200,000,000 in value, or 25 per cent gain, as compared with the period of depression, including 1894, 1895, and 1896.

One other feature of the improved condition of the farmer is pointed out by the American Agriculturist, and this relates to value of agricultural real estate which, it says, has more than recovered in value and is now worth $1,220,000,000 more than it was a single year ago, while the percentage of farms occupied by owners is, according to careful estimates, which it has made, now larger than ever before, while the number of farms under mortgage has materially decreased. The amount of mortgages on farms occupied by their owners is estimated at about $300,000,000 less than at the beginning of the decade.

Mortgages—

It says—

> now average only about 27 per cent of the value of the farms they are on, the rate of interest has declined, and the great bulk of mortgages now in force were incurred to buy the farm or to improve it.

EVERY STATE SUFFERED UNDER LOW TARIFF.

To those who desire to trace carefully the course of prices by the various articles and in each section of the country during the years 1892 to 1899, another table (No. 9) will offer this opportunity. It will be seen that every State shared in the depression, as did also every article of farm production.

RELATIVE FALL IN PRICES OF ARTICLES OF FARM PRODUCTION AND FARM CONSUMPTION, 1870 TO 1899—FARMERS HAVE BEEN GAINERS—A LESS REDUCTION IN PRICES OF ARTICLES PRODUCED THAN IN ARTICLES REQUIRED FOR CONSUMPTION.

On this question of prices of farm products several other tables will prove especially interesting to those desiring to make a careful study of the subject. A table (No. 10) shows the average farm price for the principal articles of farm production in each year from 1870 to 1899; also the wholesale price in New York of the principal articles of farm consumption during the same period. This table is compiled by the Bureau of Statistics from the reports of the Department of Agriculture and from the Aldrich report on prices, supplemented by the reports of the Department of Labor on prices since 1890.

A careful study of this table shows that the prices of articles consumed on the farm have fallen with greater rapidity than those of the articles produced on the farm. Wheat, for instance, fell in price from 94.4 cents per bushel in 1870 to 58.4 cents in 1899, a decline of 37 per cent, while sugar, one of the most important classes of articles purchased by farmers for consumption, fell from 13.2 cents per pound in 1871 to 4.9 cents in 1899, a decrease of 63 per cent. Corn fell from 49.4 cents per bushel in 1870 to 30.2 cents in 1899, a decrease of 39 per cent, while sheetings fell from 14¼ cents per yard in 1870 to 5.2 cents in 1899, a reduction of 64 per cent. Oats fell from 39 cents in 1870 to 25 cents in 1899, a reduction of 36 per cent, while drillings fell from 14.9 cents in 1870 to 5.1 cents per yard in 1899, a decrease of 65 per cent.

Horses, which probably show a greater fall in value than any other article of farm production, owing to the substitution of steam and electricity for the class of transportation of which those animals formed so important a factor, show a fall in average farm price from $81.38 per head in 1870 to $37.40 in 1899, a decline of 54 per cent, while mineral oil shows a fall from 30.5 cents per gallon in 1870 to an average of 5.8 cents in 1899, a reduction of 80 per cent in cost. Sheep show an average price per head in 1870 of $2.29 and a fall to $1.58 in 1895 under the low tariff, but a return to $2.75 in 1899, the average value of sheep being higher in 1899 than in any year since 1875. Swine show a fall in the average value on the farm of from $7.03 per head in 1870 to $4.40 in 1899, a reduction of 37 per cent, while fine salt shows a fall of from $2.15 per barrel in 1870 to 65 cents per barrel in 1899, a reduction of 70 per cent.

Milch cows show a fall of from $39.12 per head, average farm price, in 1870 to $27.66 in 1899, a fall of 29 per cent, while the average wholesale price of shoes (men's brogans) is quoted at $1.50 per pair in 1870 and 93 cents in 1899, a fall of 38 per cent. Potatoes show an average farm price of 72 cents per bushel in 1870 and 43.4 cents per bushel in 1899, a fall of 40 per cent, while bags show an average price of 36.2 cents each in 1870 and 14.3 cents in 1899, a drop of 60 per cent. Hay shows a fall from $13.82 per ton, the average farm price in 1870, to $7.27 in 1899, a fall of 44 per cent, while scythes are quoted at $12 per dozen in 1870 and $3.74 in 1899, a reduction in price of 69 per cent. Cotton shows an average farm price in 1871 of 16.9 cents, but in 1872 it was 22.1 cents. Comparing 1899, when the price was 6.88 cents, with 1872, the higher of the two former years under consideration, we find that the fall in price is 69 per cent, while cotton tickings have declined in price from 28.6 cents per yard in 1870 to 7 cents per yard in 1899, a fall of 75½ per cent.

FREIGHT RATES HAVE FALLEN MORE RAPIDLY THAN FARM PRICES.

One further fact of interest to the farmers is that freight rates have fallen with greater rapidity than prices of farm production. Table No. 11, besides showing the average annual prices of farm production and farm consumption, presents columns showing the average annual freight rate on wheat from Chicago to New York by rail; also the rates by canal from Buffalo to New York. The average rate by all rail in 1870 was 33.3 cents per bushel, and in 1899 11.1 cents, a fall of 66⅔ per cent; while the rate from Buffalo to New York by canal fell from 11.2 cents per bushel in 1870 to 3 cents per bushel in 1899, a reduction of 73 per cent. On freight rates from the Pacific coast to New York the rates on canned goods in carload lots show a fall from $3.66 per hundredweight in 1870 to 75 cents per hundredweight in 1897, the latest year for which this information is available, a reduction of 80 per cent.

On this question of freight rates Tables 12, 13, 14, and 15 are also instructive. They show that the freight rates on live cattle from Chicago to New York fell from 55 cents per 100 pounds in 1880 to 25 cents in 1899; hogs, from 43 cents to 25 cents; sheep, from 65 cents to 25 cents, and dressed beef, from 88 cents to 40 cents, while refrigerator car rates on dressed hogs fell from 59 cents in 1887 to 40 cents in 1899. Freight rates on wheat from New York to Europe also show a marked reduction, as will be seen by the Tables Nos. 16, 17, and 18.

The above statements of prices on farms and in the New York markets, also those relating to freights, it is proper to add, are officially compiled by the Statistical Bureaus of the Agricultural and Treasury Departments except where otherwise specified.

PROSPERITY AND THE SILVER QUESTION.

The facts which I have cited, Mr. Speaker, showing prosperity in every branch of industry, have an important relation to the silver question, which formed so prominent a feature of the campaign of 1896 and which the Democratic leaders promise to again urge in the campaign of 1900. We were told in that campaign that the cause of the depression which then existed in every industry was not the tariff, but the lack of sufficient currency, and that this could only be supplied by the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. The country rejected free coinage and adopted a protective tariff, and the prosperity which has come both in increased business and increased currency fully disproves the Democratic claim that the depression which then existed was due to the necessity for free coinage of silver, and at the same time sustains the claim of Republicans that it was due to the low tariff then existing.

TABLE No. 1.—*Farm products and duties thereon under four tariffs.*

[From the American Economist.]

Articles.	Law of 1883.	Republican tariff of 1890.	Democratic tariff of 1894.	Republican tariff of 1897.
Barley	10 cents per bushel	30 cents per bushel	30 per cent ad valorem	30 cents per bushel.
Buckwheat	10 per cent.	15 cents per bushel	20 per cent ad valorem	15 cents per bushel.
Corn	10 cents per bushel	do	do	Do.
Oats	do	do	do	Do.
Wheat	20 cents per bushel	25 cents per bushel	do	25 cents per bushel.
Butter	4 cents per pound	6 cents per pound	4 cents per pound	6 cents per pound.
Cheese	do	do	do	Do.
Beans	10 per cent	40 cents per bushel	20 per cent ad valorem	45 cents per bushel.
Eggs	Free	5 cents per dozen	3 cents per dozen	5 cents per dozen.
Hay	$2 per ton	$4 per ton	$2 per ton	$4 per ton.
Hops	8 cents per pound	15 cents per pound	8 cents per pound	12 cents per pound.
Potatoes	15 cents per bushel	25 cents per bushel	15 cents per bushel	25 cents per bushel.
Flaxseed, etc	20 cents per bushel	30 cents per bushel	20 cents per bushel	Do.
Garden seeds	20 per cent	20 per cent	10 per cent ad valorem	30 per ct. ad valorem.
Bacon and hams	2 cents per pound	5 cents per pound	20 per cent ad valorem	5 cents per pound.
Beef, mutton, etc	1 cent per pound	2 cents per pound	do	2 cents per pound.
Wool:				
First class	10 cents per pound	11 cents per pound	Free	11 cents per pound.
Second class	12 cents per pound	12 cents per pound	do	12 cents per pound.
Third class	2½ cents per pound	32 per cent	do	4 cents per pound.
Third class	5 cents per pound	50 per cent	do	7 cents per pound.
Leaf tobacco:				
Stemmed	$1 per pound	$2.75 per pound	$2.25 per pound	$2.50 per pound.
Not stemmed	75 cents per pound	$2 per pound	$1.50 per pound	$1.85 per pound.
All other stemmed	40 cents per pound	50 cents per pound	50 cents per pound	50 cents per pound.
Cattle		$10 per head	20 per cent ad valorem	27½ per ct. ad valorem.
Sheep		$1.50 per head	do	$1.50 per head.
Horses		$30 per head	do	$30 per head.
Poultry, dressed		5 cents per pound	3 cents per pound	5 cents per pound.
Cabbage		3 cents per head	Free	3 cents per head.
Honey		20 cents per gallon	10 cents per gallon	20 cents per gallon.
Onions		40 cents per bushel	20 cents per bushel	40 cents per bushel.
Apples		25 cents per bushel	do	25 cents per bushel.

AGRICULTURAL IMPORTS AND EXPORTS, 1894–1899.

[From official reports of the Department of Agriculture.]

The value of the agricultural imports and exports of the United States during each fiscal year from 1894 to 1899, inclusive, as compared with the total imports and total domestic exports, is shown by the official statistics given below.

TABLE No. 2.—*Value of imports and domestic exports of the United States, total and agricultural, and excess of agricultural exports over agricultural imports during each fiscal year from 1892 to 1899, inclusive.*

Years ended June 30—	Imports.		
	Total.	Agricultural.	Per cent agricultural.
1894	$654,994,622	$357,743,253	54.62
1895	731,969,965	373,115,985	50.97
1896	779,724,674	391,029,407	50.15
1897	764,730,412	400,871,468	52.42
1898	616,049,654	314,291,796	51.02
1899	697,148,489	355,514,881	51.00
Annual average, 1895–1899	717,924,639	366,964,708	51.11

Years ended June 30—	Domestic exports.			Excess of agricultural exports over agricultural imports.
	Total.	Agricultural.	Per cent agricultural.	
1894	$869,204,937	$630,270,788	72.51	$272,527,535
1895	793,392,599	558,385,861	70.38	185,269,876
1896	863,200,487	574,598,264	66.54	183,398,857
1897	1,032,007,003	689,755,193	66.84	288,883,725
1898	1,210,291,913	*859,018,946	70.98	544,727,150
1899	1,203,931,222	792,811,733	65.85	437,296,852
Annual average, 1894–1899	1,020,564,765	694,874,000	68.09	327,900,292

*The value of the agricultural exports for 1898 has been increased $511,004 above the amount previously stated, this sum being the value of exports of waste cotton, an item that was not separately recorded in the customs returns prior to 1898.

TABLE No. 3.—*Importation of eggs, as affected by the tariff.*

Prior to the enactment of the McKinley law, in 1890, there was no duty on eggs, but the framers of that measure, seeing that the importation of this class of farm production had become large and was constantly growing, placed a duty of 5 cents per dozen on eggs. The framers of the Wilson law saw that the effect of this duty had been such that they dared not entirely remove it, so they merely reduced the rate to 3 cents per dozen. The Dingley Act restored the McKinley law rate of 5 cents per dozen.

Let us now see to what extent the McKinley and Dingley tariffs by putting a duty on eggs protected the American farmer's egg basket; whether or not they checked the importation of foreign eggs. Here are the figures for sixteen years:

Imports of foreign eggs.

Year ending June 30—	Dozens.	Value.
1883	15,279,065	$2,667,604
1884	16,487,204	2,677,630
1885	16,088,450	2,476,672
1886	16,092,883	2,173,454
1887	13,934,654	1,900,396
1888	15,642,861	2,512,478
1889	15,918,609	2,418,976
1890	15,092,796	2,074,912
1891	8,253,043	1,185,595
1892	4,188,492	522,240
1893	3,295,842	392,617
1894	1,791,420	190,536
1895	2,709,411	324,133
1896	947,138	88,682
1897	580,681	47,709
1898	169,319	8,078
1899	225,180	21,300
1900*	175,000	12,700

*May and June estimated.

TABLE No. 4.—*Merchandise imported into, exported from, and retained for consumption in the United States, 1868 to 1899.*

[From the Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1899.]

Year.	Imports.		Exports of domestic merchandise.			Retained for consumption per capita.			
	Merchandise imported for consumption per capita.	Duty collected per capita.	Exports per capita.	Exports of agricultural products, per cent of total exports.	Exports of products of manufacture, per cent of total exports.	Raw cotton.	Wheat and wheat flour.	Raw wool consumed.	
								Total per capita.	Foreign.
				P. cent.	P. cent.	Lbs.	Bush.	Lbs.	P. cent.
1868	$9.33	$4.34	$7.29	70.19	.....	10.51	5.36	5.14	11.9
1869	10.45	4.68	7.29	75.35	.....	12.88	5.21	5.78	17.8
1870	11.06	4.96	9.77	75.40	.....	13.82	5.41	5.43	23.7

TABLE No. 4.—*Merchandise imported into, exported from, and retained for consumption in the United States, 1868 to 1899*—Continued.

Year.	Imports.		Exports of domestic merchandise.			Retained for consumption per capita.			
	Merchandise imported for consumption per capita.	Duty collected per capita.	Exports per capita.	Exports of agricultural products, per cent of total exports.	Exports of products of manufacture, per cent of total exports.	Raw cotton.	Wheat and wheat flour.	Raw wool consumed.	
								Total per capita.	Foreign.
				P. cent.	*P. cent.*	*Lbs.*	*Bush.*	*Lbs.*	*P. cent.*
1871	$12.65	$5.12	$10.83	70.74	.....	14.10	4.09	5.73	29.4
1872	13.80	5.23	10.55	74.13	.....	11.10	4.70	6.75	45.3
1873	15.91	4.44	12.12	76.10	.....	15.19	4.81	5.67	33.2
1874	13.26	3.75	13.31	79.37	.....	13.60	4.46	4.81	17.5
1875	11.97	3.51	11.36	76.95	16.57	11.90	5.38	5.28	22.1
1876	10.29	3.22	11.64	71.67	17.08	14.77	4.89	5.21	18.3
1877	9.49	2.77	12.72	72.63	21.16	14.03	5.01	5.16	16.3
1878	9.21	2.67	14.30	77.07	17.79	13.71	5.72	5.28	16.9
1879	8.99	2.73	14.29	78.12	16.72	15.90	5.58	5.03	14.2
1880	12.51	3.64	16.43	83.25	12.48	18.94	5.35	6.11	34.9
1881	12.68	3.78	17.23	82.63	12.92	19.64	6.09	5.66	17.3
1882	13.64	4.12	13.97	75.31	18.38	16.15	4.98	6.36	19
1883	13.05	3.92	14.98	77.00	16.69	20.80	6.64	6.62	18.7
1884	12.16	3.47	13.20	73.98	18.81	16.30	5.64	6.85	20.6
1885 *	*10.52*	*3.17*	*13.94*	*72.96*	*20.25*	*15.16*	*6.77*	*6.69*	*18.0*
1886 *	*10.89*	*3.30*	*11.60*	*72.88*	*20.50*	*19.59*	*4.57*	*7.39*	*28.9*
1887 *	*11.65*	*3.65*	*11.98*	*74.40*	*19.45*	*16.84*	*5.17*	*6.68*	*27.4*
1888 *	*11.88*	*3.60*	*11.40*	*73.23*	*19.05*	*19.59*	*5.63*	*6.31*	*23.9*
1889	12.10	3.60	11.92	72.87	18.99	17.22	5.34	6.33	31.8
1890	12.35	3.62	13.50	74.51	17.87	18.50	6.09	6.03	27.0
1891	13.36	3.39	13.63	73.69	19.37	22.02	4.58	6.43	30.8
1892	12.44	2.66	15.53	78.69	15.61	24.03	5.91	6.72	32.1
1893 †	*12.64*	*2.97*	*13.44*	*75.05*	*19.08*	*17.07*	*4.85*	*7.06*	*25.7*
1894 †	*9.33*	*1.90*	*12.73*	*72.23*	*21.14*	*15.91*	*5.41*	*5.08*	*14.2*
1895 †	*10.48*	*2.14*	*11.87*	*69.79*	*23.14*	*22.48*	*4.54*	*6.39*	*40.0*
1896 †	*10.66*	*2.80*	*13.11*	*66.09*	*26.58*	*18.40*	*4.78*	*6.83*	*45.9*
1897 †	*10.84*	*2.37*	*14.17*	*66.23*	*26.37*	*18.46*	*3.83*	*8.26*	*57.8*
1898	7.89	1.96	16.27	70.54	24.02	25.26	4.21	5.34	48.9
1899	9.02	2.66	15.84	65.20	28.13	27.14	5.95	4.40	32.8

* Democratic President, but Republican control of one branch of Congress.
† Democratic President and low tariff.

TABLE No. 5.—*Imports of foreign wool from 1860 to 1899 and prices, in cents, of fine, medium, and coarse washed clothing Ohio fleece wool in the Eastern markets for the months of January, April, July, and October, from 1854 to 1899.*

[From the Statistical Abstract, 1899; data as to prices furnished by Messrs. Maugor & Avory, New York.]

Year ending June 30—	Imports.	January.			April.			July.			October.		
		Fine.	Medium.	Coarse.	Fine.	Medium.	Coarse.	Fine.	Medium.	Coarse.	Fine.	Medium.	Coarse.
	Pounds.												
1854	.....	53	47	42	57	52	46	45	37	30	42	36	30
1855	.....	40	35	32	43	35	32	50	40	33	52	41	36
1856	.....	50	38	35	57	45	38	55	42	36	60	55	45
1857	.....	58	50	42	60	56	45	56	50	40	38	30	25
1858	.....	40	33	27	42	35	30	43	37	30	56	41	36
1859	.....	60	52	45	60	46	37	56	40	35	60	50	42
1860	26,282,955	60	50	42	52	45	40	55	50	40	50	45	40
1861	.....	45	40	37	45	37	32	38	30	22	47	48	50
1862	.....	48	50	50	46	45	43	48	47	45	60	60	63
1863	75,121,728	75	68	70	80	85	80	75	70	65	85	80	76
1864	91,250,114	80	78	76	78	77	72	100	100	90	103	95	100
1865	44,420,375	102	100	96	80	80	75	75	73	65	75	75	65
1866	71,287,988	70	65	50	65	60	48	70	67	60	63	60	56
1867	38,158,382	68	53	50	60	55	50	55	49	45	48	46	40
1868	25,467,336	48	43	38	50	48	45	46	45	43	48	48	45
1869	39,275,926	50	50	48	50	50	48	48	48	47	48	48	46
1870	49,230,199	48	46	44	48	47	46	46	45	43	48	48	44
1871	68,058,028	47	46	43	50	52	47	62	60	55	63	62	58
1872	126,507,409	70	72	66	80	80	76	72	70	65	66	60	57
1873	85,496,049	70	68	65	56	53	48	50	48	44	54	53	47
1874	42,939,541	58	54	47	56	56	47	53	53	46	54	54	47
1875	54,901,760	55	56	47	54	52	46	52	49	46	48	50	43
1876	44,642,836	48	52	42	46	49	40	38	35	31	45	40	33
1877	42,171,192	46	43	36	45	40	33	50	44	37	48	44	36
1878	48,449,079	44	45	38	40	43	35	36	36	32	35	37	32
1879	39,005,155	34	35	32	34	34	31	37	38	34	41	43	38
1880	128,131,747	50	55	48	55	60	52	46	48	42	46	48	42
1881	55,964,236	47	49	43	40	44	37	42	44	36	43	46	36
1882	67,861,744	44	46	37	42	45	34	42	45	34	42	45	34
1883	70,575,478	40	43	33	44	44	37	39	41	33	39	40	34
1884	78,350,651	40	40	34	38	38	34	35	34	30	35	34	30
1885	70,596,170	34	33	29	32	32	28	32	31	28	33	35	32
1886	129,084,958	35	36	32	33	34	30	33	33	29	35	38	34
1887	114,038,030	33	38	34	33	37	33	34	37	34	32	36	34
1888	113,558,753	31	35	33	31	34	33	29	33	31	31	34	31
1889	126,487,729	34	38	33	33	37	31	35	39	32	33	37	31
1890	105,431,285	33	37	29	32	36	29	33	37	29	33	37	31
1891	129,363,648	33	37	31	32	37	31	31	35	29	31	35	30
1892	148,670,652	30	35	31	29	34	31	28	34	30	29	33	29
1893	172,433,838	29	33	29	30	33	31	24	26	25	23	24	21
1894 *	55,152,585	23	25	21	21	23	20	20	21	18	19	21	19
1895 *	206,053,906	17½	20	19	16¼	20	18	18	21	19	18	21	19
1896 *	230,911,473	19	21¼	19	19	21	18	17	18	17	18	19	18
1897 *	350,852,026	19	21	19	21	22½	20	21½	23½	21	27	29	25
1898	132,795,202	29	30	26	29	29½	25½	28	29	24½	28½	30	24½
1899	76,736,209	26¼	29	24	25½	28	24	29	31¼	27	31	33½	29

* Democratic and low tariff years.

NOTE BY MESSRS. MAUGER & AVERY.—This table exhibits in a concise form the prices of the three grades of a standard domestic fleece wool in the seaboard markets at the beginning of each quarter. In its present shape it is deemed to be intelligible to all interested in wool. In the special features of character and condition, "washed Ohio fleece wool" is less subject to variation than any other description, and thus is more a basis of value than any other class. Wool, owing to its wide variety, difference in character and condition, and liability to shrink in cleaning, is precluded from speculative operations which apply to products which may be dealt in as "futures." For these reasons the prices of wool are not liable to the same changes as cotton, wheat, etc.

TABLE No. 6.—*Wool production, imports, consumption, and manufacture in the United States; also price of wool and value of sheep on farms, 1875 to 1900.*

[From the Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1899.]

Year ending June 30—*	Production.	Imports.	Per cent of consumption, foreign.	Value of imports of wool, and manufactures of.		Price of fine washed clothing, Ohio fleece, per pound.†	Sheep on farms in the United States.‡	
				Wool, raw.	Manufactures of wool.		Number.	Value.
	Pounds.	*Pounds.*		*Dollars.*	*Dollars.*	*Cents.*		*Dollars.*
1875	181,000,000	54,901,760	22.1	11,071,259	44,609,704	48	33,783,600	94,330,652
1876	192,000,000	44,642,836	18.3	8,247,617	33,209,808	45	35,935,300	93,666,318
1877	200,000,000	42,171,192	16.3	7,156,944	25,701,922	48	35,804,200	80,892,683
1878	208,250,000	48,449,079	16.9	8,303,015	25,290,154	35	35,740,500	80,605,062
1879	211,000,000	39,005,155	14.2	5,034,545	24,355,821	41	38,123,800	79,023,984
1880	232,500,000	128,131,747	34.9	23,727,650	33,911,006	46	40,765,900	90,230,537
1881	240,000,000	55,964,236	17.3	9,703,968	31,156,426	43	43,569,899	104,070,759
1882	272,000,000	67,861,744	19.0	11,096,050	37,361,520	42	45,016,224	106,595,954
1883	290,000,000	70,575,478	18.7	10,949,331	44,274,952	39	49,237,201	124,366,335
1884	300,000,000	78,350,651	20.6	12,384,709	41,151,583	35	50,626,626	119,902,706
1885	308,000,000	70,596,170	18.0	8,879,923	35,776,559	33	50,360,243	107,960,659
1886	302,000,000	129,084,958	28.9	16,746,081	41,421,319	35	48,322,331	92,443,867
1887	285,000,000	114,038,030	27.4	16,424,479	44,902,718	32	44,759,314	89,872,839
1888	269,000,000	113,558,753	28.9	15,887,217	47,719,393	31	44,544,755	89,279,226
1889	265,000,000	126,487,729	31.8	17,974,515	52,564,942	33	42,599,079	90,640,369
1890	276,000,000	105,431,285	27.0	15,264,083	56,582,432	33	44,336,072	100,659,761
1891	285,000,000	129,363,648	30.8	18,231,372	41,060,080	31	43,421,136	108,397,447
1892	294,000,000	148,670,652	33.1	19,688,108	35,565,879	29	44,938,365	116,121,290
1893	303,153,000	172,433,838	35.7	21,064,180	38,048,515	23	47,273,553	125,900,264
1894 §	*298,057,385*	*55,152,585*	*15.2*	*6,107,438*	*19,439,372*	*19*	*45,048,017*	*89,186,110*
1895 §	*309,748,000*	*206,053,906*	*40.0*	*25,556,421*	*38,539,890*	*18*	*43,294,064*	*66,685,767*
1896 §	*272,474,709*	*230,911,473*	*45.9*	*32,451,248*	*53,494,400*	*18*	*38,298,723*	*65,167,735*
1897 §	*259,153,251*	*350,852,026*	*57.3*	*53,243,191*	*49,163,992*	*27*	*36,818,645*	*67,020,043*

TABLE No. 6.—*Wool production, imports, consumption, and manufacture in the United States, etc.*—Continued.

Year ending June 30—*	Production.	Imports.	Per cent of consumption, foreign.	Value of imports of wool, and manufactures of.		Price of fine washed clothing, Ohio fleece, per pound.†	Sheep on farms in the United States.†	
				Wool, raw.	Manufactures of wool.		Number.	Value.
	Pounds.	*Pounds.*		*Dollars.*	*Dollars.*	*Cents.*		*Dollars.*
1898	266,720,684	132,795,202	32.8	16,783,692	14,823,771	28½	37,056,900	92,721,133
1899	272,191,330	70,736,209	19.2	8,322,345	13,832,621	31	39,114,453	107,607,530
1900							41,883,035	122,605,913

* Except in number and value of sheep on farms and prices of wool.
† On October 1 of each year.
‡ On January 1 of year named.
§ Democratic and low-tariff years.

NOTE.—The importations of wool and woolen goods in the fiscal year 1894 were held back to obtain the reduction in duties by the Wilson act, then pending, and which went into effect August 28, 1894.

TABLE No. 7.—*Number and value of farm animals from 1875 to 1899.*

[From the annual reports of the Department of Agriculture.]

January 1—	Horses.		Mules.		Milch cows.		Oxen and other cattle.		Sheep.		Swine.		Total value farm animals.
	Number.	Value.	Number.	Value.	Number.	Value.	Number.	Value.	Number.	Value.	Number.	Value.	
1875	9,504,200	$646,370,939	1,393,750	$111,502,713	10,906,800	$311,089,824	16,313,400	$304,858,859	33,783,600	$94,320,652	28,062,200	$149,809,234	$1,618,012,221
1876	9,735,300	632,446,985	1,414,500	106,565,114	11,085,400	320,346,728	16,785,300	319,623,509	35,935,300	93,666,318	25,726,800	175,070,484	1,647,719,138
1877	10,155,400	610,206,631	1,443,500	99,480,976	11,260,800	307,743,211	17,956,100	307,105,386	35,804,200	80,892,683	28,077,100	171,077,196	1,576,506,083
1878	10,329,700	600,813,681	1,637,500	104,323,939	11,300,100	298,499,866	19,223,300	329,541,703	35,740,500	80,603,062	32,262,500	160,338,532	1,574,020,783
1879	10,938,700	573,254,808	1,713,100	96,033,971	11,826,400	256,953,928	21,408,100	329,543,327	38,123,800	79,023,984	34,766,100	110,613,044	1,445,423,062
1880	11,201,800	613,296,611	1,720,500	105,948,319	12,027,000	279,899,420	21,231,000	341,761,154	40,765,900	90,230,537	34,034,100	145,781,515	1,576,917,556
1881	11,429,626	667,954,325	1,720,731	120,096,164	12,368,653	296,277,060	20,938,710	362,861,569	43,569,899	104,070,759	36,247,683	170,535,435	1,721,795,252
1882	10,521,554	615,824,914	1,835,169	130,945,378	12,611,632	326,489,310	23,280,238	463,069,501	45,016,224	105,595,954	44,122,200	263,543,195	1,906,468,252
1883	10,838,110	765,041,308	1,871,079	148,732,390	13,125,685	396,575,405	28,048,077	611,549,109	49,237,231	124,386,335	43,270,086	291,951,221	2,338,215,768
1884	11,169,683	833,734,400	1,914,126	161,214,976	13,501,206	423,486,649	29,046,101	683,229,054	50,626,626	119,902,706	44,200,893	246,301,139	2,467,868,924
1885	11,564,572	852,282,947	1,972,569	162,497,097	13,904,722	412,903,093	29,866,573	694,382,913	50,360,243	107,980,650	45,142,657	226,401,683	2,456,428,383
1886	12,077,657	880,823,208	2,052,593	163,381,096	14,235,388	389,985,523	31,275,242	661,956,274	48,322,331	92,443,867	46,092,043	196,569,894	2,385,159,862
1887	12,496,744	901,085,755	2,117,141	167,057,538	14,522,083	378,789,589	33,511,750	663,137,226	44,759,314	89,872,839	44,612,836	230,043,291	2,409,586,933
1888	13,172,936	946,096,154	2,191,727	174,853,568	14,856,414	396,252,173	34,378,383	611,750,520	44,544,755	89,279,926	44,346,525	220,811,082	2,409,043,418
1889	13,663,294	982,194,827	2,257,574	179,444,481	15,298,625	396,226,376	35,032,417	597,236,812	42,599,079	90,640,369	50,301,592	291,307,193	2,507,050,058
1890	14,213,837	978,516,562	2,331,027	182,394,099	15,952,883	353,152,133	36,849,024	560,025,137	44,336,072	100,659,761	51,902,780	243,418,336	2,418,766,028
1891	14,056,750	941,823,222	2,296,532	178,847,370	16,019,591	346,397,900	36,875,648	544,127,908	43,421,136	108,397,447	50,625,106	210,193,923	2,329,787,770
1892	15,498,140	1,007,593,636	2,314,699	174,882,070	16,416,351	351,378,132	37,651,239	570,749,155	44,938,365	116,121,290	52,398,019	241,031,415	2,461,755,698
1893*	*16,206,802*	*992,225,185*	*2,331,128*	*164,763,751*	*16,424,087*	*357,299,785*	*35,954,196*	*547,882,204*	*47,273,553*	*125,909,264*	*46,094,807*	*295,426,492*	*2,483,506,681*
1894*	*16,081,139*	*769,224,799*	*2,352,231*	*146,232,811*	*16,487,400*	*358,908,661*	*36,608,168*	*536,789,747*	*45,048,017*	*89,186,110*	*45,206,408*	*270,384,626*	*2,170,816,754*
1895*	*15,893,318*	*876,730,580*	*2,333,108*	*110,927,834*	*16,504,629*	*362,601,729*	*34,364,916*	*483,999,129*	*42,204,064*	*66,635,767*	*44,165,716*	*219,501,267*	*1,819,446,306*
1896*	*15,124,057*	*500,140,186*	*2,278,946*	*103,204,457*	*16,137,586*	*363,955,545*	*32,035,400*	*508,923,416*	*38,208,783*	*65,167,735*	*42,342,759*	*186,529,745*	*1,727,926,084*
1897*	*14,364,667*	*452,649,396*	*2,215,654*	*92,302,090*	*15,941,727*	*369,239,993*	*30,508,408*	*507,929,421*	*36,818,643*	*67,020,942*	*40,600,276*	*166,272,779*	*1,655,414,618*
1898	13,960,911	478,362,407	2,190,282	96,109,516	15,840,886	434,813,826	29,264,197	612,296,634	37,053,960	92,721,133	39,759,993	174,351,409	1,888,654,925
1899	13,665,307	511,074,813	2,134,213	93,963,261	15,990,115	474,233,923	27,994,225	637,931,135	39,114,453	107,607,530	38,651,631	170,109,743	1,997,010,407
1900	13,537,594	603,989,442	2,066,127	111,717,092	16,292,360	514,812,106	27,610,054	689,486,260	41,883,035	122,605,913			†2,212,756,578

* Democratic and low-tariff years.
† The total of all farm animals includes swine at the valuation of 1899; the Department of Agriculture makes no estimate of swine for 1900.

TABLE No. 8.—*Value of principal farm crops in the United States, 1866 to 1899.*

[From reports of Department of Agriculture.]

Calendar year.	Corn.	Wheat.	Oats.	Rye.	Barley.
1866	$441,450,830	$232,109,630	$94,057,945	$17,149,716	$7,916,342
1867	437,769,763	307,387,146	123,902,556	29,280,584	18,027,746
1868	424,656,649	243,032,746	106,355,976	21,349,190	24,948,127
1869	522,550,500	199,024,996	100,521,734	17,341,861	20,298,164
1870	540,520,456	222,766,969	96,443,637	11,320,967	20,792,213
1871	430,355,910	264,075,851	92,591,359	10,927,623	20,204,015
1872	385,736,210	278,522,068	81,303,518	10,071,061	18,415,839
1873	411,961,151	300,069,533	93,474,161	10,638,258	27,794,229
1874	406,271,255	295,881,167	113,133,934	11,610,339	27,997,824
1875	484,674,804	261,396,926	113,441,491	11,894,223	27,367,522
1876	456,108,521	278,697,238	103,844,896	12,504,970	24,402,691
1877	467,635,230	385,089,444	115,546,194	12,201,750	21,629,130
1878	440,280,517	325,814,119	101,752,468	13,566,002	24,454,301
1879	580,486,217	497,030,142	120,533,294	15,507,431	23,714,444
1880	679,714,499	474,201,850	150,243,565	18,564,560	30,090,742
1881	759,482,170	456,880,427	193,198,970	19,327,415	33,862,513
1882	783,867,175	445,602,125	182,978,022	18,439,194	30,768,015
1883	658,051,485	383,649,272	187,040,264	16,300,503	29,420,423
1884	640,735,500	330,862,200	161,528,470	14,857,040	29,779,170
1885	635,674,630	276,320,300	179,651,800	12,504,820	32,867,696
1886	610,311,000	314,226,020	186,137,930	13,181,330	31,840,510
1887	646,106,770	310,612,960	200,609,790	11,283,140	29,464,390
1888	677,561,580	395,248,030	195,424,240	16,721,809	37,672,033
1889	597,918,829	342,491,707	171,781,008	12,009,752	32,614,271
1890	754,433,451	334,773,678	222,048,486	16,229,992	42,140,502
1891	836,439,228	513,472,711	232,312,267	24,589,217	45,470,342
1892	642,146,630	322,111,881	209,253,611	15,160,056	38,026,065
1893*	*591,625,697*	*213,171,231*	*187,576,093*	*13,612,223*	*28,729,386*
1894*	*654,719,162*	*225,902,025*	*214,816,980*	*13,395,476*	*27,134,127*
1895*	*514,985,534*	*237,038,998*	*163,055,068*	*11,964,826*	*29,312,413*
1896*	*491,006,967*	*310,002,539*	*132,435,033*	*9,960,769*	*22,491,241*
1897	501,072,962	428,547,121	147,974,719	12,239,647	25,142,139
1898	552,023,428	392,770,320	186,405,364	11,875,350	23,064,359
1899	629,210,110	319,545,259	198,167,975	12,214,118	29,594,254

* Democratic and low-tariff years.

TABLE No. 9.—*Prices of principal agricultural products on the farm December 1, 1892 to December 1, 1899.*

[From reports of the Department of Agriculture.]

State or Territory.	Corn (per bushel).								Wheat (per bushel).								Oats (per bushel).							
	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.	1897.	1898.	1899.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.	1897.	1898.	1899.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.	1897.	1898.	1899.
	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.									Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.
Maine	67	62	72	54	47	47	48	50	$1.02	$1.02	$0.79	$0.82	$0.84	$1.06	$0.89	$0.91	45	45	44	34	31	32	34	38
New Hampshire	65	57	76	51	45	45	46	49	1.00	.85	.80	.76	1.00	1.10	.92	.95	44	43	49	35	35	38	38	39
Vermont	64	61	69	48	38	43	44	47	.96	.85	.67	.69	.93	1.04	.90	.85	43	42	51	33	31	32	35	37
Massachusetts	62	62	61	52	46	47	49	51	.97	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	48	42	43	34	35	33	37	38
Rhode Island	63	69	75	56	49	54	64	53	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	49	43	47	39	31	34	37	37
Connecticut	62	64	68	51	42	49	52	50	.87	.....	.....	.68	.....	1.00	.88	.95	45	40	43	31	31	34	36	37
New York	60	55	61	45	38	40	43	45	.85	.76	.62	.68	.88	.90	.72	.80	39	30	39	28	26	27	31	33
New Jersey	58	52	54	42	36	38	40	40	.83	.70	.61	.71	.89	.93	.73	.75	41	35	38	29	28	30	31	33
Pennsylvania	57	49	55	39	33	34	40	41	.81	.65	.56	.65	.83	.91	.68	.66	40	35	38	27	24	27	30	29
Delaware	44	40	45	34	25	30	31	34	.75	.60	.55	.64	.87	.94	.69	.68	38	38	35	29	21	23	30	35
Maryland	45	44	50	37	32	30	35	36	.74	.76	.54	.64	.88	.93	.70	.68	38	35	39	27	23	26	29	30
Virginia	53	46	47	37	32	38	35	38	.76	.63	.56	.65	.80	.92	.66	.69	39	35	37	30	26	29	29	33
North Carolina	54	50	47	38	37	43	43	47	.89	.72	.65	.72	.83	.94	.78	.82	45	44	44	38	35	37	37	41
South Carolina	57	60	65	46	46	49	46	50	.93	.98	.87	.88	.89	1.18	.94	.99	52	53	53	49	48	45	45	47
Georgia	56	56	58	41	43	48	48	50	.90	.90	.76	.82	.89	1.03	.98	.98	52	52	51	46	41	42	48	48
Florida	60	68	71	47	53	55	50	53	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	55	55	61	65	53	53	54	50
Alabama	52	59	53	37	45	46	41	47	.93	.88	.78	.80	.85	1.01	.90	.89	51	51	51	42	41	43	41	43
Mississippi	51	55	49	37	44	45	39	46	.90	.85	.75	.61	.82	.99	.83	.78	50	47	47	39	44	44	42	50
Louisiana	50	57	62	40	45	45	41	44	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	50	44	47	36	34	38	38	40
Texas	45	54	56	31	41	41	34	36	.75	.58	.54	.66	.75	.89	.68	.68	38	42	39	26	34	27	28	30
Arkansas	47	45	47	32	37	40	29	38	.80	.65	.55	.59	.71	.84	.58	.64	40	39	40	32	31	33	29	34
Tennessee	43	39	39	27	28	36	29	39	.68	.57	.51	.62	.74	.95	.67	.78	38	31	35	27	26	28	28	32
West Virginia	56	55	57	40	34	40	37	45	.75	.72	.60	.69	.78	.89	.71	.71	41	38	39	32	28	30	30	35
Kentucky	40	43	44	27	25	35	27	37	.67	.57	.50	.61	.76	.89	.62	.66	37	34	36	26	24	27	27	32
Ohio	42	40	43	27	21	25	27	30	.68	.57	.49	.60	.78	.88	.66	.64	35	30	31	22	17	20	24	25
Michigan	46	45	50	32	24	27	34	36	.67	.57	.52	.60	.84	.87	.64	.65	35	32	34	23	19	23	27	28
Indiana	40	36	37	23	19	21	25	27	.64	.53	.46	.57	.80	.89	.63	.64	34	28	30	20	16	19	23	23
Illinois	37	31	39	22	18	21	25	26	.63	.51	.45	.53	.74	.89	.60	.63	31	27	29	17	15	18	23	22
Wisconsin	38	35	45	30	22	25	28	30	.62	.54	.51	.51	.70	.84	.59	.61	29	27	30	18	17	19	24	23
Minnesota	37	34	43	20	19	24	24	24	.61	.51	.49	.44	.68	.77	.54	.55	28	26	30	14	15	19	21	22
Iowa	32	27	45	18	14	17	23	23	.60	.49	.50	.46	.62	.75	.52	.55	26	23	28	14	12	16	24	19
Missouri	36	30	40	20	20	24	27	30	.58	.48	.43	.51	.70	.85	.59	.62	30	25	29	18	17	19	23	24
Kansas	31	31	43	19	18	22	26	25	.52	.42	.44	.45	.63	.74	.50	.52	26	27	31	17	16	18	22	22
Nebraska	28	27	50	18	13	17	22	23	.50	.40	.49	.40	.58	.69	.47	.49	23	22	36	14	11	15	20	22
South Dakota	33	25	46	23	18	21	23	26	.51	.44	.46	.38	.62	.69	.50	.50	23	25	35	17	13	18	21	23
North Dakota	40	38	44	24	25	32	36	33	.52	.43	.43	.38	.64	.74	.51	.51	28	28	29	16	18	26	26	27
Montana	70	70	82	75	60	65	66	52	.69	.60	.54	.73	.66	.68	.58	.61	40	37	31	44	31	33	35	39
Wyoming	61	63	65	57	78	50	55	43	.66	.65	.63	.64	.62	.70	.69	.67	38	40	48	30	53	35	40	40
Colorado	40	51	61	41	36	38	40	43	.58	.52	.65	.56	.61	.70	.56	.57	34	37	46	28	30	32	41	42
New Mexico	72	71	75	56	55	58	56	58	.80	.75	.88	.73	.66	.75	.62	.61	56	51	50	45	40	41	41	44
Arizona	65	66	100	75	.....	.....	.....	.....	.78	.65	1.00	.65	.80	.74	.92	.64	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Utah	58	58	58	49	51	55	60	59	.62	.60	.53	.44	.68	.68	.54	.53	40	33	34	30	39	33	38	40
Nevada	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.75	.73	.75	.49	.69	.90	.95	.76	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Idaho	70	71	59	62	.....	.....	.....	.....	.60	.60	.46	.47	.65	.70	.51	.50	37	41	32	29	30	32	36	38
Washington	60	62	60	40	57	55	42	55	.58	.48	.39	.41	.74	.68	.54	.51	35	35	31	28	40	35	40	38
Oregon	56	47	56	55	56	53	60	64	.64	.55	.43	.47	.72	.72	.62	.53	37	37	28	27	33	35	40	41
California	55	50	57	53	53	56	62	60	.68	.53	.57	.60	.83	.83	.72	.62	40	38	44	39	44	49	50	47
Oklahoma	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	20	.....	.....	.51	.48	.68	.76	.52	.53	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
General average	39.3	36.5	45.7	25.3	21.5	26.3	28.7	30.3	.694	.538	.491	.509	.726	.808	.582	.584	31.7	29.4	32.4	19.9	18.7	21.2	25.5	24.9

State or Territory.	Barley, per bushel.								Hay, per ton.								Cotton, per pound.							
	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.	1897.	1898.	1899.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.	1897.	1898.	1899.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896	1897	1898	1899
	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.									Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.
Maine	68	67	66	52	43	55	56	59	$12.80	$12.13	$9.60	$9.68	$10.25	$9.75	$7.60	$10.10	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
New Hampshire	74	70	63	56	53	60	58	65	13.20	15.60	10.50	12.50	12.90	11.50	9.25	11.75	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Vermont	66	60	60	47	41	46	47	52	10.00	10.63	9.94	12.25	10.28	9.25	6.35	9.25	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Massachusetts	75	90	63	65	58	66	66	68	16.00	17.33	15.50	17.50	16.40	13.90	12.10	15.50	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Rhode Island	82	87	72	75	60	54	61	70	17.40	19.00	16.33	17.25	16.00	14.50	12.65	17.25	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Connecticut	76	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	16.50	17.50	15.56	16.10	14.71	13.00	11.15	14.50	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
New York	75	60	56	81	39	42	48	50	11.00	11.33	9.66	13.70	12.04	8.25	5.75	10.45	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
New Jersey	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	14.25	17.43	14.09	12.64	14.35	10.75	9.60	15.35	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Pennsylvania	57	50	48	41	40	39	44	49	12.30	14.40	11.31	12.30	12.15	9.15	7.90	11.50	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Delaware	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	12.33	17.00	15.00	12.16	13.00	10.00	8.45	11.65	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Maryland	.....	55	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	11.75	14.25	11.13	11.55	11.85	10.50	9.30	12.15	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Virginia	.....	48	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	11.50	13.09	11.89	11.43	10.21	10.25	8.50	10.25	8.6	7.1	5.0	7.8	7.1	6.9	5.9	7.0
North Carolina	.....	52	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	10.55	11.11	10.93	10.14	10.75	9.75	9.30	10.10	8.6	7.2	4.8	8.2	6.7	7.0	5.9	7.2
South Carolina	.....	115	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	11.30	9.67	10.75	7.62	11.32	11.50	9.50	10.30	8.6	7.1	5.0	8.8	6.8	6.9	5.6	7.0
Georgia	.....	115	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	11.80	12.06	12.38	10.90	11.05	13.00	11.75	13.15	8.5	7.3	4.5	7.0	7.0	6.7	5.6	7.2
Florida	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	14.00	19.75	16.25	13.24	13.00	14.25	14.10	14.35	8.2	7.3	4.8	11.5	8.7	6.8	5.6	8.4
Alabama	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	10.80	11.24	9.51	10.21	9.80	10.25	9.25	11.40	8.5	7.0	4.8	7.8	6.5	6.7	5.7	7.0
Mississippi	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	9.91	9.61	9.67	9.70	9.46	9.50	8.40	9.25	8.5	7.0	4.1	7.5	6.7	6.7	5.7	7.0
Louisiana	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	9.80	9.00	10.64	9.64	8.75	8.75	9.40	9.70	8.4	7.0	4.3	7.8	6.7	6.7	5.7	6.9
Texas	65	62	55	54	50	43	50	66	8.56	9.60	7.62	9.43	7.20	7.25	5.85	7.10	8.0	6.9	4.5	7.3	6.5	6.6	5.8	6.8
Arkansas	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	8.74	9.37	8.83	9.27	7.54	8.65	6.75	8.65	8.5	6.8	4.8	7.6	6.4	6.5	5.8	6.9
Tennessee	66	55	56	50	45	59	56	64	10.40	10.76	11.27	10.83	9.67	10.75	9.50	11.25	8.5	6.5	4.5	7.3	6.2	6.6	5.7	7.5
West Virginia	.....	.....	.....	38	.....	.....	.....	.....	10.50	12.75	10.66	12.73	9.79	8.85	8.40	9.45	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Kentucky	68	51	47	38	40	40	40	43	9.50	10.16	10.47	10.94	9.46	10.00	9.10	10.40	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Ohio	57	47	48	41	38	41	44	45	9.17	10.05	8.46	12.76	7.93	6.25	5.75	8.95	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Michigan	60	49	50	43	42	40	44	48	8.40	9.16	9.04	13.09	8.48	7.75	7.15	8.50	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Indiana	52	45	45	40	33	44	44	45	7.80	9.16	7.58	12.03	7.18	5.90	5.60	7.80	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Illinois	49	40	48	45	31	38	39	47	7.53	8.86	8.33	10.25	6.39	6.15	3.90	7.75	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Wisconsin	50	43	45	34	27	32	40	40	7.65	7.20	7.96	9.63	6.60	6.25	5.75	6.85	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Minnesota	42	36	41	24	20	24	33	31	4.60	4.57	5.30	5.12	3.79	4.40	3.70	4.35	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Iowa	40	33	42	23	21	24	34	31	5.25	6.16	7.39	6.45	3.99	4.25	4.05	5.30	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Missouri	42	40	51	48	25	40	36	42	6.75	7.04	7.82	6.80	4.85	6.15	5.80	6.25	7.8	.....	4.6	7.4	6.2	6.4	5.8	7.0
Kansas	35	47	49	23	22	25	27	27	4.40	4.60	5.25	3.26	2.70	3.40	3.25	3.50	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Nebraska	33	31	43	24	19	24	25	30	4.27	4.37	7.12	3.56	2.44	3.00	3.30	3.70	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
South Dakota	35	33	35	19	19	22	27	29	3.40	3.67	4.28	3.29	3.12	2.95	3.00	3.10	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
North Dakota	33	31	36	20	21	27	29	33	4.10	3.72	3.87	3.48	3.39	3.25	3.25	3.30	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Montana	66	50	40	59	55	50	57	51	8.95	7.89	7.17	1.40	6.86	7.75	6.80	7.70	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Wyoming	68	73	.....	28	.....	.....	.....	.....	6.40	8.00	10.00	6.50	7.14	6.00	5.90	6.00	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Colorado	54	50	58	60	46	51	46	55	6.50	6.98	7.54	5.87	6.22	5.50	5.40	7.35	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
New Mexico	65	58	70	68	65	55	55	61	11.25	8.50	11.50	6.00	5.70	7.00	7.35	10.60	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Arizona	.....	52	75	70	.....	.....	.....	.....	10.50	8.25	12.00	9.00	8.75	5.00	12.00	10.35	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Utah	52	45	46	39	42	45	47	52	6.31	5.17	5.56	5.27	5.00	4.75	4.50	7.10	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Nevada	60	60	51	50	.....	.....	.....	.....	7.00	10.00	7.25	6.75	4.82	5.00	7.00	7.65	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Idaho	38	53	47	42	28	42	48	46	7.40	5.50	4.34	6.25	4.71	5.25	4.90	6.30	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....

TABLE No. 9.—*Prices of principal agricultural products on the farm, December 1, 1892, to December 1, 1899*—Continued.

State or Territory.	Barley, per bushel.								Hay, per ton.								Cotton, per pound.							
	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.	1897.	1898.	1899.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.	1897.	1898.	1899.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896	1987	1898	1899
	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.									Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.
Washington	45	39	32	38	40	43	45	44	$9.00	$9.17	$7.38	$6.75	$7.00	$9.00	$7.60	$8.90	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Oregon	46	40	33	40	45	45	49	50	8.92	8.10	5.86	6.12	6.60	7.75	7.25	6.85	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
California	47	42	45	40	48	54	65	55	8.76	7.87	9.50	7.06	6.35	9.00	14.25	8.00	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Oklahoma	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	4.6	7.5	6.2	6.7	5.8	6.8
Indian Territory	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	7.3	....	6.4	5.8	6.9
General average	47.2	41.1	44.2	33.7	32.3	37.7	41.3	40.3	8.49	8.68	8.54	8.35	6.55	6.62	6.00	7.27	8.4	7.0	4.6	7.6	6.6	6.6	5.7	....

TABLE No. 10.—*Prices of articles of farm production and farm consumption, respectively, 1870 to 1899, showing the price of farm products on farms as reported by the Department of Agriculture, and the wholesale price of articles of merchandise in New York, as shown by the Aldrich report, prior to 1890, and publications of the Department of Labor from 1890 to 1899.*

FARM PRODUCTION.

Year.	Wheat, per bushel.	Corn, per bushel.	Oats, per bushel.	Barley, per bushel.	Rye, per bushel.	Horses, per head.	Mules, per head.	Milch cows, per head.	Other cattle, per head.	Sheep, per head.	Swine, per head.	Potatoes, per bushel.	Hay, per ton.	Butter, per pound.	Cheese, per pound.	Eggs, per dozen.	Wool, per pound. Cotton, per pound.	Tobacco, per pound.	Wool, per pound. Fine.	Medium.	Coarse.	Milk, per quart.
	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.							Cts.		Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.
1870	94.4	49.4	39.0	79.1	73.2	$81.38	$109.02	$39.12	$22.54	$2.29	$7.03	72.0	$13.82	29.3	15.5	.....	.....	.....	47.5	46.50	44.25	6.3
1871	114.5	43.4	36.2	75.8	71.1	78.52	101.53	37.33	22.82	2.32	6.20	59.6	15.81	21.5	13.7	28.5	16.95	9.2	55.5	55.00	50.75	6.5
1872	111.4	35.3	29.9	68.6	67.6	73.38	94.83	31.97	19.62	2.80	4.36	59.9	14.52	19.4	11.7	20.3	22.19	10.3	72.00	71.00	66.00	6.5
1873	106.9	44.2	34.6	86.7	70.3	74.22	95.16	29.72	20.06	2.97	4.60	70.5	13.55	21.1	13.1	26.6	20.14	10.7	55.09	55.50	51.00	6.5
1874	86.3	58.4	47.1	86.0	77.4	71.45	89.22	27.99	19.15	2.61	4.36	67.7	13.73	25.0	13.1	22.1	17.95	9.6	55.25	54.25	46.75	6.5
1875	89.5	36.7	32.0	74.1	67.1	68.01	80.00	28.52	18.63	2.79	5.34	38.9	12.27	23.7	13.5	25.6	15.46	11.3	52.25	51.75	45.25	6.1
1876	96.3	34.0	32.4	63.0	61.4	64.96	75.34	28.90	19.04	2.61	6.80	67.2	9.74	23.9	12.6	28.0	12.98	10.4	44.25	44.00	36.05	6.1
1877	105.7	34.8	28.4	62.8	57.6	60.09	68.92	27.33	17.10	2.26	6.09	44.8	8.59	20.6	11.8	25.9	11.82	10.2	47.25	47.75	35.05	5.7
1878	77.6	31.7	24.6	57.9	52.5	58.16	63.71	26.42	17.14	2.26	4.99	58.9	7.21	18.0	11.4	15.8	11.22	8.7	38.75	40.25	34.25	5.5
1879	110.8	37.5	33.1	58.9	65.6	52.41	56.03	21.73	15.39	1.84	3.18	43.6	9.32	14.2	8.9	15.5	10.84	7.8	36.50	37.50	33.75	5.2
1880	95.1	39.6	36.0	66.6	75.6	54.75	61.26	23.27	16.10	2.21	4.28	48.3	11.65	17.1	9.5	16.5	11.51	7.7	49.25	52.75	46.00	5.2
1881	119.2	63.6	46.4	82.3	93.3	58.44	69.79	23.95	17.33	2.39	4.70	90.9	11.82	19.8	11.1	17.2	12.03	8.3	43.00	45.75	38.00	5.5
1882	88.4	48.5	37.5	62.9	61.5	58.53	71.35	25.89	19.89	2.37	5.97	55.7	9.70	19.3	11.0	19.2	11.56	8.5	42.50	45.25	34.75	5.5
1883	91.1	42.4	32.7	58.7	58.1	70.59	79.49	30.21	21.81	2.53	6.75	42.0	8.19	18.6	11.2	20.9	11.88	8.3	40.50	42.00	34.25	5.5
1884	64.5	35.7	27.7	48.7	51.9	74.64	84.22	31.37	23.52	2.37	5.57	40.0	8.17	18.2	10.3	21.2	10.88	9.1	37.00	34.50	32.00	5.5
1885	77.1	32.8	28.5	56.3	57.9	73.70	82.38	29.70	23.25	2.14	5.02	44.7	8.71	16.8	9.3	21.5	10.45	9.9	32.75	32.75	29.25	5.5
1886	68.7	36.6	29.8	53.6	53.8	71.27	79.60	27.40	21.17	1.91	4.26	45.0	7.36	15.6	8.3	18.3	9.28	9.6	34.00	35.25	31.25	5.5
1887	68.1	44.4	30.4	51.9	54.5	72.15	78.91	26.08	19.79	2.01	4.48	68.5	9.34	15.8	9.3	16.3	10.21	8.7	33.00	37.00	33.75	5.0
1888	92.6	34.1	27.8	59.0	58.8	71.82	79.78	24.65	17.79	2.05	4.98	40.4	8.76	18.3	9.9	15.9	10.03	8.3	30.50	34.00	32.00	5.0
1889	69.8	28.3	22.9	41.6	42.3	71.89	79.89	23.94	17.05	2.13	5.79	40.3	7.88	16.5	9.3	13.9	10.65	8.8	33.75	37.75	32.00	4.9
1890	83.8	50.6	42.4	62.7	62.9	68.84	78.25	22.14	15.21	2.27	4.72	77.7	7.74	14.4	9.0	15.4	11.07	8.6	32.75	36.75	29.05	4.0
1891	89.9	40.6	31.5	52.4	77.4	67.00	77.88	21.62	14.76	2.50	4.15	37.1	8.39	14.5	9.0	17.7	8.00	8.7	31.75	30.00	30.75	4.0
1892	62.4	39.4	31.7	47.5	54.1	65.01	75.55	21.40	15.16	2.58	4.60	67.3	8.49	16.0	9.4	18.0	7.71	8.4	29.00	34.00	30.25	3.8
1893	53.8	30.5	29.4	41.1	51.3	61.22	70.68	21.75	15.24	2.66	6.41	59.0	8.68	19.0	9.4	23.2	8.56	9.0	26.50	28.75	29.00	3.8
1894	49.1	45.7	32.9	44.2	50.1	47.83	62.17	21.77	14.66	1.98	5.98	53.6	8.54	17.6	9.7	16.9	6.94	8.5	20.75	23.25	19.05	3.8
1895	50.9	25.3	19.9	33.7	44.0	36.29	47.55	21.97	14.06	1.58	4.91	28.6	8.35	16.4	9.1	16.8	7.44	8.7	17.50	20.80	18.75	3.8
1896	72.6	21.5	18.7	32.3	40.9	33.07	45.29	22.55	15.86	1.70	4.35	28.6	6.55	15.2	8.4	14.7	7.93	8.5	18.25	19.875	18.00	3.6
1897	80.8	26.3	21.2	37.7	44.7	31.51	41.66	23.16	16.65	1.82	4.10	54.7	6.65	14.3	9.1	13.8	7.00	8.0	22.125	24.00	21.25	3.6
1898	58.2	28.7	25.5	41.3	46.3	34.26	43.88	27.45	20.92	2.46	4.39	41.3	6.00	15.0	8.6	16.3	5.94	8.7	28.625	29.75	25.125	3.6
1899	56.4	30.2	24.9	40.3	51.0	37.40	44.96	27.66	22.79	2.75	4.40	43.4	7.27	16.3	8.6	19.1	6.88	9.3	25.50	30.50	26.00	3.6

FARM CONSUMPTION.

	Sugar, per pound.	Sheetings, per yard.	Drillings, per yard.	Shirtings, per yard.	Prints, per yard.	Ginghams, per yard.	Tickings, per yard.	Bags, each.	Carpets, per yard.	Coffee, per pound.	Coal, per ton.	Nails, per 100 pound.	Shovels, per dozen.	Matches, per gross.	Scythes, per dozen.	Shingles, per thousand.	Molasses, per gallon.	Starch, per pound.	Illuminating oil, per barrel.	Salt, fine, per barrel.	Men's brogans.
	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	$1.1134	Cts.							Cts.	Cts.			
1870	.....	14.58	14.98	22.50	12.41	15.19	28.69	36.25		10.00	$4.39	$4.40	$14.09	$1.575	$12.00	$4.125	67.00	9.45	$30.50	$2.15	$1.50
1871	13.2	13.00	13.64	20.83	11.62	13.64	27.13	27.44	1.1371	11.25	4.46	4.52	12.83	1.40	12.50	4.000	58.75	9.00	25.70	2.00	1.42
1872	12.6	14.27	15.14	20.66	12.00	13.38	27.13	30.31	1.2673	16.32	3.74	5.46	13.54	1.30	11.00	3.80	50.75	8.55	24.90	1.40	1.42
1873	11.6	13.31	14.13	19.41	11.37	13.06	26.31	29.44	1.1045	18.38	4.27	4.90	13.62	1.20	10.50	3.875	62.50	8.55	23.50	1.40	1.40
1874	10.5	11.42	11.75	18.04	9.75	11.25	23.73	27.81	1.0192	21.25	4.55	3.99	13.30	1.15	9.00	3.75	64.38	8.55	17.30	1.60	1.40
1875	10.8	10.41	11.12	15.12	8.71	10.50	22.25	26.31	.9519	18.06	4.39	3.42	12.73	1.112	8.78	3.675	54.38	8.44	14.10	1.40	1.40
1876	10.7	8.85	8.71	13.58	7.06	10.00	17.75	18.89	.8863	17.38	3.87	2.98	11.14	1.10	8.00	3.55	55.25	8.1	14.00	.90	1.35
1877	11.6	8.46	8.46	12.46	6.77	8.18	15.38	17.88	.8121	16.94	2.59	2.57	10.00	1.062	7.56	3.10	58.75	7.93	21.10	.85	1.35
1878	10.2	7.80	7.65	11.00	6.09	8.75	15.13	17.88	.7333	16.38	3.22	2.31	9.64	1.012	7.25	2.50	43.75	7.44	14.40	.75	1.10
1879	8.81	7.97	7.57	11.62	6.25	8.25	14.31	17.94	.6480	14.31	2.70	2.69	9.07	1.00	7.00	2.375	38.00	7.00	10.8	1.25	1.275
1880	9.80	8.51	8.51	12.74	7.41	8.81	15.88	19.31	.8767	15.13	4.53	3.68	10.03	1.00	6.50	2.375	47.34	7.00	8.6	.75	1.30
1881	9.70	8.51	8.06	12.74	7.00	9.31	16.25	18.06	.7314	12.06	4.53	3.09	9.47	.987	6.83	2.875	51.25	7.11	10.3	.75	1.30
1882	9.35	8.45	8.25	12.95	6.50	8.94	16.56	18.56	.7821	9.13	4.61	3.47	9.34	.94	6.85	3.75	46.00	7.44	9.1	.75	1.275
1883	8.65	8.32	7.11	12.93	6.00	7.50	14.63	18.31	.7263	9.31	4.54	3.06	9.09	.73	5.40	3.125	39.50	7.76	8.8	.75	1.25
1884	6.75	7.28	6.86	10.46	6.00	6.88	12.44	17.15	.6340	10.75	4.42	2.39	8.82	.46	5.40	2.95	40.25	7.20	9.2	.75	1.20
1885	6.53	6.75	6.36	10.37	6.00	6.75	11.38	15.94	.5955	8.97	4.10	2.33	8.38	.37	5.00	2.75	37.50	6.75	8.7	.70	1.20
1886	6.23	6.75	6.25	10.05	6.00	6.63	11.75	14.44	.6075	9.53	4.00	2.27	7.87	.37	5.00	3.00	36.00	6.08	8.7	.65	1.177
1887	6.02	7.15	6.58	10.88	6.00	6.88	13.25	14.69	.5740	16.97	4.05	2.30	7.87	.37	4.50	3.20	37.50	5.85	7.8	.65	1.15
1888	7.18	7.25	6.75	10.94	6.50	6.88	12.75	15.44	.5305	15.81	4.21	2.03	7.87	.37	4.50	3.15	40.00	5.85	7.9	.65	1.125
1889	7.89	7.00	6.75	10.50	6.50	6.31	12.13	15.75	.5177	17.62	4.04	2.00	7.87	.37	4.05	3.05	38.25	5.85	7.8	.65	1.075
1890	6.27	7.00	6.75	10.90	6.00	6.25	12.00	15.94	.5059	19.56	3.93	2.00	7.87	.37	4.00	2.90	39.00	5.85	7.4	.65	1.05
1891	4.65	6.83	6.41	10.64	6.00	6.50	11.75	15.56	.5395	18.38	3.85	1.86	7.87	.37	3.60	2.775	35.25	5.90	7.0	.65	1.05
1892	4.35	6.50	5.60	10.25	6.25	6.50	11.50	15.50	.5043	17.16	3.98	1.83	7.87	.39	3.60	2.65	33.75	6.08	5.9	.65	1.037
1893	4.84	5.90	5.72	9.75	5.25	6.31	11.19	14.94	.5166	19.00	3.90	1.44	7.87	.483	3.60	2.60	33.75	6.08	4.9	.65	1.013
1894	4.12	5.11	5.07	9.50	4.90	4.90	10.91	12.75	.4523	19.13	3.90	1.08	7.45	.495	3.60	2.563	37.00	6.13	4.2	.65	.969
1895	4.12	5.74	5.69	9.85	5.25	4.66	10.06	11.50	.4079	18.05	3.50	1.47	7.45	.495	3.60	2.537	36.50	6.08	4.9	.65	.966
1896	4.53	5.45	5.48	9.50	4.66	4.56	7.25	12.81	.3957	17.00	3.50	2.32	7.80	.495	3.51	2.51	35.25	5.91	.....	.65	.994
1897	4.50	4.73	4.75	9.25	4.70	4.38	7.00	13.00	.4218	12.06	3.50	1.47	7.93	.495	3.33	2.59	32.00	5.85	.....	.65	.95
1898	4.97	4.20	4.10	8.00	3.96	4.31	7.00	13.38	.4617	7.03	3.50	1.31	7.93	.495	3.60	2.675	33.00	5.75	.....	.65	.913
1899	4.92	5.28	5.13	9.50	4.25	4.75	7.00	14.33	.4118	7.21	3.75	2.21	7.77	.495	3.74	2.867	36.33	5.85	5.8	.65	.933

TABLE No. 11.—*Average annual freight rates from 1870 to 1899.*

[From Statistical Abstract.]

Year.	Freight rates on wheat, per bushel.		Freight rates on canned goods, per cwt., from Pacific coast to New York.	
	Chicago to New York, by rail.	Buffalo to New York, by canal.	Less than carloads.	In carloads.
	Cents.	*Cents.*		
1870	33.3	11.2	$3.66	$3.66
1871	31	12.6	3.76	3.76
1872	33.5	13	3.74	3.74
1873	33.2	11.4	3.69	3.69
1874	28 7	10	3.78	3.78
1875	24.1	7.9	3.66	3.66
1876	16.5	6.6	3.77	3.77
1877	20.3	7.4	4.06	4.06
1878	17.7	6	4.17	4.17
1879	17.3	6.8	4.20	4.20
1880	19.9	6.5	4.20	4.20
1881	14.4	4.7	2.54	2.54
1882	14.6	5.4	1.50	1.50
1883	16.5	4.9	1.50	1.50
1884	13.1	4.2	1.50	1.41
1885	14	3.8	1.50	1.25
1886	16.5	5	1.18	1.01
1887	15.7	4.5	1.55	1.20
1888	14.5	3.4	1.80	1.13
1889	15	4.8	2.30	1.06
1890	14.3	3.8	2.30	1.00
1891	15	3.5	2.30	1.09
1892	14.2	3.5	2.30	1.05
1893	14.7	4.6	2.30	1.00
1894	12.9	3.2	2.30	1.00
1895	12.3	2.2	2.30	1.00
1896	12	3.7	1.91	.75
1897	12.3	2.8	1.90	.76
1898	11.6	2.8	.....	.....
1899	11.1	3	.....	.....

TABLE No. 12.—*Live stock and dressed meats, Chicago to New York. Average freight rates, in cents, per 100 pounds.*

[From Bulletin 14, Department of Agriculture.]

Year.	Cattle.	Hogs.	Sheep.	Horses and mules.	Dressed beef.	Dressed hogs.	
						Refrigerator cars.	Common cars.
1880	55	43	65	60	88	.....	.....
1881	35	31	61	60	56	.....	.....
1882	36	29	53	60	57	.....	.....
1883	40	32	50	60	64	.....	.....
1884	31	28	44	60	49	.....	.....
1885	31	26	43	60	55	.....	.....
1886	33	30	42	60	61	.....	.....
1887	36	32	40	60	62	59	54
1888	22	26	31	60	46	46	44
1889	25	30	30	60	47	47	45
1890	28	28	30	60	39	39	39
1891	27	30	30	60	45	45	45
1892	28	28	30	60	45	45	45

TABLE No. 12.—*Live stock and dressed meats, Chicago to New York, etc.*—Continued.

Year.	Cattle.	Hogs.	Sheep.	Horses and mules.	Dressed beef.	Dressed hogs.	
						Refrigerator cars.	Common cars.
1893	28	20	30	60	45	45	45
1894	28	30	30	60	45	45	45
1895	28	30	30	60	45	45	45
1896	28	30	30	60	45	45	45
1897	28	30	30	60	45	45	45
1898	28	30	30	60	45	45	45
1899*	25	25	25	60	40	40	40

* These rates went into effect February 1, 1899, and lasted till January 1, 1900, when the rates used in 1898 again went into effect.

TABLE No. 13.—*Grain, Chicago to New York, and average rates, in cents, per bushel.*

[From Bulletin No. 14, Miscellaneous Series, of the Division of Statistics.]

Year.	Wheat.				Corn.	
	Via lake and rail.		Via all rail.		Via lake and rail.	Via all rail.
	As reported by New York Produce Exchange.	As reported by Chicago Board of Trade.	As reported by New York Produce Exchange.	As reported by Chicago Board of Trade.	As reported by Chicago Board of Trade.	As reported by Chicago Board of Trade.
1868	20.76	.....	30.49	27.00	.....	25.28
1869	18.80	18.80	26.39	26.74	17.71	24.96
1870	19.15	19.58	28.08	26.11	19.33	24.37
1871	22.38	22.76	27.75	28.47	21.24	26.57
1872	24.91	26.25	29.80	31.13	23.67	29.06
1873	23.64	21.63	29.17	27.26	20.19	25.42
1874	15.20	15.37	25.81	23.61	12.48	22.03
1875	12.71	12.09	20.97	20.89	11.34	19.50
1876	10.58	10.19	14.80	15.12	9.68	14.12
1877	15.08	14.75	19.37	19.56	13.42	18.03
1878	11.31	11.99	17.56	17.56	10.45	16.39
1879	13.30	13.13	17.30	17.74	12.20	14.56
1880	15.70	15.80	19.90	19.80	14.43	17.48
1881	10.40	10.40	14.40	14.40	9.42	13.40
1882	10.90	10.91	14.60	14.47	10.28	13.50
1883	11.5	11.63	16.5	16.20	11	15.12
1884	9.55	10	13.12	13.20	8.50	12.32
1885	9.03	9.02	14	13.20	8.01	12.32
1886	12	13	16.50	15	11.20	14
1887	12	12	16.33	15.75	11.20	14.70
1888	11	11.14	14.50	14.50	10.26	13.54
1889	8.70	8.97	15	15	8.19	12.6
1890	8.50	8.52	14.31	14.30	7.32	11.36
1891	8.53	8.57	15	15	7.53	14
1892	7.55	7.59	14.23	13.80	7.21	12.96
1893	8.44	8.48	14.70	14.63	7.97	13.65
1894	7	7	12.88	13.20	6.50	12.32
1895	6.95	6.96	12.17	11.89	6.40	10.29
1896	7.32	6.61	12	12	6.15	10.50
1897	7.37	7.42	12.32	12.50	6.92	11.43
1898	.....	4.91	11.55	12	4.41	9.80
1899	6.63	6.63	11.13	2.30	5.83	10.08

TABLE No. 14.—*Freight rates.*

[From reports of the Department of Agriculture.]

From—	To—	Freight rates (all rail) in effect January 1, 1893 to 1897 (in cents per 100 pounds).														
		Wheat (carloads).					Corn (carloads).					Wool in bales (carloads).				
		1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.	1897.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.	1897.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.	1897.
Cincinnati, Ohio	Boston, Mass	23½	23½	23½	19	19½	23½	23½	23½	19	19½	62	62½	62½	62½	59
	New York, N. Y	21½	21½	21½	17	17½	21½	21½	21½	17	17½	46	56½	56½	56½	54
	Philadelphia, Pa	19½	19½	19½	15	15½	19½	19½	19½	15	15½	44	54½	54½	54½	52
	Baltimore, Md	18½	18½	18½	14	14½	18½	18½	18½	14	14½	43	53½	53½	53½	51
Indianapolis, Ind	Boston, Mass	25	25	25	21½	20½	25	25	25	21½	20½	56½	66½	66½	66½	41½
	New York, N. Y	23	23	23	19½	18½	23	23	23	19½	18½	49½	60½	60½	60½	36½
	Philadelphia, Pa	21	21	21	17½	16½	21	21	21	17½	16½	47½	58½	58½	58½	34½
	Baltimore, Md	20	20	20	16½	15½	20	20	20	16½	15½	46½	57½	57½	57½	33½
Chicago, Ill	Boston, Mass	27	27	27	22	22	27	27	27	22	22	50	71	71	71	44
	New York, N. Y	25	25	25	20	20	25	25	25	20	20	53	65	65	65	39
	Philadelphia, Pa	23	23	23	18	18	23	23	23	18	18	51	63	63	63	37
	Baltimore, Md	22	22	22	17	17	22	22	22	17	17	50	62	62	62	36
East St. Louis, Ill	Boston, Mass	31	31	31	25	25	31	31	31	25	25	63½	81½	81½	81½	50
	New York, N. Y	29	29	29	23	23	29	29	29	23	23	61½	75½	75½	75½	45
	Philadelphia, Pa	27	27	27	21	21	27	27	27	21	21	59½	73½	73½	73½	43
	Baltimore, Md	26	26	26	20	20	26	26	26	20	20	58½	72½	72½	72½	42

TABLE No. 15.—*Transportation rates on grain in sacks by steamers, in cents, per 100 pounds.*

[Compiled for Bulletin No. 14, miscellaneous series, of the Division of Statistics from reports of the St. Louis Merchants' Exchange.]

Year.	From St. Louis, Mo., to—								
	Memphis, Tenn.			Vicksburg, Miss.			New Orleans, La.		
	Highest.	Lowest.	Longest in effect.	Highest.	Lowest.	Longest in effect.	Highest.	Lowest.	Longest in effect.
1877	24	11.9	14.3	33	19	19	33	14	19
1878	50	7.4	7.4	50	10	10	35	10	10
1879	20	10	12.5	35	15	17.5	30	10	12.5
1880	51	12.5	20	30	20	20	25	15	20
1881	22.5	15	15	30	20	20	25	15	22.5
1882	17.5	12.5	12.5	30	20	20	25	20	20
1883	17.5	12.5	17.5	25	20	25	22.5	12.5	20
1884	15	13	15	22.5	20	20	17.5	12.5	12.5
1885	15	15	15	22.5	22.5	22.5	17.5	15	17.5
1886	15	10	10	20	17.5	17.5	17.5	15	17.5
1887	20	10	10	20	17.5	20	20	15	17.5
1888	15	10	10	20	17.5	17.5	17.5	12.5	12.5
1889	17.5	10	11	25	17.5	17.5	20	17.5	17.5
1890	12.5	10	10	17.5	15	17.5	17.5	15	15
1891	20	10	10	25	17.5	17.5	20	15	15
1892	20	10	10	25.5	17.5	17.5	20	15	17.5
1893	12	12	12	17.5	17.5	17.5	17.5	15	17.5
1894	15	12	12	20	17.5	17.5	20	12.5	20
1895	15	10	10	20	12.5	15	20	10	10
1896	12.5	10	10	17.5	15	15	15	10	15
1897	8	8	8	15	15	15	15	15	15
1898	10	10	10	15	15	15	10	10	10
1899	10	6	10	15	15	15	10	10	10

TABLE No. 16.—*Freight rates on wheat from New York to Liverpool, in cents, per bushel.*

[From reports of the Department of Agriculture.]

Year.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May.	June.	July.	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.
1873	21.84	18.82	14.56	12.34	13.94	16.00	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1880	7.00	7.62	12.00	11.90	9.00	10.12	14.60	14.76	11.38	12.30	15.12	14.62
1885	9.30	5.32	7.30	8.38	5.60	5.00	4.76	5.30	7.72	5.70	5.12	6.48
1890	11.13	10.75	8.00	4.00	4.13	3.75	4.25	2.00	1.38	.38	4.50	5.00
1891	7.25	4.75	3.00	3.00	3.25	4.00	4.00	6.00	8.63	11.13	11.50	8.75
1892	9.00	6.38	7.50	3.75	4.88	4.00	5.50	4.25	4.00	6.00	4.88	.....
1893	8.00	3.25	2.75	2.63	3.75	5.88	6.50	7.13	4.38	5.25	6.00	5.88
1894	6.25	4.75	4.63	4.25	2.38	3.50	2.88	1.63	1.75	2.25	5.63	5.88
1895	3.38	3.88	4.37	3.88	3.50	2.25	3.25	3.88	4.75	5.62	6.62	6.38
1896	6.12	4.50	3.25	3.88	4.12	4.00	4.00	5.25	8.00	9.88	10.38	7.12
1897	5.87	5.25	5.25	4.87	3.37	3.75	5.87	6.62	7.50	9.00	8.75	8.00
1898	6.50	6.12	6.62	7.50	8.75	5.37	3.37	8.00	6.37	9.37	10.50	8.50

TABLE No. 17.—*Rates (all rail) on live stock and dressed meats from Chicago to New York (in cents per 100 pounds).*

Year.	Cattle.	Hogs.	Sheep.	Horses and Mules.	Dressed beef.	Dressed hogs, refrigerator cars.	Dressed hogs, common cars.
1880	55.00	41.25	65.00	65.00	88.00	.....	.....
1885	29.00	25.00	42.00	60.00	50.60	.....	.....
1890	21.69	25.42	30.00	60.00	37.40	.....	.....
1891	28.00	30.00	30.00	60.00	45.00	45.00	45.00
1892	28.00	24.37	30.00	60.00	45.00	45.00	45.00
1893	28.00	20.00	30.00	60.00	45.00	45.00	45.00
1894	28.00	28.33	30.00	60.00	45.00	45.00	45.00
1895	28.00	25.00	30.00	60.00	45.00	45.00	45.00
1896	28.00	30.00	30.00	60.00	45.00	45.00	45.00
1897	28.00	30.00	30.00	60.00	45.00	45.00	45.00
1898	28.00	30.00	30.00	60.00	45.00	45.00	45.00
1899*	25.00	25.00	25.00	60.00	40.00	40.00	40.00

* The 1899 rates went into effect February 1, 1899, and lasted until January 1, 1900, when the rates used in 1899 again went into effect. This makes the actual average a little higher than the figures herewith given.

TABLE No. 18.—*Average freight rates on grain, flour, and provisions (per 100 pounds), through from Chicago to European ports, by all rail to seaboard and thence by steamers, from 1890 to 1899.*

[Prepared by the secretary of the Board of Trade, Chicago.]

Shipped to—	Articles.	1890.	1891.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.	1897.	1898.	1899.
Liverpool	Grain	$0.3187	$0.4075	$0.3287	$0.3410	$0.3250	$0.3200	$0.3350	$0.3300	$0.3435	$0.2972
Do	Sacked flour	.3625	.4187	.3625	.3513	.3316	.3400	.3430	.3681	.3766	.3012
Do	Provisions	.5109	.5531	.4575	.4547	.4406	.4181	.4491	.4440	.4715	.4050
Glasgow	Grain	.3550	.4425	.3550	.3585	.3463	.3419	.3422	.3523	.3600	.3235
Do	Sacked flour	.4188	.4469	.3906	.3925	.3503	.3625	.3650	.3906	.3906	.3125
Do	Provisions	.5833	.5953	.4969	.4828	.4659	.4969	.4907	.5250	.5250	.4469
London	Grain	.3550	.4250	.3462	.3760	.3288	.3329	.3348	.3400	.3500	.3060
Do	Sacked flour	.4047	.4328	.3681	.3704	.3493	.3513	.3528	.3612	.3725	.3350
Do	Provisions	.5813	.5953	.4688	.4828	.4575	.4603	.4715	.4814	.4969	.4414
Antwerp	....do	.4688	.5250	.5025	.4828	.4688	.4828	.4969	.5109	.5250	.4750
Hamburg	....do	.5250	.5500	.5000	.5250	.5000	.5000	.5100	.5100	.5200	.4600
Amsterdam	....do	.5000	.6000	.5500	.5000	.5000	.5000	.5200	.5200	.5250	.4700
Rotterdam	....do	.5000	.6000	.5500	.5000	.5000	.4800	.5200	.5200	.5250	.4700
Copenhagen	....do	.5813	.6375	.6094	.5531	.5531	.5531	.5812	.5728	.5813	.5172
Stockholm	....do	.6094	.6938	.7219	.6656	.6656	.6656	.6937	.6853	.6925	.6297
Stettin	....do	.6813	.6375	.6094	.5531	.5531	.5531	.5812	.5728	.5813	.5172
Bordeaux	....do	.6650	.7500	.6200	.6000	.6250	.6413	.6413	.6413	.6575	.5912

Trusts.

SPEECH

OF

HON. E. R. RIDGELY,

OF KANSAS.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, May 31, 1900.

The House having under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 136) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States and the bill (H. R. 10539) to amend an act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraint and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890—

Mr. RIDGELY said:

Mr. SPEAKER: By a special rule adopted by the Republican majority of this House, we are permitted to discuss but not to amend this proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

The Republicans say, "Indorse this amendment just as we dictate, or reject it if you dare." For one, I shall reject it, and in the brief time allotted I shall state reasons for my negative vote. First, let me read the proposed amendment:

ARTICLE XVI.

SECTION 1. All powers conferred by this article shall extend to the several States, the Territories, the District of Columbia, and all territory under the sovereignty and subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

SEC. 2. Congress shall have power to define, regulate, prohibit, or dissolve trusts, monopolies, or combinations, whether existing in the form of a corporation or otherwise.

The several States may continue to exercise such power in any manner not in conflict with the laws of the United States.

SEC. 3. Congress shall have power to enforce the provisions of this article by appropriate legislation.

Passing section 1, which clearly exposes a theoretical dilemma into which the Republicans have fallen—namely, by their absurd theory that the Constitution (which is the people's limit upon Congressional power, as well as upon the powers of the judiciary and executive branches of our Government) does not apply to all parts of the nation unless Congress sees fit to permit. This ridiculous assumption is too absurd for serious consideration. It will serve, however, to emphasize the straits to which modern Republicanism is driven in its efforts to establish imperialism by annulling the Constitution at will. It also exposes a fit of generosity in permitting this new section to apply coextensive with the sovereignty of the Government. But we may ask, Why leave all the balance of the Constitution limited in its territorial jurisdiction? This proposition is too silly to dignify with discussion.

Section 2, however, is not so harmless. If adopted, it will place in Congress the most sweeping and unlimited power possible to express in four short lines of type—the power to define, regulate, and destroy all organizations, whether in the form of corporations or otherwise. This is a sweeping power, and might be abused to the extent of destroying all co-operation of our citizens and every labor organization, farmers' association, or common partnership.

It will center in Congress and the courts a dangerous and unnecessary power, taking the same away from the people and the States, and may be abused to destroy the liberties of the people instead of preserving them. I believe it is intended to be used against labor organizations, and I am not alone in this conclusion.

When this discussion began I called President Gompers of the American Federation of Labor over the telephone and asked him to state, for the labor organizations he represents, their opinion of the amendment.

In reply I have just received the following letter:

DEAR SIR: I am just in receipt of your message over the phone, in which you ask me my opinion regarding the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States known as Article XIV. I have already stated our position to you over the phone, but in order that you may have a record of the matter, I write this.

In my judgment the proposed constitutional amendment is one of the most dangerous to the right and the liberties of the people of our country that has ever been introduced in Congress. Your attention is called to section 2 of the article, as follows:

"Congress shall have power to define, regulate, prohibit, or dissolve trusts, monopolies, or combinations, whether existing in the form of a corporation or otherwise."

By emphasizing the words "combinations" and "otherwise," as they appear in the section, you will at once see the basis upon which my judgment is formed.

There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that if this amendment to the Constitution were adopted, it would prove destructive to any effort on the part of the working people of our country to protect themselves against the aggression of accumulated wealth.

The trusts, against which this constitutional amendment is ostensibly aimed, have thus far been enabled to successfully defend themselves; and in spite of the amendment, in future will be enabled to protect themselves against any hostile legislation or hostile action, even on the part of the courts. The legislation which the amendment empowers Congress to enact, if taken advantage of at all, will, I have no doubt, be leveled against the associations and combinations of the working people who may be organized, or who are now organized, for the purpose of protecting themselves and their interests against the aggressions of accumulated and concentrated wealth.

It may not be amiss to call attention to the fact that there have been many efforts made in the history of the English-speaking peoples to crush out the organizations of the working people. The combinations among those having a common interest are numerous, and cover an infinite variety of purposes, such as churches, clubs, and other organizations for religious, social, and business purposes. The legality of such combination is conceded on common-law principle, and much encouragement has been and is furnished by statute for their formation; but, as to the combinations among wage-workers, there has been ofttimes the anomalous doctrine announced that these combinations are illegal and criminal conspiracies; but despite such efforts to wipe out the labor organizations by statute, they have been maintained. Under those adverse circumstances their maintenance was secret, and their methods necessarily unlawful. They emerged from that dark period and are now open and avowed, and their every act open to the keenest scrutiny of any opponent.

The origin of this supposed doctrine appears on a consideration of the social conditions that prevailed, particularly in England, for centuries, producing a series of statutes dated as far back as the fourteenth century, operating most oppressively upon the laboring classes, which doctrine has been transferred to the jurisprudence of our own country.

This doctrine found support in such decisions as King *vs.* Journeymen Tailors of Cambridge (1721).

This decision was followed in Hornby *vs.* Close (1867), holding combinations of workmen to be illegal. But the advance in public opinion is shown by the decision of the same court in the case of Farrer *vs.* Close (1869), the court now being equally divided on the question of the legality of such combinations.

As a result of the decision that the Boiler Makers and Iron Ship Builders, being a society "in restraint of trade," was an illegal body, rendered in the case of Hornby *vs.* Close (Queen's Bench, 1867), a royal commission was appointed, which, at the conclusion of its labors, recommended protective legislation for the trade unions. That recommendation was carried into effect by the trade-union act of 1871 (34 and 35 Victoria, chap. 31), the second and third clauses of which read as follows:

"The purpose of any trade union shall not, by reason merely that they are in restraint of trade, be deemed to be unlawful so as to render any member of such trade union liable to criminal prosecution for conspiracy.

"The purpose of any trade union shall not, by reason merely that they are in restraint of trade, be unlawful so as to render void or voidable any agreement or trust."

Maryland, in a statute, adopted the following progressive law:

"An agreement or combination by two or more persons to do or procure to be done any act in contemplation or furtherance of a trade dispute between employers and workmen shall not be indictable as a conspiracy if such act committed by one person would not be punishable as an offense; nothing in this section shall affect the law relating to riot, unlawful assembly, breach of the peace, or any offense against any person or against property."—Act of 1884; Code of 1888.

Following King *vs.* Journeymen Tailors of Cambridge (1721), such a combination was held illegal in People *vs.* Fisher (N. Y., 1835); but People *vs.* Fisher is not law in New York since the enactment of Penal Code, section 170.

In the same State the validity of such combinations has, as in England, been expressly declared by statutes, while the act of Congress (24 U. S. Stat. L.) authorized the incorporation of national trade unions.

Thus you will see that there has been a growing and more enlightened public sentiment crystallized into law regarding the lawful and natural and inherent rights of the wage-workers to organize and associate themselves together to improve their material, moral, and social conditions. The adoption of the proposed constitutional amendment would practically render all past efforts of the working people on this line nugatory, and with a stroke of the pen organizations of labor, having attained the position of lawful bodies, will be outlawed.

What, I ask you, do the men think who have in mind the suppression of the labor organizations would be the result if success attended their efforts and the workers were denied the lawful right to associate themselves in a lawful manner and in a lawful manner redress their grievances? All history attests to the fact that when people have been denied a lawful method to defend and protect themselves that they have then resorted to the means at their command.

If organized labor should be destroyed (and I have no doubt but that the amendment is really aimed to accomplish that purpose), it will throw every man upon his own resources; no man will be responsible to his fellows, and instead of a well-regulated, reasonable, intelligent, cohesive, and practical labor movement it would give place to chaos and anarchy in its worst accepted sense.

The amendment strikes at the individual liberty of the citizen and the constitutional guaranty and right of association; and I have too much confidence in the intelligence and good faith of the people of our country to believe that they will sanction such an unwarrantable, dangerous, and indefensible departure from the fundamental law of our country.

Very respectfully, yours,

SAML. GOMPERS,
President American Federation of Labor.

Hon. EDWIN R. RIDGELY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

This letter speaks for organized labor.

REPUBLICANS DODGE AND DECEIVE.

Is it not strange and suggestive, Mr. Speaker, that, in answer to the universal cry coming up from all classes of our people for protection against the abuses of corporations, trusts, and combines, our Judiciary Committee will not offer something more in harmony with the public demands?

In submitting this proposed amendment to our Federal Constitution our Committee on Judiciary have cunningly dodged the important provisions demanded by a large and growing number of our people, among which is the constitutional power to levy a graduated tax upon centralized wealth, in whatever form it may exist. As proof of this sentiment I cite the income-tax law, which was popular with the masses of all political parties, but which the Supreme Court decided could not be enforced without a change in our Constitution. But our committee seems determined that the people shall have no opportunity to amend the Constitution so as to carry out their will and judgment in the matter of taxation.

Some time ago I introduced a resolution proposing an amendment to section 9, Article I, of the Constitution, relating to taxation, which amendment reads as follows:

Congress may impose taxes on incomes, inheritances, corporations, corporate stocks and obligations, and estates of living persons, in excess of such exemptions as it shall deem reasonable, and may graduate the rate of taxation and impose higher rates per cent on large incomes, inheritances, and estates than on smaller ones.

My proposed amendment was referred to the Judiciary Committee, where it peacefully sleeps, and in all of the months our committee has stubbornly refused to report it, nor will they permit anyone to amend this abortive thing which they have reported; nor will the committee offer an amendment providing for a direct vote of the people in the election of United States Senators or the referendum privilege, by which the people can enact or repeal any law by direct popular vote.

The committee dare not give the people a chance to adopt constitutional amendments along these lines; nor will they permit us to enlarge our constitutional powers of public ownership and operation of public utilities. So afraid are they that the people's friends on this side will offer these amendments, they have smothered all privilege of amending their resolution. They know full well that if we on this side were permitted to offer amendments, they would be compelled to go on record with their opposition votes, thereby exposing to the country their determination to protect and shield the trusts and all forms of monopoly and centralized wealth. The Republican party as now organized and dominated is the special machine by which these great trust combinations are plundering the people and controlling the Government in every department.

CONGRESS HAS POWER NOW.

Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House contend that Congress has more power now to suppress trusts than it will use while under a Republican majority. The trouble is not so much in the lack of power; it is in the unfortunate fact that a majority of the people's representatives do not represent them, but instead, they continually aid these monopolies and shield them in their wicked plundering.

But, Mr. Speaker, we have another proof of the inconsistency of this Republican proposition. By the same rule under which we are considering this proposed constitutional amendment we are also to take up and pass House bill 10539, known as the anti-trust bill, also submitted to us with favorable recommendation by the Republican majority of our Judiciary Committee, being the same committee which submits this proposed constitutional amendment. The double absurdity is here exposed of saying first we must have a constitutional amendment before we can do anything with these trusts, and in the same breath and by this same rule asking us to legislate under the Constitution as it is; but these careful defenders of the trusts aim their proposed legislation against organized labor and the people, while pretending to restrain the trusts.

As we are also to consider this bill at this time, I will confine myself to the problem of needed anti-trust legislation, and first let me say that I shall vote for every amendment to this bill which has been offered by the Democratic minority, which amendments, I am glad to know, will have to be voted on by the House, one of the most important of which reads as follows:

Nothing in this act shall be so construed as to apply to trade unions or other labor organizations organized for the purpose of regulating wages, hours of labor, or other conditions under which labor is to be performed.

If this amendment to the pending bill is accepted by the House, I shall vote for the bill, and I predict now that when the roll call is taken and the Republican majority are compelled to go on record before organized labor and the country, they will vote for this amendment in the face of the fact that they have refused to report it with the bill, and the further fact of their determined opposition to it during the debate.

NO REMEDY IN THE AMENDMENT OR THE BILL.

However, Mr. Speaker, neither the adoption of the proposed constitutional amendment nor the enactment of this anti-trust bill will reach the seat of the trouble we seek to eradicate. To get out of this trouble of congested wealth and the extortions which it is imposing on our people, our legislation must be such as will accomplish two things.

A REMEDY OFFERED.

The first and most practicable at present is that of taxing this wealth in accordance with its ability to pay. This is the true spirit of equitable taxation, but we sadly fail to carry it out.

If, instead of the pending bill, the committee had reported the one which I introduced January 10 and which has been before them since that date (No. 5756), we would have before us something practical and effective which we could enforce even without amending the Constitution. I will read the bill to which I refer:

A bill (H. R. 5756) for raising revenue, and other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That after the 1st day of July, A. D. 1900, no corporation shall do business in the United States without first taking out a United States license, the fees for which shall be based on the amount of their capital stock and outstanding bonds combined.

Second. That two or more corporations, each one having a United States license in force, on which the fees have been paid in full, may combine their business and interests for the purpose of reducing their operating expenses and increasing their ability to command a better price for their products, by taking a special license, the fee for which shall be based on the aggregate stock and bonds of the participant corporations; the penalty for a corporation to do business without a license to be 1 per cent of its capital stock and bonded debt per week, and for a trust the penalty for a failure to comply with this law to be twice as much as for a single corporation and to be collected from the several corporations comprising the trust, in proportion to capital stock and bonded debt.

Third. The president or secretary of all corporations and of all trusts to make a quarterly statement to the Treasury Department, giving list of officers, a financial statement, and report of business operations.

Fourth. The fees for an annual license to be graduated according to the total amount of outstanding stock at par, plus any market premium, and bonds, and to be paid in quarterly installments by all corporations, and also by all trusts and combinations of corporations, as follows:

When the aggregate stock and bonds amount to less than $1,000,000, a tax of 1 per cent per annum; on $1,000,000 and not over $10,000,000, 1½ per cent; on $10,000,000 and not over $25,000,000, 2 per cent; all over $25,000,000 and not over $50,000,000, 2½ per cent; all over $50,000,000 and not over $100,000,000, 3 per cent; all over $100,000,000 and not over $150,000,000, 4 per cent; all over $150,000,000 and not over $200,000,000, 5 per cent; all over $200,000,000 and not over $250,000,000, 6 per cent; all over $250,000,000 and not over $300,000,000, 7 per cent; all over $300,000,000 and not over $400,000,000, 8 per cent; all over $400,000,000 and not over $500,000,000, 9 per cent; all over $500,000,000, 10 per cent.

Fifth. The Secretary of the Treasury shall make all necessary rules and regulations for assigning to the Internal Revenue Bureau the duty of enforcing this act.

If we will enact this bill into law we will at least compel these powerful combinations of capital to contribute to the nation's revenue a fair portion of the wealth they are enabled by their monopoly to unjustly extort from the people. This revenue will make it possible to put into operation the second provision, which is absolutely necessary to free the people from the poverty and slavery imposed upon them by greedy trusts and corporation combines.

CONSTRUCTIVE REMEDY BEST.

To succeed we must enter upon a constructive remedy, which will be much more potent in solving this problem than any effort to prevent, destroy, or break up great combinations of wealth, which under nature's economic law are absolutely necessary to the most successful accomplishment of production and distribution.

We can make certain this constructive remedy if we will but put into the hands of the people through public ownership the necessary instruments of production and distribution. Do this and they will take care of themselves without any restrictive legislation against trusts, as this will at once free them from the necessity of paying tribute to the trusts and will also enable the people to find ready employment with double present wages, as it will no longer be possible for the trusts to suppress wages and control both production and distribution.

CENTRALIZATION VS. DISTRIBUTION.

It is an indisputable fact that no person can actually produce more than a fraction of a million dollars in values during a lifetime. Then it must follow that if anyone is permitted to be the lawful owner of property amounting to millions of dollars in value, such owner has appropriated the title to the products of another's labor without giving an equivalent in value therefor.

If such results are permitted by law, we are legalizing injustice and robbery, which we have already done and are still doing, to the extent of producing millions of homeless and propertyless families, which are in evidence in every community throughout the nation, while a few multimillionaires go unrestrained but are legally aided in adding to their millions by increased spoliation of the people.

The great problem of temporal comfort in this life that confronts every being upon earth can be successfully solved by two acts, namely, the production and distribution of the things necessary to human life and comfort. These two acts are simple in their statement, but far-reaching and complex when we attempt to put them into successful operation over a great and extensive country like ours, the greatness of which makes possible equally extended human comforts and happiness if we correctly solve the problem of production and distribution.

In the matter of production alone we are making wonderful progress in every department. We have outstripped the world in quantity, quality, and variety; but in the second act—that of distribution—our system is an absolute failure. Instead of distributing the titles to our products it eternally centralizes them, until less than 10 per cent of our people own 90 per cent of all the values created by the present and all preceding generations. We find undeniable proof of this lamentable congestion of wealth, not only in the centralized ownership of all products of labor, but we also find by the census of 1890 (Abstract Eleventh Census, page 223) this alarming revelation of the centralized ownership of real estate:

Total number of homes in the United States.

Total number of families owning homes	2,923,671
Total number of families renting homes	4,999,302
Total number of families occupying homes	7,922,973

This table reveals the startling fact that of all the families occupying homes a little less than 37 per cent claim to be home owners, leaving 63 per cent home renters, while we discover by the same table that of the above reputed home owners 28 per cent of these homes were mortgaged, leaving but a trifle over 15 per cent of the families occupying homes actually owning the same.

Mr. Speaker, with this alarming condition before us is it any wonder that the great mass of our people are crying out for deliverance from the burdens imposed by a system which has robbed them of their homes and the products of their labor?

Negative legislation against trusts and corportions will not solve this problem, but in our efforts to check these greedy combinations we will discover that the real trouble lies deeper than the trusts, which are but the inevitable result and not the cause of this ruinous congestion of wealth.

REAL CAUSE OF OUR TROUBLE.

Looking deeper, we find this underlying principle in our productive and distributive system. The real cause of our trouble is this: We assume that all capital used in production and distribution must draw unto itself some per cent of increase. We force this payment of increase out of the products of human labor and the absorption of land titles by various methods known by the familiar names of interest, rents, profits, gain, etc.

We find on further inspection of this system and its operation that our official statistics reveal the fact that 10 per cent of our people, who own substantially all of the capital and instruments used in production and distribution, are taking from the other 90 per cent at the place of production over half of all newly created values; or, to state more clearly, the total earnings, or wages, of the 90 per cent army will not buy one-half of the property their labor creates, reckoned at wholesale values at the place of production, and not to exceed one-fourth in the retail markets.

While it is true the other half does not go to the immediate capital used by the laborers, it does go to the billions of capital which of necessity must be used in the collection of the materials necessary to production.

Analyzing this system further, we find it not only robs the producers of over half the values they create, but it brings disaster and failure upon the 10 per cent fellows who are getting the titles to the other half of all our productions.

The owners of the billions of capital we are using at first own the entire product, but admitting the total wages paid by them to the laborers will buy back half of the newly created values, these 10 per cent fellows find their real trouble begins at this point. Their great difficulty is to find customers able to buy the other half of their goods.

Every nation has an enormous surplus of products left over after its people have purchased to the last dollar of their wages. Hence our manufacturers are crying for a market, urging increased exportations, which can only be possible (in anything like adequate quantities) by exchanging our surplus productions for the surplus of other nations. Returning home with these, we find our people no better able to buy the goods brought in than they were those taken out. Hence the 10 per cent fellows are still in trouble, and we find them crying out "overproduction."

They next resort to shutting down their mills, mines, and factories to stop overproduction; but this, like their exportation, is also a flat failure, because in shutting down their productive

plants they cut off the wages of the people; hence they destroy their market simultaneously with the reduction of products.

Thus these 10 per cent fellows are involved in serious financial trouble. In their efforts to get out they are forming trusts. The 90 per cent fellows having legislated against this, the next and present effort of the 10 per cent fellows is to merge their entire capital and property into a few gigantic corporations. But when this is all accomplished they will still be unable to successfully continue this worn-out system of gathering tribute to capital for its use. It has only been possible to operate this system in the past by steadily absorbing the titles to all of the world's real estate, which has been the mighty values added to the people's earnings, which added value has alone made it possible for the people to buy the products of their own labor under this system.

This land value was originally a gift to the people from nature; hence their purchase power has been their earnings (wages) plus their credit (the latter a lien on their land). The two combined have enabled the people to purchase the products of their own labor, but this has only been possible by passing the titles of their lands over to the 10 per cent fellows. As proof of this we need only to cite the fact that the great centers of capital in the older nations, as well as in our own country, have ever been absorbing real-estate titles and driving an army of homeless people westward to seek lands. This process has gone on until it has finally belted the earth.

NO RELIEF FOR US IN ASIA.

We are now looking with longing eyes across the Pacific to the Asiatic shores, where the world's civilization first established this system of paying tribute to capital, and what do we find there? Ten to twenty times as many people per acre as we have here, with their wealth and land titles centralized to a greater extent than anywhere else upon earth, while their great army of laborers are reduced to the condition of serfs, starving by millions, their wages, when employed at all, being but a very few pennies per day; yet some foolishly believe that we can take our machinery over there, employ these serf laborers at 10 to 20 cents per day, and grow rich by throwing their products into the world's markets, which they say is the only outlet for the surplus productions of our laborers. If anyone believes our mad rush into Asia will bring relief to our congested civilization, he is doomed to serious and bitter disappointment.

No, Mr. Speaker, we can not force this old system much further. Already we hear the cry of overproduction again in our land, with our factories and mills shutting down and a nervous unrest in the camp of our capitalists as well as among our great army of laborers; and yet they call these prosperous times. In this statement they confess that they expect serious disaster just ahead, while we do nothing but keep up this eternal quarrel between the capitalists and laborers, each trying to force upon the other the greater burdens of this faulty and decaying system.

PUBLIC OWNERSHIP THE REMEDY.

We must find a solution for these troubles. The above analysis of their cause clearly indicates the remedy which can alone be found in the abolishment of all payments of increase to capital for its use in any form. We must find a way by which all the people can have free and voluntary access to, and use of, all necessary capital and instruments of production and distribution, without paying any increase whatever to their values. Public ownership of these instruments provides the way for this new and better system. We pay no interest, tribute, or increase to public capital.

Let us abolish our present system of bank issues and loaning of money and in its stead issue all money direct by the Government, a full legal tender, regardless of the material used in its coinage, create and issue a sufficient volume to effect all exchanges of titles to property upon a cash basis, put this money into circulation by paying it out in settlement of all governmental expenses, and abolish forever all interest-bearing bonds and all forms of private debts.

This will free labor from all tribute to capital in the form of money and make it possible to exchange and distribute titles to all property without the creation of debts.

The first act in distribution of property is to change the titles from the one having too much of an article to the one that has not enough. Money is the best instrument of account ever devised by man to exchange titles to property. There should be enough money to displace all use of credits and avoid all borrowing of money by the citizen.

The next step in distribution, after the change of titles, is to move the goods from the place of production to the place of consumption. Th s calls for the instruments of transportation, which should also be public. Therefore let us begin at once to establish a national system of transportation for all kind of goods as well as the necessary instruments of communication. Place these instruments subject to the voluntary use of all the people on equal terms, charging only what is sufficient to renew, repair, and operate. When we have done this we will be ready to open up our mills, mines, and factories as fast as their present owners shut them down.

The Government should buy these idle mills and instruments of production at their true values and permit the people to use them on such terms as would cover the cost of renewal and repair. If we will turn our legislation in this direction, we will find a speedy solution of all of these troubles, which manifest themselves at this time in the form of trusts and corporation monopolies, money lords, landlords, strikes, and lockouts.

By this new system we will restore universal prosperity among our people, give to every laborer more than double his present earnings, and, instead of this eternal legislation to keep the peace between capital and labor, we will create universal peace and prosperity, turn all of our idle soldiers and millionaires into the natural channel of production and distribution, lift our civilization to a much higher plane, forever settle these troubles, and make it possible for each individual citizen to supply himself with all things necessary to the highest possible development and realization of happiness.

Mr. Speaker, I am rejoiced to know that millions of our people are already turning their attention not only to the causes that produce trusts with all of their attending evils, but they are also seeking a permanent remedy which they believe can only be found by abolishing forever all tribute to capital for its use. This they have determined can best be accomplished by public ownership.

Our mechanics and wage-workers, through their labor organizations, are, in their study of the vital problem of production and distribution, rapidly coming to espouse public ownership, and as proof that our farmers also feel the burdens that monopoly is heaping upon them, and that they, too, have reached the same solution and look to public ownership as the way out, I will close my remarks by reading a paper written by a farmer in my own State, as presented to one of our agricultural institutes, which you will observe forcibly arraigns the trusts; and after presenting the hardships they impose upon the farmer, the paper closes advocating public ownership as their only escape. This able paper I will now present:

THE FARMER AND THE TRUSTS.

[Paper read before the Brown County Farmers' Institute, January 18, 1900, by Grant W. Harrington.]

"There will soon be a trust for every production and a master to fix the price for every necessity of life." Such was the prophecy made by John Sherman ten years ago, when the Senate was considering the trust question. One decade has been sufficient to see the fulfillment of the Senator's prophecy. There is to-day a trust for every production and a master who does fix the price of every necessity of life. From the individual producer to the partnership; from the partnership to the corporation; from the corporation to the pool; from the pool to the trust, the concentration of wealth has gone steadily on until a few individuals exercise absolute control over the business affairs of the nation. The trusts have now thrown off all form of combinations and assumed the dress of corporations. This gives them the standing of persons in the courts and enables them to laugh to scorn any public power that has yet been invoked against them.

More than one-fourth of the entire manufacturing capital of the country is now controlled by the trusts. The New York Investor in its issue of December 30, 1899, says there were 532 trusts, with a capital of over $8,000,000,000, organized during the years 1898 and 1899. Over three and a half millions of people now look to the trusts for employment. Such concentration of wealth and power is a menace to a free government and demands the earnest consideration of every man who loves his country and her free institutions.

The best definition of a trust I have yet seen is the one given by Senator CHANDLER in the January number of Munsey's Magazine. He defines it as:

"An association of separate individuals or corporations having in view the control of the production of some article of merchandise and the increase of its price to the consumer by preventing competition in the sale of the product." "Such a trust," he says, "is usually made up of a combination of corporations, because neither individuals nor partnerships are willing to invest sufficient capital to accomplish the monopoly of production and the suppression of competition. In addition to trusts composed of corporations there is another species of trust, namely, a single corporation of sufficient magnitude to take control of the whole production of the article of merchandise, crush out competition, and keep up the price."

The essential feature of the trusts is their monopolistic character. This was well put by Justice Sherwood, of Michigan, in a recent decision against the match trust, in which he says:

"The sole object of this corporation is to make money by having it in its power to raise the price of the article or diminish the quantity to be made and used at its pleasure. Thus both the supply of the article and the price thereof are made to depend upon the action of a half dozen individuals, more or less, to satisfy their cupidity and avarice, who may happen to have the controlling

interest in this corporation—an artificial person, governed by a single motive or purpose, which is to accumulate money regardless of the wants of or necessities of over sixty million people."

By their vast capital trusts are enabled to secure the greatest opportunities for economy, not only in the manufacture of goods, but also in the purchase of raw material and in the marketing of the finished products. These things enable them to practically regulate all competition and fix the price of their product with but little reference to competitors or the cost of production, but mainly with reference to securing the greatest net results. The farmer is the great consumer of the country, and the ability of the trusts to control the market enables them to take toll of every bushel of grain the farmer raises and of every pound of meat he puts upon the market, so that nothing could be more fitting in a gathering of farmers than a discussion of the "Relation of the Farmer and the Trusts."

I believe two propositions can be demonstrated:

First. The trusts have increased the prices of things the farmer has to buy.

Second. The trusts tend to depress the prices of raw material and so injure the farmer's market.

If these two propositions are true, then we are rapidly getting around to the point where the farmer should take Mrs. Lease's advice and begin to raise less corn and more hell.

Now, as to the first proposition, Have the trusts raised the prices of the things the farmer has to buy?

Let us call a few of the Hiawatha business men to the stand and see how they will answer the question.

HORACE AMANN. Axes, hammers, chisels, and everything in that line is controlled by the American Edged Tool Company, and they have advanced the price about 40 per cent. Copper goods have gone up 100 per cent. Barbed wire and nails have advanced 100 per cent. Glassware, 15 to 20 per cent. Granite, 25 to 50 per cent.

O. W. BROWN. Lumber is more than one-third higher than it was a year ago. Some grades have advanced more than 50 per cent. A few men are securing control of all the desirable timber lands, and this puts them in a position to make any prices they see fit.

FRANK CASE. Farm wagons cost about $6 apiece more now than they did a year ago. Buggies cost from five to ten dollars more.

ED ZIMMERMAN. Horseshoes and horseshoe nails have gone up until it now costs me about 20 cents more to shoe a team of horses than it did a year ago.

HILL BROTHERS. Nails have gone up from 2 cents to 4¼ cents. Barbed wire has risen from $1.75 to $4.30 per hundred pounds. Tin plates have risen from $7.75 to $10.60 a box. Stoves have increased 40 per cent in cost. Farm machinery has risen 25 per cent. Shovels, hoes, rakes, and that class of goods have gone up 50 per cent.

J. T. GRIMES. Galvanized pipe has risen from 11 cents, in Kansas City, to 17 cents. Wire fence has risen from 28 to 35 cents per rod. Cypress lumber for tanks has gone from $32 to $42 per thousand. The material in a 10-barrel galvanized stock tank will cost at least 50 cents more to-day than it did a year ago.

M. E. YOST. Furniture has advanced from 15 to 20 per cent. Every new list shows an advance. Carpets and linoleums have gone up from 5 to 10 per cent. Coffins and undertaking supplies have advanced fully 10 per cent.

MINER & STEVENS. There is practically nothing in the trust line of goods that has not advanced. Glass has gone up 30 per cent, linseed oil 25 per cent, and wall paper 30 per cent.

HAL FAIRCHILD. There is nothing in my line but that has increased in price. Iron pipe has doubled in price. Bath tubs have increased from 10 to 15 per cent. Boilers and radiators have gone up from 20 to 30 per cent.

J. C. KELSEY. Prices have gone up 25 to 50 per cent in the harness business in the last six months. Leather is up about 30 per cent, deer-hair pads for horse collars 40 per cent, horse collars 20 per cent, and fur robes 25 per cent.

H. P. WELSH. Clothing has advanced from 15 to 25 per cent. The advance is very noticeable on all goods controlled by trusts.

HENRY HAMANN. There has been an advance on shoes. One lot that I have just duplicated has risen from $1.85 to $2.10 in four months.

W. M. SMITH. Oil and gasoline have jumped from 2 to 3 cents per gallon. Matches have gone from $1.25 a case to $1.55. A tobacco which cost 14 cents last year now costs 33 cents.

LEVI OGLE. There has been an average advance of 12½ per cent on rubber goods. Fleeced underwear has advanced 25 per cent in sixty days. Cotton fleeced goods have advanced 20 per cent. The broom-corn trust has advanced the price of the brush since it left the farmers' hands $100 per ton. The result is two advances on brooms, amounting to $1.75 per dozen.

Such testimony could be prolonged indefinitely, but this is certainly enough to prove the proposition.

Who is getting the benefit of this rise in prices?

Henry Clews, the recognized mouthpiece of Wall street, in a recent letter says that commodities have advanced 15 per cent on the average and that wages have advanced 5 per cent. What has become of the other 10 per cent? Manifestly it went to the holders of the trust stock. The average Brown County farmer will not kick very much about the 5 per cent which labor receives, but he has good grounds for kicking about the 10 per cent which capital has appropriated.

Now, as to the second proposition: Do the trusts tend to lower the prices of raw material and so injure the farmer's market?

Let us call Secretary Coburn, of the State board of agriculture, to the stand and see what has happened in Brown County in the past ten years. His testimony will show that wheat, corn, and oats are all lower in price to-day than the average price has been for the last ten years. Let us take them up one at a time, beginning with 1890, the year when Congress decided that the trusts had reached sufficient magnitude to call for some sort of regulation:

WHEAT.

Year.	Average price.	Year.	Average price.
	Cents.		*Cents.*
1890	93	1896	50
1891	80	1897	70
1892	60	1898	60
1893	50	1899	55
1894	42		
1895	60	Average for 10 years	62

The average price for the ten years has been 62 cents per bushel. To-day the best grade of wheat is selling in Brown County for 55 cents, or 7 cents per bushel less than the average price for the last ten years.

"What we want," said a member of the Millers' Trust, "is cheaper wheat and dearer flour." How they get it is well told by John A. McGuire, of the Hiawatha Mills, who says:

"I am satisfied that the cracker trust has reduced the price of soft wheat at least 5 cents per bushel. Before the trust was formed there was competition and when the Hiawatha Mill had a car of soft wheat on hand we asked for a bid and the wheat went where it would bring the most money. Now one man in Chicago buys all the wheat for the trust factories and I am satisfied that the trust figures on getting its flour at the cost of the wheat and that they do not propose to let the miller have anything for grinding it. This forces the miller to reduce the price of soft wheat to the farmer.

In this connection it will be interesting to note that the legislature of Minnesota appointed a committee in 1892 to investigate the wheat combine and that the committee reported that the evidence it had secured tended to show that the price was 6½ cents per bushel below what it ought to be.

Let us next see what has happened to corn during this same period. Mr. Coburn's biennial reports show:

CORN.

Year.	Average price.	Year.	Average price.
	Cents.		*Cents.*
1890	42	1896	16
1891	38	1897	18
1892	32	1898	24
1893	28	1899	25
1894	34		
1895	26	Average for 10 years	28.2

The average price for the ten years has been 28.2 cents per bushel. To-day No. 2 corn is selling in Brown County for 24 cents. This is 4.2 lower than the average price for ten years.

Oats too in sympathy with wheat and corn have taken a slump. The Coburn reports show:

OATS.

Year.	Average price.	Year.	Average price.
	Cents.		*Cents.*
1890	33½	1896	12
1891	26	1897	29
1892	25	1898	20
1893	21	1899	18
1894	26		
1895	19	Average for 10 years	22.90

The average price for the ten years is a fraction less than 23 cents per bushel. Good bright oats are selling in Brown County to-day for 18 cents, or 5 cents less than the average price for ten years. Do not forget in this connection that the oatmeal trust

has put up the price of the finished product more than a hundred per cent.

If the rise in commodities is a natural and a legitimate one, why is it that the farmer's product has not kept pace with it and gone up instead of down?

Horses have also gone down in value, according to Secretary Coburn:

HORSES.

Year.	Average price.	Year.	Average price.
1890	$80	1896	$25
1891	70	1897	33
1892	65	1898	33
1893	52	1899	42
1894	32		
1895	28	Average for 10 years	44

The average value for the ten years has been $44 per head. Last year, notwithstanding the fact that the horse supply was short, his average value was only $42.

Cattle have gone up in price, according to the same authority.

CATTLE OTHER THAN MILCH COWS.

Year.	Average price.	Year.	Average price.
1890	$16.00	1896	$21.00
1891	17.00	1897	24.00
1892	17.00	1898	26.00
1893	17.00	1899	27.00
1894	18.00		
1895	19.00	Average per head	20.20

At the beginning of the decade a select committee from the United States Senate was examining into the cattle business. That committee found that the cattle market was controlled by "The Big Four," of Chicago, and that under the influence of that combine the price of cattle had gone down. The business had become so unprofitable that hundreds of men quit it and hurried their breeding stuff onto the market. When the reaction set in it was found that the supply of cattle was short everywhere, and ten years has not been enough to bring the supply back where it equals the demand. When we take this into consideration and remember that one war is just over and that two more are in progress the only wonder is that beef prices are not higher than they are.

When beef is high there is supposed to be a greater demand for pork, but the Coburn figures show that the Brown County hog has not kept pace with the "beef steer and his sister."

SWINE.

Year.	Average value per head.	Year.	Average value per head.
1890	$8.00	1896	6.50
1891	6.00	1897	$5.00
1892	6.00	1898	4.50
1893	7.50	1899	6.00
1894	7.00		
1895	5.50	Average for 10 years	5.81¼

We are told in glowing headlines every day of wonderful prosperity of the country, but it is certainly evident from these figures that the farmer is not getting his share of it. The trusts look upon him as their lawful prey, and they pluck him accordingly. Prof. John F. Crowell, of New York, presented figures before the Industrial Commission the other day showing that in manufacturing the annual product per capita was $393, in mining $740, and in farming only $290.

My farmer friends, you are up against it. What do you propose to do about it? If a vote was taken here to-day as to whether the farmers here assembled were opposed to the trusts, every one of you would vote "aye," but what is your remedy? It has been well said that he who shoots at nothing always hits it. What are you aiming at?

Are you in favor of national control? We have tried that. Congress in 1890 passed an anti-trust law and the courts said in substance that these vast corporations were creatures of the State, and that Congress had no power to outlaw a business which the State declared was legitimate. Corporations, you know, are citizens, and as such are entitled to all the rights and privileges accorded to a Brown County farmer. There is no limit to the amount of property they may buy and hold, and the law can not take mere size into consideration when dealing with them.

Are you in favor of a national commission to regulate the trusts? We have had an interstate railway commission clothed with power to regulate the great railroad trusts of the country, and in its last report the members threw up their hands and acknowledged their inability to cope with existing circumstances.

Listen to their tale of woe:

"We are satisfied from investigations conducted during the past year * * * and from information which is perfectly convincing to a moral intent, that a large part of the business at the present time is transacted upon illegal rates. Indeed, so general has this rule become that in certain quarters the exaction of the published rate is the exception. From this two things naturally and frequently result. First, gross discriminations between individuals and gross preferences between localities; and these discriminations and preferences are almost always in favor of the strong and against the weak. There is probably no one thing to-day which does so much to force out the small operator, and to build up those trusts and monopolies against which law and public opinion alike beat in vain, as discrimination in freight rates. Second, the business of railroad transportation is carried on to a very large extent in conceded violations of law.

"Men who in every other respect are reputable citizens are guilty of acts which, if the statute law of the land were enforced, would subject them to fine or imprisonment. This is true both of the traffic operator and the shipper. It is difficult to estimate the moral effect of such a condition of things upon a great section of the community, and almost impossible to believe that it can be allowed to continue without some attempt at reformation. This condition the present law is powerless to control."

Do you favor State control? Kansas has had a little experience along that line. She, too, had been trying to regulate the railroads of the State; but to-day the question of railroad legislation is still agitating the farmer and the stock raiser, and they are asking for some power that will compel equitable treatment.

Our sister State, Nebraska, passed a maximum freight bill, saying what the roads of the State should charge for hauling the farmers' grain to market, and the Supreme Court of the United States gravely declared that the roads were entitled to make money and that the State could not pass a law reducing the rates below the point where the roads could pay expenses, interest on their bonds, and have something left.

Kansas passed a law regulating the Kansas City stock yards, and that gigantic corporation went into the Federal courts to resist the new rates, alleging that not compensatory, and the court acting along the same lines as the Nebraska decision, appointed a master to take testimony to see how much money the corporation could make under the new rates. Kansas also passed a law reducing telegraph charges, and an obliging Federal judge declared it unconstitutional.

Kansas also passed laws known as the scrip and screen laws to secure justice for the coal miners of Kansas, but it is notorious that they have been evaded at every turn. The experience of Kansas ought to be enough to convince us that the State can not regulate something it does not own.

The end of business is to make money. Corporations have no souls, and whatever the trusts want from legislators, courts, assessors, and public prosecutors they will get if they can and pay for it. They will buy exemption from molestation from party bosses when they must. They will run conventions and concern themselves in elections. They will subsidize newspapers, bribe voters, buy legislators, and spread corruption wherever their financial interests seem to demand it.

What, then, is the remedy? There is but one, and that is Government and State ownership. Your cities have pointed the way. Municipal ownership of public utilitiesare every where replacing private monopolies. You can scarcely pick up a daily paper in which you do not read of some city which has just voted to own its own waterworks, electric-light plants, gas works, street railways, or some similar business. So rapidly is this idea growing that you can scarcely mention any line of business, from running a newspaper to manufacturing locomotives, thrashing machines, and other heavy machinery, which some city in this or some other country is not trying and trying successfully.

This is the road along which the people must march in doing battle with the trusts. The State and the nation must supplement and extend the work of the cities. The Government must carry the farmer's grain and his cattle and his hogs as well as his newspaper and his letters. While the railroads remain in private hands they will continue to furnish special privileges to the big shipper to the detriment of the little one. An equal and exact justice to all, with special privileges to none, can not be secured as long as these great highways are left in private hands. With this great bulwark taken away from the trusts, if competition does not then regulate the question, then the Government must go on, step by step, appropriating the mines of the country, the mills, the factories, the packing houses, and all instruments of collective industry, until the last vestige of private monopoly has been succeeded by public ownership.

Mr. Speaker, just one minute more. It is clear to everyone present that the Republican managers here do not intend or

expect to really pass any legislation against trusts and monopolies; they are in too close partnership with them.

All this noise just at the close of this session is a cheap play to fool the people. The proposed constitutional amendment is too absurd to ever be submitted to the States.

The bill before us under the rule will pass here and slumber in the Senate as a convenient reference during the campaign, but it will never be permitted to pass so long as Republicans control Congress. It will not pass the Senate, but the people will not be fooled; they know you can stop the trusts but you will not.

Pensions.

SPEECH

OF

HON. CYRUS A. SULLOWAY,

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, May 7, 1900.

The House having under consideration the bill (S. 1477) amending sections 2 and 3 of an act entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents," approved June 27, 1890—

Mr. SULLOWAY said:

Mr. SPEAKER: It seems idle, perhaps sophomorical, to stand here and waste time in the discussion of a bill that nobody opposes. I want to say that I am in favor of this bill without any "ifs" or "ands." I want to say further that it is not a committee bill.

Questions have been asked as to why we did not report this or that, and in reply I will say that this bill is the child of the Grand Army, born of their wish, and we bring it to you to-day without dotting an "i" or crossing a "t." They believe, and their representatives who were clothed with authority to appear before the Senate committee and before the House committee believe, that it will bring the relief that is desired by those men who are entitled to relief and who were their comrades on bloody fields.

Now, to satisfy you of that fact I want to read a passage from what took place at the hearings before the Senate committee. The hearings before our committee were not reported. The chairman of the Senate committee, Senator GALLINGER, put this question to Mr. Patrick, who represented the Grand Army on that occasion.

As a final question, and for the purpose of having this matter distinctly understood, let me ask you if the committee of the Senate is correct in the supposition that if the act of June 27, 1890, is so amended as to specifically provide that these minor disabilities shall be aggregated, and that the widows shall be pensionable who are without means of support other than their daily labor, and an income not exceeding $250 per year, the Grand Army will be entirely satisfied?

Now listen to Mr. Patrick's reply:

Mr. PATRICK. Yes, sir; we shall be entirely satisfied. We criticise no other inequalities, and we ask nothing more than the two amendments referred to; they not to change existing law, but merely to change the phraseology so that it may plainly read as Congress originally intended and not be susceptible of two widely diverse constructions.

And I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that this bill does not change existing law, save only that it declares with reference to widows that an income of $250 shall not prevent the granting of a pension, whereas after the enactment of June 27, 1890, of which this is but declaratory of the meaning thereof, they were pensioned when their incomes were $300. As to disabilities, Congress, in March, 1895, in an appropriation bill enacted into law the following:

And it is further provided, That from and after the passage of this act all pensioners now on the roll who are pensioned at less than $6 per month for any degree of pensionable disability shall have their pensions increased to $6 per month, and that hereafter, whenever any applicant for a pension would under existing law prior to the passage of the act of 1890 be entitled to less than $6 for any single disability or several disabilities combined, such pensioner shall be rated at not less than $6 per month.

Now, what the Grand Army complain of is this, that men are not properly rated, that the disabilities of claimants are not aggregated; and it is a truthful complaint. It is a complaint that was born under the last Administration and one that continues to-day. It is idle to deny it. Why, when that committee called on the Commissioner and asked him whether or not he aggregated the ratings, he assured them that he combined them, and sent out into another room and had some papers brought in cases that were adjudicated the day before, and the first one, as I am informed, that they took up demonstrated that their complaints were well founded.

Here was a man whose medical examination showed that the applicant was disabled to the extent of 50 per cent in the use of his right shoulder from crepitus, and for that he was rated nine-eighteenths. For another disability he was rated six-eighteenths, for another six-thirtieths, and yet that applicant's claim, notwithstanding the ratings showed him to be a total wreck (eighteen-eighteenths), was rejected. That is what the Grand Army complain of, and they believe that this mandate of this Congress, re-enacted explicitly in the language that is put into this bill, will produce a change in the Pension Bureau.

Mr. CURTIS. Don't you know that in that hearing before the Senate committee the Commissioner said he combined disabilities, but did not combine ratings? And in this bill all you ask him to do is to combine disabilities. If he combines disabilities now, what do you make by passing this bill?

Mr. SULLOWAY. Well, my good friend from Kansas, while I do not care to talk about it here, I think the old soldiers have a kindly sort of feeling toward me, and I rather think that in my short life I have been rather friendly toward them; but I want to say to you that you can not pen language stronger or more explicit in the English language than that used in this bill if it is obeyed, and if you have a Commissioner of Pensions who will not obey the mandates of Congress it is idle to enact statutes.

Now, let us see what we have here on page 2 of this bill, beginning with line 11:

Proportioned to the degree of inability to earn a support; and in determining such inability each and every infirmity shall be duly considered, and the aggregate of the disabilities shown be rated.

Can you use language that will express more than that? It is clear and plain. There is no ambiguity; it is capable of but one construction.

It provides that each and every infirmity shall be considered and rated, and that the ratings shall be aggregated. Words can not make clearer the duty of the chief of that bureau.

And if that language, when enacted into law, is to be disobeyed, if the Commissioner neglects and refuses to rate as the law directs him to do, Congress can do no more. The sovereign remedy is in the hands of another Department of this Government.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Will my friend permit me to make a suggestion?

Mr. SULLOWAY. Certainly.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. You can make it a good deal stronger by putting in the words "shall be rated as of service origin." If you want to strengthen the language, put that in and there will be no escape.

Mr. SULLOWAY. What difference does it make whether it is of service origin or of some other origin, under the act of 1890, if he has the disability?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. That would narrow it instead of enlarging it. That would be a limitation.

Mr. SULLOWAY. As suggested by the gentleman from Maine, it would narrow it instead of enlarging it.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Oh, no.

Mr. SULLOWAY. It certainly would. The act of 1890 is for the benefit of soldiers who do not trace, and are not required to prove, their disabilities to be of service origin, though in an overwhelming majority of cases the disabilities are in fact due to exposure and hardship endured when in the service.

Mr. STEELE. If the gentleman will allow me to suggest, I should like to have the following changes made: Strike out the word "not," at the end of line 9, page 2, and the word "exceeding," at the beginning of line 10, page 2, and then strike out, beginning at the word "and," in line 10, "and not less than $6 per month, proportioned to the degree of inability to earn a support," and then, in line 13, beginning with the word "and," strike out the words "and the aggregate of the disabilities should be rated;" so that it will read:

And be entitled to receive a pension of $12 per month; and in determining such inability each and every infirmity shall be duly considered, and such pension shall commence from the date of the filing of the application in the Bureau of Pensions, after the passage of this act, upon proof that the disability or disabilities then existed, and shall continue during the existence of the same.

Mr. SULLOWAY. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. STEELE] very well understands that that would enact into law an increase of the pension of every man who draws six dollars and make it twelve.

Mr. STEELE. That is what I am trying to get at—a disability pension.

Mr. SULLOWAY. That would be the result if the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana were adopted. The veterans of the civil war do not ask that. They do not ask for legislation that will enlarge their rights in that respect. They are content with the existing law, construed as the language used demands, and honestly administered. This bill does not change in spirit existing law so far as it relates to invalid pensions or claims for invalid pensions. It is a reenactment, in explicit language, of existing law.

It is a declaration by Congress, a mandate, that the chief of the Bureau of Pensions should not disregard, disobey, or defy. It is the voice of 75,000,000 of people speaking through their Representatives clothed with authority to make laws. It grants to at least a million men, who were the flower of the Federal army from 1861 until General Lee's surrender, certain rights, namely, the

right to receive from the Government that they and their comrades by their valor preserved and perpetuated in contests on bloody fields for years with as heroic men as ever wielded swords or drew a bead, pension: that pension to be not less than $6 nor more than $12 per month, according to their disability, rank not to be considered, the private and the general to fare alike.

The Commissioner of Pensions refuses, I understand, to pay them that were orphans, made so by the death of their fathers in defense of their country, the pittance of $2 per month that the Government allowed them as pension from the cradle, if they were there when the father was killed or died in the service, until they should become sixteen years of age. They were then under disability as minors. They could not, if they knew that they were entitled, obtain the pension. Not one in a thousand, probably, of those that did not receive it ever knew until they had grown to manhood or womanhood that they were entitled to it; to that pittance which, as a matter of law, belongs to them as clearly as the salary of the Commissioner of Pensions belongs to him at the end of each month, and which is denied them and withheld; and we stand before the world repudiating our obligations, created by statute, and which morally and sacredly could not be more binding.

For his country the father died. We promised, and wrote upon the statute of the United States, that we would pay to his little helpless children $2 per month until they became 16 years of age; and to-day, and for months and years, as I am informed and believe, the chief of that Bureau, in defiance of the statute, has refused to pay them, who were powerless to recover what belonged to them when minors, because that, in the chapter of accidents and in the providence of God, they did not starve or freeze, but lived to be 16 years of age. This is the treatment meted out to them whose fathers on some bloody field left them helpless, to be cared for as objects of charity.

If individuals as a whole had been as destitute of respect for what duty and honesty demand at their hands, and had refused to aid them, and had withheld, as the Commissioner of Pensions does, what law, duty, and decency demand that they have as a matter of right, purchased with their father's blood, there would be no claims of that character pending in the Bureau of Pensions to-day. Death would have relieved this poor, weak people of the obligation to pay them the sum of 6⅔ cents per day, with which to purchase care, comfort, medical attendance, and education from the cradle until 16 years of age.

In the name of justice and in behalf of these claimants and the honor of the United States, I protest against any further withholding of pensions to this class of claimants. Such a course ought to mantle the cheek of every patriotic American with a crimson tinge of shame. It is abhorrent to every principle of law and justice and to the wishes of a patriotic people. I have drawn a bill making it mandatory upon the Commissioner of Pensions to pay these claimants.

The amount paid annually for pensions is rapidly decreasing. It was $6,296,826 less for the year 1899 than for the year 1898. No legislation that will ever be had will, looking to the payment of pensions in the future, require an annual appropriation of $144,651,000—the amount appropriated in 1898—unless it provides for the rerating and equalizing of pensions since the adoption of Order 225. To do that would require $40,000,000.

For five years past the average annual decrease of the roll has been 43,492, by death and other causes. The annual decrease of the names of invalids from the rolls by death is 27,000.

Since the close of the fiscal year 1894 there have been dropped from the rolls, for death and other causes, 255,572 names. The annual dropping from the rolls by reason of death and other causes lessens the amount to be paid about $5,500,000 annually.

As I have stated, the actual decrease for the year 1899 was $6,296,826 less than was paid in 1898.

It is estimated that of the 2,778,304 men who engaged in the struggle for the preservation of the Union during the civil war, 999,000 are living in the year 1900. Of that number, 742,476 were on the pension rolls June 30, 1899, leaving 256,872 survivors of that conflict not pensioned.

It is estimated that at least 20 per cent of those not pensioned would for various reasons never apply for pension.

It is more than probable that if an act were passed granting a pension to all the survivors of that conflict who served ninety days and had been honorably discharged, it would add less than 200,000 names to the pension rolls.

I believe that the time has come when we should make provision for pensioning every Union soldier who participated in that conflict. I have prepared a bill providing that every officer or enlisted man in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States who served ninety days or more and has an honorable discharge from the service, and who is or may become 62 years of age, shall be pensioned for senility at $6 per month; that those who are or who may become 65 years of age shall be pensioned at $8 per month; that those who are or who may become 68 years of age shall be pensioned at $10 per month, and that those who are or who may become 70 years of age shall be pensioned at $12 per month.

The following tables, prepared by Gen. F. C. Ainsworth, Chief of the Record and Pension Office of the War Department, will show the number of survivors who will become 62 years of age until all have reached that age:

TABLE No. 1.—TOTAL SURVIVORS.

Showing the probable total number of survivors of the war of the rebellion (excluding deserters) on June 30 of each year from 1890 to 1910, inclusive, and at the close of each quinquennial period thereafter until none shall remain.

Year.	Survivors.	Year.	Survivors.
1890	1,285,471	1904	858,002
1891	1,261,232	1905	820,687
1892	1,236,076	1906	782,732
1893	1,209,968	1907	744,196
1894	1,182,889	1908	705,197
1895	1,154,810	1909	665,832
1896	1,125,725	1910	626,231
1897	1,095,628	1915	429,727
1898	1,064,524	1920	251,727
1899	1,032,418	1925	116,073
1900	999,339	1930	37,033
1901	965,313	1935	6,206
1902	930,380	1940	340
1903	894,585	1945	0

TABLE No. 2.—*Survivors becoming 62 years of age.*

Showing the probable number, June 30, 1899, of the survivors of the war of the rebellion (excluding deserters), the number who will be 62 years of age, or over, on that date; also the number who will attain 62 years of age after 1899, with the year in which they will reach that age.

Probable number of survivors in 1890 1,285,471
Probable number of survivors in 1890 62 years of age or over 149,591

Will live to be 62 years old.		Will live to be 62 years old.	
In year—	Number of men.	In year—	Number of men.
1891	20,817	1901	62,414
1892	22,602	1902	70,799
1893	24,891	1903	80,234
1894	27,480	1904	90,733
1895	30,530	1905	106,043
1896	34,073	1906	97,836
1897	38,203	1907	44,747
1898	43,025	1908	5,672
1899	48,611	1909	820
1900	55,042		

As more than three-quarters of all the survivors are now drawing pensions, only one-quarter of those who become 62 years of age would become pensioners if the bill prepared shall become a law. This year—1900—55,042 will become 62 years of age, three-quarters of whom are now on the roll. There would be 13,760 added to the roll as beneficiaries under the proposed enactment, about one-half as many as are dropped from the roll of invalid pensioners by death and other causes annually.

In no year would the names added by reason of the passage of the bill equal the number dropped from the roll of invalid pensioners.

Under existing law officers are retired when they become 62 years of age. Why should not the remainder of that vast army that did so much for man and humanity be recognized and receive a pittance, if they elect to apply for it, during the few remaining days they have to live? Who in this land will object?

The flower of that great army who are pensioned to-day are on the roll under the act of June 27, 1890. Many of them are men who had no hospital record. They had nerve, endurance, and lion hearts. If unable to stand when the roll was called, they shouted "Here!" When the bugle called, they jumped into line with their comrades.

By night and by day, in sunshine and in storm, amid the smoke of battle where shells burst, minies hissed, and solid shot mowed down their comrades, they stood firm beneath the crack of the enemy's musketry, the roar of his artillery, and quailed not at the impetuosity of his charge. If Abraham Lincoln, who called these men to the conflict, were a member of this House, does anyone doubt that he would vote to pension them? If Grant, Sherman, Sheridan, McClellan, Hooker, Heintzelman, Sedgwick, Rosecrans, Howard, Logan, Sickles, and the other great commanders were members of this House, which side of this question they would be on no one can doubt. Almost every man who for any time participated in that terrible conflict where Americans were contending with Americans, by exposure incident to the service, exhausted his nerve force and physical strength and is prematurely old to-day.

When their duty in the field had been performed they went home with the same heroic determination to fight the battle of life that had made them the flower of the army in the field. They

asked no favors and made no applications for pension. After a time the store of nerve force and physical strength they had became exhausted, causing them to surrender. Men of iron, who were always at the front when cannon talked, could no longer compete in the struggle of a busy life with those who stayed at home and enjoyed the comforts thereof while they were enduring the exposures and the hardships incident to a soldier in the field. Let us provide a system of pensioning these men that will do away with the expense of special examiners and make it impossible for the medical referee in the Bureau of Pensions to deprive them of what the law gives. No one of these should ever suffer for the necessaries of life or be an object of local or individual charity. They are the wards of the nation and should be cared for from the National Treasury.

It seems to me that he who opposes this is as destitute of the light flashed down from Calvary two thousand years ago as the Dead Sea is of live ashes.

If we are to relieve these claimants, alleviate their sufferings, and recognize the sacrifices they made, we must act while they live. It will not comfort them to visit their graves with a flood of tears and a handcart full of bouquets. Aid them now and make dry that brave old warrior's cheek now moist with tears born of suffering, with the necessaries of life that will cheer him with comfort on his way to the grave.

"Loot the Treasury!" There was never uttered a more infamous libel, a more wanton and barbarous attack upon any class of men than the assault upon the soldiers of the civil war that they desire to "loot the Treasury." Men who left home as beardless boys, or as husbands or fathers, in response to the call of Abraham Lincoln, entered the service, and were shot at for years for $13 a month, and a considerable part of the time received their pay in a currency worth less than 50 cents on the dollar; preserved this Government; purchased for all who live under our flag to-day all the blessings we enjoy that come from government; and now, decrepit, aged, diseased, suffering physical pains and mental anguish, these men ask for a pittance; and some sordid, soulless brute shouts, "They want to loot the Treasury!" Such creatures are destitute of patriotic impulses, dead to humanity, and barren of every shadow of love and gratitude, and if some man undertakes to aid in preparing papers for helpless orphans, widows in mourning, and old warriors crippled and in distress, to make application for pension, he is denounced as a shark, a land pirate, and a claim agent.

The act of March 2, 1895, provided that from and after the passage of said act—

all pensioners now on the rolls who are pensioned at less than $6 per month for any degree of pensionable disability shall have their pensions increased to $6 per month; and that hereafter, whenever any applicant for pension would, under existing ratings, be entitled to less than $6 for any single disability, or several combined disabilities, such pensioner shall be rated at not less than $6 per month.

To me it seems that that law has been disregarded and defied from its passage until this day. Congress intended, and by legislation said, that every soldier entitled to a rating giving him any pension should receive $6 per month. Instead of increasing the pension and giving the soldier the benefit of that act, the practice at the Pension Bureau has been to reject a claim under the act of June 27, 1890, unless the rating for disability would give the claimant a pension under the general law of $10 per month; and in thousands of cases disabilities, and ratings for disabilities, have not been aggregated, as I contend the law directs, and the claimants have been refused a pension who are clearly entitled, and who would be in receipt of a pension to-day if their claims had been adjudicated as the law provides.

I am earnestly in favor of the provision, when amended as we have proposed, which directs the chief of the Pension Bureau to grant pensions under the act of June 27, 1890, to widows who have a net income of not more than $250 per year.

When the act of June 27, 1890, was passed, the law was administered fairly and pensions were granted to widows with an income of $300. I know of no reason why any sum should be named or any amount of income should bar the widow. The soldier, if possessed of a million dollars (and I wish no one of them had less), would be entitled to pension at the same rate that he would be if he was not possessed of a penny.

I believe that there are no more worthy or deserving persons whose names are on the roll of pensioners to-day than the widows who were the wives of soldiers during the war. Mentally, they suffered a million times more than the soldiers in the field, and especially was that true of the wife and mother. The soldier knew his condition. The mother never kissed her children to bed at night knowing whether they were orphans, whether the father was wounded and bleeding on some battlefield, or was captured and on his way to some Confederate prison to starve. When a battle like Gettysburg was being fought, and every tick of the wire told of the terrible slaughter, the wife and mother suffered more than the lion-hearted warrior, who thought only of duty and victory. As the wife read the daily papers and ran her eyes down over the list of killed and wounded, the little ones at her knee, watching the expression of her countenance, and looking into her eyes moist with tears, asked, "Is papa dead, mamma? Is papa killed?"

Only the God of matchless love, who reads all hearts, can ever know the agony such mothers endured. He who would deny to such widows, or deprive them of, the pittance of $8 per month pension because they have, in the providence of God, a little property, would, had he been present, have agreed to the objection that was made to the anointing of the Saviour's feet, and would have insisted that the ointment should be sold and the proceeds put into the treasury. As I view it, such, if any there be, are devoid of gratitude, destitute of patriotism, barbarous and inhuman. My conviction of what duty demands is that any woman who was the loyal wife of a soldier during the war should, at any time thereafter, if she be a widow, upon proof of that fact, have her name written on the roll of pensioners; and I care not if she has had as many husbands as Solomon had wives, when she is a widow she should receive a pension.

The President favors the passage of this bill, and in his annual message recommended a change by statute that will overturn the ruling of the Pension Bureau which denied to widows a pension when they had an income amounting to $96 a year, directing that widows whose actual net income does not exceed $250 shall be pensioned.

That recommendation evidenced the loyalty and thoughtful remembrance by President McKinley of the widows of the brave men who were his comrades in arms. It was a noble and a patriotic act, and where he leads, we will follow.

All will remember an address that he made to his comrades of the Grand Army of the Republic who visited him at his home in Canton in 1896.

I can not quote it from memory, but in substance it was as follows:

After welcoming them kindly, he said: When the war closed the nation owed two great debts, one to those who loaned it the money to enable it to feed and clothe its soldiers and provide them with arms and munitions of war. That debt, said he, is substantially paid. The great debt the nation owes to-day is to the men who, with arms in their hands, defended our flag and preserved and perpetuated our Government. That debt must and shall be paid. The great heart of the nation throbs with gratitude to its defenders. Duty and patriotism alike demand that we care for all who are in want and for the widows and orphans of those who fell on the field or have since died from wounds received or disease contracted while in the service.

In substance, he declared that all such are the wards of the nation, and should be cared for out of the national Treasury rather than by local or individual charity.

Does anyone doubt the sincerity of President McKinley? Does anyone fear that he will not demand of the Chief of the Bureau of Pensions a liberal construction of what we are about to enact into law?

I do not doubt. I will not fear. I have implicit confidence that he will see that his comrades in arms receive every penny that the law entitles them to, and I believe that immediately we shall observe, and the old warrior claimants realize, that the change has come.

All know that there should be a change; the people do in every neighborhood where lives an old veteran, broken down, sick, and suffering, who has been examined by surgeons who have known him for years, whose neighbors have furnished a volume of testimony to prove his inability to labor and to earn, yet who receives a letter from the Chief of the Pension Bureau informing him that he is not disabled or disqualified for labor in a pensionable degree.

The rejection of cases such as I have named enrage the veteran soldiers of this land and the people in every community where such a one lives.

Almost our entire population demand a change, and without a dissenting vote in the Senate or the House, I trust we shall write a law that declares that the practice that has been in vogue must stop. The unanimous vote of the representatives of 75,000,000 people must be respected. The declaration in the statute that every disability shall be considered and the ratings aggregated must be respected. That he who is afflicted with a disability in every limb and almost every organ is to be rejected because all his disabilities are not concentrated in one limb or organ is a construction both outrageous and wicked. Aggregated ratings for disabilities is all that claimants for pension ask. That they are entitled to and must have. This people do not want a sordid or niggardly treatment of broken-down, prematurely old, and disabled veterans of the civil war. The man who enjoys the blessings purchased by their valor and sacrifices, and then complains because they are pensioned, ought to flee to Canada, or elsewhere, as some did during the civil war to avoid the draft.

I desire to call attention to what purports to be a letter written

by the Hon. H. Clay Evans, Commissioner of Pensions, and published in the Washington Star, March 29, 1900. It reads as follows:

Some days ago the Union Veteran Legion of Pittsburg sent to Commissioner H. Clay Evans, of the Pension Office, as well as to the chairmen of both Pension Committees of Congress, copies of a resolution passed at a recent meeting of the Legion, denouncing the bills for the relief of deserters and bounty jumpers. Commissioner Evans answered the kindly expressed letter accompanying the resolution, and said:

"A glance at the many bills that have been introduced in Congress which have for their object the removal of charges of desertion and the granting of pensions to those who have now no legal status will convince you that a persistent and organized effort is being made to secure special legislation for the relief of individuals, as well as general legislation, which will operate to place upon the pension rolls the names of many of those who are now barred therefrom by reason of dishonorable discharge or desertion.

"In addition to the above, numerous bills have been introduced and are being pushed in Congress for the purpose of granting pensions to teamsters, telegraph operators, employees of military railroads, employees of the Life-Saving Service, and others whose service was rendered as civil employees and who were never connected with the Army or Navy. These men were paid good wages while so employed, and to place them on the pension rolls alongside of the veterans who composed the ranks of the organization which you represent would be an act of injustice.

"One of the first bills introduced in the present Congress was to grant an honorable discharge to all soldiers who were at any time in the service of the United States, and who have for more than thirty years been held to be ineligible for such discharge. The number of deserters at large at the close of the civil war is estimated at 117,247. Under the operations of this bill honorable discharges would be granted to all."

The object and purpose of the author of that letter is patent. It impugns the motives of members of Congress, seeks to create a prejudice against granting pensions by special act, very many of which are made necessary by reason of the unjust rejection of meritorious claims in the Pension Bureau. If not alleged, it is implied, and intended to be understood that members of Congress are engaged in a persistent and organized effort to secure unjust and improper legislation, such as is named. I desire to denounce that statement as absolutely destitute of any foundation. There is not a shred of truth in the warp or woof thereof. It is due to my associates on the Committee on Invalid Pensions, as well as to my colleagues of the House of Representatives, that I brand that charge as I have.

A statement that any such claim has been urged or "pushed" by any single individual before our committee is also untrue, and born of misrepresentation or delusion. The writer of that letter seems to think that if a soldier, by reason of sickness or some other cause no fault of his, was borne on the rolls as a deserter, it is a crime to have the record corrected in accordance with what justice and truth demand. Many private soldiers stood charged with desertion when the war closed against whose names there was no more reason for such record than there was for charging General Grant with desertion. When the facts warrant, such charge should be removed and the record corrected. It is to the credit of our people that a party which repudiates the obligations a nation owes to its defenders and to the widows and orphans of those who fell or who have since passed away can not command the votes of the citizens in communities where Union soldiers live.

Not long ago we witnessed the experiment of attempting to coin a surplus out of a deficiency by robbing pensioners, and the party that attempted it counted its electoral vote north of Mason and Dixon's line in the list of scattering at the next election thereafter. The amount paid for pensions in the fiscal year 1893 was $156,806,537.94; for the year 1894, $139,986,626.17; reduction in one year, $16,819,911.77.

The only men for whom the Commissioner of Pensions evidences any solicitude were Confederate soldiers. If it is true that out of a total of 665,000 claims disallowed and rejected from 1861 to June 30, 1899, there were rejected in the year ending June 30, 1899, 107,000, nearly one-sixth of all rejected in thirty-eight years, it might create suspicion that he did not desire to have Congress review and pass upon claims that he had rejected.

I quote from his letter:

In addition to the above, numerous bills have been introduced and are being pushed in Congress for the purpose of granting pensions to teamsters, telegraph operators, employees of military railroads, employees of the Life-Saving Service, and others whose service was rendered as civil employees and who were never connected with the Army or Navy. These men were paid good wages while so employed, and to place them on the pension rolls alongside of the veterans who composed the ranks of the organization which you represent would be an act of injustice.

I desire to say that if any such bill has been referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions no one has ever asked it to report a bill pensioning any person in any one of the classes named; and he who states that anyone is "pushing," or has "pushed," or asked, or urged the committee to report any bill of the character named is grossly mistaken, or deliberately states what is absolutely false.

It is the right of each and every citizen to criticize any act of Congress; that right extends to and includes bureau chiefs. It becomes the duty of Congress to examine and review, so far as time will admit, the action of the Chief of the Bureau of Pensions, and to do, what in some instances he could not do, in others what the law directed and the evidence made it his duty to do, which he neglected and refused to do.

In conclusion, I will say that the author of that letter appeared before our committee and urged us to report favorably a bill to pension Confederate soldiers, no matter how long they fought for the Confederacy and against the Union—it may have been from Bull Run until ninety days before Lee's surrender—if they deserted the lost cause and came into our lines, enlisted, and served ninety days before the war closed.

That bill made no provision for pensioning Union soldiers who may have fought under our flag for three years or longer and were captured, taken to some Confederate prison like Andersonville, where, naked and starving, to save their lives they entered the Confederate service with the intention of escaping and returning to our lines and who did make their escape and so return; but it did provide for Confederates who came into our lines and served for ninety days.

Gentlemen, I desire to say to you and to the country, in replying to that Bureau Chief, that of more than 4,700 bills, public and private, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, if there has been a persistent and organized effort made to secure legislation which would operate to place on the pension roll the name of many who are now barred therefrom, it was in the bill championed by Commissioner Evans to pension Confederate soldiers.

If claims that are conclusively proved up and claimants rated by the boards of examining surgeons as the law provides were allowed at the Bureau, there would be fewer applications for pensions by special act.

When a claimant has proved his case beyond all doubt and it is rejected at the Bureau, as many are, claimants have no remedy but to appeal to Congress; and it is the duty of Congress to grant to claimants what was wrongfully withheld and denied at the Bureau.

When claimants are treated fairly at the Bureau there will be few applications for special acts.

Nicaragua Canal.

SPEECH
OF
HON. HENRY D. CLAYTON,
OF ALABAMA,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Wednesday, May 2, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 2538) to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans—

Mr. CLAYTON of Alabama said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am glad that there is no division on any party lines as to the passage of this bill. I regret to see that there is any member of this body who thinks it is his duty to oppose this measure. It is true, Mr. Chairman, that in some particulars it could have been bettered. It could have been more specific on some points; it could have been improved in other respects.

But, Mr. Chairman, the argument made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COX] is the argument we have heard for more than two decades in reference to the Nicaraguan Canal. The excuse, in Congress after Congress, has been, "Wait until some survey has been made, and then we can act more intelligently on the subject." Mr. Chairman, this is the best proposition we can get before this House for consideration at this time, and as one who favors this great project, one who believes that notwithstanding any treaties that may be ratified, this great canal will be used as a benefit to America in case of war if necessary, and a means of spreading our commerce in time of peace, I shall give it my support.

A few days ago the people in the first State of the Union alphabetically, and I think, Mr. Chairman, I may say with pardonable pride the best State in the Union, spoke in no uncertain tones in reference to this pending measure.

On the 26th day of April last the people of Alabama in a Democratic convention assembled adopted the following resolution, and when I say a Democratic convention in Alabama I mean a convention composed of intelligent, straight-haired men with white faces, like those I see before me here to-day. [Applause.]

That convention declared:

We advocate the construction of the Nicaragua Canal to make a highway from the Atlantic to the Pacific and to make the seaport of the State of Alabama the front door of the United States, and that this party pays its tribute of affection and admiration to our distinguished citizen, Hon. JOHN T. MORGAN, whose integrity, intellect, energy, and persistence have accomplished so much in forwarding this great enterprise to a point where there can be no longer a doubt of its ultimate success.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, the argument that was made, more than any other argument, for the return of Senator MORGAN to the other branch of Congress, a body which he has adorned with his learning for so many years—the chief argument that sent him back there the other day so triumphantly was his long, conspicuous, and able advocacy of the Nicaraguan Canal. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CLAYTON of Alabama. I ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

Civil Code for Alaska.

SPEECH
OF
HON. HENRY F. NAPHEN,
OF MASSACHUSETTS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, May 17, 1900.

The House having under consideration the bill (S. 3419) making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes—

Mr. NAPHEN said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I shall avail myself of the latitude allowed in debates on this bill by confining myself to another subject, one which is of more importance than the bill under consideration. Though the treaty with Spain was ratified in February, 1899, and a few days later the President in an address, speaking of our foreign possessions, said, "This whole subject is now with Congress, and Congress is the voice, the conscience, and the judgment of the American people," nevertheless Congress has not thus far been called upon to determine the status of the peoples of the Philippine Islands. I wish to call attention to this fact and place on public record my emphatic protest against the Philippine policy of the Administration—a policy which has tarnished the honor of the nation, a policy of burdensome taxation and an unwarranted expenditure of money, and waste of human life, and a policy which is contrary to the principles upon which our form of government rests.

I do this with sincerity, placing duty to country above all other considerations.

In our treatment of the peoples of our new possessions we have substituted for the law of justice the maxim of Rob Roy—

> That they should take who have the power,
> And they should keep who can.

The claim made that we came into possession of those islands through force of circumstances beyond our control is not true.

We declared to the world at the beginning of the war with Spain that it was not for a mercenary purpose, but for humanity and for the liberation of Cuba.

In a letter from Mr. Williams, our consul at Manila, to Mr. Cridler, dated February 22, 1898, he states:

"The condition here," referring to the Philippine Islands, "and in Cuba are practically alike. * * * A republic is organized here, as in Cuba."

Nothing was said indicating it to be our purpose to enter upon and forcibly retain possession of those islands, thousands of miles from our shores, inhabited by 10,000,000 of peoples, consisting of 84 different tribes, of all colors, from the deepest black to the lightest yellow, and of various customs, and speaking a babel of tongues.

The facts justify me in saying that it was the original purpose of the Administration to obtain and retain possession of those islands. This intention of the Administration was hidden and not at first disclosed. The people were charmed by patriotic phrases and lured along as the Pied Piper led the children of Hamelin by his music.

The day before the President sent his message to Congress recommending that a resolution be passed declaring a state of war to exist between Spain and the United States, Mr. Pratt, our consul at Singapore, was in consultation with Aguinaldo, the leader of the insurgents, and as a result of the interview he that same day telegraphed to Admiral Dewey:

> Aguinaldo, insurgent leader, here. Will come Hongkong arrange with Commodore for general cooperation insurgents Manila, if desired. Telegraph.
>
> PRATT.

Admiral Dewey replied:

> Tell Aguinaldo come as soon as possible.
>
> DEWEY.

And the next day Aguinaldo set sail to meet Dewey.

The following letter, dated May 5, is from Mr. Pratt to Mr. Day:

Mr. Pratt to Mr. Day.

No. 217.] CONSULATE-GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Singapore, May 5, 1898.

SIR: I regret to have to report that the circumstances attending the departure from here of Gen. Emilio Aguinaldo to join Commodore Dewey, which I endeavored so hard to prevent being disclosed, were, in substance, made public in yesterday's edition of the Singapore Free Press, from the inclosed copy of which you will note, by reference to my reports Nos. 212 and 213 of the 28th and 30th ultimo, respectively, that though the facts are, in the main, correctly given, the dates are not quite accurate, and a certain amount of conjecture has been indulged in as regards my action in the matter and that of the Commodore.

Almost immediately after the occurence the editor of the above journal told me that he had been informed, but declined to say by whom.

I endeavored to get him to promise to keep the whole affair quiet, but, though he would not agree to this, he gave me his word not to mention it until after sufficient time should have elapsed to admit of General Aguinaldo's reaching Hongkong, which he must already have done.

Hence no harm can come of the disclosure, and though it is annoying, I suppose I should rather congratulate myself that the secret possessed by such a number was kept so long.

I have, etc.,

E. SPENCER PRATT,
United States Consul-General.

The publication referred to is as follows:

[The Singapore Free Press, Wednesday, May 4, 1898.]

THE WAR—IMPORTANT POLITICAL ARRANGEMENT—AGUINALDO IN SINGAPORE—AN INCOGNITO VISIT—HE JOINS ADMIRAL DEWEY—PLAN CARRIED OUT BY AMERICAN CONSUL-GENERAL.

Just before the actual outbreak of hostilities between Spain and the United States Singapore has been the scene of secret political arrangement by which Gen. Emilio Aguinaldo y Fami, the supreme head of the revolutionary movement in the Philippines, has entered into direct relations with Admiral Dewey, commander of the American squadron in China waters while that officer was still at Hongkong.

In order to understand and appreciate this interesting historical incident properly, it will be necessary to allude to the causes leading to the second appearance of the rebellion in the Philippines, which was almost coincident with, though not instigated by, the strained relations between Spain and the United States.

In December last Gen. Primo de Rivera, who above all other Spanish generals has an intimate knowledge of the country and its inhabitants, found the position untenable for both parties.

Neither of these had the remotest chance of terminating the rebellion decisively, the rebels secure in their mountain fastnesses, the Spaniards holding the chief towns and villages on the coast. Primo de Rivera therefore sent two well-known Philippine natives, occupying high positions in Manila, to propose terms of peace to General Aguinaldo in Biac-na-Bato. A council of the revolutionary government was held, in which it was agreed to lay down arms on condition of certain reforms being introduced. The principal of these were:

1. The expulsion, or at least secularization, of the religious orders, and the inhibition of these orders from all official vetoes in civil administration.
2. A general amnesty for all rebels, and guaranties for their personal security and from the vengeance of the friars and parish priests after returning to their homes.
3. Radical reforms to curtail the glaring abuses in public administration.
4. Freedom of the press to denounce official corruption and blackmailing.
5. Representation in the Spanish Parliament.
6. Abolition of the iniquitous system of secret deportation of political suspects, etc.

Primo de Rivera agreed to these reforms in sum and substance, but made it a condition that the principal rebel leaders must leave the country during His Majesty's pleasure. As these had lost all their property or had had it confiscated and plundered, the Government agreed to provide them with funds to live in a becoming manner on foreign soil.

The rebels laid down their arms and peace was apparently secured; but no sooner had they done so and returned to their houses than the intransigeant religious orders commenced at once to again persecute them and trump up imaginary charges to procure their rearrest. The Spanish Government, on its side, imagining itself secure, desisted from carrying out the promised reforms, thinking another trick like that played on the Cubans after the peace of Zanjon, arranged by Martinez Campos, might succeed. The Filipinos, however, with this business before them, refused to be made dupes of, and have taken up arms again, not alone in the immediate districts round Manila but throughout the archipelago, which merely awaits the signal from General Aguinaldo to rise en masse, no doubt carrying with them the native troops hitherto loyal, and for which loyal service they have received no thanks, but only ingratitude.

Gen. Emilio Aguinaldo, accompanied by his aide-de-camp, Col. Marcelo H. del Pilar, and his private secretary, Mr. J. Leyba, arrived incognito in Singapore from Saigon on April 21, 1898. In Saigon, where Aguinaldo had remained for one week, he had interviews with one or two old Filipino friends now resident there. The special purpose of Aguinaldo's visit to Singapore was to consult other friends here, particularly Mr. Howard W. Bray, an old and intimate English friend, for fifteen years resident in the Philippines, about the state of affairs in the islands generally—particularly as to the possibility of war between the United States and Spain, and whether, in such an event, the United States would eventually recognize the independence of the Philippines, provided he lent his cooperation to the Americans in the conquest of the country.

The situation of the moment was this, that the conditions of the honorable peace concluded on December 14, 1897, between President Aguinaldo, on behalf of the Philippine rebels, and H. E. Governor-General Primo de Rivera, on behalf of Spain, had not been carried out, although their immediate execution had been vouched for in that agreement.

These reforms would have provided protection to the people against the organized oppression and rapacity of the religious fraternities, would have secured improved civil and criminal procedure in courts, and have guaranteed, in many ways, improvements in the fiscal and social conditions of the people. The repudiation by the Spanish Government of these conditions, made by General Primo de Rivera, now left the rebel leaders, who had for the most part gone to Hongkong, free to act. And it was in pursuance of that freedom of action that Aguinaldo again sought counsel of his friends in Saigon and Singapore, with a view to the immediate resumption of operations in the Philippines.

Meantime Mr. Bray, whose assistance to this journal on matters connected with the Philippines has been very considerable, as our readers will have seen, was introduced by the editor of the Singapore Free Press to Mr. Spencer Pratt, consul-general of the United States, who was anxious, in view of contingencies, to learn as much as possible about the real condition of the

Philippines. It was a few days after this that Aguinaldo arrived incognito in Singapore, when he at once met his friends, including Mr. Bray.

Affairs now becoming more warlike, Mr. Bray, after conversation with Mr. Spencer Pratt, eventually arranged an interview between that gentleman and General Aguinaldo, which took place late on the evening of Sunday, the 24th of April, at "The Mansion," River Valley road. There were present on that occasion Gen. Emilio Aguinaldo y Fami, Mr. E. Spencer Pratt, consul-general United States of America; Mr. Howard W. Bray; Aguinaldo's private secretary, Mr. J. Leyba; Col. M. H. del Pilar, and Dr. Marcelino Santos.

During this conference, at which Mr. Bray acted as interpreter, General Aguinaldo explained to the American consul-general, Mr. Pratt, the incidents and objects of the late rebellion, and described the present disturbed state of the country. General Aguinaldo then proceeded to detail the nature of the cooperation he could give, in which he, in the event of the American forces from the squadron landing and taking possession of Manila, would guarantee to maintain order and discipline amongst the native troops and inhabitants in the same humane way in which he had hitherto conducted the war, and prevent them from committing outrages on defenseless Spaniards beyond the inevitable in fair and honorable warfare. He further declared his ability to establish a proper and responsible government on liberal principles, and would be willing to accept the same terms for the country as the United States intend giving to Cuba.

The consul-general of the United States, coinciding with the general views expressed during the discussion, placed himself at once in telegraphic communication with Admiral Dewey at Hongkong, between whom and Mr. Pratt a frequent interchange of telegrams consequently took place.

As a result another private interview was arranged at the American consular residence at the Raffles Hotel between General Aguinaldo, Mr. Spencer Pratt, Mr. Howard Bray, and Mr. Leyba, private secretary to General Aguinaldo.

As a sequel to this interview, and in response to the urgent request of Admiral Dewey, General Aguinaldo left Singapore for Hongkong by the first available steamer, the Peninsular and Oriental *Malacca*, on Tuesday, the 26th of April, at noon, accompanied by his aid-de-camp, Captain del Pilar, and Mr. Leyba, his private secretary.

The only interview or conversation with any strangers that General Aguinaldo had during his stay in Singapore other than the above interviews was during a visit paid by General Aguinaldo to Mr. W. G. St. Clair, editor of the Singapore Free Press, at the office of this journal. On that occasion General Aguinaldo was accompanied by Mr. Bray and Mr. Leyba.

Throughout the whole stay of General Aguinaldo in Singapore the editor was kept fully informed daily of the progress of affairs. Naturally, however, all statement of what occurred has been withheld by us until what has been deemed the fitting moment has arrived.

The substance of the whole incident in its relations to the recent course of affairs in the Philippines has been very fully telegraphed by the editor both to New York and London.

The influence of the incident on the future of the Philippines may prove to be of a far-reaching historical character.

AGUINALDO'S POLICY.

General Aguinaldo's policy embraces the independence of the Philippines, whose internal affairs would be controlled under European and American advisers. American protection would be desirable temporarily, on the same lines as that which might be instituted hereafter in Cuba. The ports of the Philippines would be free to the trade of the world, safeguards being enacted against an influx of Chinese aliens, who would compete with the industrial population of the country. There would be a complete reform of the present corrupt judicature of the country, under experienced European law officers.

Entire freedom of the press would be established, as well as the right of public meeting. There would be general religious toleration and steps would be taken for the abolition and expulsion of the tyrannical religious fraternities who have laid such strong hands on every branch of civil administration. Full provision would be given for the exploitation of the natural resources and wealth of the country by roads and railways and by the removal of hindrances to enterprise and investment of capital. Spanish officials would be removed to a place of safety until opportunity offered to return them to Spain. The preservation of public safety and order and the checking of reprisals against Spaniards would naturally have to be a first care of the government in the new state of things.

On May 20, 1898, Mr. Pratt sent a letter to Mr. Day containing a translation of a proclamation of the rebel leaders in Hongkong headed "American allies—the manifesto of the Filipinos," in which they called upon their brothers in the Philippines, "where you see the American flag flying assemble in numbers; they are our redeemers." The following is the manifesto referred to:

AMERICAN ALLIES—THE MANIFESTO OF THE FILIPINOS.

COMPATRIOTS: Divine Providence is about to place independence within our reach, and in a way the most free and independent nation could hardly wish for.

The Americans, not from mercenary motives, but for the sake of humanity and the lamentations of so many persecuted people, have considered it opportune to extend their protecting mantle to our beloved country, now that they have been obliged to sever relations with Spain, owing to the tyranny this nation is exercising in Cuba, causing enormous injury to the Americans, who have such large commercial and other interests there.

At the present moment an American squadron is preparing to sail for the Philippines.

We, your brothers, are very much afraid that you may be induced to fire on the Americans. No, brothers, never make this mistake. Rather blow your own brains out than fire a shot or treat as enemies those who are your liberators.

Your natural enemies, your executioners, the authors of your misery and unhappiness, are the Spaniards who govern you. Against these you must raise your weapons and odium; understand well, against the Spaniards and never against the Americans.

Take no notice of the decree of the Governor-General calling you to arms, although it may cost you your lives. Rather die than be ungrateful to our American liberators.

The Governor-General calls you to arms. What for? To defend your Spanish tyrants? To defend those that have depised you, and even in public speeches asked for your extermination—those that have treated you little better than savages? No! No! A thousand times no!

Give a glance at history and you will see that all Spain's wars in Oceania have sacrificed Philippine blood. We have been put to fight in Cochin China to assist the French in an affair that in no way concerned the Philippines. We were compelled to spill our blood by Simon de Anda against the English, who in any case would have made better rulers than the Spaniards. Every year our children are taken away to be sacrificed in Mindanao and Sulu on the pretense of making us believe these people are our enemies, when in reality they are our brothers, like us, fighting for their independence.

And having sacrificed our blood against the English, against the Annamites, against the people of Mindanao, etc., what recompense or thanks have we received from the Spanish Government? Obscurity, poverty, the butchery of those dear to us. Enough, brothers, of this Spanish tutelage.

Take note, the Americans will attack by sea and prevent any reenforcements coming from Spain; therefore we insurgents must attack by land. Probably you will have more than sufficient arms, because the Americans have arms and will find means to assist us.

There, where you see the American flag flying, assemble in numbers. They are our redeemers.

Our unworthy names are as nothing, but one and all of us invoke the name of the greatest patriot our country has seen, in the sure and certain hope that his spirit will be with us in these moments and guide us to victory—our immortal José Rizal.

On June 9 Mr. Pratt sent a letter to Mr. Day giving an account of an address presented to him by the Philippine colony at Singapore after Aguinaldo's success near Manila, in which they said:

Our countrymen at home and those of us residing here, refugees from Spanish misrule and tyranny in our beloved native land, hope that the United States, your nation, persevering in its humane policy, will efficaciously second the programme arranged between you, sir, and General Aguinaldo in this port of Singapore, and secure to us our independence under the protection of the United States.

To this Consul Pratt replied in part as follows:

Rest assured, though, that I fully understand and sincerely appreciate the motives that have prompted your present action, and that your words, which have sunk deep in my heart, shall be faithfully repeated to the President, to Admiral Dewey, and to the American people, from whom I am sure they will meet with full and generous response. (See Appendix for full account—Exhibit A.)

Mr. Pratt did not deny that such an agreement had been entered into with Aguinaldo, as claimed by the Filipinos, whereby their independence would be secured under the protection of the United States. On the contrary, he said:

I am thankful to have been the means, though merely the accidental means, of bringing about the arrangement between General Aguinaldo and Admiral Dewey, which has resulted so happily. I can only hope that the eventful outcome will be all that can be desired for the happiness and welfare of the Filipinos.

I admit that a letter was written by Mr. Day on June 16 to Mr. Pratt, in which he states:

It is assumed that you did not attempt to commit the Government to any alliance with the Philippine insurgents. * * * To obtain the unconditional personal assistance of General Aguinaldo in the expedition to Manila was proper, if in so doing he was not induced to form hopes which might not be practicable to gratify.

This letter, however, was written after Admiral Dewey and his heroic men achieved the glorious victory in Manila Bay, a victory which earned the deserved gratitude of a nation for that intrepid leader and his men, and after Aguinaldo arrived at Manila on one of our ships with thirteen staff officers, at the request of Dewey, and had gathered around him between eight and forty thousand men, who were supplied by us with arms, ammunition, and supplies, and also after they had rendered valuable assistance in subduing and holding the city of Manila, and we had treated them as our allies. That they were treated as allies is evidenced by a letter from General Anderson to Aguinaldo, dated July 6, 1898, from which I quote the following:

Very soon we expect a large addition to our forces, and it must be apparent to you, as a military officer, that we will require much more room to camp our soldiers, and also storeroom for our supplies. For this I would like to have your excellency's advice and cooperation, as you are best acquainted with the resources of this country. It must be apparent to you that we do not intend to remain here inactive, but to move promptly against our common enemy.

And in a letter from Major Jones written to Aguinaldo, dated July 17, which said in part:

Our nation has spent millions of money to send forces here to expel the Spaniards and to give a good government to the whole people, and the return we ask is comparatively slight. General Anderson wishes you to inform your people that we are here for their good.

There was no suggestion by us that it was our intention to deprive them of their independence.

It is claimed that Mr. Pratt was not authorized to act for us, yet he was in correspondence with our Secretary of State, and was supposed to keep him informed of what he was doing. If Mr. Pratt believed he did not have authority, he could have cabled Mr. Day before he cabled Dewey and before entering into negotiations with Aguinaldo.

I am justified in claiming that some inducements must have been held out to Aguinaldo. Some political pledges, express or implied, were given; otherwise, why did he, after having at first failed to gather his people around him and was about to sail away, return at the request of Admiral Dewey and successfully accomplish that for which we brought him to Manila.

I appeal to any lawyer on this floor, would he not be justified, if he were arguing a case with facts similar to this, in asserting that there must have been some promise given, *express* or *implied*?

Gentlemen, the American people are the jury in this case, and they will render a just verdict next November.

The first time we publicly indicated our purpose to obtain and retain possession of the Philippine Islands was in the communication from our Secretary of State to the minister of state of Spain, in which he declared it to be our intention to occupy and hold the city, bay, and harbor of Manila pending the conclusion of the

treaty of peace which was to "determine the control, disposition, and government of the Philippine Islands."

The majority of the commissioners appointed by the President to negotiate the treaty of peace were members of the Senate—two of whom were on the Committee on Foreign Relations. They represented the Executive to negotiate a compact upon which they were thereafter to sit in judgment as members of the legislative branch of the Government, though the constitutional theory of our Government is that the executive, legislative, and judiciary departments are to be kept separate and distinct.

This commission received definite instructions as to the terms which were to be offered to Spain, though these instructions have never been made public. One of the principal requirements insisted upon by the commission was the cession of the Philippine Islands.

The first article of the protocol gave us authority to occupy and hold the city, bay, and harbor of Manila pending the conclusion of the treaty of peace, which was to determine the disposition, control, and government of the Philippines. Nevertheless, the President issued an order to the Secretary of War eleven days after the signing of the Paris treaty by the representatives of both nations, in which he said:

> The future control, disposition, and government of the Philippine Islands are ceded to the United States. In fulfillment of the rights of sovereignty thus acquired, and the responsible obligations of government thus assumed, the actual occupation and administration of the entire group of the Philippine Islands becomes immediately necessary, and the military government heretofore maintained by the United States in the city, harbor, and bay of Manila is to be extended with all possible dispatch to the whole of the ceded territory. * * * It will be the duty of the commander of the forces of occupation to announce and proclaim in the most public manner that we come, not as invaders or conquerors, but as friends. * * * The operations of civil and municipal government are to be performed by such officers as may accept the supremacy of the United States by taking the oath of allegiance. * * * Finally, it should be the earnest and paramount aim of the military administration to win the confidence, respect, and affection of the inhabitants of the Philippines by assuring to them in every possible way that full measure of individual rights and liberties which is the heritage of free peoples, and by proving to them that the mission of the United States is one of benevolent assimilation substituting the mild sway of justice and right for arbitrary rule.

(Letter appendix—Exhibit B.)

The President, on January 20, in instructions to the Secretary of State, informed him that he had appointed a commission to facilitate effective extension of authority throughout the islands, and stated that the treaty had not been ratified, but expected it to be by the time the commission arrived at Manila, and that he intrusted the temporary government of the islands to the military authorities until Congress should determine otherwise.

The territory was not ceded to us at this time. The treaty had not been ratified by the President with the consent of the Senate, as provided, nor had the terms of ratification been exchanged between the Governments.

According to the terms of the treaty, until its ratification we had not the right to occupy a foot of territory beyond the city of Manila. We had not succeeded to the sovereignty of Spain, and the Filipinos were not under our authority or sovereignty. Acting under that unauthorized possession, we occupied territory which had been occupied by the Filipinos as conquered territory. Nevertheless, on August 28, 1899, the President, in a speech at Pittsburg, said: "Every step taken was in obedience to the requirements of the Constitution. It became our territory, and is ours as much as the Louisiana Purchase, or Texas or Alaska. A body of insurgents, in no sense representing the sentiment of the people of the islands, dispute our lawful authority, and even before ratification of the treaty by the American Senate were attacking the forces who fought for and secured their freedom. This was the situation in April, 1899, the date of the exchange of ratifications."

Our action was in the nature of a declaration of war upon those people, who had been aiding us, and who had given no offense.

So far, then, from the acquisition of the Philippine Islands being forced upon us as the result of circumstances, it is apparent that their acquisition was contemplated from the beginning.

The treaty as made required the assent of two-thirds of the Senate. This number could not be obtained unless heroic measures were resorted to. Our troops and the Filipino forces were at this time facing each other peacefully awaiting the outcome of negotiations with Spain. There were in the Senate, as there are in all bodies, men who are afraid of being suspected of want of patriotism—halting, waiting, wavering men—not men of earnest and pronounced opinions, not men who considered only the public good, but of that class who look particularly to their own political fortunes and want to be on what they suppose the "popular side."

On the morning of the day the vote was to be taken upon the ratification of the treaty news came that our troops were fired upon by the Filipinos, and the wavering Senators went over to the majority. The treaty was confirmed by a single vote over the requisite number.

It was for the advantage of the Filipinos that the treaty should be defeated. If it was not ratified, the United States would not acquire even a paper title to the islands, and nonratification of the treaty meant practical independence for the Filipinos. It was for their interest to avoid a rupture. On the other hand, it was for the interest of the Administration seeking additional Senatorial votes to bring about a condition of things which would capture the weak and wavering.

General Otis could tell the facts—the real facts, and it is quite likely one of the reasons why he was retained there so long is, because he could throw a brilliant light upon this and many features of the Philippine campaign, for which he has been held responsible when he was only obeying orders.

It will go into history that the conflict from which the present war followed—a war that has caused a waste of human life and treasure—was brought about to secure the ratification of the treaty and the cession of the Philippine Islands. Regardless of our pledges to the Filipinos and the world, we propose to hold those islands without obtaining or asking the consent of the people and to govern them by laws in the making of which they have had no voice. All this we are told is for "civilization"—shooting them if they do not accept our authority. Let us not pretend to be there for the spiritual good of the people, when in reality we are there for nuggets of gold, mountains of iron and—power.

Civilization—civilization—many sins are committed in thy name.

In the language of Washington, in his Farewell Address, "The maxim is no less applicable to public than to private affairs—honesty is the best policy."

Jefferson foresaw the present condition when he said, "Indeed, I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just."

Assuming that the honor of the nation is not tarnished, will it pay us to hold possession of those islands?

The most careful examination of statistics show that the entire product of the islands, consisting of hemp, sugar, and copra, will not exceed $25,000,000 per year, and the entire imports have not exceeded over $12,000,000 a year. The cost of maintaining our soldiers in a foreign country is not less that $1,000 each man, per year. It must be conceded that from 30,000 to 40,000 men will be required permanently in the islands after we have conquered the people into sullen submission.

The 63,000 men we have there now will soon be disabled. Add to that the dead and the sick up to date, and it will reach 80,000. Our pension list is now over $130,000,000. This war will bring it over $200,000,000.

Where will we get 63,000 men to replace the men now there?

Add to that the expenses of the Federal lists to keep the people enslaved and force our modern Christianity upon them by the sword.

If the products were all plunder and the exports to the islands were all profit, the maintenance of the Army alone would almost consume the products and exports. The exports to China, about which we are hearing so much, it is safe to say, do not exceed $340,000,000.

If it were possible for the United States, by reason of its occupation of the Philippine Islands, to secure the whole of the trade with China and add to it the entire trade of the Philippines, the profit upon it would not equal the cost of maintaining the Army, Navy, and the civil administration necessary to keep the Philippines in subjection and properly carry on their government.

We owe to-day $4,380,000,000—almost $1,380,000,000 more than England, with her large navy and immense territory—and yet they tell us that it pays.

Verily this Administration needs an arithmetic as much as it needs a conscience.

It is safe to say that the cost of the war in the Philippines will reach $200,000,000 to date. Add to that the expenses of the current year, which will exceed $100,000,000, and it will be found that the cost of the Government has so increased that a man who has a family of five persons will, before the end of the year, have paid almost $20 as his share of the cost of our mission of "benevolent assimilation, march of civilization, manifest destination, and plain duty."

The function of government is to increase the material prosperity of its people, not to wave flags in their faces and rifle their pockets.

In the language of Macaulay:

> That is the best government which desires to make the people happy and knows how to make them happy.

If one-tenth of this money squandered in shooting down fellowmen because they refuse to submit to be treated as subjects, was judiciously employed in developing the harbors of our principal cities, it would call into existence ten times more trade for the country than we possibly can expect by holding those islands as a colonial possession and keeping a people under submission by military rule.

The money unnecessarily taken from the people could be used in perfecting the fortifications of our coast and make them more

impregnable against the attack of a foreign power, and be used in a way that would materially promote commerce by improving the harbors of our principal cities. Then we would have the true expansion—industrial expansion—manufacturing expansion—commercial expansion. With deep and wide harbors to accommodate the deepest-draft vessels afloat, backed by a merchant marine, our vessels will carry the flag and the trade into every market in the world. This is the expansion we want, and the expansion we must obtain—an expansion that does not require the aid of the sword.

Let not our place among the commercial nations of the world be obtained at the sacrifice of human liberty.

Great Britain's object in the war of the Revolution was to control the trade and commerce of the United States. The response of the colonists, through Benjamin Franklin, was as follows:

> To me it seems that neither the obtaining nor retaining of any trade, how valuable soever, is an object for which men may justly spill each other's blood—that the true and sure means of extending or securing commerce is the goodness and cheapness of commodities; and that the profit of any trade can never be equal to the expense of compelling it and holding it by fleets or armies, and I am persuaded that cool, dispassionate posterity will condemn to infamy those who advise it, and that even success will not save from some degree of dishonor those who voluntarily engage in it.

Much has been said about the purchase of Louisiana. This was contiguous territory and came within the pale of our American system.

It was a territory fit for probatory before coming to statehood. Not so here. The peoples of those islands never can become Americanized. The inhabitants of the Louisiana territory asked to be annexed for their own protection. For their commercial interests, and their commercial rights they wanted to become a part of us. Its acquisition was peaceful and bloodless, and was the first step in the withdrawal of European sovereignty from this hemisphere, and prevented war. Every square mile of additional territory meant more room, more homes, and more opportunities for our people.

The Philippines we hold possession of through the sacrifice of lives. Their possession brings us within reach of European nations, and we will be obliged to enter into their councils, and if they engage in a war we will be liable to become involved. Even if we subdue the people into submission, a large standing army and navy will be necessary to defend the islands against the ambition and jealousy of other nations.

You can not go to the Philippines to live and work. Those islands only furnish a chance for capitalists to increase their wealth through the employment of cooly, contract, or practically slave labor, the product to be sold in competition with what we produce, while the cost of the army and navy necessary to keep the people in subjection and protect these capitalistic enterprises will be borne by the working people. The evidence is overwhelming that men from the temperate zone can not become acclimated in the Tropics, and such regions must continue to be permanently peopled by their native inhabitants.

Captain Hatch, of the Eighteenth Infantry, who was with the first troops to go to the Philippines and remained there for more than one year, recently stated that—

> The climate is that of the torrid zone. There is little difference between July and December. There is a constant, never-ceasing heat, that depresses and enervates the constitution of a man from the temperate clime. An American in the Philippines can not work in the sun or at outdoor labor. He would not live six months at such work. Only a Chinaman, a Filipino, or some one with a dark skin can ever work out of doors in the Philippines. An American may live in the Philippines, pursuing an occupation that would keep him under cover; out of doors, never.

This is borne out by the testimony of Professor Dean C. Worcester and many other authorities. The Philippines, therefore, can not be held as a possession to successfully colonize. If we retain them they will be a "weight around our necks." Let us hesitate before we commit ourselves to the policy of holding them, or we may repent; we will discover too late, that our supposed diamonds of great price are only paste.

Assuming that by retaining possession of those islands we have not violated national morals, and that from a mercenary standpoint it will pay us to keep them, there are still grave objections to our retention of them.

It can not be questioned but that the United States has a right to acquire territory either by purchase, cession, or conquest, but in holding it we must act within the limits of constitutional authority. In the interpretation of the Constitution it is to be construed in favor of justice, and the same rule should be followed that is adopted in interpreting a statute—that is, it should be construed according to the intention of the framers.

As stated by Chief Justice Taney, 19 Howard, at page 426, Scott vs. Lanford—

> The Constitution must be construed now as it was understood at the time of its adoption. As long as it continues to exist in its present form, it speaks not only with the same words but the same meaning and intent with which it spoke when it came from the hands of the framers, and was voted on and adopted by the people of the United States. What the Constitution was at that time I think there can be hardly any doubt.

If we retain possession of those islands and govern them as colonial dependencies, as proposed, our much-abused Constitution, which has been stretched and bent under the implied-power doctrine until in many respects it has lost its original meaning, will by this policy receive an additional wrench, and we must read into it the words "colonies" and "subjects." It must be stretched to cover new laws, new officials, new responsibilities, new duties, and new powers.

Instead of an instrument confining and restricting the powers of the Government, our Constitution has come to be regarded as a document in which the Government can find warrant for the exercise of any power.

Procrustes stretched and shortened his victims to make them fit his bed. The proposition now is to make our bed—the Constitution—in which we have rested for over one hundred years, adjustable to whatever giant or dwarf may come along our national highway.

Our Constitution is the foundation of all law. Respect for law is of necessity the foundation of democratic form of government, and whatever is done to undermine or weaken that respect is a source of great danger.

The practice of wresting the Constitution from its plain purpose to meet the exigencies of a particular occasion will have a distinctly pernicious effect upon the morals and conduct of the people, by causing them to regard law as something to be evaded, if possible, and obeyed as a last resort under compulsion.

There is no authority, even under the most elastic estimate of the implied powers of Congress, that confers a right upon the United States to hold and govern those possessions as colonial dependencies.

Herein precisely is where our form of government differs from Old World forms. To carry out this proposition, not only must our Constitution be trampled under foot, but the whole history and spirit of our institutions must be defied, and the flag robbed of its brightest glory.

Webster, in his speech in 1848 on the Mexican Star, used these words:

> An arbitrary government may have territorial government in distant possessions, because an arbitrary government may rule its distant territories by different laws and different systems. Russia may govern the Ukraine, the Caucasus, and Kamtschatka by different codes or ukases. We can do no such thing.

To assert this right is contrary to the vital principles of the Declaration of Independence, which the American people have believed in, and have no more questioned their truth, than they have questioned the Ten Commandments or the Sermon on the Mount, and is an insult to the memory of those who pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor for justice and liberty—an insult to the memory of those who suffered, bled, and died during the seven years' war of the Revolution.

It was against this method of government that the men of the Revolution fought. It can not be assumed that those who composed the Constitutional Convention, many of whom had been leaders in the struggle, and all ardent sympathizers and active supporters of that cause, should turn about and coolly make provisions to fasten upon other people that same galling yoke which they had so recently escaped. Rather is it to be supposed that they had in mind the principles of the Declaration of Independence, that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," and that the freedom which they had fought for and won, they intended sharing with all who might be entitled to our protection.

Exclusive Federal control of territory should be but a temporary stage, to be followed by the permanent condition of statehood. Judge Cooley, in his Constitutional Law (page 188), says:

> Indeed, it could never have been understood that any territory which by purchase, cession, or conquest should at any time come under the control of the United States should permanently be held in a territorial condition—and when territory is acquired, the right to suffer States to be formed therefrom and to receive them into the Union must follow, of course—not only because the Constitution confers the power to admit new States without restriction, but also because it would be inconsistent with institutions founded on the fundamental idea of self-government, that the Federal Government should retain territory under its own imperial rule and deny the people the customary local institution.

The same point is emphasized by Chief Justice Marshall in Loughborough *vs.* Blake (5 Wheaton, 317–324). His language is as follows:

> The Territories are in a state of infancy advancing to manhood—looking forward to complete equality so soon as that state of manhood shall be determined.

In reply to the charge that the United States maintain a condition that the colonies denounced Chief Justice Marshall in the same case said:

> The difference between requiring a continent with an immense population to submit to be taxed by a government having no common interest with it, separated from it by a vast ocean and associated with it by no common feelings, and permitting the representatives of the American people under the restriction of our Constitution to tax a part of society which is in a state of infancy, advancing to manhood, looking forward to complete equality, so soon as that state of manhood shall be attained, as is the case with the Territories, * * * is too obvious not to present itself to the minds of all.

In Scott *vs.* Sanford (19 Howard, 393–446), Chief Justice Taney said:

There is certainly no power given by the Constitution to the Federal Government to establish and maintain colonies bordering on the United States or at a distance to be ruled and governed at its own pleasure, nor to enlarge its territorial limits in any way except by the admission of new States, but no power is given to acquire territory to be held and governed permanently in that character

Chancellor Kent, in his Commentaries, page 385, states that:

The establishment of distant Territorial governments ruled according to the will and pleasure of Congress would have a very natural tendency, as all preconsular governments have had, to abuse and oppression.

In the case of Murphy *vs.* Ramsey (114 United States, page 15) the language of the courts is as follows:

The power of Congress over Territories is limited by the obvious purposes by which it was conferred, and these purposes are satisfied by measures which prepare the people of the Territories to become States of the Union.

Justice Gray, in the case of Shively *vs.* Bollby (152 United States, 1–57), said:

Upon the acquisition of territory by the United States, whether by cession by one of the States, or by treaty with a foreign country, or by discovery and settlement, the same title and dominion pass to the United States for the benefit of the whole people in its trust for the several States to be ultimately created out of the territory.

The Philippine islands are as much a part of the dominion of the United States as Maine or California, and our sovereignty over the inhabitants is complete.

The Spanish treaty recognizes the nationality of the Spanish subjects remaining in the ceded territory who do not formally record a declaration of their intention to preserve such allegiance, to be held to have renounced it, and to have adopted the nationality of the territory in which they may reside.

Story on the Constitution, paragraph 1324, referring to territory acquired by conquest or treaty, says:

The ceded territory becomes a part of the United States. The act transferring the country transfers the allegiance of the inhabitants so that they become citizens of the Union thereby.

Hallett on International Law, page 380, holds that—

In either case—conquest or cession—the national character of the inhabitants who remain is deemed to be changed from that of the former to the new sovereign, and that in their relations with other nations they are entitled to all the advantages and subject to all the disadvantages of their new international status.

In the case of the American Sugar Company *vs.* Canter (1 Peters, 511), Chief Justice Marshall said:

On such transfer of territory it has never been held that the relation of the inhabitants with each other undergo any change. Their relations with their former sovereigns are dissolved and new relations between them and the government which has acquired their territory. The same act which transfers their country transfers the allegiance of those that remain in it.

In New Orleans *vs.* The United States (10 Peters, 662) it is laid down that—

The succession of sovereignty does not authorize the United States to exercise prerogatives of sovereignty not consistent with the Constitution of the United States.

In Johnson *vs.* McIntosh (8 Wheaton, 589) it is laid down:

The title by conquest is required to be maintained by force—the conqueror prescribes its limits—humanity, however, acting on public opinion has established as a general rule that the conquered shall not be wantonly oppressed and that their condition shall remain as eligible as is complete with the objects of the conquest. Most usually they are incorporated with the victorious nation and become subjects or citizens of the country with which they are connected. The new and old members of society mingle with each other—the distinction between them is gradually lost, and they make one people. Where this incorporation is practicable, humanity demands, and a wise policy requires, that the rights of the conqueror to property should remain unimpaired—that the new subjects should be governed as equitably as the old, and that confidence in their security should gradually banish the painful sense of being separated from their own connections and united by force to strangers.

If we retain possession of the Philippines, they can not be held as colonies or dependencies; they must be held as territory to be governed within constitutional limitations, with the beacon light of statehood held before them. The same Constitution which governs us must govern these inhabitants; every prohibition which binds Congress here binds it there. The Constitution is for their peoples as it is for us; the sacred rights which the Constitution guarantees are theirs as much as they are ours. Liberty does not mean one thing in the States and something entirely different in the Philippines.

In the language of Washington, "The cause of liberty is confined to no continent or climate."

This is the most serious question that has confronted us during our existence as a nation. If we hold them, we must make them a part of our Government, and open our doors to the cooly labor of the Philippines, which will enter into competition with American labor, and this reservoir of human labor will hopelessly submerge the workmen of America. "A gulf profound as that Serbonian bog betwixt Damiata and Mount Casius old" will then rise between wealth and poverty, and the workingmen will be ground down to a state lower than before.

Then it will not be a foe from without but a foe from within that we must fear. It is the degeneration and demoralization that will happen if this flotsam and jetsam of the Orient are brought here. When the "war drums throb no longer and the battle flags are furled," there will grow cancer-like in our nation, the discontent of labor. God forbid that the shadow of pre-revolutionary France is upon this nation. Let us hope that the cunning, clever, and unscrupulous demagogues will not have the opportunity to fan the flames of discontent into a fire that will cost millions in treasure and countless lives. Let us hope that the same hand that wielded the sword in defense of our country will, when the sword is beaten into the plowshare, be guiding the development of the country.

To hold the Philippine Islands will not only cause danger from within, but will be contrary to the teachings of the fathers of the Republic, and will be a departure from our traditionary policy, which has been "accretion, not colonization."

Washington in his Farewell Address said:

The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. * * * Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none or very remote relation. * * * Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. * * * Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves by artificial ties in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities. Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. * * * We may choose peace or war as our interests, guided by justice, shall counsel. Why forego the choice of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by entangling our destiny with any part of Europe, entangle the peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, and caprice?

No one can deny but that which he warned us against will happen if we retain this territory thousands of miles away. We will not be in a position to choose betwen peace or war as we desire. No nation possessing foreign colonies has been able to choose between peace and war.

Jefferson, in writing to Madison concerning territorial aggrandizement, when a commercial treaty with England was in prospect, said:

Bonaparte would give us the Floridas to withhold intercourse with the residue of those (the Spanish) colonies. But that is no price, because they are ours in the first moment of the first war, and until a war they are of no particular necessity to us; but although with difficulty he will consent to our receiving Cuba into our Union—that would be a price, and I would immediately erect a column on the southernmost limit of Cuba and inscribe on it "Ne plus ultra"—"As to us in that direction." We should then have only to include the North in our confederacy, which would be, of course, in the first war, and we should have such an empire for liberty as she never surveyed since the creation.

In a letter to Thomas Payne, March 18, 1801, Jefferson wrote:

Determined as we are to avoid, if possible, wasting the energies of our people in war and destruction, we shall avoid implicating ourselves with the powers of Europe, even in support of principles which we mean to pursue. * * * we believe we can enforce those principles as to ourselves by peaceable means, now that we are likely to have our public councils detached from foreign views.

In a letter to William Short, October 3, 1801, on the Monroe doctrine, Jefferson said:

We have a perfect horror at everything like connecting ourselves with the politics of Europe.

On August 4, 1820, in a letter to William Short, he said:

I hope he [referring to the minister to Brazil by the Government of Portugal] sees and will promote in his new situation the advantages of a cordial fraternalization among the American nations and the importance of their coalescing in an American system of policy, totally independent and unconnected with that of Europe. The day is not distant when we may formally require a meridian of partition through the ocean which separates the two hemispheres, on the hither side of which no European gun shall be heard nor an American on the other, and when during the rage of the eternal wars of Europe the lion and the lamb within our regions shall lie down together in peace.

Monroe said in his annual message of December 2, 1823:

In the wars of European powers, in matters relating to themselves, we have never taken any part; nor does it comport us so to do. With the movements of this hemisphere we are of necessity more immediately connected, and by causes which must be obvious to all enlightened and impartial observers. The political system of the allied powers is essentially different in this respect from that of America. We owe it therefore to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies and dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere.

Our proposed policy will be a departure from the above.

Webster, on April 11, 1826, in a speech on the Panama mission, came boldly to the defense of the Monroe doctrine and said:

The country's honor is involved in that declaration. * * * I look upon it as a part of its treasures of reputation, and for one I intend to guard it. * * * I look on the message as forming a bright page in our history. I will help neither to erase it or tear it out, nor shall it be by any act of mine blurred or blotted. It did honor to the sagacity of the Government, and I will not diminish that honor.

Edward Everett, Secretary of State, outlines the policy of the United States on territorial growth, in a letter to M. Sartiges, December 1, 1852, when the United States was invited by France

and England to become a party to the proposed convention relative to Cuba, said:

England within half a century has added very extensively to her empire. These acquisitions have created no uneasiness on the part of the United States. In like manner the United States have within the same period greatly increased their territory. The largest addition was that of Louisiana, which was purchased from France.

These accessions of territory have properly caused no uneasiness to the great European powers, as they have been brought about by the operation of natural causes and without any disturbance of the international relations of the principal states. They have been followed also by a great increase of mutually beneficial commercial intercourse between the United States and Europe; but the case would be different in reference to the transfer of Cuba from Spain to any other European power—we should view it in somewhat the same light in which France and England would view the acquisition of some important island in the Mediterranean by the United States, with this difference, it is true—the attempt of the United States to establish themselves in Europe would be a novelty.

How much more of a novelty is it to extend our territory in Asia?

Hamilton Fish, who was Secretary of State under General Grant, in a letter to Sir E. Thornton, in April, 1873, stated:

It is not the policy of the United States to undertake in Africa the management of movements within the particular range of private enterprise.

Secretary Frelinghuysen, Secretary of State under President Arthur, in a letter to Mr. Langston, in 1883, said:

The policy of this Government as declared on many occasions in the past has tended toward avoidance of possessions disconnected from the main continent. Had the tendency of the United States been to extend territorial dominion beyond intervening seas, opportunities have not been wanting to effect such a purpose, whether on the coast of Africa, in the West Indies, or in the South Pacific.

In another letter, in 1884, he said:

A conviction that the fixed policy dating back to the origin of our constitutional Government was considered to make it inexpedient to attempt territorial aggrandizement which would require maintenance by a naval force in excess of any yet provided for our national uses—has led this Government to decline territorial acquisition.

Secretary Bayard, in 1885, wrote:

The policy of the United States declared and pursued for more than a century discountenances, and in practice forbids, distant colonial acquisition.

President Cleveland, in his first annual message, said:

I do not favor the policy of acquisition of new and distant territory or incorporation of remote interests with our own.

Our Philippine policy is well described by John Morley in criticising the foreign policy of England:

First, you push on into territories where you have no business to be and where you had promised not to go; secondly, your intrusion provokes resentment, and in these wild countries resentment means resistance; thirdly, you instantly cry out that the people are rebellious and that their act is rebellion (this in spite of your own assurance that you have no intention of setting up a permanent sovereignty over them); fourthly, you send a force to stamp out the rebellion; and, fifthly, having spread bloodshed, confusion, and anarchy, you declare with hands uplifted to the heavens that moral reasons force you to stay, for if you were to leave this territory would be left in a condition which no civilized power could contemplate with equanimity or composure. These are the five stages in the Forward Rake's progress.

The words of Burke in 1775 apply with equal force at the present time concerning our policy in the Philippines:

To prove that they ought not to be freed, we are obliged to depreciate the value of freedom itself * * * all dread of a standing military force is looked upon as a superstitious panic. We grow indifferent to the consequences inevitable to ourselves from the plan of ruling half the world by a mercenary sword * * * between craft and credulity the voice of reason is stifled and all misconduct, all the calamities of war are continued * * * the use of force alone is but temporary. It may subdue for a moment, but it does not remove the necessity of subduing again, and a nation is not governed which is perpetually to be conquered. A further objection to force is that you impair the object by your very endeavors to preserve it * * * the thing you fought for is not the thing which you recovered.

Students of history and political science are opposed to our Philippine policy.

Andrew Carnegie said:

That Britain possesses her colonies is a mere figure of speech; that her colonies possess her is nearer the truth. Our colonial empire seems a big phrase, but so far as material benefits are concerned the balance is the other way.

Trade does not follow the flag in our day; it seeks the lowest prices current.

It has heretofore been the glorious mission of the Republic to establish upon secure foundations Triumphant Democracy: and the world now understands government of the people, for the people, and by the people. * * * Must the millions of Filipinos, who have been asserting their God-given right to govern themselves, be the first victims of Americans, whose proudest boast is that they secured independence for themselves? If we take these islands we will have to govern them as generously as Britain has governed her colonies. This will leave nothing but a source of expense.

John G. Carlisle said:

There is no room in the Constitution for a military despotism or for the exercise of arbitrary power by the civil authorities anywhere in the jurisdiction of the United States in time of peace, and whenever the Philippine Islands, Porto Rico, or other islands shall become a part of our territory their inhabitants will be entitled to all the rights, privileges, and immunities secured to the people by the Constitution.

Professor McDonald, professor of history and political science in Bowdoin College, Maine, said:

The permanent governing of outlying districts or colonies in fact, though not in name, is so far foreign to our historic usage, and rests upon so different a theory of national organization, that the adoption of such a course might well be fraught with grave menace to our whole constitutional system * * * Instead of being the means of wealth to the mother country, the English colonies have become so great a source of expense that statesmen have wondered whether the load could be much longer borne. * * * The adoption of the policy of national expansion, even upon a moderate scale, means the adoption of a new scale of national taxation and expenditure and opens the doors to administrative outlays, direct and indirect, greatly in excess of those to which we are now accustomed.

Dr. Felix Adler said:

The principle that an inferior class shall be ruled by a superior class is a principle of aristocracy. The principle that no class shall be regarded as politically inferior, but that all shall participate on equal terms in the government, is the principle of democracy. The two principles can not keep house together in the same state. * * * If we accustom ourselves to see millions of persons who live within the territories which belong to the United States excluded from the rights of citizenship on the ground that they are not fitted to exercise them, the question will presently be raised—indeed, here and there it has already been raised—whether on the same ground millions of persons now exercising the franchise within the limits of the United States ought not to be deprived of their rights.

What is our duty in the present exigency? All the testimony goes to show that the Filipinos are capable of self-government. Admiral Dewey says they are better fitted for self-government than the Cubans. General Wheeler says:

I consider the Filipinos a very superior people—a people with great possibilities.

"Once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide,
"In the strife of truth with falsehood, for the good or evil side."

The time has come for us to decide. The sword that was unsheathed for freedom should be used in freedom's cause. The principles of imperialism should not be substituted for the teachings of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln. We have an opportunity to win the greatest victory we ever achieved—to conquer ourselves and stand by the faith of the fathers. Give to the Filipinos the pledge we gave to Cuba. Give to them their freedom and our protection, and we will have the honor of bringing into existence a new nation, for which posterity will bless us.

EXHIBIT A.

[Inclosures.—The Straits Times, June 9.]

MR. SPENCER PRATT SERENADED—MEETING OF FILIPINO REFUGEES AT THE UNITED STATES CONSULATE—THEY PRESENT AN ADDRESS TO MR. SPENCER PRATT AND DRINK TO AMERICA, ENGLAND, AND ADMIRAL DEWEY.

The United States consulate at Singapore was yesterday afternoon in an unusual state of bustle. That bustle extended itself to Raffles Hotel, of which the consulate forms an outlying part. From a period shortly prior to 5 o'clock, afternoon, the natives of the Philippines resident in Singapore began to assemble at the consulate.

Their object was partly to present an address to Hon. Spencer Pratt, United States consul-general, and partly to serenade him, for which purpose some twenty-five or thirty of the Filipinos came equipped with musical instruments. Gradually the crowd gathered in the vicinity of the United States consulate, and, after a little quiet, preliminary music, Dr. Santos, as representing the Philippine community in Singapore, proceeded to read the following address, which was originally drafted in Spanish and then translated into French. The address was read in French, and the following is an English translation:

THE ADDRESS.

"*To the Hon. Edward Spencer Pratt, Consul-General of the United States of North America, Singapore:*

"SIR: The Philippine colony resident in this port, composed of representatives of all social classes, have come to present their respects to you as the legitimate representative of the great and powerful American Republic, in order to express our eternal gratitude for the moral and material protection extended by Admiral Dewey to our trusted leader, Gen. Emilio Aguinaldo, who has been driven to take up arms in the name of 8,000,000 Filipinos, in defense of those very principles of justice and liberty of which your country is the foremost champion.

"Our countrymen at home, and those of us residing here, refugees from Spanish misrule and tyranny in our beloved native land, hope that the United States, your nation, persevering in its humane policy, will efficaciously second the programme arranged between you, sir, and General Aguinaldo in this part of Singapore, and secure to us our independence under the protection of the United States. Our warmest thanks are especially due to you, sir, personally, for having been the first to cultivate relations with General Aguinaldo and arrange for the cooperation with Admiral Dewey, thus supporting our aspirations, which time and subsequent actions have developed and caused to meet with the applause and approbation of your nation. Finally, we request you to convey to your illustrious President and the American people, and to Admiral Dewey, our sentiments of sincere gratitude and our most fervent wishes for their prosperity.

"SINGAPORE, *June 8, 1898.*"

Dr. Santos, having presented the above address to Mr. Spencer Pratt, proceeded, speaking in French, to state his belief that the Filipinos would prove and were now proving themselves fit for self-government. While it would be very desirable that such a government should be under American protection, yet it would be found that the brave Filipinos, who were now driving the Spanish troops before them, were quite fit also to fill offices of civil administration. Referring to certain news which had been telegraphed from Europe, Dr. Santos deprecated the transfer of the Philippines from Spain to any power. He was quite confident that the sympathy of the American people would be with a nation who were struggling to be free.

THE UNITED STATES CONSUL-GENERAL REPLIES.

After listening to the address, the United States consul-general, also speaking in French, said:

"Gentlemen, the honor you have conferred upon me is so unexpected that I can not find appropriate words with which to thank you and with which to reply to the eloquent address you have just read to me. Rest assured, though, that I fully understand and sincerely appreciate the motives that have prompted your present action and that your words, which have sunk deep in my heart, shall be faithfully repeated to the President, to Admiral Dewey, and to the American people—from whom I am sure that they will meet with full and generous response.

"A little over a month ago the world resounded with the praises of Admiral Dewey and his fellow-officers and men for a glorious victory won by the American Asiatic Squadron in the bay of Manila. Now we have news of the brilliant achievements of your own distinguished leader, Gen. Emilio Aguinaldo, cooperating on land with the Americans at sea. You have just reason to be proud of what has been and is being accomplished by General Aguinaldo and your fellow-countrymen under his command. When, six weeks ago, I learned that General Aguinaldo had arrived incognito in Singapore, I immediately sought him out. An hour's interview convinced me that he was the man for the occasion; and, having communicated with Admiral Dewey, I accordingly arranged for him to join the latter, which he did at Cavite. The rest you know.

"I am thankful to have been the means, though merely the accidental means, of bringing about the arrangement between General Aguinaldo and Admiral Dewey which has resulted so happily. I can only hope that the eventful outcome will be all that can be desired for the happiness and welfare of the Filipinos. My parting words to General Aguinaldo were, 'General, when you have proved yourself great, prove yourself magnanimous,' and from the treatment accorded to the recent Spanish prisoners it would appear that he had done so." [Applause.]

At the conclusion of Mr. Pratt's speech refreshments were served, and as the Filipinos, being Christians, drink alcohol, there was no difficulty in arranging as to refreshments. "Long life and prosperity" were drunk to Mr. Consul-General Spencer Pratt. Then the American Republic was cheered. Then Commodore Dewey was cheered for his gallant victory. Then England was cheered for sheltering the Filipino refugees.

PRESENTING A FLAG.

Then Dr. Santos, as the spokesman of the Filipino refugees, again addressed the audience with many complimentary remarks on the gallantry of Admiral Dewey and the skill and foresight of United States Consul-General Pratt, and with glowing forecasts of the prosperity that awaited the Philippine Islands under the new régime. He expressed a desire to have an American flag as a reminiscence of the day's proceedings. Mr. Spencer Pratt, again speaking in French, replied, saying:

"This flag was borne in battle, and is the emblem of that very liberty that you are seeking to attain. Its red stripes represent the blood that was shed for the cause; the white represents the purity of the motive; the blue field stands for the azure of the sky; the stars are the free and independent States of the Union. Take the flag and keep it as a souvenir of this occasion."

At the conclusion of Mr. PRATT's speech he handed an American flag to Dr. Santos, who received it reverently and waved it exultantly, amidst the cheers of the assembled Filipinos. The flag would, said Dr. Santos, be preserved so that future generations might look at it with pride.

[Singapore Free Press, June 9, 1898.]

MR. SPENCER PRATT AND THE FILIPINOS OF SINGAPORE—AN ADDRESS OF CONGRATULATION.

A little after 5 p. m. last evening a numerous deputation, consisting of all the Filipinos resident in Singapore, waited upon the American consul-general, Mr. Spencer Pratt, at his residence, and presented him with an address congratulatory of the American successes in the present war, and expressive of the thanks of the Filipino community here for the aid now being given by the United States to the aspirations of the Filipino people for national freedom.

There were also present Mr. W. G. St. Clair, editor of the Singapore Free Press; Mr. A. Reid, editor of the Straits Times, and Mr. Howard W. Bray, whose active sympathies with the Filipino nation are so well known as to entitle him to be styled "Aguinaldo's Englishman." Mr. Spencer Pratt and Mr. Bray both wore the badge of the Liga Filipina, presented to them by General Aguinaldo during his incognito visit to Singapore.

After Mr. Bray had performed the ceremony of introducing the deputation to Consul-General Spencer Pratt, Dr. Santos, the chief Filipino refugee here, who has been educated at Barcelona and Paris, delivered the address, of which the following is a translation:

"The Hon. EDWARD SPENCER PRATT,
"*Consul-General of the United States of North America, Singapore.*

"SIR: The Filipino colony resident in this port, composed of representatives of all social classes, have come to present their respects to you as the legitimate representative of the great and powerful American Republic, in order to express our eternal gratitude for the moral and material protection extended by Admiral Dewey to our trusted leader, Gen. Emilio Aguinaldo, who has been driven to take up arms in the name of 8,000,000 Filipinos in defense of those very principles of justice and liberty of which your country is the foremost champion.

"Our countrymen at home and those of us residing here, refugees from Spanish misrule and tyranny in our beloved native land, hope that the United States, your nation, persevering in its humane policy, will efficaciously second the programme arranged between you, sir, and General Aguinaldo in this port of Singapore, and secure to us our independence under the protection of the United States.

"Our warmest thanks are especially due to you, sir, personally, for having been the first to cultivate relations with General Aguinaldo and arrange for his cooperation with Admiral Dewey, thus supporting our aspirations which time and subsequent actions have developed and caused to meet with the applause and approbation of your nation.

"Finally, we request you to convey to your illustrious President and the American people, and to Admiral Dewey, our sentiments of sincere gratitude and our most fervent wishes for their prosperity.

"SINGAPORE, *June 8, 1898.*"

The address, which was written in Spanish, and read in French by Dr. Santos, the spokesman, was replied to in French by Mr. Spencer Pratt, to the following effect:

"Gentlemen, the honor you have conferred upon me is so unexpected that I can not find appropriate words with which to thank you, with which to reply to the eloquent address you have just read to me. Rest assured, however, that I fully understand and sincerely appreciate the motives that have prompted your present action, and that your words, which have sunk deep in my heart, shall be faithfully repeated to the President, to Admiral Dewey, and to the American people, from whom, I am sure, they will meet with full and generous response. A little over a month ago the world resounded with the praise of Admiral Dewey and his fellow-officers and men for a glorious victory won by the American Asiatic Squadron in the bay of Manila.

"To-day we have the news of the brilliant achievements of your own distinguished leader, Gen. Emilio Aguinaldo, cooperating on land with the Americans at sea. You have just reason to be proud of what has been and is being accomplished by General Aguinaldo and your fellow-countrymen under his command. When, six weeks ago, I learned that General Aguinaldo had arrived incognito in Singapore, I immediately sought him out. An hour's interview convinced me that he was the man for the occasion, and having communicated with Admiral Dewey, I accordingly arranged for him to join the latter, which he did at Cavite. The rest you know.

"I am thankful to have been the means, though merely the accidental means, of bringing about the arrangement between General Aguinaldo and Admiral Dewey which has resulted so happily. I can only hope that the eventual outcome will be all that can be desired for the happiness and welfare of the Filipinos. My parting words to General Aguinaldo were, 'General, when you have proved yourself great, prove yourself magnanimous,' and from the generous treatment that we understand he has accorded to the Spanish prisoners taken in the recent fight he has done so." [Applause.]

Dr. Santos, then addressing his fellow-countrymen (Paysanos), called for successive "vivas" for the President of the United States, for Admiral Dewey, and for Consul-General Pratt; for England, the "nation hospitalière," and for the editors of the Singapore Free Press and Straits Times. Consul-General Pratt called for "vivas" for General Aguinaldo and the Filipino people.

Mr. Spencer Pratt subsequently presented an American flag to Dr. Santos for the Filipino deputation. "This flag," he said, "was borne in battle, and is the emblem of that very liberty that you are seeking to attain. Its red stripes represent the blood that was shed for the cause, the white the purity of the motive, the blue field the azure of the sky, the stars the free and independent States of the Union. Take it and keep it as a souvenir of this occasion."

On receiving the flag from the consul's hands Dr. Santos called for three cheers for the American nation, waving the flag on high, and stating that the Filipinos would always cherish this emblem, which would be preserved for future generations to look upon with pride.

A band of Filipino musicians was in attendance and played a selection of music, including some very pretty melodies of their native land.

This interesting ceremony terminated about 6 p. m.

EXHIBIT B.

[Circular No. 4.]

DIVISION OF CUSTOMS AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 16, 1899.

The following order of the President is published for the information and guidance of all concerned:

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *Washington, December 21, 1898.*

The SECRETARY OF WAR.

SIR: The destruction of the Spanish fleet in the harbor of Manila by the United States naval squadron commanded by Rear-Admiral Dewey, followed by the reduction of the city and the surrender of the Spanish forces, practically effected the conquest of the Philippine Islands and the suspension of Spanish sovereignty therein.

With the signature of the treaty of peace between the United States and Spain by their respective plenipotentiaries at Paris, on the 10th instant, and as the result of the victories of American arms, the future control, disposition, and government of the Philippine Islands are ceded to the United States. In fulfillment of the rights of sovereignty thus acquired and the responsible obligations of government thus assumed the actual occupation and administration of the entire group of the Philippine Islands becomes immediately necessary, and the military government heretofore maintained by the United States in the city, harbor, and bay of Manila is to be extended with all possible dispatch to the whole of the ceded territory.

In performing this duty the military commander of the United States is enjoined to make known to the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands that in succeeding to the sovereignty of Spain, in severing the former political relations of the inhabitants, and in establishing a new political power the authority of the United States is to be exerted for the security of the persons and property of the people of the islands and for the confirmation of all their private rights and relations.

It will be the duty of the commander of the forces of occupation to announce and proclaim in the most public manner that we come, not as invaders or conquerors, but as friends, to protect the natives in their homes, in their employments, and in their personal and religious rights. All persons who, either by active aid or by honest submission, cooperate with the Government of the United States to give effect to these beneficent purposes will receive the reward of its support and protection. All others will be brought within the lawful rule we have assumed, with firmness if need be, but without severity so far as may be possible.

Within the absolute domain of military authority, which necessarily is and must remain supreme in the ceded territory until the legislation of the United States shall otherwise provide, the municipal laws of the territory in respect to private rights and property and the repression of crime are to be considered as continuing in force and to be administered by the ordinary tribunals so far as practicable. The operations of civil and municipal government are to be performed by such officers as may accept the supremacy of the United States by taking the oath of allegiance, or by officers chosen, as far as may be practicable, from the inhabitants of the islands.

While the control of all the public property and the revenues of the State passes with the cession, and while the use and management of all public means of transportation are necessarily reserved to the authority of the United States, private property, whether belonging to individuals or corporations, is to be respected except for cause duly established. The taxes and duties heretofore payable by the inhabitants to the late Government become payable to the authorities of the United States unless it be seen fit to substitute for them other reasonable rates or modes of contribution to the expenses of government, whether general or local. If private property be taken for military use it shall be paid for when possible in cash at a fair valuation, and when payment in cash is not practicable receipts are to be given.

All ports and places in the Philippine Islands in the actual possession of the land and naval forces of the United States will be opened to the commerce of all friendly nations. All goods and wares not prohibited for military reasons by due announcement of the military authority will be admitted upon payment of such duties and other charges as shall be in force at the time of their importation.

Finally, it should be the earnest and paramount aim of the military administration to win the confidence, respect, and affection of the inhabitants of the Philippines by assuring to them in every possible way that full measure of individual rights and liberties which is the heritage of free peoples, and by proving to them that the mission of the United States is one of benevolent assimilation, substituting the mild sway of justice and right for arbitrary rule. In the fulfillment of this high mission, supporting the temporary administration of affairs for the greatest good of the governed, there must be sedulously maintained the strong arm of authority to repress disturbance and to overcome all obstacles to the bestowal of the blessings of good and stable government upon the people of the Philippine Islands under the free flag of the United States.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

This order will be duly proclaimed and enforced.

G. D. MEIKLEJOHN,
Assistant Secretary of War.

Pensions and Pension Laws—A Review of the Work of the Pension Office under President McKinley—His Instruction to "Be Generous Within the Limit of the Law" has been Fully Carried Out by Commissioner Evans—A Brief Review of the Pension Legislation of the Republican Party—The Most Generous Pension Laws the World Has Ever Seen—The Pension Acts of 1900 and Their Effect.

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES DICK,

OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, June 5, 1900.

The House having under consideration the bill (H. R. 11538) making appropriations for the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901—

Mr. DICK said:

Mr. SPEAKER: The record of this Administration and of this Congress in regard to our soldiers and our pension laws needs no defense. It is not improper, however, now that the session is ending and three years of the Administration have passed into history, to briefly review the work that has been done in behalf of this class of our citizens, for whom our Government has cared and is caring with a tenderness and generosity unexampled in the history of nations.

WHAT THIS ADMINISTRATION HAS DONE FOR PENSIONERS.

Hon. Henry Clay Evans was appointed Commissioner of Pensions April 1, 1897.

He was born in Pennsylvania, and at an early age moved to Wisconsin, where he resided until he went into the military service in a Wisconsin regiment. After his muster out he served in the Quartermaster's Department until 1870, when he located at Chattanooga, Tenn., where he has since been engaged in business.

During the Administration of President Harrison he served as First Assistant Postmaster-General, and at the Republican national convention held at St. Louis, Mo., June 16, 1896, he was the principal competitor of Garret A. Hobart for the nomination as Vice-President, having received 277½ votes in the convention. He represented his district in the Fifty-first Congress.

He was elected governor of Tennessee on the Republican ticket in 1894 by a large majority, but was counted out by the Democrats, who controlled the machinery of the State.

Upon assuming the duties of Commissioner, Mr. Evans selected as Deputy Commissioners two ex-Union soldiers who had been employed in the Bureau for many years and who were thoroughly familiar with the pension system. He also appointed ex-Union soldiers to the other responsible positions in the Bureau. The two final adjudicating branches of the Bureau, viz, the board of review and the medical division, were placed in charge of experienced men, both ex-Union soldiers.

The chief of the board of review lost a leg in the service, and the assistant chief lost an arm and was otherwise severely wounded in action. The board of review is divided into four sections, all of which are in charge of ex-Union soldiers, two of them having lost an arm in battle. The great majority of the members of the board of review, whose functions are to pass upon the legal aspects of claims for pension, is composed of ex-Union soldiers of long experience in the examination of claims.

The organization of the medical division is similar to that of the board of review. The medical referee has a brilliant military record, having been granted a medal of honor by Congress for conspicuous bravery in action.

The majority of the medical examiners, whose duty it is to pass upon the medical questions involved in claims, are ex-Union soldiers.

The other important divisions in the Bureau are mostly in charge of ex-Union soldiers.

When Mr. Evans assumed the duties of his office, the President told him "to be generous within the limits of the law." In carrying out this policy the Commissioner called around him the ex-Union soldiers in the Bureau and asked their best efforts to aid him in carrying out the instructions of the President and the provisions of the pension laws as they exist. To the extent of his power he determined to make it a "soldiers' Bureau." The entire organization of the Bureau is consequently controlled by those who served in the Union Army. In all matters pertaining to the organization of the different divisions of the Bureau, in appointments, reinstatements, and promotions, the ex-Union soldier and sailor have been given the preference. The statute which gives preference to honorably discharged soldiers and sailors in the matter of appointments has been faithfully observed, and he has reinstated 157 ex-Union soldiers and sailors who had been discharged under former Administrations, besides promoting 287 of those now employed in the Bureau. He has also reinstated 23 ex-Union soldiers in the different agencies and promoted 29 to higher places. He has not stopped here in his good work, but in addition has reinstated and promoted 64 widows and orphans of deceased soldiers.

The Commissioner has fully realized the difficulties in his way in conducting the affairs of the Bureau to the satisfaction of all, and he therefore concluded that the soldiers of the country would appreciate the fact that their old comrades in arms were to have charge of the settlement of their claims.

No ruling of the Pension Bureau has ever evoked as much criticism and condemnation among pensioners and others interested in the work of the Bureau as Orders 225 and 239, issued during the Administration of President Cleveland.

Order 225 directed that all cases allowed under section 2 of the act of June 27, 1890, be drawn from the admitted files as rapidly as practicable, and that they be examined for the purpose of determining whether the allowances were in accordance with law. Under the operations of this order the names of many thousands of pensioners were dropped from the rolls and a great many pensioners had their pensions reduced.

The revision of claims referred to has not been done at all during the administration of Commissioner Evans. On the contrary, many of those who had been dropped under the former Administration have been restored to the rolls and a large number of those who were reduced have had their pensions increased.

Those who are familiar with the workings of Order 229 will readily recall the difficulties produced in the preparation of testimony and the many vexatious delays caused thereby. One of the first official acts of Commissioner Evans when he took charge of the Bureau was the revocation of said order, for which action he received the thanks of the national encampment Grand Army of the Republic.

The number of unsettled claims on file in the Pension Bureau June 30, 1897, was 578,099; the number on file June 30, 1898, was 635,059, and the number remaining on hand June 30, 1899, was 477,239. It will be remembered that with the advent of this Administration many thousands of new claims of all kinds were filed in the Pension Bureau, the number of original claims filed during the years 1897, 1898, and 1899 alone aggregating 126,136. The total number of all applications received during the fiscal year of 1899 was 164,881, while for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1898, the number was 218,489.

Notwithstanding this avalanche of new claims, which was added to the half million claims pending when Commissioner Evans assumed charge of the Bureau, the work of settling claims has been prosecuted with such diligence that at the end of the fiscal year of 1899 only 477,239 unsettled claims remained in the pending files of the Bureau, and only 172,197 of these are original claims, the balance being claims for increase or additional allowance.

In fact the work of the Bureau is now so nearly current that original claims can be settled as fast as they are completed by the claimants by furnishing the necessary evidence.

This result has been accomplished notwithstanding the fact that about 20,000 additional claims were filed last year on account of service in the war with Spain.

During the years of 1897, 1898, and 1899, nearly 140,000 original pensions were granted, while for the three years preceding 1897, viz, 1894, 1895, and 1896, only 118,644 of the same class were allowed.

On June 30, 1897, there were 976,014 pensioners on the rolls of the different agencies, while on June 30, 1899, the number was 991,519, showing a net increase since 1897 of 15,505.

The increase in the number of pensioners has grown steadily from year to year, the maximum number being in 1898, viz, 993,714. In 1894 the number was 969,544.

Since the close of the fiscal year 1894 there have been dropped from the rolls—

On account of death	185,572
Other causes, remarriage, etc	70,000
Total	255,572

And yet the roll has continued to increase each year until now it contains nearly 1,000,000 names.

The amount paid for pensions during 1893, the last year of the Harrison Administration, was $156,806,537.94.

During the following year (1894), which was the first year of the Democratic Administration, the amount paid for pensions dropped to $139,986,626.17, *being a reduction in one year of $16,819,911.87.*

During the present fiscal year up to May 31, 1900, the Pension Bureau has issued 90,918 certificates, and the number to be issued during the month of June will bring the total number of certificates issued for the year 1900 to over 100,000.

The payments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, on account of pensions will amount to over $140,000,000.

The annual value of the pension roll as it stood on June 30, 1899, was $131,619,961, and the average annual value of each pension was $132.74. The annual value of the roll is greater now than it ever was before.

Since April 1, 1897, over 12,000 names of pensioners, who had been previously dropped for various causes, have been restored to the rolls, and these persons are now receiving pensions amounting to $1,600,000 annually.

This work is still in progress, the Commissioner having directed the restoration of 503 names during the month of May, 1900.

In 1878 President Garfield predicted that the pension roll, which then aggregated $26,786,000, and embraced 232,137 pensioners, was at its maximum, but it has been steadily growing, until now the number of pensioners is nearly a million, and the amount necessary to pay the same is in excess of $140,000,000 a year.

In the State of Ohio alone, the number of pensioners on June 30, 1899, was 105,627, and the amount paid to them yearly was $15,456,003, or an annual average of $146.32 to each pensioner.

Since 1866 the total payments for Army and Navy pensions have been $2,389,910,974, and the magnitude of the pension roll, both as to the number of beneficiaries and the amount paid, has excited the wonder and admiration of the world.

ACT OF JUNE 27, 1890.

This beneficent law was passed by a Republican Congress, was approved by a Republican President, and has been so liberally administered by two Republican Administrations that there are now 420,912 soldiers and sailors, and 130,266 widows receiving its benefits who would not be entitled under the general pension laws. During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1899, the sum of $64,321,460.77 was paid to the pensioners under this act, being nearly one-half of the entire amount disbursed on account of pensions. The total amount paid to pensioners under the act of 1890 since its enactment is more than $500,000,000.

ACT OF MAY 9, 1900.

While this large number of beneficiaries take pension under the act of 1890, it was found that the terms of the law debarred many meritorious claimants from sharing in its benefits, and therefore an act was passed May 9, 1900, popularly known as the "Grand Army bill," amending the act of June 27, 1890, so as to bring within its provisions all meritorious claimants requiring some measure of relief from the Government on account of disability or dependency. This bill had previously received the approval of the President and the officers of his Administration, including the Commissioner of Pensions, who had for several years past recommended legislation along the same lines.

It is expected that under the operations of this act many thousands of names will be added to the pension rolls, and the Comsioner of Pensions is now actively engaged in making preparations looking to the prompt settlement of all claims that may be filed under its provisions.

Section 3 of this act liberalizes the provisions for pensioning soldiers' widows. The law of June 27, 1890, provided that the widow must be "without other means of support than her daily labor" to give her a pensionable status. The Secretary of the Interior held that unless the widow's other means of support exceeded what her pension would be ($96) she might be deemed to be without other means of support than her daily labor. The act of May 9, 1900, section 3, provides that if the soldier's widow's net income does not exceed $250, she shall be pensionable. This act will be the means of placing upon the pension rolls, according to the estimates of Bureau officials, from 35,000 to 40,000 soldiers' widows—a generous increase of about $3,500,000 annually to these most deserving representatives of the nation's defenders.

It is a well-known fact that President McKinley in his message to Congress recommended this legislation; that it was recommeded by the honorable Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Pensions. The Grand Army of the Republic at its national encampment at Philadelphia took occasion to commend the Commissioner for his recommendation of this generous liberalizing of the law.

ACT OF APRIL 15, 1900.

This is an act passed by Congress repealing the provisions of section 4716, Revised Statutes, so far as the same may be applicable to the claims for pension of dependent parents of soldiers, sailors, and marines who served in the Army or Navy of the United States during the war with Spain.

This law gives title to pension in cases where its beneficiaries aided and abetted the late rebellion and who furnished sons for the Army or Navy during the war with Spain who died or may hereafter die as a result of said service.

ACT OF APRIL 22, 1900.

This law, which was enacted by the present Congress, makes provision for granting an increase of pension to certain survivors of the war with Mexico who may become totally disabled and destitute.

This legislation will reach a very meritorious class of pensioners who have heretofore been debarred from applying for increase, notwithstanding they may have become totally disabled for the performance of any manual labor.

It is expected that a large number of beneficiaries will apply under this act, and their claims will receive prompt attention when filed in the Pension Bureau.

AMOUNT PAID FOR PENSION DURING THE YEAR 1899.

The payments on account of pensions during the year ending June 30, 1899, were $138,253,922.

The total payments on account of pensions during President Grant's first term were $116,136,275; during his second term, $114,395,357; during President Hayes's term, $145,322,489.

It will be noted that the payments for the one year (1899) were far in excess of the entire amount paid during the first or second Administrations of President Grant, and almost as much as was paid during the entire four years of President Hayes's Administration.

In the matter of allowances of original pensions it may be stated that during the first year of President McKinley's Administration there were allowed 52,648 original pensions. During the first year of President Cleveland's second Administration there were allowed only 39,085.

During the entire four years of President Grant's second Administration there were allowed only 42,917 original pensions.

RATES OF PENSION.

The rates of pension paid under the act of June 27, 1890, range from $6 per month (minimum) to $12 per month (maximum).

Total disability for manual labor under the general law is rated at $30 per month. The same degree of disability entitles to $12 per month under the act of June 27, 1890.

Under the general law (disability of service origin) 46,583 soldiers receive $12 per month, 21,970 receive $24 per month, and 15,498 receive $30 per month.

Under the act of June 27, 1890 (disability not of service origin), 160,406 soldiers receive the maximum rate ($12 per month), 26,540 receive $10 per month, 128,143 receive $8 per month, and 105,787 receive $6 per month.

This shows that there are more persons pensioned at the maximum rate than any other rate under the act of 1890, and that the number receiving the rate for total disability under that act is more than ten times the number receiving pension for total disability of service origin. These figures show that the ratings of the Pension Bureau in claims allowed under the act of 1890 are very liberal indeed.

Let us for a moment consider what this generous nation has done and is doing for its defenders:

First. The most liberal pension system that the world ever saw for those who were wounded or otherwise disabled in the service, and their widows and children and dependent parents and sisters and brothers.

Second. If the soldier lost a limb in the service, or, as the result of his service, in line of duty, the law provides that he shall be furnished, in addition to his pension, an artificial limb free of cost (every three years), or commutation therefor, and transportation from his home to such place as he shall select the artificial limb and return.

Third. A pension for all who served ninety days and who are now incapacitated for earning a support, and suitable provision for the widows and children and dependent parents.

Fourth. Preference in appointments to places of trust and profit, and preferences for retention in all civil-service positions.

Fifth. National Homes, located at convenient and healthy points in different parts of the country, where all the comforts of a home are provided free of all expense, including comfortable quarters, clothing, medical attendance, free library and amusements of different kinds, the Government providing free transportation to the Homes, and continuing payments of pension while a member of the Home, and increasing same as disabilities increase.

Sixth. State Homes (29 in number) kept up by the different States, and similar in their purpose to the National Homes, the sum of $100 being annually paid by the General Government to such Homes for each inmate. Many of these State Homes also provide for the wives and families of the inmates, so that they need not be separated while they are members of the Home.

Seventh. Soldiers' orphan schools, established by the different States, providing for the maintenance and education of soldiers' orphans until they attain the age of 16 years.

Eighth. There has been, in addition to all this, granted for various military services, as provided by law, over 70,000,000 acres of land, known as bounty land.

When we add to the $144,000,000 annual appropriation for the payment of pensions the amounts expended in other benefits to the soldiers, who can truthfully say of this Government that it is ungrateful to its defenders?

I find it interesting to compare what this generous nation is doing for its defenders with that which other great nations do for their military establishments.

Russia maintains a standing army of 1,000,000 soldiers in times of peace; of 2,125,000 soldiers in war, with a reserve of 6,950,000 men. Her total annual expenditures are $715,000,000, and of this

amount $155,000,000 (or 22 per cent) goes to the support of her great army.

France maintains a standing army of 589,000 soldiers in times of peace, with a reserve army of 2,500,000 men. Her total annual expenditures are $680,000,000; of this amount $145,000,000 (or 22 per cent) is appropriated to the support of her standing army.

Germany has a standing army of 585,000 soldiers in times of peace; in war, 2,320,000, with a reserve army of 4,300,000 men. Her annual expenditures for the support of her army amount to $135,000,000.

It will be seen by these figures that this generous nation pays, and rightly pays, about as much each year in the way of pensions, the support of its Homes, and other sources, to its patriotic defenders of 1861 to 1865, as does either of these great nations for the support of its mighty standing army in the field.

I have before me a pamphlet published "by authority"—"The advantages of the army; conditions on which young men are invited to join Her Majesty's regular forces"—and on page 11, section 37, I find:

The amount now paid in pensions annually to officers who have risen from the ranks, and to discharged soldiers, is as follows: Officers, warrant officers, sergeants, corporals, privates, etc. Number in receipt of pensions, total, 80,070; amount paid in pensions, £1,847,047.

Or, in our money, $8,922,237. Great Britain is a mighty nation in war and is always prepared and ready for war.

I have taken pains to make a careful examination of the several counts contained in the "indictment against Evans," presented in the National Tribune on August 31, 1899.

These counts comprise substantially the complaints which had been published from time to time in that paper and have been brought before the nation again by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER], and it will be found from an unbiased standpoint that there is nothing in these charges that constitutes a valid ground for complaint against the administration of the Pension Bureau.

First count.—Henry Clay Evans became Commissioner of Pensions at the close of an administration which was notorious for the narrowness, unfairness, injustice, not to say illegality, of its construction and administration of the pension laws. On him devolved the duty of formulating and putting into effect the policy of the new Administration, which there were the best of reasons for believing would be fair and just to the beneficiaries of the pension laws. But we found him soon devising means to obstruct and delay the ends of justice—to create new obstacles to the speedy adjudication and payment of claims.

Among his first official acts of importance was one which in effect required that all completed increase claims under the general law, based on disability not covered by the pension certificate, be sent to the special examination division for investigation, a course which was equivalent to burying these claims for from one to three years. (Instructions to Chiefs of Adjudicating Divisions, 1897.)

This count evidently refers to claims for increase on account of disabilities alleged years after filing the original claim for pension, and which are not sustained by the records of the War Department or by medical evidence of treatment in the service. It was uniformly held by the Department that where a claimant years after his discharge alleges a new disease or other disability of which his hospital record contains no mention and of which also there was no evidence at discharge, the presumption is that the disease or disability was not incurred in the service, but subsequently to his discharge, and it is not therefore pensionable.

It will be seen that under this rule most of this class of claims must be rejected. In order to avoid the necessity for this action, Commissioner Evans instructed the chiefs of the adjudicating divisions to exercise great care in the consideration of these claims, and, instead of rejecting those in which the evidence was general and vague as to origin in service of the alleged disabilities, to refer them for special examination in order to aid the claimants in establishing their claims. This action was entirely in the interests of claimants, for in the absence of facilities for obtaining additional information most of this class of claims would have to be rejected.

Second count.—He instituted a practice of refusing to consider any claim for increase of pension until a year had elapsed since the previous adjudication. (Order No. 352, dated December 24, 1897.) This he did without consultation with his superior officers of the Interior Department, and by a decision rendered March 30, 1898, he was required to abrogate this practice and reinstate the former practice dating from 1882. (P. D., 9, page 285.)

When the present Administration came into power many thousands of pensioners who were dissatisfied with the action of the prior Administration in rejecting their claims for increase of pension filed new claims for increase, amounting the first year to 109,479. It was simply impossible to handle this enormous amount of work except to the detriment of the thousands of original claims of persons who had never received any pension, and therefore a rule was adopted to the effect that claims for increase of pension would not be considered within twelve months from the date of the last action of the Bureau. This course was deemed necessary for the time being, as it enabled the Bureau to give more time and attention to those claimants who were not yet in receipt of a pension, and for the further reason that it was found in many cases so filed that the new claims for increase were filed within a week or a month of the last adjudication by the Bureau.

As it was believed by the Department that this rule might result in injustice to some meritorious applicants, it was deemed best to abrogate the rule after it had been in operation but a few months, and the former practice making the time six months was reestablished.

Third count.—In disregard of the law and taking upon himself the right to administer the laws or not as he saw fit, he refused to consider lawful pensions claims because the applicants were apparently residing beyond the limits of the United States. (Act of March 2, 1895; order dated November 23, 1897.) He was required to abandon this practice and subordinate himself to law. (P. D., 9, page 437.)

No orders were ever issued by the Commissioner in connection with the matters referred to in this count. Verbal instructions were given to return to the files some cases of claimants residing in foreign countries, in which orders for medical examination were to be issued, until the Commissioner could find time to consider them, he believing that claimants who resided in the United States and who pay taxes in this country should have preference in the consideration of their claims over claimants residing in foreign countries, most of them not citizens of this country and had never even been in this country.

Fourth count.—He prohibited any evidence obtained on special examination being made known to and permitted to be examined by claimant or attorney after the receipt of same in the Pension Bureau, alleging that the claimant had the right to follow the special examination in person or by attorney, but knowing that it is the exception rather than the rule where a claimant is able to himself follow or employ another to follow a special examination, often extending over several States. This he did in disregard of a rule and the settled practice of the Interior Department (December 19, 1891), and was required to return to the former practice. (P. D., 9, page 471.)

Under the rules and practice of the Bureau every pensioner or claimant whose case had been sent to the field for special examination is duly advised by the special examiner as to the time of commencement of the examination, and is also informed in every instance that he or she has the right to be present at such examination, either in person or by attorney, to introduce testimony, cross-examine witnesses, etc., and it is his privilege if he can not be present during the progress of the examination, to have read over to him by the special examiner all the testimony taken in his absence. There is, therefore, no bar to a claimant obtaining full knowledge of the testimony taken in such examination.

The facilities for obtaining full information by claimants being deemed ample, it was believed that no good purpose would be subserved by exhibiting the reports of special examiners to other persons, it having been found that such exhibition in many cases resulted in attempts to impeach the testimony of reliable witnesses who had testified before the special examiner.

In August, 1898, the Department, in the interest of harmony, established a rule permitting attorneys, under certain conditions, to examine the evidence obtained by special examiners.

Fifth count.—He adopted measures to defeat the act of July 18, 1894, relative to the right of claimant or attorney to inspect reports of examining surgeons. The enactment was in consequence of the action of the Lochren administration taking away the privilege of inspection of such reports, and though Mr. Evans professed to believe that his action was strictly in accordance with the law, it was clear that he desired to restore so far as possible the Lochren practice, with the evident incidental purpose of "getting even" with attorneys whom he claims were instrumental in the passage of the law. (Order dated October 21, 1897.)

He was required to abrogate this practice and restore that in full accordance with the spirit of the law. (P. D., 9, page 478.)

Commissioner Evans never adopted measures to defeat the act of July 18, 1894, which provides that the reports of examining surgeons when filed in the Bureau should be open to the examination and inspection of claimant or his attorney. On the contrary, he complied fully with the law and exhibited such certificates to those who had authority to examine them, but he declined to show them to persons not named in the law. The departmental decision of August 27, 1898, extended the privilege of seeing these papers to the representatives of recognized attorneys when they have written authority from their employer.

Sixth count.—To retard and obstruct the settlement of claims which he does not wish to allow, save at his pleasure, he adopted rules making it a disbarring offense for any attorney to seek, or to even suggest to a claimant to seek, information through a member of Congress as to the official status of a pension claim; and through evidently misleading representations as to the status of the work of the Bureau and the character of claims in which inquiry is made through members of Congress, he secured formal approval of said rules. (Rules 22 and 23, approved March 10, 1898.)

The requirements necessary to the proper adjudication of a claim are always plainly stated to the attorney, and in common justice to all claimants it is proper that their cases should be taken up for action in their regular order. To take them out of their order is a manifest injustice to other claimants. Congressional calls and letters of inquiry come to the Bureau at the rate of over a million annually.

The order of the Commissioner does not in any way abridge the rights of a claimant of his own volition to solicit the aid of his Representative in Congress if he so desires, but it does prohibit attorneys from annoying members of Congress with requests that

the claims which they represent be called up for action out of their turn, and Representatives in Congress should feel grateful to the Commissioner for relieving them of this annoyance.

Seventh count.—In disregard of a decision construing the law relative to the pension title of remarried dependent mothers under the act of June 27, 1890 (P. D., 6, page 30), he instituted a practice of rejecting the claims of all such, having covertly secured the formal approval of such practice by embodying the rule therefor in an alleged codification of existing practice in April, 1898. He was required to amend his self-instituted rule and regard the law and the decision of the Department. (P. D., 10, dated June 21, 1899.)

However, it is the truth that none of the claims rejected under his infamous ruling set aside by the decision (P. D., 10, dated June 21, 1899) have ever been reopened and allowed, he claiming that the decision is not "res adjudicata." Yet common sense, or a desire to be reasonably honest in his endeavor to do right, should have readily pointed his plain duty to recall from the rejected files all such claims and adjudicate them in accordance with the construction of the law promulgated by his immediate superior.

Section 4708 of the Revised Statutes provides that the remarriage of a dependent mother after the death of her son shall be a bar to pension, and there is nothing contained in the terms of the first section of the act of June 27, 1890, repealing, by implication or otherwise, section 4708.

When the Pension Bureau prepared its treatise on the practice, it held that the remarriage of a mother after the death of the soldier was a bar to pension. This treatise, instead of as charged in this count, was before the Department for a considerable time for review, and under date of April 9, 1898, received the approval of the then Secretary of the Interior, Hon. C. N. Bliss.

The charge that the approval to such treatise was covertly secured is wholly false and is entitled to no further comment. All claims rejected under that practice upon the ground of remarriage have been and are now being adjudicated under the departmental decision of June 21, 1899, which decision reverses the practice formerly sanctioned and approved by the Department, as fast as they come up for action.

Eighth count.—He continues to reject the just claims under the act of June 27, 1890, of those denied by the last Administration, and to cut off from the pension roll those who escaped the merciless "revision" perpetrated by his immediate predecessors; and the city of Chicago and elsewhere has inaugurated experimentally an iniquitous and unwarranted inquisition to discover possible fraud and to complete the work of Lochren and Hoke Smith and cut off those pensioners held entitled under the Harrison Administration and who have heretofore by some chance escaped the blights of the Hoke Smithism and Lochrenism. No one desires to shield the malefactor, but there is no warrant in law for the indiscriminate and insulting investigation put upon the innocent many by the present Commissioner to seek out the possible guilty few, that he may win anew the plaudits of the press that finds special satisfaction in all that puts upon the pensioners the stigma of dishonor and dishonesty.

This count is so general and indefinite in its terms and so manifestly untrue that it hardly warrants any consideration. Whenever title to pension is shown under the law, a certificate issues in favor of such claimant; but where there is no legal title shown, the claim must necessarily be rejected.

With reference to the investigations instituted by the Bureau in Chicago and elsewhere, it will be recalled that time and again it has been stated by prominent members of the Grand Army of the Republic that if the pension rolls contained the names of persons who were not entitled to pension by law, but who had obtained such pension by fraud, the Grand Army of the Republic was ever ready and desirous of having such names dropped and the rolls purged.

The efforts of the Commissioner to expose fraud fearlessly when found should, instead of causing condemnation, merit commendation.

When complaints as to fraud are made to the Commissioner or he has good reason to believe that the law has been violated, it is his duty to ferret out the same and to punish the guilty.

Examination of the agency rolls in several cities in 1898 revealed 189 cases in which pension was being paid in violation of law. Will any fair-minded man say that the names of these parties should have remained upon the rolls, or that the 157 convictions by the courts of offenders against the pension laws during the year 1899 should be set aside, and that the Commissioner should be condemned for instituting the inquiries which developed these frauds?

Ninth count.—He continues to nullify the act of March 6, 1896, passed by Congress to correct an abuse and misinterpretation of the act of June 27, 1890, by the Cleveland Administration; and until required by the direction of his superior officer, refused to apply the law, even to the extent permissible under the interpretation of the former administration, unless specifically requested by claimants. (P. D., 10, dated December 21, 1898.)

An examination of the Treatise on the Practice of the Pension Bureau, approved by the Secretary of the Interior April 9, 1898, fully disproves the charges in this count as to the act of March 6, 1896. The instructions contained on page 97 of that treatise provide fully for carrying out the provisions of said act, and further comment is unnecessary as to the charges in this count.

Tenth count.—Contrary to the law and the rights of claimants to choose, he has rejected thousands of claims on the alleged ground of "no benefit," whereas the claims should have been granted and the claimants permitted to elect which of two pensions they would prefer to receive. He was required to discontinue this practice. (P. D., 10, dated December 7, 1898.)

Ever since the passage of the act of June 27, 1890, and with the approval of the Department, the Pension Bureau, in order not to delay the payment of pension to those adjudged entitled thereto and who were often in immediate need of relief, elected for the claimant, if he had a claim pending under both laws, that one which would give him the greater benefit. This practice was a beneficent one to claimants, as it avoided the delay that now must necessarily occur by awaiting their replies to correspondence as to which of the two pensions they prefer to take.

Eleventh count.—For nearly two years he has unlawfully withheld from settlement all general law claims of children over 16 years of age, in disregard of the law and decision of the Department (P. D., 7, page 433); meanwhile using every effort to secure such a construction of the law as will enable him to reject and deny these lawful claims, the matter being now pending on his renewed request for reconsideration of the questions of law.

The proviso to the act of March 3, 1879, exempting from the limitation therein imposed all claims by or in behalf of children under sixteen years of age, has been the subject of many different constructions, and Commissioner Evans, being desirous of executing the law justly, determined to refer the matter at issue to the Secretary of the Interior for his decision. The only cases held up pending such decision were those in which applications for pension were filed after a child had reached the pensionable age.

The pension to minor children was intended by Congress to aid, assist, and comfort the children during the period of their minority and not after they had grown up to mature manhood or womanhood.

The decision of the Secretary of the Interior recently handed down, shows the wisdom of the Commissioner in withholding action in this class of cases, as such action has undoubtedly saved the Government from paying a large amount of money to persons whose pensionable status must be determined by judicial process.

Twelfth count.—He has for the past year unlawfully withheld from official consideration in ordinary course of business the just claims of soldiers and sailors of the Spanish war, many of them sons and other relatives of soldiers and sailors of the rebellion, on the misrepresentation that the War Department has been unprepared or unwilling or unable to furnish required information from the official military records, whereas the War Department has been ready and willing to furnish desired reports on twenty-four hours' notice. (National Tribune, June 29, 1899.) The unlawful and unjustifiable action of the Commissioner of Pensions in this class of claims furnishes striking evidence of his personal feelings and disposition toward all beneficiaries of the pension laws, there being with respect to this class of claims no room for the slanderous objection or suggestion that the claimants have for many years slept on their alleged rights and the claims are therefore presumably of doubtful or fraudulent character.

The report of the Commissioner of Pensions for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1899, shows that there had been filed 17,560 Army and Navy claims, and 303 allowed, on account of service in the war with Spain, the latter being claims of widows and invalids, by reason of gunshot wounds and for the more severe disabilities, and that claims for minor disabilities or disabilities of a temporary character are being taken up for action in the order of their filing.

The charge that this class of cases is not being considered in their regular order is as ridiculous as the charge made in some newspapers that the cases of soldiers of the civil war were being side-tracked and delayed in order that the cases of soldiers of the Spanish war might have preference. All these cases are receiving careful attention just as fast as they can be reached in the order of their filing.

Thirteenth count.—It is notorious that claims filed under the general law before July 1, 1880, and therefore involving arrears to date of discharge, are rejected by his direction unless supported by record evidence, and if supported by record evidence are buried in the special examination division, the evident purpose being to reject if not to delay indefinitely all claims requiring a large first payment.

The charges in this count are general and indefinite, and not a single case is cited to show that the practice complained of has ever been instituted.

Claims for pension carrying arrears are allowed without any record evidence whatever of the disabilities alleged whenever the proof required by the law to establish a claim has been furnished.

To refute this charge it is only necessary to state that within the past year nearly 300 claims have been allowed, carrying from $1,000 to $3,800 on the first payment.

Fourteenth count.—He has rejected thousands of claims for invalid pensions under the act of June 27, 1890, the applicants in which are 62 years of age and over, notwithstanding that under the Mexican war pension act of January 29, 1887, claimants 62 years of age are regarded as pensionably disabled and entitled to the rating of $8 per month, and notwithstanding that 62 years is the compulsory retirement age of the Regular Army, Navy, and Marine Corps.

The act of January 29, 1887, pensions soldiers of the Mexican war when they become 62 years of age. It is also true that officers in the Army and Navy are being retired upon attaining that age, but the Commissioner of Pensions has no power to make laws, and the act of June 27, 1890, does not contain a word to the effect that a survivor of the civil war is entitled to pension by reason of his having reached the age of 62 years.

It is manifestly absurd to charge the Commissioner with the violation of a law which has no existence, and this charge is a fair specimen of the recklessness which has obtained in formulating the different counts in this indictment.

Fifteenth count.—Upon manifestly misleading representations as to the status of the official business of the Pension Bureau he procured the reduction of the office force of the Pension Bureau by 100 (July 1, 1898), notwithstanding that the delays in action and settlement were then great, and have

continued notoriously so to the present time, being as great as if not greater than for many years past, thousands of claimants being unable to secure any action on their claims, or learn what, if any, additional evidence is necessary, weeks and months growing into years without any information of any character being elicited as to the official status of the claim. It is worthy of note that a discrimination appears to be made against claims on file many years, and therefore involving considerable sums as arrears, the official reports as to the average amounts of first payments bearing out what has become noticeable in this regard. (Annual Report, 1898, page 23.)

The charge that 100 clerks were dropped from the rolls June 30, 1898, is true. It is also true that the efficiency of the service was in no way impaired by this reduction.

There were just that number of employees in the Bureau who had become inefficient for the work of the Bureau by reason of age and physical disabilities, and the only question was whether they should be carried on the pay roll as pensioners or be dropped. They retarded rather than helped the work of the Bureau, and it is not proposed to made a defense with regard to this reduction of force.

Sixteenth count.—Notwithstanding the great number of just and valid claims awaiting settlement for many years, he has diligently avoided their consideration in order that he may be able to turn back unexpended into the Treasury large amounts of the appropriations for pensions. (Annual Reports, 1897, 1898, 1899.)

The report of the Commissioner of Pensions for the year ended June 30, 1898, shows that the board of review examined during that year 233,065 cases which were submitted by the adjudicating divisions, and for the year ended June 30, 1899, 245,355 were examined by the board.

This showing certainly refutes any charges of avoidance of consideration of claims.

With reference to the charge that the Commissioner is anxious to turn back unexpended into the Treasury large amounts of the appropriations for pensions, it is only necessary to state that for the fiscal year of 1898, when the appropriation of $140,000,000 was in danger of becoming exhausted, the Commissioner asked for and received a deficiency appropriation of over $8,000,000 to pay the pensions for that year, and he expended the greater part of this amount in addition to the regular appropriation of $140,000,000.

Seventeenth count.—He has sought to deprive claimants of the benefit of advice of counsel by forwarding to them direct the orders for medical examination, expecting and desiring that claimants, without knowledge of their rights and privileges and without due regard for their interests, will place themselves at a disadvantage and afford a greater opportunity for the rejection or delay of their claims. (Order 361, dated April 14, 1898.)

Order 361, dated April 14, 1898, simply directed that all orders for medical examination shall be sent direct to the claimant, and that the attorney be notified by card on the same day that an examination has been ordered.

The charge does not point out nor can it be understood how under this arrangement any rights of a claimant have been abridged or how a claimant is thereby deprived of the benefit of advice of counsel, if any such were needed, or how the mere fact of transmittal of an order for medical examination direct to the claimant would afford opportunity for the rejection or for delay in the claim. This charge is simply ridiculous. The order was issued in order to avoid delay on the part of the attorney in forwarding it to the claimant and to give the claimant an opportunity of presenting himself before a board of surgeons without waiting for the attorney to send him the necessary authority.

Eighteenth count.—While criticising, both in the public press and in official reports, the work of the examining surgeons appointed and retained by him on grounds of fitness, and showing the fallibility of the examinations made by them under his direction, he nevertheless habitually regards their reports as absolutely correct when unfavorable to the claimants, and, as the personal knowledge and experience of thousands of claimants attest, wholly disregards favorable reports on slight pretext or no pretext whatever. (See Associated Press reports and annual report for 1898.)

The charges in this count are so completely without foundation and so devoid of truth that it would be absurd to attempt to answer them, especially as no particular cases are cited and no facts are stated to substantiate them.

Nineteenth count.—Before he had been in office a year he entered upon a course of tirade against alleged pension frauds, his pratings in the public press in the form of inspired articles and statements purporting to be "interviews" rivaling and eclipsing in misrepresentation and maliciousness anything of similar character published during the preceding Administration. (Associated Press reports.)

The Commissioner has used every effort to discover frauds, and when he has found that certain attorneys have been guilty of wholesale fabrications of declarations and affidavits, or, rather, papers purporting to be such, by causing them to be signed in blank, by deceiving witnesses as to the contents of their affidavits, by forging jurats, altering of records, etc., and wholesale frauds, such as men drawing two and three pensions, and false personations of soldiers and pensioners, he has deemed it his duty to state these facts in his annual reports, and he should not be condemned either for uncovering the frauds or for letting the public know that such frauds have been committed. Would it not be reprehensible for a public officer to conceal the existence of fraud? Knowing the Commissioner of Pensions as well as I do, I do not think he is built that way, and it is my opinion that he will continue to prosecute fraudulent claimants and attorneys as long as he remains Commissioner of Pensions, the National Tribune and the advisers of the honorable gentleman from New York to the contrary notwithstanding.

Twentieth count.—He has studiously invited and obtained the approval, to a large degree, of the same portion of the public press that applauded the "revision" and alleged "reforms" instituted by Lochren and Hoke Smith, and has claimed personal credit for the detection and suppression of alleged frauds and for reducing the pension roll or permitting a minimum increase. The same press that acclaimed Lochren and Hoke Smith as wise and just finds joy and satisfaction in Henry Clay Evans. At the same time he has cunningly sought and obtained credit with the press friendly to the Union survivors of the war of the rebellion and their interests, by an apparently considerable number of allowances, a large percentage of which, however, have represented little or nothing of substantial benefit to the alleged beneficiaries, being reissues, duplicates, renewals, supplementals, and the like.

The allowance during the fiscal year of 1898 of 52,648 new claims and of 26,760 claims for increase, of 37,077 new claims and 24,497 increase claims during the year of 1899, the allowance of over 100,000 claims of all classes for the year of 1900, the increase of the average annual value of the roll for the year 1899 over that of 1898, show of itself whether a little or nothing of substantial benefit has accrued from the allowances of claims during the period stated.

Twenty-first count.—He has vilified the wives of survivors of the war of the rebellion, wickedly attributing to them unworthy, mercenary motives in their marriages, not only in the public press, but in official reports (Annual Report, 1898), and has sought in Congress to obtain legislation to cut off the helpmates of the declining years of invalid pensioners.

When Congress passed the act of June 27, 1890, it saw fit to grant pension under its provisions only to those who had married the soldier or sailor prior to the passage of said act.

The Commissioner believed that there should be no discrimination between the wife of a soldier who applied for pension under the general law and the one who applied under the act of 1890. He therefore recommended certain legislation to that effect, but he did not in any way vilify the wives of survivors of the civil war, only pointing out the apparent discrimination in the law and citing some cases in which late marriages were evidently contracted by reason of mercenary motives.

Twenty-second count.—He has vilified in the public press the claimants whose just claims have been unjustly rejected by him, insinuating that they are rejected because fraudulent, and that every honest, lawful claim is granted promptly and freely by him. (Associated Press reports.)

If so many claims have been unjustly rejected by the Commissioner, as charged in this count, is it not very strange that the Bureau of Pensions has been overruled by the Department in so few cases? It can not be denied that cases have been rejected because they are fraudulent, and certainly no one can hold that a fraudulent claim is a just one. The reports of the Commissioner freely discuss the various grounds upon which claims had to be rejected, and I commend these reports to your careful consideration.

Twenty-third count.—He has vilified in the public press all survivors of the war and others acting as the authorized representatives of pension claimants, characterizing them as "buzzards," and alleging that they are regularly engaged in the prosecution of known fraudulent claims, and that through his thwarting of such attempted frauds he has incurred the ill will of the attorneys and thereby of the order of the Grand Army. This he has done notwithstanding that attorneys admitted to practice before the Department are obliged by law and the official regulations to furnish satisfactory evidence that they are of "good moral character and in good repute" (act of July 4, 1884, section 5), and are subject to disbarment for offenses far less grave than wittingly prosecuting fraudulent claims. After broadly characterizing the attorneys admitted and continued in good standing by his official superiors of the Department, he proposes no reform or remedy for the alleged corruption and disregard of law but the absolute prohibiting of the employment or recognition of attorneys, agents, or counsel whatever in behalf of pension claimants and the vesting of the prosecution as well as the adjudication of pension claims in the Commissioner of Pensions. (P. D., 10, dated December 7, 1898.)

That there are many attorneys practicing before the Pension Bureau who are in every way honorable, and that there are others who do not hesitate to resort to fraudulent and questionable ways, can not be denied, and no abuse showered upon Commissioner Evans by the last-named attorneys or by their newspaper organs will for one moment receive the sanction of an impartial public.

Twenty-fourth count.—Instead of desiring and suggesting, as was his privilege and right, the abrogation of rules and practice instituted under the late Administration, and working great wrong and injustice and disregard of the letter and spirit of the law, especially with regard to the act of June 27, 1890, he prefers and seeks the continuance of odious measures and practice, particularly Order 225, of June 9, 1898. The alleged Treatise on the Practice of the Pension Bureau, prepared and published under his direction in April, 1898, instead of being the vehicle, or even the means of suggestion, of the obviation of harsh measures and a liberalizing of the practice, was used as a means to covertly introduce new obstructions and limitations with regard to increase claims (page 117) and dependent mothers' claims (page 116), as already shown, the whole codification being approved en bloc upon his evident misrepresentation as to the character of the publication.

Twenty-fifth count.—He resolves all doubts against the claimant, as the experience and observation of thousands attest, and has not originated nor instituted a single practice looking to a greater liberality in dealing with claimants.

Since the incumbency of Commissioner Evans not one case previously allowed has been revised under Order 225.

The practice, instead, has been liberalized. Certain disabilities for which, under the prior Administration, no rating was allowed under the act of June 27, 1890, have been held to be ratable.

Those who have known the Commissioner in and out of the office, can truthfully testify that it has been his desire, expressed through his direction to the officers of the Bureau, that all reasonable doubts in pension cases should be resolved in favor of the claimant, and he has also repeatedly advised the medical officers of the Bureau to act liberally within the law in all cases. The fact must not be lost sight of that he is only an executive officer and is charged simply with the execution and not with the enactment of the law.

Twenty-sixth count.—His every official recommendation has been looking to restriction and limitation upon existing rights under the pension laws (Annual Reports, 1897, 1898), in glaring contrast with those of most of his predecessors. (Annual Reports, 1887, 1891, 1892, 1893, 1896, and others.)

It has been conceded by very eminent lawyers that the third section of the act of June 27, 1890, if literally construed, would debar from pension any widow of a soldier who has any means whatever aside from her daily labor, but the Department has held that the income of a widow, if below the amount which the act bestows ($96 per year), should not be a bar to title.

It is well known that Commissioner Evans has always held a different opinion from that held by the Department. He has uniformly held that an income up to $250 per year should not defeat the title of a widow for pension under said act, and by the act of May 9, 1900, Congress has indorsed his opinion by fixing that amount as the allowable income of a widow claimant.

If necessary to show the liberality of the Commissioner in his ideas of construction of the pension laws, I could cite numbers of cases in which he recommends more liberal legislation from Congress and a more liberal construction of existing laws, but enough has already been said to show the unreliable character of the charges contained in this indictment.

Not a discreditable feature has ever been disclosed in any of the publications from the National Tribune that has in any way affected the character of the Commissioner of Pensions or his loyalty to the country or to the soldiers and their dependents.

His aim has been to mete out justice to the defenders of the Union, and no better friend of the good soldier has ever filled the office of Commissioner of Pensions than Henry Clay Evans, of Tennessee.

Much has been said about the extravagance or expense of the maintenance of our great pension system. I find from official figures that the pension agencies are now paying over 1,000,000 pensioners (covering the names that are each year added to the rolls, and those being dropped for death and other causes), doing all the work, including salaries, rent, fuel, lights, and other expenses of supplies incident, in making four quarterly payments for the thirty-four years (beginning with the year 1866 and ending with the fiscal year 1899), for one-half of 1 per cent, or, in round numbers, *$12,000,000* for disbursing $2,389,310,864.

During the thirty-four years ending with the year 1899 there has been paid for pensions alone *$2,389,910,874.74*, and covering all salaries and all other expenses of the Bureau for the same period there has been disbursed the sum of $52,237,226.42. This sum includes salaries to all employees, including special examiners and their traveling expenses, and all the other expenses incident to the adjudication and payment of pensions.

This sum is a little in excess of 2 per cent of the amount disbursed for pensions.

Gossips have had much to say about the methods of the Bureau in investigating claimants for widows' pensions. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER] has taken occasion to quote that often-told falsehood. It is true that the printed instructions to special examiners in the field prior to this Administration were a little too plain in their requirements. The present Commissioner of Pensions issued a new book of instructions and placed in the hands of each special examiner in 1897 (a copy of which I have), forbidding the asking of the widow if she has violated the act of August 7, 1882 (page 8), and if any examiner does this, he violates his instructions on original applications; and it is only done when it is reported that the widow, already pensioned, is living in marriage or adultery. "In such cases the examiner will make his investigation carefully and discreetly, so as not to cause unnecessary neighborhood gossip or scandal."

If an examiner does more or does less, he violates the law and instructions. Congress made the law; if it is an unjust law, let us repeal it. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER] makes use of a letter addressed to the editor of the National Tribune by Charles L. De Weale, referring to the case of Mrs. Mary M. Elliott, of Roscommon, Mich. I have investigated this case. Mr. Carpenter and Mrs. Elliott were not so old when they commenced living under the same roof; they were not then, thirty-three years ago, so decrepit. Some of the neighbors thought it at least suspicious, and if not suspicious, it must be a sporadic case of thirty-three years of virtue. However, why did not the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER] tell the whole truth and say that full justice was done; that the benefit of the doubt was given, and that Mrs. Elliott was continued on the pension roll?

One more item, and I am done. The whole parade of figures and alleged facts presented by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER] are wholly unreliable and unworthy of consideration. He gives the amounts appropriated each year to pay special examiners, and credits the year 1897 to the "Evans" administration. It must be remembered that *1897 $500,000* was for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, ending soon after the "Evans" administration came in. This appropriation was reduced for 1898 to $450,000, and not all expended. In 1899 it was again reduced to $400,000, and was not all expended. For the current year the appropriation is $400,000, and I know a considerable per cent will not be expended. Let us be truthful; let us not misrepresent our own generous Government. I know of many just claimants who never could have established their claims without the aid of the special examiner, and the just and generous system of the Government in sending these claims to the different parts of the country, and these same special examiners affording the claimant full opportunity to prove his or her claim. They are not spies, but they are sworn officers of the Government.

The fact remains that this generous Government pays over *$140,000,000* annually to pensioners. No other government in the world, in all time, dealt so generously with its defenders as does this great Republic of ours.

The course of the United States, Mr. Speaker, in regard to its military and military needs is unique. While European nations are spending vast sums for the maintenance of standing armies, our nation contents itself with a small army in times of peace, relying with perfect confidence on the patriotism of her citizens to come to her support in time of war. And in this she is never disappointed. No army ever made a better record than did our volunteer soldiers in the war with Spain or in the civil war, and we are thus fully justified in devoting to an unprecedentedly liberal pension system the money which we would otherwise expend upon a standing army. In this way we keep our entire population employed in peaceful pursuits, which add to the prosperity and wealth of the nation and at the same time insure to future generations the same prompt and patriotic response from the people should occasion require their services in defense of the country's honor.

THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—ITS SPLENDID WORK IN BEHALF OF THE FARMERS OF THE COUNTRY UNDER THE ADMINISTRATION OF PRESIDENT M'KINLEY.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to take this opportunity to point out some features of the splendid work which the Department of Agriculture has performed in behalf of that most important and largest class of our citizens, the farmers and those engaged in agricultural pursuits of all kinds. The selection of the President for this important duty as a member of his Cabinet was a most happy one. Hon. James Wilson, of the great agricultural State of Iowa, had been for many years one of its most successful farmers, and at the same time a careful student of agriculture in those lines which enable an intelligent combination of science and practical experience. A thorough student of soils and their various products and of all matters pertaining to farm life and production, he brought to the Department a rare combination of practical experience and high intelligence. Adding to these his long experience as a member of the State legislature, member of Congress, director of the State agricultural experiment station, and professor of agriculture at the Iowa State University, he was especially fitted to give to the farmers of the country the best results by far that they have ever obtained from the work of that great Department, established by Republican legislation in 1862, in their special interest—the only Department of the Government which devotes its attention to the interests of a single class of our population.

STUDYING THE DISEASES OF FARM ANIMALS.

During the past three years several important problems concerning the suppression and eradication of contagious and infectious diseases of domestic animals have been carefully studied. The diseases selected for investigation have been those which experience and recorded observations have proven to be most injurious from an economic point of view. Especial attention has been given to the cattle disease known as blackleg, a disease which, although it occurs more or less throughout the United States, was not recognized as a cause of very serious losses until about four years ago, when this investigation was begun. It has been proved that blackleg is the most destructive disease known among young cattle in this country, and the annual loss caused by it must be counted in millions of dollars. As it seemed to be on the increase in many of the principal cattle-raising States, and as it was known from investigations made in Europe that blackleg may be prevented through vaccination, it was decided to try the same remedy in this country. Experiments made in the field with the so-called double vaccine soon proved that the method could not be employed where the question was to treat thousands

of half-wild cattle, and it was therefore decided to try the method known as single vaccination, which had not been previously used in this country. Experiments covering more than a year resulted in the preparation of a vaccine which, through a single inoculation, would render all treated animals practically immune against this disease.

During the past three years there have been prepared nearly 2,000,000 doses of blackleg vaccine, which have been distributed among the farmers and cattle owners in the infected districts, with the result that the mortality among the young cattle in the infected districts has been reduced from 10 to 15 per cent annually to one-half of 1 per cent. At the present rate of distribution more than 2,000,000 calves annually will be vaccinated, which means a saving to the country of five or six millions of dollars every year.

The animal parasites of sheep have been given much attention, and comparative tests have been made of the most promising methods of treatment. The gasoline treatment has given extremely satisfactory results, not only destroying the parasites of the stomach and intestines, but apparently also those in the lungs and air passages, including the larvæ of the œstrus (grubs) in the nasal chambers. If on further trial this remedy continues to yield the results which have apparently been obtained by its use up to this time, it will be of very great assistance to the sheep industry. In all sections of the country, but particularly in the South, stomach worms, intestinal worms, lung worms, and grubs in the head have made sheep raising a difficult and precarious industry. But this treatment, which is very cheap and easily administered, seems to solve the problem, and makes it possible to raise sheep safely and successfully where heretofore the animals have been destroyed or rendered valueless through the rapid invasion of these parasites.

A serious and somewhat fatal disease of sheep, known as facial dermatitis, has been partially studied. This disease, which causes much suffering by invading the mouth to such an extent that the affected animals can not eat, is found to yield readily to appropriate treatment, and any sheep owner will be able hereafter to conduct the treatment and eradicate it.

Another disease of sheep, called provisionally pseudo-tuberculosis, affects the lymphatic glands and appears to be quite common in some sections of the country. The bacillus causing the disease has been discovered, but the conditions under which the disease is communicated have not yet been determined.

The preparation of antitoxic serums for hog cholera and swine plague has been conducted on a large experimental and practical scale. During the past two years extensive field experiments have been conducted in several counties in the State of Iowa with altogether satisfactory results, from 70 to 80 per cent of the treated animals being saved. There have been two or three herds out of some 23,000 to 24,000 animals that were treated in Iowa that have not shown good results. The disease in these herds, however, was found to be of a very virulent character, more virulent than other outbreaks with which the Department had previously had to contend.

The method of serum treatment at present is not perfect, but it has given uniformly very much better results than any other method of treating these diseases in swine than has heretofore been suggested. The experiments are being continued with a view of perfecting the details.

Experimental exports of selected creamery butter were made to England for the purpose of attracting attention to the fine butter produced in this country and of gaining information beneficial to all persons desiring to sell in British markets. Shipments were made periodically during the greatest butter-producing months of the year 1897. In this experiment every feature of the shipment of butter was considered—the characters of butters in demand in English markets, the kinds of packages most desirable, the best methods of packing and transportation, as well as original cost, transportation charges, and selling prices. All considered, the operations of the first year were regarded as reasonably satisfactory in a business way as well as otherwise, while at the same time a number of points were developed showing where greater economy could be practiced in the experiments which were to follow. A full report of this work appeared in the Fifteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of Animal Industry. Experiments along the same line were conducted in 1898 and in 1899 in shipments to Asiatic countries with like satisfactory results, and a report will soon appear in the Sixteenth Annual Report of the Bureau.

In addition to the above, some interesting and satisfactory experiments in the shipment of eggs, with the same objects in view as in the butter shipments have been conducted. A report of this work will also appear in the Sixteenth Annual Report of the Bureau.

The inspection of live stock and their products (meat inspection) has been extended to 60 additional abattoirs and packing houses in 16 cities and is now carried on at 148 abattoirs in 45 cities.

Inspection has been established at one abattoir where horses are slaughtered and the flesh prepared for exportation. A regular inspection of horses exported to foreign countries has been established and this has also been extended to the examination of horses which are imported from foreign countries into the United States.

Measures have recently been adopted for preventing the interstate traffic of sheep affected with scab and efforts made for cooperation with State authorities for the eradication of this disease. Sheep which are infected with scab or have been exposed to the infection are prohibited from shipment from one State or Territory into another unless dipped in a preparation approved by this Department. In pursuance of this order 1,781,468 sheep have been dipped which were either infected with or exposed to the contagion of this disease. The effect of this order has been extremely satisfactory. The indications are that it will soon be possible to make stock cars, the principal stock yards, and other channels of interstate commerce safe and free from infection, in which case store sheep may be purchased in the market without danger of infection.

The antemortem inspections of animals numbered 42,310,107 in 1897, 51,335,398 in 1898, and 53,223,176 in 1899; and the post-mortem inspections numbered 26,580,689 in 1897, 31,116,833 in 1898, and 34,163,155 in 1899.

A remarkable advancement in the microscopic inspection of pork is shown. The total amount thus inspected in 1896 was 22,900,880; in 1897, 43,572,355; in 1898, 120,271,659; in 1899, 108,928,195. In 1896 it cost the Government 0.264 cent per pound to inspect this pork and in 1899 0.182 cent.

DEVELOPMENT OF NEW AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRIES.

One of the first enterprises taken up under Secretary Wilson was the investigation of the growing in this country of those agricultural products for which we have heretofore depended on foreign countries. The first one taken up was chicory cultivation. Our imports of this product in the fiscal year 1896 had a value of $225,229.31; our imports for the years 1898 and 1899 had a value of $14,677 and $13,470, respectively. As thus indicated, the chicory consumed in the United States is now produced almost entirely by our own farmers. This is a striking illustration of the application of the best American methods of farming to a foreign agricultural industry.

Several other crops of foreign countries are now under investigation, and reports on them will be published as the experiments are completed.

FIBER PLANTS.

The special appropriation for fiber investigations which had been made for some years having been discontinued on June 30, 1898, this line of work was incorporated with that of the Division of Botany, and, while no funds have been provided, experimentation has been begun in a small way, directed toward the establishment of a fine hemp industry in the United States, as well as toward the growing of Egyptian cotton. While the experiments on these crops have not yet been completed, the present indications give promise that the Department will ultimately be in a position to indorse them as worthy of commercial trial.

SEED TESTING.

The movement against the sale of impure or nongerminable seed by unscrupulous dealers resulted in the enactment of a provision in the agricultural appropriation act of 1898 authorizing the Department to test seed purchased in the open market and publish the results of the tests, when not up to the standard, together with the names of the seedsmen by whom the seeds were sold. Many tests have been made under this law, but the Department, after careful investigation of the commercial questions involved, has preferred up to the present time to notify seedsmen privately, in case the tests showed an inferior article, rather than to publish the information. It has come to be more and more evident, as this work has progressed, that one of the best means of preventing the sale of inferior seed is to demonstrate to farmers and other seed-purchasing classes that the only sure way to secure high-grade seed is to test it themselves or to get some reliable organization to test it. The wide extension and appreciation of information of this sort will, it is believed, be a good foundation for the ultimate adoption of vigorous measures for protecting the public against unscrupulous dealers.

The action of the Department in conducting an educational campaign against the sale of inferior seed has been heartily seconded by the agricultural experiment stations, and the officers of the seed-testing laboratory in the Department have been largely instrumental in devising a special apparatus and a system of rules for seed testing which have been officially adopted by the Association of Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations.

SEED AND PLANT INTRODUCTION.

The determination on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture to use a portion of the seed-distribution funds in introducing new and valuable products from other countries resulted in sending a special agent to Russia in 1897 to procure a stock of cereals, forage

plants, and other things promising to be worthy of introduction into this country. At the same time, under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Division of Forestry was endeavoring to make provision for securing from the arid regions of the world any trees giving promise of successful introduction into the arid parts of the United States. This work, together with the distribution of the importations made by the Russian agent, led to the establishment in the Division of Forestry of an agency for carrying out these two objects. In the succeeding year a special provision was inserted in the seed-purchase law authorizing the expenditure of $20,000 for the purpose of carrying on work of this character, and this was afterwards organized as a branch of the Division of Botany, devoted to seed and plant introduction. The organization consists, first, of a group of agricultural explorers, who are sent to investigate particular agricultural industries and secure a stock of new varieties or new kinds of plants suitable for introduction into American agriculture; and, secondly, of an office force which receives and distributes the importations and keeps records of the experimental work done on them. The writing of reports on the plants thus introduced is intrusted either to the explorers after they return, or to members of the permanent experimental force of the Department, or to outside investigators, as may seem most appropriate and most conducive to effective results.

A large number of improved products have been added to American agriculture, and while most of them are still in the experimental stage it is already assured that certain of them will add millions of dollars annually to American products. Notable among these are a highly productive and otherwise superior rice from Japan, a drought and cold resistant alfalfa from Turkestan, a drought-resistant grass from southern Russia, and several cereals particularly adapted to the conditions of our arid regions.

TROPICAL AGRICULTURE.

Recent political changes having brought the United States into new relations with tropical lands, the question of tropical agriculture has been brought conspicuously to the attention of the American people, and the large number of requests for information on the subject has shown how widespread this interest is. The Division of Botany has already published an account of vanilla culture as practiced in the Seychelles Islands, and has made an investigation of the plant products and agricultural crops of Porto Rico, devoting particular attention to the coffee problem, and is engaged also in investigating, so far as can be done without additional funds, the subject of India-rubber cultivation.

In addition to the lines of work undertaken by the Division of Botany since 1896, enumerated in the above statement, several other lines of investigation established earlier have been carried on, and other new ones of less importance have been taken up. In the brief period that has elapsed since these new investigations were initiated it has, of course, been possible to prepare reports on only a comparatively few, but the new investigations have proceeded in such a manner that reports are constantly coming to completion, and the next few years will indicate in the publications of the Division, even better than has already been indicated, the results of these new lines of work.

A STUDY OF THE SOILS OF THE VARIOUS SECTIONS AND THEIR ADAPTABILITY TO VARIOUS BRANCHES OF AGRICULTURE.

The most important work of the Division has been the survey and mapping of the soils in a number of the important agricultural districts of the United States. The most important work of this kind has been in the arid portions of the United States, where irrigation is practiced. About 450,000 acres have been surveyed and mapped in some of the principal irrigated districts of Montana, Utah, New Mexico, and Arizona, the maps so prepared having a very practical value, as they show the distribution of the different types of soil, which lands can be irrigated with safety, those which require special care in the application of water on account of alkali, and those which have too much alkali for cultivation without special efforts for reclamation. Practical methods for removing the salts have been and are being worked out. In the vicinity of Billings, Mont., thousands of dollars are being invested now as a result of our investigations, and it is likely that this investment will be worth hundreds of thousands of dollars to the immediate vicinity.

In the vicinity of Salt Lake, Utah, there is a large area of 80,000 acres of land at present lying idle on account of the accumulation of alkali, which it has been estimated could be reclaimed for a comparatively small sum, when it would be worth in the neighborhood of $5,000,000.

In the Pecos Valley, New Mexico, plans were devised for the reclamation of a large area in the immediate vicinity of Roswell which has lately been ruined by alkali and seepage water. It is estimated that at Roswell alone the damage to the land has amounted to at least $500,000. This land can all be reclaimed, and steps have been taken since our investigations to reclaim this land and to protect the rest of this area by methods pointed out by this Division.

At Carlsbad the water itself contains so high a percentage of alkali salts that special methods will have to be adopted for the use of this water to prevent further injury, as the lands have already been somewhat injured in the valley. The proper method of using this water has been pointed out by this Division. The results of this work will be worth hundreds of thousands of dollars to the Pecos Valley.

Over 1,000,000 acres of land have been surveyed and mapped in the States of Massachusetts, Connecticut, Maryland, and Louisiana, besides reconnoissance over a much larger area.

In the Connecticut Valley the tobacco lands were classified and mapped, and the influence of the soil on the character of the tobacco was studied. In addition to this the cause of the fermentation of the cigar-leaf tobacco has been worked out, and an improved method of fermenting the Connecticut tobacco has been introduced, which it is believed will revolutionize the practice in that State. This method gives a much more uniform product, and thus improves the value of the leaf. It shortens the time required to ferment the tobacco about eight months, and so reduces the insurance and the loss of interest on the money invested. It is estimated that the value of this work will amount to at least $500,000 per annum to the farmers of the Connecticut Valley. The investigations are being carried still further in order to see whether the quality of the tobacco can be further improved. There is reason to believe it can be.

In addition to these practical results, improvements have been made in the methods of soil investigation, both in the laboratory and in the field. Some very important problems connected with the physical and chemical constitution of soils are being worked out, which give promise of being of great value in economic lines.

CORDIAL COOPERATION WITH STATE EXPERIMENT STATIONS.

Under the present Administration the work of the Office of Experiment Stations has been more than doubled. This is due in part to the development of old enterprises and in part to the establishment of new ones.

The keynote of the present policy is cooperation. Through the Department and the stations thousands of practical experiments are now annually carried on in cooperation with farmers in all sections of the Union. Cordial relations are maintained with officers of the stations, and in many ways the Department helps to make their work more efficient. At the same time it has not hesitated to point out the weaknesses of the stations in confidential communications and in reports to Congress. In such criticism the aim has been not to tear down, but to build up. The Department and the stations are now working together more thoroughly and harmoniously than ever before, and the operations of these two great agencies touch every interest of American agriculture.

TO AID AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION.

Under the liberal policy of the past three years this office has largely increased its efforts to aid enterprises for the practical education of the farmer. It has joined actively in the movement to improve the methods of teaching agriculture in the colleges and to introduce agricultural subjects and nature study into the public schools. It has shown what is being done in these lines in other lands, and how we need to more thoroughly develop our system of agricultural education in order to keep pace with the strenuous efforts of our industrial rivals. It has collated and published information regarding the farmers' institutes, showing that now these institutes are held in 43 States, and are annually attended by half a million farmers. It has promoted the establishment of reading courses for farmers and published lists of useful books and bulletins, so that now any farmer in the United States can find out, by sending a postal card to the Department, what are the best books and public documents for him to read to keep abreast of the times in his business.

PUBLICATIONS FOR FARMERS.

In accordance with the general policy announced by Secretary Wilson at the outset of his administration, this office has given much attention to the preparation of farmers' bulletins. Twenty-three of these bulletins have been prepared in this office during the past three years, of which 14 have constituted the new series entitled "Experiment Station Work." In this series the office has summarized the practical results of investigations at the agricultural experiment stations and kindred institutions in this and other countries. In this way our farmers in every State are now being made acquainted with the practical results of experiments made by all our experiment stations, and thus the money given by Congress for the maintenance of experiment stations in the several States is made of benefit to the agriculture of the whole country. Besides these popular bulletins, the office has issued during this period three volumes (36 numbers) of the Experiment Station Record and 40 technical bulletins. During the past three years an average of somewhat over a million copies of documents of this office have been issued each year, of which about 800,000 copies have been in the farmers' bulletin series.

NUTRITION INVESTIGATIONS.

The investigations on the nutritive value of human foods, which are carried on in cooperation with agricultural colleges and experiment stations in different parts of the country, have been materially developed and strengthened. Twenty reports have been published during the past three years, and the results of these investigations are now largely taught in colleges and schools of different grades throughout the country. During this period the Atwater-Rosa respiration calorimeter has been completed, and experiments have been made with it regarding the utilization of food in the maintenance of the human body and the production of heat and energy therein, which have attracted very wide attention, as they have marked in some respects the highest point which science has yet reached in such investigations.

IRRIGATION INVESTIGATIONS.

The first appropriation for these investigations became available July 1, 1898. The work has been organized along two general lines: (1) The collation and publication of information regarding the laws and institutions of the irrigated regions in their relation to agriculture; and (2) the determination of the actual volume of water (duty of water) used by practical irrigators on different crops and soils. These investigations have already been carried on in fifteen States and Territories, largely in cooperation with the agricultural experiment stations and State irrigation engineers. While the headquarters of these investigations have been established in the arid region (at Cheyenne, Wyo.), and the investigations have largely been carried on there, the usefulness of irrigation in the East has also received attention, valuable experiments in this line being now in progress in New Jersey and South Carolina. So great has been the need of accurate information regarding the real conditions prevailing in the irrigated region and the actual requirements of crops of water that the demands for the extension of this work have been greater than the Department could meet, though the appropriation for this purpose was increased from $10,000 to $35,000 during the present year. In this enterprise the Department is working along lines which are new in this country, and it is believed that an organization for this work has been effected which is thoroughly efficient; so that shortly there will be developed a trained force of experts, whose services will be of incalculable benefit to a region which embraces over a third of the area of the United States.

PROGRESS IN SUGAR-BEET INVESTIGATIONS.

An attempt has been made to define with greater certainty the areas in the United States suited to the growth of high-grade sugar beets. To this end, seeds of the sugar beet have been distributed in the most promising localities and grown under identical conditions of culture, according to instructions prepared by the Division. The only variance, therefore, has been the soil and climate. The beets thus grown have been analyzed, either in the Division of Chemistry or at the agricultural experiment stations, and their saccharine qualities ascertained. As a result of the experiments which have been conducted in this manner, the areas in the original map constructed by the Division, showing the probable areas suited to beet culture, have been more definitely pointed out. This work is still in progress, and if continued for a few years longer will result in obtaining the data whereby the sugar-beet areas of the country can be mapped with a considerable degree of accuracy.

SECTION OF FOREIGN MARKETS.

Of the work accomplished by the section of foreign markets during the past three years one of the most important features was the study of trade possibilities growing out of the Spanish-American war. The islands that were brought into closer relationship to the United States by the war naturally became the subject of great commercial interest, and numerous inquiries were received regarding the trade opportunities that might be expected to result.

As the war progressed the requests for information relative to Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines increased to such an extent that the section was obliged to devote its attention almost entirely to the subject of these new dependencies. To meet the active demand for information along this line, several special reports were prepared for publication embodying such data as could be obtained regarding the commerce that was beginning to attract so much interest.

Just before the breaking out of the war, when the prevailing conditions seemed to point to probable hostilities, a report was published on the subject of our trade with Cuba, presenting detailed information as to the nature and value of the products imported and exported, and suggesting the commercial possibilities that could be looked for with a fuller development of Cuban resources.

As soon as Porto Rico began to be of special interest, owing to the shifting of the war campaign in its direction, an exhaustive report was prepared on the commerce of that island, setting forth in the fullest possible manner the character of the trade carried on with the several foreign countries, and especially with the United States.

Later a report of 160 pages was published regarding the trade of the Philippines, embracing practically all of the available statistics on the subject that could be collated from the official import and export returns of the various countries enjoying commercial intercourse with the islands.

The report on the trade of the Philippines was supplemented by a circular dealing with the agricultural resources of the islands and describing the most important plant products.

Owing to the scarcity of reliable data relative to Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines, the preparation of the reports on these former Spanish possessions required a vast amount of research. It was profitable work, however, for the reports proved to be exceedingly useful as a means of answering the frequent requests that were received for information about the new dependencies.

EXPERIMENTS WITH GRASSES AND FORAGE PLANTS.

Experiments with grasses and forage plants have been vigorously prosecuted during the past three years. These experiments are necessary in order that ranchers and farmers may be informed of the kinds suitable for their respective districts. After these preliminary facts are determined the promising varieties can be recommended and adopted without further and useless expenditure of time and money. Many of the vast cattle ranges of the West have been practically destroyed by overstocking or mismanagement, and it has become a serious question as to what are the best grasses with which to reseed them. The division has spent much time and energy in this line of investigation, and, through its work in the field and experiments, is prepared to meet many of the more important forage problems of the various parts of the United States. During the past three years the agrostologist has distributed 5,565 packages of seeds of grasses and forage plants, embracing 251 varieties. These seeds were largely procured through foreign importations and by special collections in the field made by agents or employees of the division.

In the distribution made it has been necessary to consider the adaptation of varieties for special purposes, such as the renewing of worn-out prairies, holding of embankments subject to wash, binding of drifting sands, restoring fertility to the soil, soiling crops, cover crops, grasses for lands subject to overflow, for dry lands, for semiarid districts, for alkali soils, for lawns, for parks and pleasure grounds; in fact, for every purpose to which grasses and forage plants are applied and under every condition of soil and climate which our country presents. About 2,000 reports have been received from those to whom seeds have been sent. The information thus acquired is of great value and is presented in Bulletin No. 22 of the Division, now in press. One of the most important introductions is that of Turkestan alfalfa, seed of which was widely distributed in 1898. It is too early to make positive assertions respecting this variety, but the indications are that it is more hardy, and especially more resistant to drought, than the common variety. The reports from experimenters which have already been received will soon be published as a circular of the Division. The material has been compiled for this purpose.

Another very important importation is the smooth brome-grass from Russia. Large quantities of seed of this grass have been distributed, and the reports as to its hardiness and its adaptability to trying conditions of drought are most favorable. Other recent introductions of value are oasis alfalfa, broom-corn millets, Japanese barnyard millets, and saltbushes, the latter for alkali soils. The Division has spent much time in the study of forage plants for alkali soils, and made this the subject of a paper in the Yearbook for 1898, and more recently a farmer's bulletin under the title of "Saltbushes."

Aside from the cooperative work with experiment stations implied by the distribution of trial samples of seed, the Division has carried on cooperative work with the Iowa Experiment Station, through its botanist, the results of which were published in Bulletin No. 9.

RURAL FREE DELIVERY OF MAIL—THE OFFSPRING OF THE M'KINLEY ADMINISTRATION—SOME FACTS WHICH WILL INTEREST THE FARMERS AND ALL THOSE DESIRING THEIR WELFARE.

Rural free delivery of mail is the offspring of the McKinley Administration of the Post-Office Department. Its development from the insignificant beginning of 44 routes and an appropriation of $40,000 for the fiscal year which closed in 1897 to its present magnificent proportions, with the rural routes numbered by the thousands and an appropriation of $1,750,000 voted for its further extension during the present fiscal year, has all been brought about by the McKinley Government.

A movement to broaden the free delivery of the mails was started by Postmaster-General Wanamaker, under the Republican Administration of General Harrison. It took the form of village free delivery, and was more an extension of city delivery to smaller communities than a free delivery to farmers. But, limited as was its scope and successful though it was in increasing postal receipts and postal facilities, it encountered Democratic opposition; and when Mr. Cleveland came in, his Postmaster-General, fearing its

effect in popularizing Republican principles and disseminating Republican literature, ordered it dropped.

It was a Republican Administration that conceived and executed the idea of brightening the home of the farmer, educating his children, increasing the value of his land, compelling the improvement of the roads, and bringing him news of the markets and of the weather, so as to secure him a better price for his crops by delivering his daily mail to him on his farm. Every Democratic House of Representatives since the idea was first broached of carrying the mails into the rural districts has declared against it. The Forty-third Congress, with a Democrat from North Carolina as chairman of the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, proclaimed the plan impossible and turned it down. Postmaster-General Bissell, Postmaster-General Wilson, and First Assistant Postmaster-General Jones, in the Cleveland Aministration, all took up the cry of extravagance and impossibility of execution. Consequently, little or nothing was done to give the farmers access to the mails till Cleveland went out of office.

When First Assistant Postmaster-General Perry S. Heath took up the rural service under the direction of the President and the Postmaster-General, in March, 1897, it was languishing to the point of extinguishment, and in a few months more would have been starved to death, like Mr. Wanamaker's village delivery. The official reports of the Post-Office Department record that it was almost with surprise that President McKinley and those to whom he intrusted the administration of postal affairs learned that there was such a thing as an experimental rural free-delivery mail service in progress.

They at once grasped its possibilities and advocated its immediate development, and a Republican Congress generously seconded their efforts. Under their vivifying touch it has grown until there is now not a State in the Union that has not felt the civilizing and educational influence of rural free mail delivery, and not one that does not desire a further expansion of the service. On the 1st of June, 1900, there were 1,200 rural services in actual operation and 2,000 applications for an extension of the system in process of establishment by special agents detailed for that purpose.

The appropriations for the rural free-delivery service have been increased from $50,000 in the fiscal year 1897-98 to $150,000 in 1898-99, then to $450,000 in 1899-1900, and lastly to $1,750,000 for the present fiscal year, 1900-1901.

Three years' experience has shown that in well-selected rural districts the mails can be distributed to the domiciles of the addressees or in boxes placed within reasonable distance of the farmer's home, at some crossroad or other convenient spot, at a cost per piece not exceeding that of the free delivery in many of the cities of the United States. In the vast majority of communities where it has been tested the rural free-delivery service has obtained so strong a hold that public sentiment would not permit its discontinuance. It has been a revolution, and revolutions do not move backward.

It costs very little more than the old colonial style of postal service which it supersedes, and it invariably brings a large and compensating increase in the amount of postal receipts turned into the Treasury. But even if it does cost more than the obsolete old plan, are not the farmers entitled to some of the benefits of the Government which they help so liberally to support by their taxation? The country can well afford to continue and extend a system which makes better citizens and happier homes and contributes largely to the mental, moral, and material advancement of the plain people.

Rural free delivery of mail has come to stay, and the Republican Administration, which brought it into being, will stay with it.

THE NEW CURRENCY LAW—IT IS ALREADY PROVING ITS VALUE BY AN INCREASE IN OUR CURRENCY AND IN THE NUMBER OF BANKS FOR CONVENIENCE OF THE MASSES.

Mr. Speaker, among the numerous acts of the two Congresses since President McKinley's election, the one next in importance after that which restored protection to our industries is the currency act. It has done for our currency what the Dingley Act did for our industries and commerce—given stability, confidence, activity, and prosperity. Already there have been nearly 300 applications for permission to establish national banks with capital of less than $50,000 each, showing that many communities where no national banks existed will now be given the advantages of this service, and the increase in national-bank currency already amounts to many millions of dollars.

This act is so important and its effect upon our currency and financial system so important that I desire to present a simple and concise statement of its provisions, made by that eminent authority, the present Secretary of the Treasury, on the day on which it went into operation.

SECRETARY GAGE'S STATEMENT.

The financial bill has for its first object what its title indicates—the fixing of the standard of value and the maintaining of a parity with that standard of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States. It reaffirms that the unit of value is the dollar, consisting of 25.8 grains of gold of nine-tenths fine, but from that point it goes on to make it the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to maintain all forms of money issued or coined at a parity with this standard. It puts into the hands of the Secretary ample power to do that. For that purpose the bill provides in the Treasury bureaus of issue and redemption, and transfers from the general fund of the Treasury's cash $150,000,000 in gold coin and bullion to the redemption fund, that gold to be used for the redemption of United States notes and Treasury notes. That fund is henceforth absolutely cut out of and separated from the cash balance in the Treasury, and the available cash balance will hereafter show a reduction of $150,000,000 from the figures that have heretofore prevailed. This $150,000,000 redemption fund is to be used for no other purpose than the redemption of United States notes and Treasury notes, and those notes so redeemed may be exchanged for gold in the general fund or with the public, so that the reserve fund is kept full with gold to the $150,000,000 limit.

POWER GIVEN THE SECRETARY.

The Secretary is given further power. If redemptions go on so that the gold in this reserve is reduced below $100,000,000, and he is unable to build it up to the $150,000,000 mark by exchange for gold in the general fund or otherwise, he is given power to sell bonds, and it is made his duty to replenish the gold to the $150,000,000 mark by such means.

ENDLESS CHAIN BROKEN.

The "endless chain" is broken by a provision which prohibits the use of notes so redeemed to meet deficiencies in the current revenues. The act provides for the ultimate retirement of all the Treasury notes issued in payment for silver bullion under the Sherman Act. As fast as that bullion is coined into silver dollars Treasury notes are to be retired and replaced with an equal amount of silver certificates.

The measure authorizes the issue of gold certificates in exchange for deposits of gold coin, the same as at present, but suspends that authority whenever and so long as the gold in the redemption fund is below $100,000,000, and gives to the Secretary the option to suspend the issue of such certificates whenever the silver certificates and United States notes in the general fund of the Treasury exceed $60,000,000.

SILVER CERTIFICATES.

The bill provides for a larger issue of silver certificates, by declaring that hereafter silver certificates shall be issued only in denominations of $10 and under, except as to 10 per cent of the total volume. Room is made for this larger use of silver certificates in the way of small bills by another provision which makes it necessary as fast as the present silver certificates of high denominations are broken up into small denominations, and replace them with notes of denominations of $10 and upward. Further room is made for the circulation of small silver certificates by a clause which permits national banks to have only one-third of their capital in denomination under $10.

COINING SILVER.

One clause of the bill which the public will greatly appreciate is the right that it gives to the Secretary to coin any of the 1890 bullion into subsidiary silver coins up to a limit of $100,000,000. There has for years been a scarcity of subsidiary silver during periods of active retail trade, but this provision will give the Treasury ample opportunity to supply all the subsidiary silver that is needed. Another provision that the public will greatly appreciate is the authority given to the Secretary to recoin worn and uncurrent subsidiary silver now in the Treasury or hereafter received. The bill makes a continuing appropriation for paying the difference between the face value of such coin and the amount the same will produce in the new coin.

REFUNDING THE DEBT.

A distinct feature of the bill is in reference to refunding the 3 per cent Spanish war loan, the 2 per cent bonds maturing in 1907, and the 5 per cent bonds maturing in 1904, a total of $839,000,000, into new 2 per cent bonds. These new 2 per cent bonds will not be offered for sale, but will only be issued in exchange for an equal amount, face value, of old bonds. The holders of old bonds will receive a premium in cash to compensate them in a measure for the sacrifice of interest which they make. That cash premium will be computed on a basis of the present worth of the old bonds at 2½ per cent, and will be on April 1, the date that the new 2 per cent bonds will bear $105.6851 for the threes, $111.6765 for the fours, and $110.0751 for each $100 of the fives. This exchange will save the Government, after deducting the premium paid, nearly $23,000,000, if all the holders of the old bonds exchange them for the new ones. National banks that take out circulation based on the new bonds are to be taxed only one-half of 1 per cent on the average amount of circulation outstanding, while those who have circulation based on a deposit of old bonds will be taxed, as at present, 1 per cent.

OTHER NATIONAL-BANK PROVISIONS.

There are some other changes in the national-banking act. The law permits national banks with $25,000 capital to be organized in places of 3,000 inhabitants or less, whereas heretofore the minimum capital has been $50,000. It also permits banks to issue circulation on all classes of bonds deposited up to the par value of the bonds, instead of 90 per cent of their face, as heretofore. This ought to make an immediate increase in national-bank circulation of something like $24,000,000, as the amount of bonds now deposited to secure circulation is about $242,000,000. If the price of the new twos is not forced so high in the market that there is no profit left to national banks in taking out circulation, we may also look for a material increase in national-bank circulation based on additional deposits of bonds.

National banks are permitted under the law to issue circulation up to an amount equal to their capital. The total capital of all national banks is $616,000,000. The total circulation outstanding is $253,000,000. There is, therefore, a possibility of an increase in circulation of $363,000,000, although the price of the new 2 per cent bonds, as already foreshadowed by market quotations in advance of their issue, promises to be so high that the profit to the banks in taking out circulation will not be enough to make the increase anything like such a possible total.

FREE COINAGE AT AN "APPROXIMATE RATIO"—ALL ATTEMPTS TO FIX A LEGAL RATIO AT ANY RATE DIFFERING FROM THE COMMERCIAL RATIO HAVE PROVED DISASTROUS WHEN COUPLED WITH FREE AND UNLIMITED COINAGE OF THE INFERIOR METAL—SOME INTERESTING VIEWS BY EMINENT DEMOCRATS.

Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested that if the legal ratio of silver to gold should be so changed as to approximate the commercial ratio, the objection to the free and unlimited coinage of silver would disappear.

This is not true. It is a well-known historical fact that a very small variation of the commercial ratio from the coinage ratio is sufficient to expel one of the metals from the country and disturb all business calculations and relations.

When the first United States coinage act was passed, by careful

calculation and inquiry it was assumed that the true commercial ratio was 15 to 1, and that was made the legal ratio. The mints were opened to the coinage of both metals on that basis. In a short time it became apparent that either an error had been made or the market ratio had changed. *The two metals would not circulate together.* Our gold coins were slightly more valuable as bullion than as money and were melted down or exported.

This situation was maintained until the act of 1834 changed the ratio to 16 to 1, and *that act, which was designed to correct it, actually reversed it. It brought back gold, but drove out silver.* The true commercial ratio was somewhere between 15 to 1 and 16 to 1. *Fifteen to one drove out gold, and 16 to 1 drove out silver.* After the act of 1834 went into effect silver dollars would not circulate in the United States unless they were light weight. From 1835 down to the opening of the year 1862, when paper became the currency of the United States, although the mints were opened to the unrestricted coinage of silver, the total number of silver dollars coined was $2,700,553.

JEFFERSON'S SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY ON THE "APPROXIMATE RATIO."

In 1820, when the change in ratio was under consideration, Albert Gallatin, who had been Secretary of the Treasury under Jefferson, was asked his opinion concerning the failure of gold to circulate, and, in a letter dated December 31, wrote:

> The present rate was the result of information, clearly incorrect, respecting the then relative value of gold and silver in Europe, which was represented as being at the rate of less than 15 to 1, when it was in fact 15.5 to 15.6 to 1. It would be better at all events to discontinue altogether the coining of gold than to continue the present system.

JACKSON'S SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY ON THE "APPROXIMATE RATIO" AND FREE COINAGE.

The Hon. S. D. Ingham, who was at that time Secretary of the Treasury under President Andrew Jackson, was asked his opinion, and advised the committee that any attempt to make the two metals circulate together under free coinage would be fruitless. He wrote:

> The fluctuations in the value of gold and silver can not be controlled; and even the attempt to conform the mint to the market values must produce a change in the latter. But if, after adjusting the ratio at the mint by raising the value of the gold coins, it should happen that silver should rise in the market above the mint value, the silver coins—exchange with foreign countries being unfavorable—would be withdrawn from circulation, and the only remedy within the power of the Government would be to reduce their weight, as it is now proposed in respect to the gold coins.

The committee of the House of Representatives having the matter under investigation reported—

> That there are inherent and incurable defects in the system which regulates the standard of value in both gold and silver; its instability as a measure of contracts and mutability as the practical currency of a particular nation are serious imperfections, whilst the impossibility of maintaining both metals in concurrent, simultaneous, or promiscuous circulation appears to be clearly ascertained; that the standard being fixed in one metal is the nearest approach to invariableness, and precludes the necessity of further legislative interference.

The report was dated February 22, 1831.

THOMAS H. BENTON ON THE "APPROXIMATE RATIO" AND FREE COINAGE.

The change in rates continued, however, to be agitated, and was advocated with great energy by Thomas H. Benton. His argument is summed up as follows in Benton's Thirty Years' View, volume 1, page 443:

> Mr. Benton said this was not the time to discuss the relative value of gold and silver, nor to urge the particular proportion which ought to be established between them. That would be proper work of a committee. At present it might be sufficient, and not irrelevant, to say that this question was one of commerce, that it was purely and simply a mercantile problem, as much so as is acquisition of any ordinary merchandise from foreign countries could be. Gold goes where it finds its value, and that value is what the laws of great nations give it. In Mexico and South America, the countries which produce gold and from which the United States must derive their chief supply, the value of gold is 16 to 1; in the West Indies, generally, it is the same. It is not to be supposed that gold will come from those countries to the United States if the importer is to lose one dollar in every sixteen that he brings, or that our own gold will remain with us when the exporter can give one dollar in every fifteen that he carries out. Such results would be contrary to the rules of trade, and therefore we must place the same value upon gold that other nations do if we wish to gain any part of their trade or to retain any part of our own.

Benton's statement that gold would not come to this country if the importer must lose one dollar in every sixteen, or stay if an exporter could make one dollar in sixteen, would have been equally true if he had said on one dollar in thirty-two. Indeed, the gain by exporting silver after the act of 1834 was passed was not more than one dollar in thirty-two. The ratio in the United States was 16 to 1 and in France 15½ to 1, and that difference was sufficient to take our silver to France.

FREE COINAGE OF A SILVER DOLLAR WORTH 1 CENT LESS THAN THE GOLD DOLLAR WOULD DRIVE OUT THE GOLD MONEY.

In these days of the cable and steamships and intimate banking relations, a rise in foreign exchange of less than 1 cent on the dollar will start gold to moving out of this country. Under such conditions a double standard of value is wholly impracticable. The free coinage of a silver dollar worth 1 cent less than our gold dollar would expel or lock up the entire gold stock of the country. The uncertainty of the situation would alone paralyze our industrial and commercial interests. A new ratio would have to be adopted every month, and all former issues recoined every time a new ratio was adopted.

OUR CURRENCY MUST CONFORM TO THAT OF THE COMMERCIAL WORLD.

Mr. Speaker, we can not afford experiments which would either drive the gold out of our country or put our currency on a basis differing from that of the countries with which we do business. Ninety-five per cent of the world's commerce is between the gold-standard countries of the world. Of our total exports, less than 5 per cent go to the silver-standard countries, and over 95 per cent goes to the gold-standard countries. The countries having the gold standard have the wealth, the sound currency, the sound finances, the healthful commerce, and the consuming and purchasing power. Their commerce in 1898 was over eighteen billion dollars; that of the silver-standard countries one billion.

I append a table showing the commerce, finance, currency, and general business condition of the gold and silver standard countries, respectively. It is prepared with great care by the Bureau of Statistics of the Treasury Department, and may be accepted as absolutely reliable.

Commerce, finances, and circulating medium of the gold-standard and silver-standard countries of the world, respectively, and the per capita of the revenue, expenditure, national debt, and currency in each.

[The figures on commerce are in most cases for 1898; those on circulation, 1899.]

Countries.	Population.	Total commerce.	Commerce with United States.		Money in circulation.			
			Total.	Imports from United States.	Gold.	Silver.	Uncovered paper.	Total.
Algeria	4,429,000	$108,417,000	*a* $811,000	*a* $147,000				
Austria-Hungary	41,359,000	*b* 833,606,000	14,413,000	6,359,000	$221,400,000	$147,300,000	$103,000,000	$471,700,000
Belgium	6,587,000	659,197,000	57,549,000	45,816,000	30,000,000	45,000,000	82,500,000	157,500,000
British Africa	35,160,000	263,282,000	16,800,000	15,406,600				
British Australasia	4,794,000	556,587,000	27,670,000	24,140,000	132,100,000	7,000,000	22,500,000	161,600,000
British Honduras	34,000	2,826,000	771,000	367,000				
British North America	5,031,000	305,714,000	124,164,000	88,285,000	20,000,000	5,000,000	40,500,000	65,500,000
British West Indies	1,501,000	53,345,000	25,247,000	10,382,000				
Bulgaria	3,311,000	27,967,000	No data.	No data.	1,000,000	6,800,000		7,800,000
Costa Rica	295,000	10,088,000	4,832,000	1,283,000				
Cuba	1,632,000	135,120,000	54,481,000	24,861,000	2,000,000	1,500,000		3,500,000
Denmark	2,185,000	201,398,000	19,125,000	18,474,000	10,000,000	5,400,000	5,900,000	28,300,000
Dutch East Indies	34,000,000	146,539,000	33,961,000	1,053,000				
Egypt	9,734,000	113,318,000	9,109,000	525,000	30,000,000	6,400,000		36,400,000
France	38,518,000	*b* 1,564,518,000	140,512,000	70,107,000	810,600,000	420,100,000	161,100,000	1,391,800,000
Germany	52,280,000	*b* 2,186,918,000	250,985,000	161,406,000	672,800,000	208,200,000	156,700,000	1,037,700,000
Great Britain	40,189,000	*b* 3,962,876,000	652,280,000	509,958,000	402,300,000	111,900,000	111,000,000	685,800,000
Hawaii	109,000	27,577,000	33,494,000	11,806,000	4,000,000	1,000,000		5,000,000
India and Ceylon	290,514,000	495,717,000	42,896,000	4,510,000	(*o*)	*o* 568,400,000	*o* 47,400,000	*o* 615,800,000
Japan	42,708,000	186,114,000	54,808,000	20,605,000	54,000,000	25,300,000		79,300,000
Netherlands	5,004,000	1,292,128,000	98,879,000	83,601,000	30,200,000	56,400,000	47,200,000	133,000,000
Peru	2,622,000	23,249,000	3,493,000	1,695,000				
Roumania	5,800,000	113,000,000	145,000	145,000	13,100,000	7,100,000	20,300,000	40,400,000
Russia	108,721,000	469,093,000	14,463,000	9,172,000	740,400,000	81,900,000		822,300,000
Servia	2,315,000	19,734,000			1,000,000	1,800,000	3,600,000	6,400,000
South African Republic	1,096,000	158,234,000	No data.	No data.	29,200,000	1,200,000		30,400,000
Sweden and Norway	7,011,000	305,509,000	14,904,000	11,817,000	21,600,000	8,800,000	34,600,000	65,000,000
Switzerland	3,063,000	302,418,000	16,505,000	216,000	24,000,000	10,700,000	17,400,000	52,100,000

Commerce, finances, and circulating medium of the gold-standard and silver-standard countries of the world, etc.—Continued.

Countries.	Population.	Total commerce.	Commerce with United States.		Money in circulation.			
			Total.	Imports from United States.	Gold.	Silver.	Uncovered paper.	Total.
Uruguay	828,000	$56,492,000	$3,215,000	$1,702,000				
United States	75,000,000	b 2,074,345,000			$945,800,000	$639,000,000	$329,700,000	$1,914,500,000
On a paper basis.								
Argentina	3,955,000	192,477,000	17,322,000	11,335,000	k 30,600,000	k 2,700,000	k 178,400,000	211,700,000
Brazil	14,334,000	235,149,000	11,035,000	11,454,000			n 130,000,000	130,000,000
Chile	3,049,000	47,445,000	7,474,000	2,240,000				
Greece	2,434,000	38,051,000	1,220,000	227,000	500,000	1,500,000	29,100,000	31,100,000
Haiti	960,000	18,232,000	3,220,000	2,358,000	1,200,000	3,500,000	3,700,000	8,400,000
Italy	31,668,000	444,709,000	52,222,000	25,763,000	98,000,000	43,900,000	174,900,000	316,800,000
Portugal	5,050,000	76,856,000	8,888,000	5,113,000	5,200,000	9,600,000	75,200,000	90,000,000
Spain	17,566,000	384,480,000	16,871,000	11,529,000	53,400,000	37,800,000	187,500,000	278,700,000
Turkey	22,534,000	165,685,000	7,257,000	563,000	50,000,000	40,000,000		90,000,000
Venezuela	2,444,000	34,751,000	8,311,000	2,641,000				
Total gold-standard countries	929,934,000	18,295,410,000	1,909,339,000	1,197, 67,000	4,501,300,000	2,505,200,000	1,962,200,000	8,969,200,000
China	402,680,000	285,738,000	39,421,000	15,225,000		750,000,000		750,000,000
Guatemala	1,535,000	16,971,000	3,041,000	843,000				
Honduras	400,000	5,908,000	1,919,000	1,039,000				
Hongkong	222,000	90,000,000	10,128,000	7,788,000	(r)	(r)	(r)	(r)
Korea	10,529,000	19,011,000	129,000	128,000				
Mexico	12,620,000	102,673,000	53,935,000	29,310,000	8,600,000	106,000,000	4,000,000	118,600,000
Nicaragua	420,000	5,547,000	3,031,000	1,486,000				
Persia	9,000,000	43,798,000	No data.	No data.				
Salvador	804,000	10,833,000	1,118,000	635,000				
Straits Settlements	512,000	413,947,000	No data.	No data.		r 242,000,000	(r)	r 242,000,000
Siam	5,000,000	27,681,000	No data.	No data.	20,000,000	193,400,000		213,400,000
On a paper basis.								
Bolivia	2,020,000	22,557,000	27,000	27,000				
Colombia	4,000,000	26,617,000	8,448,000	2,986,000		1,473,000	7,527,000	9,000,000
Ecuador	1,272,000	11,008,000	2,278,000	1,180,000				
Paraguay	600,000	7,883,000	11,000	11,000			1,165,000	1,165,000
Total silver-standard countries	451,614,000	1,029,302,000	124,136,000	60,658,000	28,600,000	1,292,873,000	12,692,000	1,334,165,000

Countries.	Circulation per capita.				Debt.		Revenue and expenditure.				Railway mileage.	
							Revenue.		Expenditure.		Miles.	Mileage per 100,000 inhabitants.
	Gold.	Silver.	Paper.	Total.	Total.	Per capita.	Total.	Per capita.	Total.	Per capita.		
Algeria							$10,451,000	$2.35	$14,160,000	$3.19	2,146	48.5
Austria-Hungary	$5.35	$3.56	$2.49	11.40	c $2,821,706,000	$68.22	f 633,692,000	15.32	644,688,000	15.59	21,805	52.7
Belgium	4.45	6.83	12.52	23.90	508,853,000	76.95	97,255,000	14.76	99,549,000	15.11	3,783	57.4
British Africa					c 185,189,000	37.55	c 51,703,000	c 10.48	c 57,594,000	c 11.68	c 3,010	c 61.0
British Australasia	27.61	1.46	4.70	33.77	1,110,465,000	231.64	154,163,000	32.16	151,298,000	31.56	14,773	308.2
British Honduras					199,000	4.97	275,000	8.09	302,000	8.88		
British North America	3.97	.99	8.05	13.01	72,017,000	14.49	42,396,000	8.41	41,026,000	8.15	17,508	348.0
British West Indies					20,459,000	13.63	9,189,000	6.12	9,267,000	6.17	s 330	s 22.0
Bulgaria	.80	2.05		2.35	50,612,000	15.28	16,370,000	4.94	16,356,000	4.94	835	25.2
Costa Rica					11,125,000	37.71	3,753,000	13.03	3,599,000	12.20	131	44.4
Cuba	1.23	.08		2.15	341,726,000	209.39	10,430,000	6.39	8,950,000	5.42	1,135	69.5
Denmark	7.73	2.47	2.70	12.90	56,287,099	25.76	h 19,080,000	8.73	h 20,437,000	9.35	1,618	74.1
Dutch East Indies							53,569,000	1.57	58,311,000	1.78	1,200	3.5
Egypt	3.08	.66		3.74	481,359,000	49.45	56,424,000	5.80	50,686,000	5.21	1,238	12.7
France	21.05	10.91	4.18	36.14	5,829,742,000	151.12	686,776,000	17.83	685,888,000	17.81	25,914	67.3
Germany	12.87	3.96	3.00	19.85	m 2,573,585,000	60.00	g 363,233,000	6.95	g 369,307,000	7.06	30,777	58.9
Great Britain	11.50	2.78	2.77	17.05	3,060,427,000	76.89	527,218,000	13.12	526,313,000	13.09	21,659	53.9
Hawaii	36.70	9.17		45.87	4,489,000	41.18	2,508,000	23.56	2,186,000	20.06	100	91.7
India and Ceylon	(o)	o 1.98	o .17	o 2.15	1,200,448,000	4.13	476,798,000	1.64	502,275,000	1.73	22,788	7.8
Japan	1.26	.59		1.85	201,110,000	4.71	106,998,000	2.55	106,797,000	2.50	3,481	8.2
Netherlands	6.04	11.27	9.43	26.74	470,528,000	94.03	58,447,000	11.68	61,036,000	12.19	1,696	33.9
Peru					23,796,000	9.08	i 4,825,000	1.84	i 4,451,000	1.70	911	34.7
Roumania	2.26	1.22	3.48	6.96	249,305,000	42.98	43,242,000	7.45	40,108,000	6.92	1,895	32.7
Russia	6.81	.75		7.56	3,837,156,000	35.29	665,619,000	6.12	717,346,000	6.60	26,431	24.3
Servia	.43	.78	1.50	2.76	72,075,000	31.13	12,410,000	5.36	12,410,000	5.36	354	15.3
South African Republic	26.64	1.09		27.73	13,278,000	12.12	19,386,000	17.69	19,327,000	17.63	774	70.6
Sweden and Norway	3.08	1.25	4.93	9.26	125,668,000	17.92	53,665,000	7.65	54,467,000	7.77	7,594	108.3
Switzerland	7.78	3.47	5.64	16.89	16,428,000	5.33	18,547,000	6.01	18,319,000	5.94	2,304	74.7
Uruguay					128,850,000	155.62	15,750,000	19.02	15,750,000	19.02	1,080	130.4
United States	12.60	5.52	4.40	25.52	d 2,104,875,000	28.06	610,982,000	8.15	700,094,000	9.83	186,398	248.5
On a paper basis.												
Argentina	7.74	.68	45.11	53.52	445,000,000	112.52	k 58,594,000	14.80	k 58,554,000	14.80	9,885	252.2
Brazil			9.07	9.07	566,400,000	39.51	48,123,000	3.36	60,854,000	4.25	8,718	60.8
Chile					121,670,000	39.00	32,238,000	10.59	32,020,000	10.50	2,662	87.3
Greece	.21	.62	11.95	12.78	157,563,000	13.80	10,409,000	4.27	11,354,000	4.66	591	24.3
Haiti	1.25	3.65	3.85	8.75	23,756,000	24.74	l 7,406,000	7.71	l 8,043,000	8.38		
Italy	3.09	1.39	5.52	10.00	2,388,662,000	75.43	324,830,000	10.26	324,967,000	10.26	9,765	30.8
Portugal	1.03	1.90	14.89	.82	622,895,000	123.34	57,254,000	11.34	61,654,000	12.21	1,467	29.0
Spain	3.04	2.15	10.67	15.86	1,742,857,000	99.23	164,007,000	9.34	176,594,000	10.06	8,108	46.2
Turkey	2.22	1.78		4.00	729,011,000	32.22	82,901,000	3.68	86,704,000	3.85	2,953	13.1
Venezuela					37,658,000	15.41	6,452,000	2.64	8,790,000	3.60	529	21.6
Total gold-standard countries	4.84	2.69	2.11	9.64	32,433,003,000	34.89	5,617,014,000	6.04	5,851,811,000	6.29	448,604	48.2
China		1.81		1.81	p 200,000,000	.49	q 121,663,000	.30	q 72,998,000	.18	416	.1
Guatemala					16,734,000	10.90	4,032,000	2.63	4,126,000	2.69	280	18.2
Honduras					32,430,000	81.08	1,132,000	2.83	1,138,000	2.85	60	15.0
Hongkong	(r)	(r)	(r)		1,709,000	5.31	2,958,000	9.19	2,881,000	8.95		
Korea							3,224,000	.30	3,223,000	.30		
Mexico	.68	8.40	.32	9.40	83,500,000	6.62	28,205,000	2.23	25,092,000	1.99	8,040	63.7
Nicaragua					3,000,000	7.14	2,222,000	5.29	1,826,000	4.35	91	21.7
Persia					11,588,000	1.29	c 7,500,000	.83	c 3,908,000	.43		
Salvador					37,605,000	46.77	1,909,000	2.37	2,181,000	2.71	72	9.0
Straits Settlements	(r)	r 53.82	(r)	r 53.82	(r)	(r)	r 2,365,000	r 4.62	r 2,130,000	r 4.18		
Siam	4.00	38.66		42.66			pc 8,731,000	1.75	pc 8,731,000	1.75	126	2.5

Commerce, finances, and circulating medium of the gold-standard and silver-standard countries of the world, etc.—Continued.

Countries.	Circulation per capita.				Debt.		Revenue and expenditure.				Railway mileage.	
							Revenue.		Expenditure.			
	Gold.	Silver.	Paper.	Total.	Total.	Per capita.	Total.	Per capita.	Total.	Per capita.	Miles.	Mileage per 100,000 inhabitants.
On a paper basis.												
Bolivia					$4,153,000	$2.06	*p* $2,203,000	$1.09	*p* $2,423,000	$1.20	500	24.8
Columbia		$0.37	$1.88	$2.25	18,361,000	4.59	4,568,000	1.14	5,052,000	1.26	389	9.7
Ecuador					12,500,000	9.83	3,205,000	2.52	2,697,000	2.12	58	4.6
Paraguay			1.94	1.94	42,941,000	7.01	2,727,000	4.55	3,956,000	6.59	156	26.0
Total silver standard countries	$1.62	3.05	.74	3.11	463,621,000	1.03	196,644,000	.44	142,371,000	.32	10,188	2.3

Commerce of the gold-standard countries		$18,295,410,000
Commerce of the silver-standard countries		$1,029,302,000
Commerce of United States with per cent, silver-standard countries	per cent..	5.33
Commerce of United States with gold-standard countries		$1,909,339,000
Commerce of United States with silver-standard countries		$124,136,000
Per cent of commerce with silver-standard countries	per cent..	6.15
Exports of United States to gold-standard countries		$1,197,037,000
Exports of United States to silver-standard countries		$60,058,000
Per cent of exports to silver-standard countries	per cent..	4.83

NOTE.—The above includes 97 per cent of the world's commerce at the latest available date.

a 1897.
b 1899.
c Ascension, Basuto Land, Cape Colony, Mauritius, Natal, St. Helena, Gambia, Gold Coast, Sierra Leone (population, 4,932,000).
d December 31, 1899, net debt (less cash in the Treasury) on that date, $1,056,669,000, which would make the per capita debt, $14.09.
e Including the separate debts of Austria and Hungary.
f Including the separate revenue and expenditure of Austria and Hungary.
g Imperial budget only (German official figures), whole Government. Revenue of the German States and Empire, $1,000,257,000; without State railways, $629,236,000.
h Danish official figures.
i For 1896, ended May 31.
k Argentina official figures.
l 1895.
m For 1899-1900 (see British Consular Report No. 2400, April, 1900).
n Estimated, 712,355,000 milreis, at 9d.
o Exclusive of Ceylon (see Straits Settlements).
p Estimated.
q Report of the Director of the Mint, 188,979,000 taels, according to British consular report.
r Including Aden, Perim, Ceylon, Hongkong, Labuan, with a total population of 4,500,000.
s Including British Guiana.

O. P. AUSTIN, *Chief of Bureau.*

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF STATISTICS, *June 1, 1900.*

COST OF COLONIZATION—ARE COLONIES A BURDEN TO THE COUNTRY ESTABLISHING THEM—SOME PRACTICAL FACTS FROM THE PRACTICAL EXPERIENCE OF THE MOST SUCCESSFUL COLONIZING COUNTRY OF THE WORLD.

Mr. Speaker, there have been expressions of doubt as to the direct advantages or disadvantages of colonial control—whether the countries establishing colonies find the cost greater than the net results. This is a secondary consideration, especially under the peculiar circumstances in which Porto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippines came to us. Yet it is proper that this should be considered, especially as there have been statements made to the effect that England's colonies are a heavy burden to her.

COST OF COLONIAL CONTROL.

The fact that large sums of money are expended in the physical and educational development of the countries and people controlled by the colonial systems of the British Government suggests the important question of whether or not colonies are a burden financially. It has been already shown that they are advantageous to the country controlling them in the increased market which they make for exports of that country, and the opportunity given of supplying its home market with the products of its own people. It is interesting, and indeed important, to know whether in the development of the colonies, the construction of highways, railways, telegraphs, harbors, and the establishment of postal systems, schools, and educational facilities generally, the expenses are borne by the home government. This subject is discussed in detail in a letter recently written by Mr. S. G. Hobson, editor of The Hardwareman and Hardware Exporter, of London, in response to specific inquiries regarding the experiences of the British Government along these lines. It is as follows:

In reply to your question concerning the relations of the mother country to the colonies you ask:

"1. Whether the home Government expended any considerable sums of money in the earlier history of the colonies.

"2. Whether such expenditures, if made, have been refunded by the colonies.

"3. Whether the large sums which have been expended in permanent improvements, such as railways, telegraph lines, public highways, harbors, etc., have been supplied in part by the home Government, and if so, in about what proportion?

"4. Whether the troops in the colonies are supported by the home Government or by the revenues of the colonies themselves; and

"5. Whether the colonial system is generally looked upon by the people of the home Government as advantageous or otherwise."

In reply to the first question: No; the Government has not spent any considerable sum of money in the earlier history of the colonies, so that secondly there has been no return of initial outlay by the colonies. It is necessary here to carefully discriminate between colonial expenditure, pure and simple, and home Government expenditure for defense. Wherever public works have been of strategic value, either from a military or naval point of view, the home Government always expends a fair share. For example, the harbor of St. Lucie, in the West Indies, was recently put into condition at a cost of 75,000 pounds sterling, to which the Government contributed 25,000 pounds sterling; and in like manner many of the harbors throughout our colonies, and particularly in South Australian waters, have been partially subsidized by the home Government.

But so far as colonization is concerned it has been a natural process, the home Government only taking cognizance of the colony when it has grown sufficiently to warrant self-government.

Then, again, there are occasionally grants in aid in times of colonial distress. For example, the West Indian sugar plantations having proved unremunerative, a grant in aid is made to them, and it may or may not be repaid, but sometimes the colonies have been unable to meet their liability and the Government wipes out the debt.

3. With regard to this question no governmental money is expended on railways, telegraph lines, or public highways, excepting so far as they are covered in my answer to No. 1. But the Government will often meet the case by giving a guarantee. But if the Government guarantee be given in colonial projects of this description capital is always forthcoming, and there is hardly any case on record where the Government has been called upon to make good its guarantee. The only case in my memory is that of the Turkish bonds, but as a general rule it is perfectly accurate to assume that the Government guarantee always meets the financial difficulty. For example, there is an agitation in South Africa for a railway from Cape Colony to Cairo. Mr. Rhodes has been interviewing the home Government, asking, not for capital, but for a guarantee. The Government will only guarantee the railway so far as it considers it of commercial value, and has given its guarantee for one section of this project. Mr. Rhodes will now have no difficulty in obtaining money from the nation, for it is covered by the guarantee.

The troops in the colonies are paid directly by the Home Government, but the leading colonies pay the Government a proportion. The amount, however, is proportionately very small and by no means regular; some colonies pay and some do not.

Cape Colony has recently offered the Home Government the price of a first-class battle ship. But the payments on the part of the colonies are entirely voluntary, the general principle being no taxation without representation. There is a movement here calling for imperial federation, and doubtless in the future this question will be put upon a proper foundation.

In reply to question 5, the opinion here fluctuates as to the value or otherwise of colonial expansion. Roughly speaking, the average Britisher is ready to accept responsibility, but he is not particularly enthusiastic about it.

The fact is, we are a colonizing nation, and among the well-to-do classes it is quite the usual thing for the younger sons to try the colonies for a few years. The law of primogeniture is partly responsible for this, while our industrial system is continually throwing out large bodies of men who at once emigrate.

Of course the emancipation of the slaves was a capital investment of £33,000,000, which the colonies have never repaid and never will.

IS COLONIZATION BENEFICIAL TO THE PEOPLE OF THE COLONIZED TERRITORY?

In matters of this kind prospective effects can be only determined by a study of the effect of similar conditions with similar peoples. Great Britain, an English-speaking nation, has in former years assumed toward certain people in tropical climates relations somewhat similar to those now proposed temporarily or otherwise by the United States with reference to the islands under consideration. A study of conditions in India, Ceylon, the Straits Settlements, and the British West Indies will suggest whether or not the conditions of the people in the matter of intelligence, earnings, accumulations, conveniences of civilized life, and the like, have been improved under the management and direction which the English Government and the representatives it has sent to assist in the government of these countries have undertaken. Let us take India as the largest and most important of the communities to be considered. At the head of the national system of

education in India there are now five universities—at Calcutta, Madras, Bombay, Alahbad, and the Punjab—which, while merely examining bodies, have numerous affiliated colleges in which a prescribed education is given.

Normal schools have also been established in every province for training teachers, and a staff of inspecting officers visit all schools. Medical colleges furnish a limited number of graduates and a larger number of certified practitioners, who do duty at hospitals and dispensaries. At Calcutta alone 1,695 students matriculated in 1892 and 2,899 in 1897, and at the five universities the number of students matriculated in 1897 was over 7,000. The number of colleges in India in 1897 was 160, with 18,783 scholars, while the schools for general education numbered, according to the Statesman's Year-Book for 1899, 109,287, with an attendance of 3,790,000 scholars. The total number of institutions of all kinds in India in 1897 was 152,025, with a total attendance of 4,356,870. Since the appointment of a commission in 1883 to investigate the system of education in India, public instruction has been placed on a broader and more popular basis and private enterprises for teaching encouraged, with a general advancement in education and intelligence made plainly perceptible, so that in 1896 there were 598 newspapers published regularly in the languages of the people of India. The total expenditure for public instruction in the fiscal year 1896–97 was 35,244,900 rupees, against 671,000 rupees in 1865 and 894,000 in 1868. This enormous expenditure for education, it must be understood, is not contributed by the British Government, but is simply collected through proper organization and taxation, and the money applied for educational purposes.

Of the 35,000,000 rupees expended on public instruction in India in 1896–'97, the Statesman's Year-Book for 1899 says that 5,747,150 came from local rates and cesses, 1,496,720 from municipal funds, 7,867,110 from subscriptions, endowments, etc., 10,610,930 from fees, and 9,522,990 from provincial revenues.

In the matter of railways, roads, telegraphs, irrigation, and other physical advancements of this character, the advance has been equally rapid. In 1882 the number of miles of railway opened in India was 10,145; in 1892 it was 17,571, and in 1898 it was 21,157. The Statesman's Year-Book gives the total length of public roads maintained by the Indian government in 1886–'87 at 140,000 miles. In 1878 the number of letters, newspapers, etc., carried in the mails of India was 128,826,080; in 1887, 259,570,861, and in 1897, 449,726,298, having thus considerably more than trebled in twenty years. In 1878 the number of miles of telegraph wire in India was 42,011; in 1887 it was 86,930, and in 1897 it was 148,186, with 1,573 telegraph offices, and 50,774,584 paid messages against 1,357,014 paid messages in 1878. In 1883 the number of depositors in the savings banks of India was 203,901; in 1896, 742,215, or nearly four times as many in 1896 as in 1883, while the money standing to their credit at the end of the year 1898 was 40,059,300 rupees against 108,867,920 rupees in 1896. The Statesman's Year-Book in 1899 says that the number of accounts by individual depositors in the various savings banks of India in the year 1896–'97 was 663,157, with a balance to the credit of the depositors at the end of the year amounting to 89,798,620 rupees, while the number of European or Eurasian depositors was but 79,078 with a balance at the end of the year of 19,059,290 rupees.

In other communities located in tropical climates under British management developments have been equally rapid and advantageous to the population. In Ceylon the development has been remarkable. In the Straits Settlements, in the Bahamas, in Jamaica, in Barbados, and in the Bermudas the deposits in savings institutions have shown the same rapid increase, while in education, railways, highways, and other matters of this character the development has been equally rapid and satisfactory.

All of the above discussion of conditions and developments has been confined to communities located in tropical countries controlled and directed by an English-speaking nation situated in the temperate zone, the purpose being to find as nearly as practicable conditions parallel with those under consideration with reference to the islands which the events of the year have brought into closer relationship with the people of the United States. The statements given are in all cases taken from standard publications wherever practicable, from the official publications of the British Government, and in other cases from the Statesman's Year-Book, published in London and a generally accepted authority.

COLONIES AS A MARKET FOR THE PRODUCTS AND MANUFACTURES OF THE GOVERNING COUNTRY—ENGLAND'S COLONIES INCREASE HER MARKET THREE HUNDRED MILLIONS A YEAR IN EXCESS OF WHAT SHE WOULD SELL TO THE SAME TERRITORY WITHOUT THE COLONIAL RELATIONSHIP.

The non-British world buys 15 per cent of its total foreign merchandise from the United Kingdom; the British colonial world buys 43 per cent of its foreign merchandise from the United Kingdom. The total imports of the British colonies amount to $1,075,000,000 annually, and Great Britain, by supplying 43 per cent of this instead of 15 per cent, which she averages in the commerce of other countries, makes an additional market for $300,000,000 annually of her products. Her total exports to foreign countries (omitting the colonies) are $1,030,000,000, or 15 per cent of their total imports, and if to this were added a like percentage of the imports of the colonies her total sales would be $1,190,000,000, instead of the grand total of $1,480,000,000 which she enjoyed in 1896, the year to which these figures relate. It is thus apparent that her sales are enlarged through her colonial system in the sum of about $300,000,000 in round figures per annum, thus increasing by 25 per cent her total exports, and creating by her colonial system a market for $300,000,000 worth of her products and manufactures.

These are some of the facts shown in a recent publication of the Treasury Bureau of Statistics on the Colonies, Protectorates, and Dependencies of the World. French colonies buy quite as largely from the home country as do those of Great Britain, and even the Netherlands colonies purchase largely from the mother country, although located on the opposite side of the earth.

Not only has Great Britain added to her market by bringing the 350,000,000 people of her colonies into the colonial relationship, but there has evidently been, through the material development which has followed this relationship, a great increase in the purchasing power. The construction of highways, harbors, railways, and telegraphs has evidently quickened the general business conditions and, with the increased activity and prosperity, enlarged the consuming power.

That the construction of roads, harbors, railways, and telegraphs and the establishment of postal and banking facilities must increase the activity, productiveness, and consequent consuming power goes without saying. The railways now in the British colonies alone are more than 55,000 miles in length, the telegraph lines nearly 150,000 miles, and the highways far in excess of that. A large proportion of the railway lines is under the control and in many cases operated by the Government, and it is an interesting fact that the lines operated by the Government expend a smaller proportion of their total receipts in running expenses than those operated by private corporations. In nearly all the colonies there are savings banks in conjunction with the post-offices, and the deposits in the savings banks of the colonies amount to more than $300,000,000.

In the import trade of Great Britain the colonies also prove advantageous from the British standpoint. Over one-fifth of the more than two billion dollars which Great Britain sends outside of her immediate limits in purchase of supplies is spent among the people of her colonies, and thus largely contributes to the prosperity of either British colonists or British capital. That the industries of the colonies are to a considerable extent controlled by British capital goes without saying, and that the expenditure of nearly $500,000,000 of British money in British colonies each year for the products of those colonies must benefit the capital thus employed and so reflect to the business advantage of the home country whence that capital is drawn is equally apparent. The total imports into Great Britain from the colonies in 1896 were over £93,000,000, and in 1891 were over £99,000,000, or in round terms, $500,000,000, forming more than one-fifth of the total imports into the United Kingdom.

The following table shows the exports and imports of the United Kingdom to and from its colonies in 1897:

	Exports.	Imports.
British India	£28,000,385	£24,813,000
Australasia	23,895,970	29,362,129
North American colonies	6,464,880	19,538,908
Cape of Good Hope	10,766,168	4,195,741
Straits Settlements	2,538,916	3,643,224
Hongkong	2,079,951	600,314
Natal	3,621,373	752,254
Ceylon	1,070,932	4,688,278
West India Islands	2,709,497	1,970,685
Channel Islands	1,303,259	1,327,111
Lagos	521,204	1,100,943
Malta	856,094	74,903
Gibraltar	677,781	59,365
Niger Protectorate	608,193	351,617
Gold Coast	482,378	460,131
Sierra Leone	347,728	240,721
Mauritius	593,487	94,543
Aden	173,357	173,319
British Honduras	92,830	227,808
Other British possessions	630,386	331,745
Total to and from colonies	86,934,369	94,018,933

It will be seen by the above figures that the exports from England to her colonies amounts to $430,000,000 annually, or one-third as much as the total exports of the United States, the value of the pound sterling in which the exports are stated being $4.86.

A NEW MARKET OPENED—SALES TO CUBA, PORTO RICO, HAWAII, AND THE PHILIPPINES—A RAPID GROWTH IN OUR EXPORTS TO THOSE ISLANDS—A LIST OF THE ARTICLES FOR WHICH A NEW MARKET IS FOUND.

The constant demand upon the Treasury Bureau of Statistics for information as to the recent exportations to Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Hawaiian and Philippine Islands has caused the preparation

of a list of the principal exports to those islands during ten months ending April, 1900. It is as follows:

Articles exported from United States.	Cuba.	Porto Rico.	Hawaii.	Philippines.
Total	$22,006,973	$3,052,971	$11,601,720	$2,132,944
Provisions, total	4,422,686	588,571	389,286	34,403
Iron and steel, total	3,079,276	412,928	4,320,208	317,085
Animals, total	2,621,844	1,175	211,520	441,550
Breadstuffs, total	2,410,144	672,344	917,781	142,071
Cattle	1,820,382		3,295	
Lard	1,743,360	211,265	39,827	5,275
Wood and manufactures	1,605,680	304,198	1,131,370	63,144
Boards, deals, and planks	850,638	130,393	664,165	50,862
Flour	746,102	588,721	327,564	8,880
Bacon	672,230	54,707	20,941	340
Malt liquors	585,339	17,018	104,721	309,074
Hams	575,281	80,636	47,219	5,577
Coal	558,459	34,906	91,545	126,183
Eggs	479,263	31	8,158	
Pipes and fittings	476,984	38,907	576,138	5,845
Corn	431,044	4,129	16,216	
Furniture	377,767	28,672	182,682	6,721
Potatoes	372,115	14,388	27,945	35,015
Chemicals, total	357,763	45,823	108,492	39,537
Mineral oils, crude	332,842	19,519		
Pork	351,851	184,709	7,423	134
Beans and peas	336,185	44,359	20,944	577
Fresh beef	258,259	40,844	42,909	
Hogs	249,519		15,927	
Cotton cloth, colored	244,354	34,068	122,300	5,033
Steel rails	238,521	8,374	294,146	
Mules	229,751		109,993	220,400
Boots and shoes	209,075	19,223	144,067	4,890
Saws and tools	195,742	12,957	66,078	5,459
Boilers and parts of engines	193,015	25,433	107,106	19,639
Cotton cloth, uncolored	159,210	25,521	32,816	6,928
Tobacco, plug	149,967	142	173,719	538
Horses	153,712	975	67,912	211,550
Agricultural implements	149,418	5,153	11,997	225
Wrapping paper	148,211	18,043	46,212	9,151
Cycles, and parts of	142,616	2,376	43,532	20,109
Patent medicines	132,007	24,080	9,248	3,461
Wire	130,064	13,649	1,768	
Glass and glassware	125,740	10,632	47,214	4,644
Structural iron and steel	124,295	12,950	142,825	
Copper, and manufactures of	108,446	5,855	18,300	57
Electrical apparatus	132,612	11,914	100,335	10,083
Carriages, and parts of	99,897	12,092	104,992	29,213
Builders' hardware	99,616	11,378	27,457	3,220
Articles exported during ten months ending Apr. 30, 1900.				
Fish, total	83,380	23,640	199,656	2,236
Oats	82,893	1,773	66,305	103,107
Shooks	77,619	63,335	69,442	2,183
Furniture, of metal	66,124	1,361	5,758	
Sewing machines	61,772	1,988	37,997	130
Cotton wearing apparel	59,343	18,046	50,258	2,214
Bran and mill feed	58,400		146,508	4,822
Bread and biscuit	58,316	28,282	73,321	3,389
Books, maps, etc	56,877	10,900	39,530	14,820
Cars for steam railways	56,868	8,763	15,100	
Pumps and pumping machinery	55,157	12,915	201,837	12,242
Codfish	54,393	14,615	12,890	924
Locomotives	54,180	4,500	7,625	
Electric machinery	52,112	1,608	5,230	85,433
Cut nails	49,286	2,323	53,370	
Writing paper	48,238	5,525	11,176	4,875
Oleomargarine	48,020	16,461	10,780	
Steel sheets and plates	47,162	1,089	40,386	2,916
Lamps, chandeliers, etc	46,657	4,581	22,496	3,163
Cement	42,943	1,663	5,953	1,625
Lubricating oil	41,480	3,535	31,244	4,762
Soap	40,472	8,002	43,395	1,620
Coal, anthracite	39,206	5,248	1,176	3,450
Turpentine	38,319	2,873	4,038	393
Belting, hose, etc., india rubber	34,731	2,423	15,624	377
Iron sheets and plates	31,725	25	44,610	1,000
Vegetable oil	31,106	1,672	12,712	
Stationary engines	29,460	19,625	12,247	
Bricks, for building	29,325		47,564	
Bar iron	29,174	4,343	55,427	1,865
Leather	29,096	2,624	42,550	
Typewriters	29,008	2,551	8,095	9,165
Printing paper	27,570	7,116	17,698	21,390
Sugar, refined	27,502	3,404	73,841	
Hay	27,122	180	146,235	128,999
Apples	27,007	3,794	18,329	1,554
Candy and confectionery	26,891	1,159	11,084	3,093
Logs	24,645	28,725	5,562	39
Wooden ware	25,855	720	931	142
Brass, and manufactures of	23,675	2,600	1,505	1,519
Poultry and game	23,346	661	3,602	
Cutlery	22,140	673	7,383	2,721
Lead manufactures	19,973	3,351	5,225	
Illuminating oil	19,575	20,621	147,171	12
Spirits, distilled	19,488	7,120	35,068	97,224
Timber, sawed	20,940	270	36,671	859
Jewelry	18,883	747	5,080	2,875
Harness and saddles	18,654	3,048	51,387	20,824
Varnish	17,838	1,346	769	3,313
Cordage	16,048	8,094	95,771	
Clocks and watches	15,620	552	15,859	14,503
Joists and scantlings	58,789	23,000		

GROWING EXPORTS TO CUBA, PORTO RICO, HAWAII, AND THE PHILIPPINES.

The following table shows our exports to Cuba, Porto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippines in each year since 1896, and indicates the enormous growth since the new relationship with those islands began:

Exports from the United States to the islands named below.

Year.	To Cuba.	To Porto Rico.	To Hawaiian Islands.	To Philippines.
1896	$7,530,880	$2,102,294	$3,985,707	$162,446
1897	8,250,776	1,988,888	4,690,075	94,597
1898	9,561,656	1,505,946	5,907,155	127,804
1899	18,616,377	2,685,848	9,305,470	404,193
1900*	27,000,000	3,750,000	14,000,000	2,500,000

* May and June estimated.

ONE MILLION DOLLARS A DAY—THAT IS THE PRICE WE ARE PAYING FOR OUR TROPICAL PRODUCTS FROM ABROAD—WHY NOT PAY IT TO PEOPLE UNDER THE AMERICAN FLAG AND TO INDUSTRIES SUPPORTED AND DIRECTED BY AMERICAN CAPITAL?

Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States are paying a million dollars a day for tropical products used in manufacturing or food and drink, and most of which are produced in greater or less degree or can be readily produced in the islands which have come into closer relationship with the United States through the events of the past two years. The April Summary of Commerce and Finance, which has just been issued by the Treasury Bureau of Statistics, shows that in the ten months ending with April our imports of tropical products have been over $300,000,000 in value, thus averaging fully a million dollars a day and indicating that for the full year they will reach $365,000,000.

India rubber, fibers, raw silk, cotton, gums, cabinet woods, indigo, ivory, dyewoods, and certain lines of chemicals make up the share of this vast sum which the manufacturers of the United States take and require in constantly increasing quantities. The importation of raw materials for use in manufacturing has increased steadily and now forms more than one-third of our total imports, and the large proportion of this comes from the Tropics. Of india rubber alone the imports of the ten months amount to more than $27,000,000; of fibers, to $20,000,000; of unmanufactured silk, $40,000,000; of cotton, over $7,000,000; of gums, more than $5,000,000, while cabinet woods, dyewoods, indigo, and ivory also aggregate several millions.

Of the constantly increasing proportion of imports of foodstuffs, sugar, of course, is first, and of that the proportion which comes from the Tropics is vastly greater in the past year than in immediately preceding years, the Dutch East Indies, which lie just alongside of the Philippines, being now our largest single source of supply for sugar. For the ten months the importations of sugar are more than $80,000,000; those of coffee nearly $50,000,000; tea, nearly $10,000,000; tobacco, $16,000,000; tropical fruits and nuts, $15,000,000; cacao and chocolate, $5,000,000, and such other articles as spices, rice, olive oil, etc., add several millions to the total.

The following table shows the imports of tropical products into the United States during the ten months ending with April, 1900:

Principal articles of tropical production imported into the United States during the ten months ending April 30, 1900.

Sugar	$81,090,535
Coffee	46,927,393
Silk	40,248,662
India rubber	27,722,010
Fibers	20,468,746
Fruits and nuts	15,674,965
Tobacco	16,078,744
Tea	9,819,906
Cotton	7,304,674
Gums	5,554,494
Cacao and chocolate	4,935,560
Spices	2,929,323
Rice	1,906,425
Cabinet woods	1,895,694
Licorice root	1,391,684
Indigo	1,266,501
Cork wood	1,219,405
Olive oil	898,698
Dyewoods	781,074
Ivory	632,504
Sponges	428,904
Miscellaneous	11,700,000
Total	300,035,901

WHY PRICES OF MANUFACTURES HAVE ADVANCED—COST OF RAW MATERIAL FROM ABROAD HAS INCREASED FROM 50 TO 100 PER CENT.

How far are the manufacturers of the United States responsible for the recent increase in the prices of manufactured goods? This is an especially interesting question in view of the disposition to charge every advance in price to those who produce the finished article offered to the consumer. While most thinking people probably expected to see some increase in cost of manufactures in view of the advance in wages, which has been from 10 to 50 per cent, and in some cases much more, the assertion is frequently made that the advance in the price of the finished article is more than is justified by the advance in wages.

But there is another and very important factor which is probably not taken into account. This is the even greater advance

which has occurred in the cost of the raw material entering into the manufacture of the articles used in everyday life. Iron and steel have advanced in price; but how many people know that the iron ore from which they are made has more than doubled in price? But this is the fact.

The following table, furnished by the editor of the Iron Trade Review, an accepted authority, shows the prices of iron ore in 1898, 1899, and 1900. It will be seen that the advances have been nearly, and in some cases more than, 100 per cent in the raw material:

[These prices have been furnished by Mr. A. I. Findley, editor of the Iron Trade Review, of Cleveland.]

Grades.	1898.	1899.	1900.
Mesabi Bessemer	$2.15 to $2.25	$2.25 to $2.40	$4.40 to $4.90
Mesabi non-Bessemer	1.70 to 1.85	1.90 to 2.10	4.00 to 4.25
Marquette specular:			
No. 1 Bessemer	3.10 to 3.35	3.21 to 3.50	5.93 to 6.48
No. 1 non-Bessemer	2.35 to 2.45	2.50	5.00
Chapin	2.56	2.73½	4.95
Soft hematites, No. 1 non-Bessemer	1.80 to 2.00	2.00 to 2.15	4.15 to 4.25
Gogebic, Marquette, and Menominee No. 1 Bessemer hematites	2.75 to 2.95	2.80 to 3.25	5.50 to 5.75
Vermilion No. 1 hard non-Bessemer	2.50	2.65	5.10
Chandler No. 1 Bessemer	3.13	3.35	6.00
Marquette extra low-phosphoric Bessemer	3.65	3.85 to 3.90	6.80 to 6.90

The base price for 1900 of "old range" Bessemer ores, those from the Marquette, Menominee, Gogebic, and Vermilion ranges, have been fixed at $5.50, against $2.95 in 1899.

In tin plate the advance in pig tin and steel, the chief constituents, has been over 100 per cent each, while the increase in tin plate in the New York markets has been about 50 per cent, as shown by reports to the Bureau of Statistics on the prices of all the articles mentioned.

Crude petroleum, which is supplied from hundreds of wells owned by individuals in many different sections of the country, advanced from 65 cents per barrel in January, 1898, to $1.68 per barrel in February, 1900, an increase of 158 per cent, while the price of refined oil in cases increased in the same time from 5.95 cents per gallon to 11.1 cents, or 87 per cent.

Possibly the reply to the above facts relative to the advance in the raw materials produced at home may be that their prices have been put up in some mysterious way by a combination which could control the hundreds of iron mines and oil wells.

But will it be claimed that "trusts" are controlling the prices of the raw materials which come to us from the forests of Brazil, the wilds of Central America, the jute fields of India, the tin mines of Malacca, the sisal-growing fields of Mexico, the silk-producing areas of Japan and China and Italy and France, and the cinchona growers of South America and India?

In all these articles of foreign production, which our manufacturers must have for use in their industries, the advance in the cost of the article abroad, where its price can not be affected by the American tariff, has been from 50 to 150 per cent. The Bureau of Statistics has for many years presented in its monthly and annual publications statements of the prices in foreign markets of the leading articles of manufacturers' materials and food stuffs imported. The prices of those articles are determined by the statement of the importer, who in his invoice names under oath the actual cost of the article at the foreign port whence it is shipped to the United States. The statements thus obtained indicate, therefore, the actual price in the foreign market unaffected by tariff charges at United States ports.

A study of the latest figures of the Bureau shows a remarkable increase in the foreign price of many of the articles imported for use in manufacturing. In sisal, which comes chiefly from Mexico, the increase is more than 150 per cent within the last two years; in Manila hemp, 100 per cent; in jute, over 50 per cent; in raw silk, 33 per cent; in india rubber, more than 25 per cent; in clothing wool, 33 per cent; in tin, 50 per cent; and in raw sugar, 25 per cent. During the nine months ending with March, 1900, the importation of Manila hemp amounted to 29,107 tons, valued at $4,266,580, while in the corresponding months ending with March, 1898, 39,599 tons were valued at but $2,449,468, the average price per ton in the nine months just ended being $146.50, against $61.85 in the corresponding months of 1898.

In sisal grass, which is imported from Mexico, the increase has been even more strongly marked, the 52,875 tons imported in the nine months ending with March, 1900, being valued at $8,007,961, or $151.30 per ton, against an average of $62.42 per ton in the corresponding months of 1898. Jute, which averaged $23.65 per ton in the nine months ending with March, 1898, averaged $36.80 in the nine months ending with March, 1900. Raw silk also shows a marked increase, the average price per pound in the fiscal year 1897 being $2.94; in 1899, $3.19, and in the nine months ending with March, 1900, $3.94, while during the month of March alone the average price was $4.60, as against an average of $2.84 in the fiscal year 1897. Raw sugar, "not above No. 16, Dutch standard," whose average cost in the foreign markets during the fiscal year 1897 was 2 cents per pound, was, during the nine months ending with March, 1900, 2.42 cents per pound, and in the month of March over 2½ cents per pound, an increase of 25 per cent in the cost in the foreign markets.

The following table shows the average value in foreign countries of the articles named during the fiscal years 1897, 1898, 1899, and the nine months ending with March 31, 1900, as shown by the figures of the Treasury Bureau of Statistics, which are based, as above indicated, on the statements of importers of the cost of the goods in question at the foreign ports from which they are shipped to the United States:

Prices of articles in country of origin.

Articles.	Fiscal year.			Nine months, 1900.
	1897.	1898.	1899.	
Manila hemp, per ton	$73.68	$64.44	$116.63	$146.50
Sisal, do	60.00	74.59	128.12	151.30
India rubber, per pound	.491	.551	.62	.65
Silk, raw, do	2.84	3.05	3.19	3.94
Sugar, raw, do	.0201	.0224	.0228	.0242
Tin in bars, do	.129	.1373	.1595	.230

The following table, prepared by the Bureau of Statistics, shows the average import prices of the articles named in March, 1897, 1898, 1899, and 1900:

IMPORT PRICES.

[Represents prices in foreign countries.]

Articles.	March—			
	1897.	1898.	1899.	1900.
Chemicals, drugs, etc.:				
Barks, cinchona, etc., per pound	$0.043	$0.006	$0.122	$0.193
Gums: Camphor, crude, do	.139	.171	.203	.294
Potash, nitrate of, do	.020	.022	.025	.027
Quinia, sulphate of, etc., per ounce	.152	.236	.249	.328
Sumac, ground, per pound	.015	.016	.015	.023
Cotton, raw	.112	.092	.104	.136
Manufactures of: Cloth, not bleached, per square yard	.089	.076	.081	.094
Fertilizers: Phosphates, crude, per ton	.....	2.98	5.08	5.08
Fibers, vegetable, etc.:				
Flax, do	219.54	205.66	229.53	296.18
Hemp, do	126.00	138.41	121.50	133.65
Istle or tampico fiber, do	.....	49.71	64.85	70.91
Jute, do	29.83	24.98	32.49	35.59
Manila, do	79.74	60.64	120.10	135.84
Sisal grass, do	59.85	84.47	130.33	166.23
Manufactures of *—				
Cables, cordage, etc., per pound	.189	.205	.305	.317
Hides and skins, other than fur skins:				
Goatskins, do	.220	.231	.266	.272
All other, except hides of cattle, do	.108	.153	.143	.174
Hides of cattle, do	.....	.117	.101	.130
India rubber, do	.504	.588	.603	.660
Iron and steel, and manufactures of:				
Pig iron, per ton	22.90	25.80	31.87	36.21
Tin plates, terneplates, etc., per pound	.029	.022	.024	.035
Wire, and articles made from, do	.051	.075	.071	.091
Silk, raw, do	2.97	3.26	3.43	4.63
Sugar:				
Not above No. 16—				
Beet, do	.017	.....	.021	.021
Cane and other, do	.020	.022	.025	.027
Above No. 16, do	.024	.024	.028	.037
Tin in bars, blocks, pigs, etc., do	.128	.135	.192	.254
Wood: Boards, planks, etc., per M feet	10.27	9.99	9.80	12.04
Wool:				
Class 1—clothing, per pound	.171	.160	.171	.239
Class 2—combing, do	.200	.234	.314	.212
Class 3—carpet, do	.111	.093	.096	.097
Manufactures of: Cloths, do	.567	.869	1.02	1.22
Zinc or spelter: In blocks, pigs, and old, do	.033	.039	.049	.053

* Includes thread and twine.

DEMOCRATIC CONTROL OF NEWLY ADDED TERRITORY—THE USE OF TROOPS TO SUPPRESS INSURRECTION IS NOT A NEW THING IN OUR HISTORY—DEMOCRATIC RECORD OF SUPPRESSION OF AN INSURRECTION IN NEW MEXICO IN 1847 BY USE OF THE MILITARY FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. Speaker, little by little it becomes apparent that the Democratic criticism of the methods of the present Administration in regard to newly acquired territory is a criticism of the methods followed by its own leaders and Presidents. It has been already shown that all of the vast territory added to the area of the original thirteen States was added under Democratic control, also that the leaders of the party in and out of office planned and plotted and schemed to add the islands of Cuba and Hawaii as long as a desire for more slave territory stimulated them to activity.

Driven from their former positions by these developments, they now undertake to criticise the fact that the President is using the

Army to put down the insurrection in the Philippines, notwithstanding the fact that the treaty with Spain was ratified by Democratic votes after that insurrection had been begun. It seems hardly credible that men could attack the President for carrying to a finish a war that was in existence when the purchase of the islands was authorized by their own party leaders. Yet such is the fact. The attack of the Filipino forces upon our troops in the Philippines began on February 4, 1899, and on that same night Aguinaldo issued his proclamation declaring war against the United States. Yet it was not until February 6, two days after, that the treaty was ratified, and that by 10 Democratic and 3 Populist votes, if the published statements of the detailed vote are to be relied upon, and I have not seen them denied. The statement has also been repeatedly made that some of these votes were cast for the treaty by the "advice and consent" of William Jennings Bryan.

By this action the leaders of the Democratic and Populist parties deliberately bought a fight already going on, agreeing that the United States should pay $20,000,000 for it, and in so doing placed upon the shoulders of President McKinley the duty of carrying it on. He could not do otherwise. Yet they are criticising his course, though of course it is well understood that the criticism is for political effect only.

I want to show, now, that the leaders of the Democratic party did in another similar case just what President McKinley is now doing, and did it by the direction of a Democratic President. Some papers just compiled by the War Department show that after the conquest of New Mexico by the military forces of the United States was accomplished by the campaign of 1846, General Kearny, the officer in command, organized a civil government for the occupied territory, and filled the executive and judicial offices by appointment. These civil functionaries entered upon the discharge of their duties in apparent unconsciousness of exposure to more than ordinary peril. In December, 1846, the native inhabitants organized a conspiracy to overthrow the United States authority in New Mexico. On the night of January 15, 1847, the governor, the sheriff, the circuit attorney, the prefect, and a number of others, citizens and officials of the United States, and Mexican supporters of United States authority, were assassinated in the town of San Fernando de Tayos. On the same night seven other Americans were killed at Arroya Hondo and two at Rio Colorado. It was then apparent that the insurrection was general, and the purpose was to kill all the Americans and those Mexicans who had accepted office under the American Government.

COLONEL PRICE ATTACKS THE INSURGENTS.

Col. Sterling Price was then commander of the army of New Mexico, with headquarters at Santa Fe. He learned of the uprising and attendant atrocities January 20, 1847, and that the army of insurrection was marching against Santa Fe. He took prompt and vigorous action and marched out to meet the insurgents with a force of about 400 men. There were many serious and sanguinary engagements, but the enemy was no sooner dislodged from one position than it took refuge in another, and maintained a determined resistance throughout. The losses were heavy on both sides. Owing to the mountainous character of the country, and the fact that the campaign took place in the winter time, the American forces suffered many hardships before reaching the town of San Fernando de Tayos, where the governor and party had been foully assassinated. A particularly severe engagement occurred at the near-by town of Pueblo de Tayos, which had been strongly fortified. The insurgents took position in a large church which they had pierced with embrasures for rifles. The Americans battered the church and walls for two hours without effect, and were compelled to retreat to Fernando.

The following day they returned and renewed the assault, but the artillery fire seemed to have no effect upon the church walls. Ladders were then made and holes cut in the walls with axes, through which the soldiers with their hands threw fire and lighted shells into the interior. Another assault was made on the church door, which again failed, with loss. The artillery was then brought up to within 60 yards, and after 10 rounds had been fired one of the holes which had been cut with the axes was widened to a practicable breach, through which a storming party entered, dislodged the enemy, and took possession of the church. The next morning the enemy surrendered. The loss sustained by them was about 150 killed. The number of wounded was not known. The American loss in killed and wounded was 52.

THE INSURRECTION GENERAL.

Under date of January 23, Captain Hendley, commanding at Vegas, N. Mex., reported to Colonel Price that every town and village, except Vegas and Tucoloti, had declared in favor of insurrection, and that the entire population seemed ripe for it. The insurrection in eastern New Mexico was inaugurated by the murder of eight Americans at Mora January 20, 1847, and was continued in force until the following July, having been marked with many atrocities on the part of the insurgents. Thereafter the insurrection dwindled into depredations committed by various bands of Indians instigated and led by Mexicans.

Hardly a party, large or small, traders or soldiers, crossed the plains of New Mexico without being attacked. Many men were killed and large numbers of horses, mules, and cattle driven off. In the latter part of 1847 comparative safety was secured by stationing the troops at various points. Of the insurgent prisoners, fifteen or twenty were executed by sentence of court-martial. The others were turned over to the civil authorities.

INQUIRY BY CONGRESS.

The events resulting from the insurrection did not escape the attention of Congress. That body on July 10, 1848, passed a resolution calling upon the President for information in regard to the existence of civil government in New Mexico and California, their form and character, by whom instituted and by what authority and how they were maintained and supported; also whether any persons had been tried and condemned for "treason against the United States" in New Mexico. President Polk replied to said resolution in a message dated July 24, 1848, in which he discussed the character of military government, taking the broad position that such a government may exercise "the fullest rights of sovereignty," thereby explaining the action of the military authorities in suppressing the insurrections.

The records show that a similar course of action was followed in suppressing the insurrection in California in 1848, and reestablishing the sovereignty of the United States.

THE GERMAN VOTE.

Mr. Speaker, our friends, the Democrats, are trying to make everybody believe that the German vote this year will go to the Democratic party, but there is not the slightest likelihood of this being the case.

In 1896 the Germans voted for President McKinley. They are strong believers in the advantages of a gold standard of currency. This the Republican party has given them. They know that should the Democratic candidate for President be elected, which of course would mean Democratic control of Congress, then the gold standard law would be repealed and free coinage of silver will be foisted upon the country. The Germans do not want this. They are probably the most level-headed European people who come to live here. They know that they fare better here, can make and save more money than they did in the Fatherland, and they are not a people who are led away by flights of the imagination.

An effort is being made to bring the Germans into the Democratic line by scaring them with the bugaboo of imperialism, which it is claimed would compel a large increase in our military forces. Many of them have come here to escape the strict military laws that are in force in Germany, and naturally they would not favor anything tending in the same direction in this country. I am glad this subject has developed thus early in the campaign, because the Germans will have time to read and study what the actual conditions are as to our military forces, comparing them with their Fatherland.

Germany has over 52,000,000 people. Its standing army is 600,000 men, an average of 11½ soldiers to every 1,000 people. The United States is 76,000,000, and a standing army of 65,000 men, which is equivalent to 1.86 of 1 soldier to every 1,000 of our population. While Germany has nearly 11 soldiers more per 1,000 of her people than we have, there can not be the slightest chance of the effect of imperialism being experienced in this country.

The following table shows the leading countries of the world, with their population, their standing army, and the number of soldiers each country has per 1,000 of its people:

Country.	Population.	Army.	Soldiers per 1,000 population.
France	38,500,000	560,000	14.05
Germany	52,300,000	600,000	11.05
Austria-Hungary	41,800,000	280,000	6.07
Russian Empire	129,300,000	700,000	6.01
Turkey	33,600,000	240,000	7.01
Great Britain	38,000,000	210,000	5.06
Italy	29,700,000	*210,000	7.01
United States	76,000,000	†65,000	.86

*Peace footing. †War footing.

France has 14 soldiers to every 1,000 of its population. Germany more than 11; Austria-Hungary and Russia more than 6 each; Turkey and Italy each more than 7; Great Britain more than 5½, while the United States has less than 1 soldier per 1,000 of its population. There can be no chance of the military strength of the United States ever being increased to the proportion that exists in European countries.

As a city grows in size and extends its area, the first thing for which the citizens living there ask is more police protection. Our

country is like a large city and the bigger it grows the better it should be protected. But the United States has been growing and growing year after year, and its population has doubled since the civil war, while our standing army has been kept nominally at 25,000 men, year after year. Even our present increase above 25,000 men is but temporary, as the law authorizing it expires on July 1, 1901, just a year from now.

As a matter of fact, this country has not been affording sufficient protection to its citizens in proportion to their increase. If our German friends will study the matter in this light, they will see that we are as far removed from militarism and imperialism as we were fifty years ago.

Nicaraguan Canal.

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM P. HEPBURN,
OF IOWA,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Tuesday, May 1, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 2538) to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans—

Mr. HEPBURN said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The subject that we are to consider now is one that has engaged the attention of the American people for fifty-four years. In a few days it will be just fifty-four years since the first project for an interoceanic canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic with those of the Pacific was brought to the attention of the American people. From that time down to the present, almost every year, the subject has received attention and has been a matter of infinite talk; but, notwithstanding all the volumes that have been written and the thousands of speeches that have been made, this is the first day that the proposition to secure the building of such a canal has ever received the attention of the House of Representatives for a direct vote.

While it has received the attention of many committees and been the subject of voluminous reports, there has always been some way by which definite action could be defeated. There was always some party in interest that did not want the particular project, or did not want it at that particular time, that has been enabled to interpose conclusive objection. Five years ago, after receiving the attention of the proper committee of this House for weeks and months, a report was made. A plan was devised, embodied in a bill. It came to this House. Three hundred and seven of the Representatives sitting here petitioned that there might be a rule whereby the members of the House could discuss and express themselves by vote upon the subject. That three hundred and seven were insufficient. Another committee, rather than the one charged with the duty of investigating and reporting, without consultation, took the matter into their hands and succeeded in postponing it by placing an amendment on an appropriation bill creating a commission for still further investigation. The next Congress the committee having charge of the matter again evolved a scheme and brought it into the House; but the committee——

Mr. PACKER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, a question of privilege. We are unable to hear.

Mr. HEPBURN. The Committee on Appropriations, who had never given one moment of attention to this matter, again sidetracked it by an appropriation of $200,000, creating another commission for still further investigation. Again, last year, after the Senate had adopted substantially the bill that is now before the House, another committee, that had never examined the question, that was not charged with the duty, that knew nothing about what had been done and what should be done, brought in a provision for an appropriation of a million dollars for the appointment of another committee; and again it was sidetracked. There has always been somebody in some way trenched behind authority that was able to postpone this great measure; and now, to-day, I find gentlemen, notably the gentleman who has twice prevented action, again insisting that while he is in favor of a canal, now is not the auspicious moment.

Mr. Chairman, in 1850 Congress authorized a survey of this proposed route. It was made by a capable engineer—carefully made. He made a report favoring the Nicaragua route. That report was submitted to a commission of officers taken from the Engineer Corps of the Army. They approved of the surveys and of the report. That was then sent to the foreign office in England for the purpose of being submitted to their engineers. That was done. All of their data was carefully scanned and considered, and a body of engineers from the army of Great Britain approved the report and declared it to be feasible.

Mr. GRAFF. In what year?

Mr. HEPBURN. In 1852 and 1853.

Again, in 1872, Congress authorized another survey; that was made by a distinguished officer of the Engineer Corps. He consumed two years, and with an efficient staff made an elaborate report, again confirming the feasibility of the route. Still later certain engineers and officers of the Navy were intrusted with the duty of again examining this route. They did so, and declared it to be feasible.

Then, Mr. Chairman, a company chartered by Congress and to a certain extent under the auspices of Congress, by their engineers, Mr. Menocal being at the head, made a most careful survey, occupying years of time, costing hundreds of thousands of dollars. Every feature of the route was investigated; every engineering difficulty was solved. That officer reported that the canal was feasible. But this was a commercial enterprise; they were business men engaged in this, men who were asked to put their money into it. With care that was wise they summoned a body of engineers, the most distinguished that there are in the United States. The plans of Menocal were submitted to them. After careful examination these gentlemen reported that the route was feasible and within the limits of proper cost.

That was the condition when this commission that I first called attention to was inaugurated. Mind you, every portion of this route has been investigated. They had almost, I might be justified, perhaps, in saying, a photograph of every grasshopper and bug that could be found in all that 179 miles of tropical country. Then we had the Ludlow commission. General Ludlow of the Engineers, Mr. Endicott from the Navy, and Mr. Noble, known to all the people of this country as one of the most distinguished of our civil engineers, made surveys, comparing the route with the Panama route and with others. They reported that the surveys of Menocal, with slight amendments and changes were entirely practicable and within the limits of reasonable cost. That was not sufficient. Two years later another commission, with Admiral Walker at the head, were charged with the duty of again investigating this much investigated subject. They went over the whole route. They spent $200,000 in verifying the surveys heretofore made. They made additional ones. Where there was a doubtful foundation, they extended their borings. They verified the whole engineering scheme of the Maritime Canal Company.

They became satisfied that the route was entirely practicable. Now, we have the third commission—one not ready to report, and for which report we are told we must wait. But, Mr. Chairman, these difficulties thrown in the way of this enterprise by members of this House who have doubts in regard to the engineering features—and doubts are all they have upon these matters of engineering—these gentlemen are not the only opponents. We are met by another class of gentlemen who say that while this route is practicable, while the canal is needed, while it should be an object of solicitude and fostering care and speedy completion by the Government, yet there are certain difficulties of a diplomatic nature that absolutely prevent us from doing anything.

They say truthfully that in 1850 a treaty was negotiated between Great Britain and our country, popularly known as the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, and that one of its provisions declares that neither party alone, except in conjunction with the other, will secure this water route, or will attempt in any way to defend it without the consent of the other, and they say these provisions are a barrier, and until that is removed the Government of the United States can not in good faith undertake this work.

I would not be an authority upon a grave question like this, but I want to call your attention to names of a long list of statesmen who have declared that that instrument—the Clayton-Bulwer treaty—is not now of operative force against us; that it either had been violated by Great Britain in such degree as to justify us in no longer recognizing its potency or that it had become obsolete because of the object stated by that treaty having been abandoned by both parties, or that both parties had themselves abandoned it by making no effort to carry out its provisions.

In that list of statesmen that have taken one or the other of those positions all insist that at most or at the worst we had the right to declare it void and no longer binding. All of them have gone to that extent. I name Secretary Marcy and President Pierce, Secretary Cass, and every President from Pierce down to the present incumbent, excepting Presidents Lincoln and Johnson. Douglas, Marcy, Frelinghuysen, Blaine, and others, all of them have united in saying that we stood to-day in the position, from the acts of other parties, that entitle us to declare that we would no longer be bound by its provisions.

But, Mr. Chairman, if this is not true, I insist that we occupy that position now before the world that justifies us in caring for our own; in the pursuit of our own supreme interests, to say that that obligation undertaken fifty years ago will no longer bind us. I want to call attention to this fact that while writers upon the

subject of international law tell us that in the letter of the law treaties, without there is a limitation as to time stated within them, or without they are carried out and completed, they are irrepealable and are to exist forever. That is the letter of the law, but never its spirit.

Look where you can in all the diplomacy of the world, and how many treaties do you find to-day which are fifty years old. All writers say that the rights of a nation to determine a treaty is always dependent upon the circumstances and environment; that no general law or rule can be established, and that it becomes a question of morals rather than of law, a question of whether the circumstances are such as justify the nation in saying it will no longer be bound by the long-time agreement made under other conditions, and made desirable by other surroundings or made by other generations of men.

Look at this case in 1850, and what is the situation? We were then a weak nation of 23,000,000 people. Only two years before we had acquired our Pacific coast, or the California portion of it. We owned nothing beyond. There was no Alaska for us; we had no coastwise trade. Now our coastwise traffic is measured by millions of tonnage. Then 10,000 families would have been all that could be found in all that Pacific region. Now we have three great States. Then there was poverty there; now their wealth is enumerated by billions of dollars. Then there was no commerce except the trader in hides and furs; now the commerce of that coast reaches hundreds of millions of dollars annually. I say that the conditions have so changed, I say that our necessities have so changed, I say that our interests are so great as to demand that the people of this generation will not longer be bound by the barrier that was interposed by another generation half a century ago. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, a nation of Yankees in entering into an enterprise of this kind will always want some estimate of the cost that he is to be at, and of the resources or revenues that will follow his expenditure. I make the statement that in all the estimates that have ever been made—by any engineer that gave attention to this subject who was in a position to be informed and who knew from accurate data that of which he spoke—no man has ever fixed the possible cost at more than $145,000,000. And the gentleman that fixed that high price gave it as his opinion that $135,000,000 would be the cost, but that possibly, as he says, it may reach $145,000,000.

The commission that last reported, furnishing us with their report within the last few months, tell us that the total cost will be one hundred and eighteen millions and a fraction. Another of the three, however, says that, in his judgment, making larger allowance for possible exigencies, it may reach $131,000,000. But those gentleman who say one hundred and eighteen millions, in arriving at those figures take for their unit price the prices paid in the great work at Chicago, and then for that work that lies west of the lake they add 50 per cent and for that portion lying east of the lake they add 33⅓ per cent.

Mr. TALBERT. Has the gentleman any informatiom from the last commission appointed to look into this matter? Have they laid any facts before your committee at all?

Mr. HEPBURN. None at all.

In addition to these sums they have added five millions for a hundred miles of railway; two millions for sanitary and police; one million for the maintenance of harbors during construction of canal and for buoys, beacons, and light; five million and a half dollars for engineering and administration, being 6 per cent; and then to all of these—to this aggregate—they add for general contingencies 20 per cent, making nearly $20,000,000 more. Now, to the unit of the work done in Chicago they add 33⅓ per cent. Then to that they add an additional 20 per cent for extraordinary contingencies; and they think that certainly would be sufficient.

Among the difficulties that have come in the way of this canal and of the completion of the project are the enterprising gentlemen who have something else to offer—always for sale. There has been a wonderful traffic in franchises to build canals in Nicaragua. I am told that in the last fifty-four years there have been granted 23 franchises to 23 different corporations or individuals. Whenever the treasury is low they sell a franchise if there happens to be a Yankee about who thinks that he can sell it to somebody or hold up somebody who may have some enterprise in view and make him disgorge. Before the committee of which I am a member we have had visitations from no less than eight of these corporations or individuals who had something to sell in the shape of a franchise. For a long time it was the Maritime Canal Company; now the successors of that; now the old Atlas Company, that was organized long prior to the completion of the Panama route and that at one time ran a steamboat and stage line from the town of Greytown on the Caribbean Sea to Brito on the Pacific Ocean, accommodating the California travel.

But there is another route upon which there have been vast expenditures and which I have been told strikes the minds of some of our people as more favorable to the interests of the United States than the route I have been describing. That is the Panama route. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that in my judgment, that route can never be made feasible for our purposes. We are told that $256,000,000 already has been spent or squandered in the construction of that route; and we are told that but two-fifths of it is completed, and that two-fifths is two-fifths of the linear extent, not two-fifths of the work; but that in the alluvial lands—the low-lying lands, those on the sea level—11 or 12 or 13 miles on the east side and 5 or 6 on the west side, that there the canal is partially completed, but that the great work of cutting through the divide, that stupendous work involving a cut of two or three hundred feet in depth and 8 miles in extent, that other wonderful feat in the engineering world, the control of the Chagres River, a torrential stream draining hundreds of square miles of mountain surface, that rises sometimes 70 feet in twenty-four hours, and that other engineering feat of supplying the summit level of the Panama Canal, these have never been touched. They are simply known as they appear to the mind of the engineer. This Herculean task, involving millions that are to be expended in subduing nature and overcoming its forces, has not yet passed the stage of engineering speculation and debate.

But aside from that there is no assurance that we could ever control that canal. I challenge any of the friends of the enterprise to show how we could do it. Two hundred and fifty-six million dollars of its stock is scattered all over the face of France. It was a favorite investment twenty years ago. The poor were induced to yield up their hoardings and take stock certificates in exchange. They hold them to-day. They are the dream of future competency. This stock which they will hold on to is represented in the new company to-day in such a manner that they can not dispose of it.

I am speaking now by the card. I recall, as many of my colleagues will, the testimony of the half dozen gentlemen representing the new Panama Canal, who came before our committee a year ago. They told us of their arrangements; and they told us that after paying the expenses of operation, after paying their interest account, the surplus of revenue was to be divided in proportions of 40 to 60—60 per cent going to the existing stockholders of the old company and 40 per cent to the new.

Mr. GRAFF. Is it not true that there has been a foreclosure in court of the property of the old company, which has been purchased by the new company?

Mr. HEPBURN. No, sir; not a purchase. There has been no foreclosure. The property of the old company was placed in the hands of an officer whom we would call a receiver, who has made an arrangement with the new company whereby they were to put $13,000,000 of new money into the enterprise. They were to have the power to control it; they were to have the power to raise other funds and secure them. They were charged with the duty of appropriating the revenues in the manner of which I speak, so that every dollar of the old stock is represented.

Mr. GRAFF. But was that not in pursuance of some decree of the court, or an arrangement with the company itself?

Mr. HEPBURN. It was made with the knowledge, as I understand it, or the consent of the court. Whether it was a decree of the court or not I am not prepared to say; but this was the testimony before the Committee of Commerce a year ago when the matter was before that committee.

Mr. GRAFF. I only asked the question for information.

Mr. HEPBURN. That is my information on the subject.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if I am correct I do not see how it is possible that the Panama Canal can ever subserve our purposes. I want, and I think the American people want, an American canal to be built and controlled by our own people absolutely and exclusively. [Prolonged applause.] We want a canal that will discriminate, if discrimination is to be made, in favor of our own people. [Renewed applause.] In other words, we want to control the enterprise ourselves absolutely and entirely. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield for a question?

Mr. HEPBURN. I will yield to the gentleman in a moment.

I wish to call the attention of the House to the immense advantage that this construction and ownership would be to us as a people. We are now entering upon the most important of all of the conditions that the nations of the world have ever had in their efforts to control the commerce of the world. It is the purpose and the wish, as I understand it, of the American people that we shall have our full share of that commerce, and every factor in securing that commerce is of immense importance and interest to them.

Mr. Chairman, for years past we have been spending $200,000,000 annually in payment to the owners of foreign ships to carry on the commerce of the United States to foreign ports. A gentleman on yesterday on this floor spoke of the loss of three billions of money in a single decade that occurred to us in our commercial transactions by reason of this condition. In that estimate let me say that he lost sight entirely of the colossal sum of $2,000,000,000

that we have expended, or, in other words, placed in the pockets of foreign shipowners, for carrying that traffic which ought to be carried in American ships. Hundreds of gentlemen have expressed themselves in my hearing as utterly opposed to the doctrine of American subsidies for ships. And yet the whole country, without opposition, will unite with me, I know, in saying that this great canal as a means of stimulating shipbuilding in the shipyards in the United States is going to be, and must necessarily be, the most important item of legislation that this country has undertaken to enact in the last thirty years. [Applause.]

Suppose that we should give to the shipyards of the country the ability to build our American fast vessels from American materials by American woringkmen—ships to be loaded with American products and which would be a part and a parcel of the great invading army of commerce that we propose to launch in all quarters of the world. Is there a man on the floor of the House or elsewhere who would not willingly and gladly extend a helping hand to such an enterprise? Such a ship might have the use of the canal here proposed without the payment of a dollar for that character of traffic. The London merchants who trade with Hongkong—employing, we will say, a 6,000-ton ship—for the passage through the Suez Canal pays $18,600 for the round trip. What a privilege then, I repeat, the merchants of New York would enjoy who, engaged in the same trade, can use this canal without payment of toll!

Mr. Chairman, I want the canal, when it is completed, to be under our control, so that the advantages which it must bring will be reaped alike by all of our people. [Applause.] I do not want our hands tied by allowing a part of the control of this great enterprise to be under some other power.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the gentleman now yield to me for a question?

Mr. HEPBURN. Certainly I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I agree with most of what the gentleman has said——

Mr. HEPBURN. You ought to agree with all of it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. But I wish to make an inquiry of the gentleman to see whether I can agree entirely with him. I wish to ask him, in the first place, if the Hay-Pauncefote treaty is in force and has been placed upon our statute books?

Mr. HEPBURN. Well, now, the gentleman from Missouri ought not to ask me that question. He has just as much information as I have on that subject.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I take it for granted that it has not been enacted or is not in force——

Mr. HEPBURN. Well, the gentleman may assume that position——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The point I want to get at is simply this: If we pass this bill, and if that treaty is in force, is there not a conflict at once aroused? Do not the sections of that treaty take precedence over your bill by the operation of the time limit, if in no other way?

Mr. HEPBURN. I do not know that I quite catch the gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What I mean is, does not the treaty take precedence of the proposition embodied in the bill you are now seeking to enact?

Mr. HEPBURN. Well, I do not hold myself out as competent now to answer that question without consideration.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me ask you one more, and I will stop.

Mr. HEPBURN. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Your bill contemplates that we shall protect this canal. That is my understanding. My own version is that we have the right to fortify; to do as we please with it; that it is ours. Now, the Hay-Pauncefote treaty comes along and says that England shall have the same rights in that canal as we have. So where would that provision in your bill go to?

Mr. HEPBURN. I am afraid it would be unfortunate for the provision of my bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. So am I.

Mr. HEPBURN. But I understand this, that if this House of Representatives, by an almost unanimous vote, declares that it ought to be the policy of the American people to own that canal, untrammeled by entangling alliances with any nation or nations, there is no official in the United States that will dare to say nay to that. [Loud applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am not certain about that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. In other words, we can repeal the treaty beforehand.

Mr. HEPBURN. No one will want to say nay to that.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me ask you one more question.

Mr. HEPBURN. And I want to say that there is no power of administration here that wants to thwart the will of the American people if it is fairly expressed.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, now, does not the very fact that they persist in urging that treaty in the Senate demonstrate that there is an official somewhere that does not care what the House of Representatives does?

Mr. HEPBURN. I have never known that there is. I do not know that there is a party anywhere persisting in that. I remember that some weeks ago the matter came up—at least, I have been told so in the newspapers, and I am quoting newspapers—that in another body a provision, I suppose like that which the gentleman is talking about, came up for action and that the expression was of that character—so unanimous and vigorous against affirmative action that the gentleman who had it in charge was glad to withdraw it.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. HEPBURN. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman think that the same body of legislators would ratify the Hay-Pauncefote treaty and pass this bill?

Mr. HEPBURN. I think that answers the question of the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I did not hear that.

Mr. HEPBURN. The gentleman suggests that the body that would pass this bill would not probably ratify the Hay-Pauncefote treaty.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, if they do not intend to press that treaty, why do they not withdraw it from the attention of the Senate and be through with it?

Mr. HEPBURN. Oh, well, now, that is a question which the gentleman ought not to ask. You know that nobody can answer that. What particular reason there may be for withdrawing it or withholding the withdrawal nobody knows excepting those that have charge of the subject.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. CLARKE of New Hampshire. We ought to do our duty, anyway.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Does not the gentleman think the passage of this bill would go a very long way in persuading gentlemen in some other body to withdraw that treaty?

Mr. HEPBURN. I should certainly hope that that would be so. But, gentlemen, are we going to stop now because of the fear that something may lie in the future?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No——

Mr. HEPBURN. That is what we have been doing for fifty years. Are you going to continue it?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will make one suggestion, if you will permit. If you will put back that word "fortify" into this bill and pass it here almost unanimously, and then if the conferees of this House will stand up to it, we do not care about the treaty.

A MEMBER. That word "fortify" is not out of the bill yet.

Mr. HEPBURN. I am glad the gentleman has reminded me of that branch of the matter. The changes that the committee have consented to in the interest of harmony, as they supposed, thinking that they had done all that any opponent of the bill required—being misled in that direction; and I do not mean to say improperly misled, for perhaps we misled ourselves—I would say that I do not think those changes make any radical difference in the bill. If the gentleman will allow me, in the eighth line the proposition of the committee was to strike out the word "defend" and insert the word "protect." Can the gentleman find any difference?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes, I can find a difference. One of them is just a hazy proposition, and the other is a direct concrete proposition in very many instances.

Mr. HEPBURN. Which is the "concrete" and which is the "hazy?"

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why, the word "protect" is hazy, and the word "fortify" is a definite word.

Mr. HEPBURN. Why, it seems to me that the word "protect" has the broader meaning. It means authorizing to defend; that is, in the sense of protection.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I know. It might not.

Mr. HEPBURN. And again——

Mr. TERRY. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to one fact there: In place of "fortification" you substitute the word "provisions," and in place of "defend" you use the word "protect." That word "protect" is the very word that is used in the Clayton and Bulwer treaty. If we put in that word "protect" in place of the word "defend," may it not virtually, to that extent, be considered as yielding to the contention of England?

Mr. HEPBURN. That word "protect" would bind the United States to defend, make safe, make secure the canal. In the treaty that is the word. Using the word "protect" compels our Government to make safe and secure the canal. What is the difference?

Mr. TERRY. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to this fact, that the Clayton-Bulwer treaty specially prohibited any fortification; but after striking out the word "defend" and the word "fortifications" you then use the very word used in that treaty, and you are proposing to use that word now.

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes, the treaty did; and yet you will remember that within ten years of that time Great Britain, in violation of

that treaty, made a treaty with Nicaragua in which she reserved and secured the power, at her pleasure, to move her forces into Nicaraguan territory for the purpose of protecting and defending the canal.

And again, our Government in 1867, seventeen years after the treaty, while certain gentlemen say it was still a subsisting, binding, and controlling obligation upon us, we negotiated for building this canal ourselves and securing it and protecting it alone, without the aid of Great Britain, and had the right to enter upon the territory with our armies and use our fleet for the purposes of protection.

Mr. TERRY. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman in his idea that England violated the Clayton-Bulwer treaty; that being so, we are absolved from that, and therefore we ought not to return to the use of language that is employed in that treaty, by striking out "fortify" and "defend" and putting in the place of those strong, plain words this word "protect" or "protection." That was in the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, and if you put it in here we may be considered to that extent as yielding to their contention.

Mr. HEPBURN. Is the gentleman from Arkansas or myself making this speech?

Mr. TERRY. I understood the gentleman to yield to me. I know the gentleman will make it better than I, and shall not interrupt him any further.

Mr. HEPBURN. It was only a matter of idle curiosity that I had. [Laughter.]

Mr. TERRY. I will be satisfied if I have aroused the gentleman's curiosity sufficient to direct his attention to this use of a word from the Clayton-Bulwer treaty.

Mr. HEPBURN. The other recommendation of the committee is to substitute the word "provisions" for the word "fortifications," in the fourteenth line of the second page, and to substitute "as may be necessary" instead of the words "will be required." And these words, you will remember, are addressed to the Secretary of War, who is charged with the construction.

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of other topics that I would like to discuss, but in view of the demands made upon me for time, and the demands that will be made upon you, I think I should not occupy the attention of the House longer.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Will my colleague permit me? I was interested in his speech, to the effect that the Clayton-Bulwer treaty might be abrogated by the Government. Do I understand the gentleman to claim that it might be abrogated by an act of Congress proceeding with the work, or does it require diplomatic negotiations?

Mr. HEPBURN. I suppose the orderly way would be to abrogate it through the State Department; but I have no doubt about our ability and our right by legislative enactment to abrogate it, or by doing publicly and above board that which would be diametrically inconsistent with its provisions.

Mr. GILBERT. Did not the building of the Suez Canal on the part of Great Britain virtually abrogate the treaty itself?

Mr. HEPBURN. I do not know that. I never heard it discussed, and have not given attention to that subject; but I want to call attention to the fact that the condition of the commerce of the whole world, especially of this country, with reference to the western coast, has so changed since that time that it would be inequitable and unjust to hold us to a treaty fifty years old, if there was no other reason than simply the fact that necessity demands its abrogation.

Mr. TALBERT. Speaking of the last commission that was appointed, I would like to ask the gentleman why that commission has not made a report.

Mr. HEPBURN. They have not got through their work yet. They have several hundred men at work now.

Mr. TALBERT. It seems that they could have reported something.

Mr. HEPBURN. I do not know; I am not informed about that.

Mr. MANN. May I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that four of the members of the present commission have already been on a commission and made a report favorable to the Nicaraguan Canal?

Mr. HEPBURN. That is a correct statement.

Mr. SNODGRASS. The gentleman speaks of a treaty having been made which authorizes us to go there. It is under that treaty that this bill is introduced.

Mr. HEPBURN. That is a subsisting treaty, and we would have the right under that treaty to-day to construct the canal if we desired to do it. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVY. Let me ask the gentleman one question. What commerce of the world will derive the largest benefit from this canal?

Mr. HEPBURN. The United States.

Mr. LEVY. Has it the largest amount of shipping?

The Questions of the Hour.

Are Trusts the Offsprings of Protection—They Have Long Flourished in Free-trade England.

A Review of Three Years of President McKinley's Administration.

Prosperity for all Classes, and Especially for the Workingman and the Farmer—The Increase of Currency and the Gold Standard—Expansion—Colonies and Colonization—The Sugar Question.

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES DICK,

OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, June 2, 1900.

The House having under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 138) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States—

Mr. DICK said:

Mr. SPEAKER: Within the last year or two we have heard and read much on the subject of the formation of large combinations of capital which are commonly called trusts. Our friends on the other side of the House, and the Democratic papers which represent them, are in the habit of claiming that trusts are simply the outcome of a protective tariff. I claim, Mr. Speaker, that this is not the case. As far back in the history of the world as the time of the ancient Greeks and Romans corporations and combinations of capital were plentiful. Under the early Roman law corporations could be formed at the will of the promoter without any special state authorization. There is record of a combination in the iron trade which was established more than 2,000 years ago. Our friends on the other side of the House must concede that this was before the days of protective tariff had developed in any part of the then known world.

Aristotle tells us that "there was a man in Syracuse, in the days of Dionysius, the tyrant, who bought all the iron in the island of Sicily, and was able to sell it at such prices as he pleased, and thereby made much profit. When Dionysius, the tryant, heard of this he was pleased with the ingenuity of the man, and told him that he might keep his money, but had better leave Syracuse."

More than a century ago Blackstone said: "When it is for the advantage of the public to have a particular right kept on foot or continued, to construct artificial presence, who may maintain a perpetual succession and enjoy a kind of legal immortality," the law authorizing corporation seems certain and proper. He predicated the need of this form of organization "for the advantage of the public."

England's industrial conditions were the precursor of those in the United States. Originally every individual worked and did business independently for himself. Gradually, however, as the demands of industry increased and broadened productive enterprise was compelled to concentrate. Capital appeared and gave employment to workers, and so the employing and employed classes were developed. Larger enterprises of manufacture, mining, and commerce called for the association of capital in order to carry on business to the best advantage. Partnerships became common and to some extent corporations succeeded the partnership form of doing business. This was the condition of affairs in England down to the beginning of the eighteenth century.

In the United States industrial development began slowly. It was retarded by the conditions relating to the settlement and subjugation of a new country, and by adverse English legislation that, until the beginning of their national existence, aimed to repress all colonial manufacture. When, however, national independence gave a stimulus to national enterprise, all forms of industry went forward with giant strides. In less than one-half a century we were rivaling the mother country in the diversity and importance of our manufacturing activities.

The United States has been notably a nation of wealth producers and distributers. Our history is a record of masterly effort to wring from the strongholds of nature the material gains that have enriched us. Inventive genius has lightened the labor of hands, and at the same time increased production and consumption to almost fabulous figures. Business sagacity and enterprise have developed commercial organization into a powerful machine, cooperating with labor and invention for the general good.

The factory system, that was to revolutionize the labor activity of mankind, began to exercise its influence in England as early as 1730, when Watts's roller spinning was introduced.

Fifty years ago the mother of the household took a week to knit a pair of stockings, and labor cost put into them was not more than

a few cents. Fifty years ago hand looms were used to weave cloth in every farmhouse throughout the country. Wool was carded at home; rag carpets, homemade, covered the floors; farmers mowed their fields with scythes; the blacksmith forged the horseshoes for the village; the seamstress made the clothes that the girls and boys wore, and everybody depended upon the shoemaker for footwear.

All that is changed now. Machinery and factories have superseded individual labor. Our knit goods, our shirts, indeed everything that we wear, are made within the factory, because they can be made better and cheaper there than they ever could be by individual workers. The mowing machine, the reaper, the raker, and binder enable one or two men to do the work of twenty.

Out of these inevitable conditions arose the corporation. With the factory came the foundry and the great manufacturing establishments, ever growing bigger and bigger in response to the ever-increasing demand of the consuming public. It was no longer possible for the individual worker to meet the situation. The formation of industrial armies followed as a matter of course—larger capital was required than any one man could control. Partnerships were for a time effective to a certain extent.

The corporation in its early days was not in favor in England, and the feeling against it found frequent expression in the common law. In the United States similar hostility to corporations was exhibited even down to the middle of the nineteenth century. Nevertheless, the corporation had to come whether the people fancied it or not, and whether the laws of the country gave free trade or protection to industry. The small corporation has had its day. It will always remain, but for large enterprises it has been superseded by those great aggregations of capital that, for want of a better term, are called trusts. These combinations are, after all, only corporations on a large scale. They are changed in size but not in form. It is the highest development of the centralization idea, manifested in capital and industry. It is the evolution of modern commerce and trade.

Mr. Speaker, what I want to show now is that these large combinations of capital, or trusts, are not the outgrowth of a protective tariff; that they are not peculiar to the United States. On the contrary, they had their existence in England long before the Dingley tariff was framed or became a law, and long before the enactment of the McKinley tariff of 1890. In order to do this, Mr. Speaker, I want to place on record before the House some facts regarding the organization and combination of some of the largest trusts in the United Kingdom. The facts given are authentic and official, and they clearly show that the trusts of to-day are as much a creature of free trade and a tariff for revenue only as they are of a protective tariff.

A surface examination of the commercial methods of the United Kingdom does not reveal such a great change when contrasted with those of ten years ago, but if we examine into the subject more minutely we see how deep a root the same principle of amalgamation has struck into the businesses of the United Kingdom as well as those of the United States. In view of the importance, both commercial and financial, of the inauguration of this new era in company promotion, I think it well to bring vividly before the House the extent to which the new movement has already gone, and the following table shows at a glance a list of some of the large combines recently formed in the United Kingdom:

Date.	Name.	Number of business.	Capital.
Oct. 6, 1888	Salt Union, Limited	.....	£2,000,000
Nov. 1, 1890	United Alkali Co., Limited	48	6,000,000
July 1, 1896	J. & P. Coats, Limited	4	5,500,000
Nov. 25, 1897	English Sewing Cotton Co., Limited	15	2,750,000
May 6, 1898	Fine Cotton Spinners and Doublers', Limited	31	6,000,000
Dec. 14, 1898	Bradford Dyers	22	4,500,000
July 4, 1898	Yorkshire Indigo, Scarler, and Colour Dyers	11	600,000
July 6, 1898	Bradford Coal Merchants and Consumers	8	250,000
Oct. 9, 1898	Yorkshire Wool Combers	38	2,500,000
Nov. 1, 1898	United Indigo and Chemical	8	250,000
Nov. 15, 1898	Textile Machinery Association	.....	170,000
Dec. 8, 1898	Calico Printers	60	9,200,000
Feb. 22, 1900	Wall Paper Manufacturers	28	4,200,000
Mar. 1, 1900	United Velvet Cutters	4	300,000
Apr. 4, 1900	British Cotton and Wool Dyers	46	2,750,000
	Total	328	46,970,000

Here is a list, and it embraces only some of the largest trusts in free-trade England, in which there are 328 different business concerns amalgamated, with a capital of £46,970,000, or $230,000,000. And there is not the shadow of an excuse to be found for their formation in the shape of a protective tariff. They are solely, thoroughly, and absolutely the product of the English system of Cobdenite free trade, or a tariff for revenue only.

With the object of giving a brief history of the above trusts, as well as setting forth their principal features and characteristics, I give the following facts acquired from the records and papers of their incorporation in England:

SALT UNION, LIMITED.

This trust was registered on October 6, 1888, to consolidate the undertakings of salt businesses in the United Kingdom, and is the oldest modern combine in that country. The salt works and properties of numerous firms and companies were acquired, including freehold and leasehold rock salt, brine, and other lands, etc. The authorized capital is £2,000,000 in ordinary shares of £10, and £1,000,000 in 7 per cent noncumulative preference shares of £10, and the whole amount has been subscribed and paid up. There are also £1,000,000 first mortgage 4½ per cent perpetual debenture stock ranking on the properties agreed to be taken over by the company, with interest payable January 1 and July 1; and £200,000 4½ per cent B mortgage debenture stock (part of £250,000 authorized), with interest payable January 1 and July 1, and the principal redeemable at the option of the company at 105 per cent, on or at any time after June 30, 1902, on six months' notice, while the company has reserved the rights to redeem the stock earlier by purchase in the market or privately, and it is secured by a first charge on properties acquired subsequently to October 8, 1888, and a second charge on the rest of the undertaking.

The stock was issued in March, 1895, through Messrs. Glyn, Mills, Curie & Co., at 104 per cent. The issue of this second debenture stock clearly proves that the company has been all along in "back water." The accounts are made up annually to December 31 and submitted in February. For the period to December 31, 1899, the ordinary capital got 10 per cent; for the year 1890, 7 per cent; for 1891 and 1892, 5 per cent; for 1893, 3 per cent; for 1894, 2½ per cent; for 1895, 2 per cent, and for 1896, 1 per cent. For 1897 the preference dividend was only paid to the extent of 1¼ per cent and for 1898 nothing was paid on either class of shares. In the accounts for 1898, including £12,531 brought forward, there was an available balance for the latter year of £45,323, and in order to pay debenture stock interest the sum of £8,676 was taken from the reserve, reducing that fund to £108,823. There are no returns for 1899. Registered office 45 Tower Buildings, Water street, Liverpool.

UNITED ALKALI COMPANY, LIMITED.

This company was formed for the purpose of purchasing and consolidating into one undertaking various chemical works in the United Kingdom, in which some or all of the following chemicals are manufactured by what is known as the Leblanc process, viz: A bleaching powder, soda ash, caustic soda, white alkali, sulphate of soda, crystals of soda, chlorate of potash, sulphuric acid, hydrochloric acid, sulphur, etc. In addition to the chemical works, the company made arrangements whereby they have power, which they have exercised, to acquire valuable salt mines and works throughout England. The Leblanc process, by which bleaching powder and other chlorine products, in conjunction with caustic soda, are economically manufactured. Carbonates of soda are produced more cheaply by the ammonia process. The following are the names of the businesses forming the trust when first established:

Names and address of venders.

Henry Baxter	St. Helens.
Globe Alkali Company, Limited	St. Helens.
Greenback Alkali Works Company, Limited	St. Helens.
A. G. Kurtz & Co	St. Helens.
James McBryde & Co, Limited	St. Helens.
St. Helens Chemical Company	St. Helens.
Sutton Lodge Chemical Company, Limited	St. Helens.
Thomas Walker	St. Helens.
The Atlas Chemical Company, Limited	Widnes.
Gaskell, Deacon & Co	Widnes.
Golding, Davis & Co., Limited	Widnes.
Hall Bros. & Shaw	Widnes.
The Liver Alkali Company, Limited	Widnes.
Niel, Mathieson & Co., Limited	Widnes.
Mort, Liddell & Co	Widnes.
Muspratt Bros. & Huntleu, Limited	Flint.
James Muspratt & Sons	Widnes.
W. Pilkington & Son	Widnes.
The Runcorn Soap and Alkali Company, Limited	Runcorn.
Thomas Snape	Widnes.
Sulivan & Co., Limited	Widnes.
The Widnes Alkali Company, Limited	Widnes.
Wigg Bros. & Steel	Runcorn.
The Netham Chemical Company, Limited	Bristol.
Hazlehurst & Sons	Runcorn.
Heworth Alkali Company	Heworth-on-Tyne.
The Jarrow Chemical Company, Limited	Jarrow.
The Newcastle Chemical Works Company, Limited	Gateshead.
J. G. & W. H. Richardson	Jarrow-on-Tyne.
The Seaham Chemical Works Company, Limited	Seaham Harbor.
The St. Bede Chemical Company, Limited	Jarrow-on-Tyne.
Charles Tenant & Partners, Limited	Hebburn-on-Tyne.
Walsend Chemical Company, Limited	Walsend-on-Tyne.
The Eglington Chemical Company, Limited	Irvine, Scotland.
The Irvine Chemical Company, Limited	Irvine, Scotland.
The North British Chemical Company, Limited	Dalmuir, Scotland.
Charles Tenant & Co	Glasgow, Scotland.
Boyd Son & Co., Limited	Fleetwood.

Arrangements of a satisfactory character were also made at the time

to obtain control of the Leblanc departments of the following businesses: E. Bramwell & Sons, St. Helens; Morgan Mooney, Dublin; Dublin and Wicklow Manure Company, Limited, Dublin; P. A. Mawdlesley, Flint, and the Tyneside Chemical Company, Limited, Newcastle-on-Tyne. Since the above was floated the following works have been taken over and now form part of the trust: Messrs. McKechina, St. Helens; Tharsis Sulphur and Copper Company, Widnes, and I. C. Gamble & Sons, St. Helens.

The authorized capital is £6,000,000, in shares of £10, half in ordinary and half in 7 per cent cumulative preference, ranking also for a priority as to capital, and power was taken to issue debenture stock for £2,500,000. A very considerable portion of the purchase money for the various works was taken in ordinary and preference shares and debenture stock, and the total capital issued is £2,893,430 ordinary shares, £2,825,240 preference shares, and all the debenture stock, the whole amount having been called up. The debenture stock carried 5 per cent interest, payable January 1 and July 1, and is redeemable at 110 per cent at the option of the company after ten years from 1891, on six months' notice.

The object of the company by its formation was the avoidance of undue competition which had prevailed between the various manufacturers mentioned; the reduction of cost of transit by supplying goods from the district nearest the consumer; the economies which would necessarily result from unity and concentration of management, and the increased efficiency of all the manufactories from applying to each the highest standard of working which the best experience and technical ability of the trade will show to be possible.

The question of arriving at the value of the properties, together with a schedule of the profits made by each firm in the trust, was at the time not even stated in the prospectus, and the public was left in complete ignorance of whether or not the businesses were being run at a profit or otherwise. All that was stated in the prospectus was that "the price to be paid for the whole of the properties and privileges, including patent and other rights and royalties, but exclusive of stock in trade materials (raw, and in the process of manufacture) and stores, is £6,851,500." The amount had been arrived at by a subcommittee of eight, acting under the direction of a committee of thirteen, appointed by the manufacturers, and after careful consideration by such subcommittee of the producing power and position of the works, and of the reports made by two or more members of the committee or directors, who in each case had examined the works.

The accounts are made up annually to December 31, and submitted in the following March. It can not be said that this company has been a success from the start, or that even to-day, as shown by its latest returns, that it is a paying concern to the investors. The following yearly payments of dividends are specially interesting:

For the period to December 31, 1891, 5 per cent was paid on the ordinary shares; for 1892, 6 per cent; for 1893, 5 per cent; for 1894, nil; for 1895, 1 per cent; for 1896, 2 per cent; and for 1897, 1898, and 1899 only the full preference dividend was paid, there being no distribution to the ordinary shareholders.

The gross profit for 1899 amounted to £380,215, and the net profit after providing £120,833, for debenture interest was £198,765. The full dividend on the preference shares absorbed £191,175, and the carry forward is raised from £29,277 to £36,868. Naturally the £2,893,430 of ordinary capital gets nothing except the glory of being in such a magnificently inflated concern. The works, property, plant, etc., are valued, for balance-sheet purposes, at £7,196,915, and stock in trade is put down at £812,376, no less. Another item to be regarded with respectful adoration is the £349,703 of investments, of which £239,95 is "in subsidiary companies." With such handsome assets it is, of course, quite unnecessary to have more than £58,000 cash in hand to pay debenture interest, £60,417; and dividends, £95,587, not to mention the £305,257 of debts owing by the company. A distribution of a beggarly 3 per cent on the ordinary capital for the past six years can only be described as bitterly disappointing and unbusinesslike, and altogether unsatisfactory.

The best critics affirm that even a spell of excellent trade, such as is being done to-day, might serve only to enable this concern to put its house temporarily in order. It is clear on the surface that the company was formed upon an artificial basis, that it is ridiculously overcapitalized, and that while it may possibly pay small dividends from time to time in a spasmodic fashion, anything like settled prosperity is quite out of the question. If the assets, including "patent and other rights," were written down to their actual value, the capital reduced accordingly, and further provision made for the requirements of the business the shareholders would find their real position improved. The operation would not be pleasant, but its results would not fail to be salutary. The registered office is 30 James street, Liverpool.

In conclusion, it may be well to mention that the English Alkali Trust, unable to sell its products in this country under the Dingley tariff, has erected a branch factory—or is about to do so—in one of our Western States.

J. & P. COATS, LIMITED, AN INTERNATIONAL TRUST.

This compony was registered originally on August 6, 1890, to take over the business of the firm of the same name, cotton thread manufacturers. This, however, included only the business of Messrs. Coats as then carried on at Paisley and in Rhode Island (United States) and elsewhere. Six years later an amalgamation was effected with the competing firms of Clark & Co., Jonas Brook & Brothers, and James Chadwick & Brother, limited. The authorized capital was then raised to £5,500,000—£3,000,000 in ordinary stock and £2,500,000 in 6 per cent cumulative preference shares of £10, the latter ranking also for a priority as to capital, and all the ordinary and £2,498,680 of the preference have been issued and paid up. The ordinary capital was formerly in shares of £10, but in 1899 it was converted into stock. There is also £2,000,000 mortgage debenture stock with 4½ per cent interest, payable January 1 and July 1, and the company may pay off the whole or part of the issue at 110 per cent at any time after January 1, 1901—if only a portion, such portion to be ascertained by drawings.

Included in the statement of capital, as above, are £500,000 of preference shares and £1,250,000 of ordinary shares (now stock), issued in 1896 in connection with the taking over of businesses, as stated above; all of these preference shares were issued to the vendors, as also many of the ordinary, partly at £50 per share, and 52,500 new ordinary shares were issued to the existing holders of ordinary at the price of £50, all the new shares carrying dividends as from July 1, 1896. So successful has been the Coats enterprise, and so large the dividends annually paid that these £10-shares are selling to-day at over £80 each. The original market value, as seen above, is £5,500,000, but the value to-day is about £28,500,000.

The accounts are made up annually to June 30 and submitted in November, an interim dividend (in 1899 of 10 per cent) being paid in May. For the year ended December 31, 1890, both preference and ordinary shareholders received interest at the rate of 5 per cent per annum in lieu of dividends. For the next half year, to June, 1891, and each of the years 1891–92, 1892–93, and 1893–94, the ordinary shareholders received 8 per cent per annum; for 1894–95, 10 per cent; for 1895–96 and 1896–97, 20 per cent; for 1897–98, 30 per cent; and for 1898–99, 30 per cent and a further bonus of 10 per cent. The reserve fund to-day stands at £1,500,000. Ordinary share premium account, £3,353,560; and there is carried forward £82,238. The dividend on the preference shares is payable half-yearly.

By the combination with the Clarks, Brooks, and Chadwicks the Coats company obtained the dominating interest in the cotton-thread trade in both hemispheres, for the old Clark firm had, like the old Coats firm, factories in the United States and elsewhere abroad. One of the secrets of the success of this thread enterprise has lain in the dexterity with which foreign markets have been secured and retained, in spite of the most prohibitive tariff walls, by the erection of factories in countries in which it was not profitable to ship thread manufactured in the mills in England and Scotland. At the last general meeting of the shareholders of J. & P. Coats, Limited, the chairman (Mr. Archibald Coats), made a significant statement and explained that the company, besides owning mills abroad, held shares in 12 manufacturing companies abroad, and he said that the major portion of the company's profits last year was derived from manufacturing outside of the United Kingdom. Time and again the selling prices of thread have been raised until, practically speaking, the price of the article is to-day something like 15 to 20 per cent higher than it originally was. Directors' qualification, £1,000 of ordinary or preference share capital. Registered office, Fergus-lie Thread Works, Paisley Scotland.

ENGLISH SEWING COTTON COMPANY, LIMITED.

This company was registered on July 16, 1897, to take over 14 businesses. The authorized capital is £2,000,000, in shares of £1, half being 5 per cent cumulative preference, having also a priority as to capital, and half ordinary; and all the preference and £875,080 ordinary have been subscribed and called up, including 125,000 ordinary shares issued in 1899 at a premium of 16s. per share. There is also £875,000 first mortgage 4 per cent debenture stock, with interest payable January 1 and July 1, while the principal is repayable at the option of the company on or after January 1, 1908, at par, or before that date at 4 per cent premium, six months' notice being required in either case. The stock is secured by a first mortgage of the freehold and leasehold properties and real estate.

The combination of the four great thread firms referred to in the Coats Company gave that trust the leading interest. But to strengthen the position it was necessary to obtain some control over the several smaller competing concerns in England. The object in view has always been to prevent makers from "cutting" against each other in oversupplied markets, and to keep prices just at a level to return a fair manufacturing profit. The more effective control of the trade that was desiderated became possible on the formation of the English Sewing Cotton Company, Limited. This company was formed nearly three years ago for the purchase and amalgamation of the sewing cotton and thread businesses of Sir Rd.

Arkwright & Co., Limited, Cromford; Lawrence Ardern, Limited, Hazel Grove Mills, near Stockport; E. Ashworth & Sons, Limited, Egerton Mills, near Bolton; Bagley & Wright, Limited, Oldham; Crawford Brothers, Limited, Beith, N. B.; John Dewhurst & Sons, Limited, Skipton; Ermen & Roby, Limited, Pendlebury; S. Manlove & Sons, Limited, Belper; J. T. Raworth, Limited, Leicester; C. A. Rickards, Limited, Bell Busk; W. G. & J. Strutt, Limited, Milford; William Waller & Co., Limited, Manchester; J. & E. Waters & Co., Limited, Manchester; Geo. Wigley & Co., Limited, Derby; Waters & Rigg, Cumberland; and R. F. & J. Alexander & Co., Limited, joined the combination last year.

The amalgamation is rather a peculiar one, inasmuch as each concern has to be carried on as a separate business, preserving its own individual characteristics, by a separate company, all the shares of which are held by the parent company. A controlling interest was also acquired by the English Sewing Cotton in the American Thread Company. The relations are no doubt somewhat complicated, for the Coats Company also is a large shareholder in the American Thread Company. It is also very significant, but J. & P. Coats, Limited, in order to obtain an effective voice in the management of the English Sewing Cotton Company, took up a large block of the shares.

When the English company was formed an agreement was concluded with the Coats Company whereby the proportions of the trade to be done by each in certain foreign markets were broadly defined. Some of the firms in the English combination are spinners of silk and linen thread, and these, of course, do not affect the Coats combination, which is interested only in cotton thread, and the arrangement as to cotton thread was something like this: Certain markets were allotted exclusively to each combination. One of these markets was Spain, which was allotted exclusively to the Coats Company. But in Spain the English combination has a mill which was erected for the supply of the Cuban market, and under the agreement was strictly confined to that market. Since Spain lost Cuba the relations between the two combinations have, until a few weeks ago, been somewhat strained by the English Sewing Cotton Company endeavoring to sell in Spain the product of the Spanish mill, for which a profitable market could no longer be found in Cuba. At one time this threatened to bring about a serious rupture between the companies, but during March, when the English Sewing Cotton, Limited, issued the balance of the authorized capital to the extent of £249,920, the chairman put at the foot of the circular an official notice that the difficulty had been successfully removed.

The accounts are made up annually to March 31 and submitted in August. For the period to March 31, 1898, only the preference dividend was paid, and for 1898–99, 1s. 9d. per share was paid on the ordinary shares, and after writing off the whole of the preliminary expenses, etc., amounting to £45,314, a balance of £40,873 was carried forward. Reserve fund (premium on new shares and debenture stock), £102,500. On account of 1899–1900 a dividend of 9d. per share has been declared, payable on January 25. Director's qualification, £1,000 of ordinary shares. Registered office, 30 Spring Gardens, Manchester.

FINE COTTON SPINNERS AND DOUBLERS' ASSOCIATION, LIMITED.

This association was registered on March 31, 1898, and was formed for the purpose of amalgamating into one concern all the companies and firms engaged in spinning fine (sea island) cotton, or in doubling yarns made from this and other staples of cotton, and of carrying on the business of fine spinners and doublers hitherto carried on by them separately. The authorized capital is £4,000,000 in shares of £1, half being 5 per cent cumulative preference, having a priority also as to capital, and half ordinary, and power was taken to issue debenture stock for £2,000,000. All the preference and debenture capital, and £1,648,000 of the ordinary, have been subscribed and called up. The debenture stock was issued at par, carried 4 per cent interest, payable March 31 and September 30, is redeemable at the option of the company on or after September 30, 1918, at par, or before that date at 10 per cent premium on six months' notice, and is secured by a first mortgage upon the freehold, leasehold, and copyhold properties.

The basis upon which the various undertakings have been united is that of profit-earning capacity, computed on a three years' average, taken in each case up to the date of the last balance prior to the signature of the contract, as ascertained by investigation of the books by a leading firm of accountants. The total purchase consideration for the land, mills, buildings, engines, and all mill equipments, including good will, was, at the time of the flotation, £3,352,804 16s. 1d., this being for 31 businesses at first amalgamated.

The objects of the formation of the company are the stereotyped ones, namely, that of centralization of office work and of buying, selling, and distributing arrangements, which it was anticipated would lead to considerable economy.

The following is a list of the firms that form the trust to-day, no less than 10 having entered since the flotation of the combine:

Names and addresses of venders.	
Balfe & Co., Limited	West Gorton.
Bazley Brothers, Limited	Ancoats.
Bellhouse, James & W., Limited	Manchester.
Bennett, C. E., & Co., Limited	Ancoats.
Bolton Spinning and Doubling Company, Limited	Bolton.
Bouth, F. W., & Co., Limited	Leigh, Lancashire.
Bradley, M. G., & A., Limited	Nottingham.
Brown, J. Henderson, Limited	Ancoats.
Brown & Fallows, Limited	Bolton.
Cash, John, & Sons, Limited	Mansfield.
Christie, Hectors, Limited	Settle.
Froggatt, John, & Co., Limited	Nottingham.
Gorsey Bank Doubling Company, Limited	Stockport.
Houldsworth, T., & Co., Limited	Bollington, Manchester.
Jackson Street Spinning Company, Limited	Manchester.
Knott, John, & Sons, Limited	Ashton-under-Lyne.
Lee, H. W., & Co., Limited	Salford.
Lee Spinning Company, Limited	Atherton.
Marsden, James, & Sons, Limited	Bolton.
Marsland, Robert, & Co., Limited	Manchester.
McConnel & Co., Limited	Ancoats.
Moorhouse, Samuel, Limited	Stockport.
Musgrave Spinning Company, Limited	Bolton.
Murray, A. & G., Limited	Ancoats.
Oliver, T., & Sons, Limited	Bollington, near Macclesfield.
Ormrod, Hardcastle & Co., Limited	Bolton.
Pearson, Isaac, Limited	Stockport.
Reddish Spinning Company, Limited	Stockport.
Rivett, Thomas, Limited	Stockport.
Rostron, John, Limited	Bolton.
Shaw, Jardine & Co., Limited	Ancoats.
Swindells, G., & Sons, Limited	Bollington, near Macclesfield.
Taylor, T., & Sons, Limited	Bolton.
Thackeray, J. L., & Sons, Limited	Nottingham.
Towle, J., & Co., Limited	Borrowash, near Derby.
Towlson, J., & Co., Limited	Derby.
Wolfenden & Son, Limited	Bolton.
Woodeaves Company, Limited	Derby.
Wright, Caleb, & Co., Limited	Tyldesley.
Société Cotonnière d'Hellemmes, Limited, care of W. H. Ingram, 15 Cross street, Manchester	Lille, France.

It is very significant that, again, J. & P. Coats, Limited, subscribed for a large number of shares in order to protect their interests as consumers. The reason for the Coats Company doing this may be seen from the fact that they buy a very large proportion, if not the greater portion, of the spun cotton they use from the Fine Spinners' combination. Only last fall, when the Fine Spinners issued the remaining balance of capital in order to further take in two more outside firms, Messrs. Coats were allotted a further sum of £100,000 in the Fine Spinners' trust.

The accounts are made up annually to March 31 and submitted in May. For the year to March, 1899, 8 per cent was paid, which for the first year's working was certainly not bad. The gross profits made was £362,927, which, after deducting interest and debenture stock and a proportion of the formation expenses, left a net profit for distribution of £299,015, out of which the ordinary shareholder received the above distribution, while £80,000 was placed to a reserve fund, and a balance carried forward of £20,879. The preference dividend is paid half yearly. Directors' qualification, £5,000, ordinary shares.

The association earned last year a net profit of no less than £459,422, after charging £102,981 for depreciation. Adding the amount brought in, there is a total disposable balance of £472,540. After deducting debenture interest amounting to £80,000, and paying off the remainder of the formation expenses (£21,401), there remains £370,139. Out of this the directors propose to appropriate a sum of £100,000 to reserve, as against £80,000 a year ago, making a total reserve of £180,000 accumulated within the two years. In addition to this reserve built up out of profits on trading, there is a special reserve of £231,175, consisting of the premium on shares issued during the financial year. After placing £100,000 to the reserve fund and providing for the preference dividend, the directors recommend a balance dividend on the ordinary shares at the rate of 10 per cent per annum, making a total distribution of 8 per cent for the year, or the same as for 1898–99. Even then the fairly substantial balance of £36,565, subject to bonuses to management and to auditor's remuneration, remains to be carried forward. Registered office, Temple Chambers, St. James's square, Manchester.

BRADFORD DYERS ASSOCIATION, LIMITED.

This company was registered on the 3d of December, 1898, and was formed primarily for acquiring the businesses of the various companies and firms engaged in what is commonly known as the Bradford Piece Dyeing Trade. From the very start it met with success. How complete is this trust will be seen from the fact that the businesses syndicated comprise about 90 per cent of the Bradford Piece Dyeing Trade; two of the firms in the trust having also extensive warp dyeing departments. Some idea of the gigantic trade done by these firms may be seen again by the fact that goods are dyed annually by the associated firms amounting in value to something like twelve to fifteen millions pound sterling ($60,000,000 to $75,000,000). The industry is one of great importance and magnitude, the number of persons (mostly men) employed by the association

being about 7,500, and the consumption of coal alone about a quarter of a million tons per annum.

The goods treated are in use in almost every household in the United Kingdom, and a large per cent also of the United States as well as other foreign countries. The authorized capital is £3,000,000 in shares of £1, half being 5 per cent cumulative preference, having a priority also as to capital, and half ordinary, and power was taken to issue debenture stock for £1,500,000. The first issue of capital was for £1,000,000 of each of the three classes, and the whole amount has been subscribed and called up, the vendors having taken £333,333 of ordinary, and a similar amount of preference shares and debenture stock. The debenture stock was issued at par, and is secured by a first deed constituting a specific first mortgage upon all the properties of the country, carries 4 per cent interest, payable January 1 and July 1, and is perpetual; although in the event of winding up at any time for the purpose of reconstruction, amalgamation or otherwise, the debenture stock is redeemable at £110 per £100 stock. The following businesses comprise the association:

Names and addresses of venders.

George Armitage, Limited	Bradford
William Aykroyd & Sons	Bradford.
Bradford and District Dyeing Company, Limited	Halifax.
George Briggs & Sons	Brighouse.
Craven Pearson & Co., Limited	Brighouse.
Fountain Finishing Company, Limited	Bradford.
W. Grandage & Co., Limited	Bradford.
Harry H. Hall & Co	Guiseley.
Hunsworth Dyeing Company, Limited	Cleckheaton.
Samuel Kirk & Sons	Leeds.
John Mitchell & Co	Keighley.
James Reffitt & Sons	Leeds.
Edward Ripley & Son	Bradford.
James and M. S. Sharp & Co., Limited	Heckmondwike.
Shaw & Co	Shipley.
John Shaw & Co., Limited	Bradford.
Sam Shepherd & Co	Yeadon.
Samuel Smith & Co., Limited	Bradford.
John H. Stott & Co	Bradford.
Thornton, Hannam & Marshall	Brighouse.
Ward & Sons, Limited	Halifax.
Whitaker Bros. & Co., Dyers, Limited	Newlay.
Frederick Cawley & Co	Manchester.
H. Kershaw & Son, Limited	Salford.
The Standish Company, Limited	Wigan.
R. W. Walker	Rochdale.

Amongst the advantages to be gained by this amalgamation of interests the following were enumerated by the promoters:

First, the avoidance of loss through undue competition and cutting of prices below cost.

Second, the economies and improvements in production arising from the combined practical knowledge of the members forming the board of directors (who are all men of great experience in the dyeing trade) as a consulting and advisory body available for each branch.

Third, the economies due to centralization of office work and of buying, distributing, and financial arrangements.

One special feature of the Dyers' Association is that, as far as possible, the control of each firm shall remain in the hands of those who have been responsible for its conduct in the past; and in order that such management may have an inducement to continue to give their best efforts to that particular business, the directors are empowered under the articles of the association to pay commissions on the profits of each individual branch, thus safeguarding the principle of individual effort, to which so much success in the past has been due.

Here again, as in most cases in arriving at the combined average profits earned by the various firms when amalgamated, figures for a period of three years have been taken, and a balance struck. When first floated only 22 firms comprised the association, and the aggregate average profit showed the annual average sum of £225,656 16s. 6d. The purchase price of the firms (22), including £681,388 of good will, amounted to the sum of £2,870,640.

The accounts are made up annually to December 31. Quite recently the first annual meeting was held and some interesting facts were brought out in the association report. The promises held out in the prospectus have been more than borne out. The gross profits estimated at the time, as set forth in the prospectus, were at the rate of £225,656 per annum. The company, when the year's accounts were made up, had been working fifteen months, and the gross profits made for that period amounted to £405,396, an excess practically of £100,000 over twelve months' accounts. The prospectus profit was arrived at after charging £50,000 per annum for maintenance and keeping the property in a thorough working order. During the period under review upward of £80,000 had been so charged. Other expenses in connection with the flotation had been met out of the profits, while £62,500 was also put down for depreciation. But after all deductions, debenture interest, and interim dividends on the preference and the ordinary shares there was an available net balance of £150,271.

This it was proposed to appropriate in paying a dividend for the six months to December 31 last of 5 per cent per annum on the preference shares, absorbing £25,000; in establishing a reserve fund with £60,000; in paying a dividend for the six months to December 31 last at the rate of 10 per cent per annum on the ordinary shares, requiring £49,328; and in carrying forward the balance of £26,033, which is equal to 2½ per cent on the ordinary shares. Calculating the dividend from the dates on which the installments of the share money fell due, the rate worked out to £8 13s. 11d. per cent per annum. A larger dividend could have been paid, but for the first year the board deemed it wiser to create a substantial reserve fund and to carry forward a good balance, which the first general meeting heartily approved. Registered office, 39 Well street, Bradford.

YORKSHIRE INDIGO, SCARLET, AND COLOR DYERS, LIMITED.

This company was registered on June 29, 1899. The company is formed for the purpose of acquiring and carrying on the businesses of several firms engaged in the Yorkshire indigo, scarlet, and color dyeing trade. The firms representing the trust comprise nearly all the Yorkshire dyeing businesses which are engaged in dyeing cloth and wool manufactured for uniforms, liveries, etc., and used by the British, Indian, colonial, and foreign governments in the army, navy, post-office, and civil-service department, and by the constabulary, railway, and other institutions. Several of the above firms have long held a wide reputation as the principal dyers in their particular trade, and are seldom in want of work; in fact, the Leeds firms especially are of excellent standing and repute.

The advantages claimed by the trust are that the indigo wool and piece dyeing is almost exclusively carried on in this part of Yorkshire. The several dyehouses taken over are conveniently situated in the centers where the goods treated are manufactured, and they possess many facilities which it would be difficult to reproduce. The dyes used in the processes of indigo and scarlet dyeing are of a very expensive character, and exceptional skill and technical knowledge are required to manipulate them profitably. Although the company thus monopolizes to a large extent the business of indigo and scarlet dyeing and is in a position to avoid cutting prices below the standard rates, the circumstances of the trade are such that very important benefits are derived from the amalgamation without interfering with the existing scale of charges. This trust, with ample capital, can buy dye wares in large quantities, and this will add materially to the aggregate profit. Some of the businesses are especially equipped for treating particular classes of material, and considerable saving is effected by distributing the work to the dyehouses best adapted for dealing with it, and which can deal with larger quantities without adding materially to their standing charges. The following is the list of firm names which comprise the trust:

William Kitchen & Co	Leeds	Established about 1700.
Croysdale Brothers	Leeds	Established 1831.
William Walker & Co	Leeds	Established 1831.
Samuel Bennett & Son	Horbury	Established 1840.
Kirkburton Dyeing Company	Kirkburton	Established 1861.
Pickles, Smithson & Pickles, Limited	Dewsbury	Established 1864.
Edwin Turner	Halifax	Established 1868.
Smith & Horsfall	Heckmondwike	Established 1870.
J. Longbottom & Co	Luddenden Foot	Established 1876.
J. & J. Longbottom	Birstal	Established 1880.
Francis Davis	Elland	Established 1881.

The several businesses, which all through the British combines are a particular feature, will, as far as practicable, retain their individuality and be continued as distinct branches under the same control as heretofore.

The authorized capital is £400,000, in shares of £1, half being 5½ per cent cumulative preference, having a priority also as to capital, and half ordinary, and £150,000 of each class of capital has been subscribed and called up. There is also 4½ per cent first mortgage debenture stock for £150,000, part of a total authorized of £200,000. The stock is secured by a mortgage on the property and fixed machinery, has interest payable January 1 and July 1, and is redeemable at the company's option at 105 per cent on or at any time after January 1, 1909, on six months' notice, while in the event of liquidation the stock is to be redeemed at 105 per cent, and the preference shares are also to participate equally with the ordinary in any surplus after repayment of the amount paid up on both classes until the preference shares shall have received a sum equal to 25 per cent. It is proposed to pay the preference dividend half yearly. The accounts are to be made up annually to June 30, the first account not yet being presented.

The present directors, who are the heads of the various dyeing businesses, have agreed to remain in management for a period of five years at an aggregate salary of £1,575 per annum and a commission equal to 10 per cent of the profits available for dividends on the ordinary shares. The assets taken over by the company from the several firms, including land, dyeworks, ware mills, warehouses, reservoirs, water rights, mill plant, good will, etc., amounted to £433,478 4s. 10d. Taken altogether, although no returns of the first year's workings are yet available, there is every evidence that this will be a paying concern. Registered office, 23 John William street, Huddersfield.

BRADFORD COAL MERCHANTS AND CONSUMERS' ASSOCIATION.

This association was registered on May 31, 1899. There can be no doubt that when this trust was mooted it was rightly considered a big venture, such a thing as a coal combine never being thought of. But when firms of such order and magnitude were disposed to combine together, a success from the beginning was already guaranteed. The businesses combined annually turn over upward of 90 per cent of the steam coal trade done in the city of Bradford, and a very large proportion of the household coal trade. The authorized capital is £250,000 in shares of £1, £100,000 being cumulative 5½ per cent preference, having a priority also as to capital, and £150,000 ordinary, and £80,000 preference and £119,797 ordinary have been subscribed and called up, all the ordinary shares having been allotted to the vendors. The following are the names of the businesses forming the trust:

Established.	Names and addresses of venders.
1869	Jabez Cole & Co., Bradford.
1863	William Parkinson, Bradford.
1850	Edward Parkinson, Bradford.
1855	Joshua Smith, Bradford.
1858	Joseph Carnelley, Bradford.
1858	Edward Pye, Bradford.
1883	Henry Thacker, Bradford.
1884	John Triffitt, Bradford.

Among the advantages of the amalgamation it is claimed that considerable economy will be effected in connection with the cost of administration, and the placing of orders with the collieries. It is a very common thing for Yorkshire owners to sell very large quantities of coal at lower prices than small quantities of a few hundred tons, hence it comes about that those firms that can place the biggest contract can always obtain the best terms as to price of the article. Then, this combination of interests will bring about a diminution of intermediate charges, the board of directors being able in every part of the business to make one buying suffice. All the managers have agreed to serve in the capacity of directors for a period not less than five years, and they also have agreed not to engage in any competing business for a period of twenty years.

The value of the various businesses, together with the good will thereof, was stated in the prospectus as being £199,650, of which £79,860 was payable in cash and the balance by allotment to the vendors at par of 119,790 ordinary shares of £1, each fully paid.

This trust has just accomplished a year's working, the first report having been issued, the accounts being made up annually to March 31 and submitted about May. The report of the directors states that, during the past year, business in the city and district of Bradford has been generally active and satisfactory, and the directors report an increased trading turnover, together with substantial profits thereon, considerably in excess of those certified in the company's prospectus issued in July, 1899. At the latter part of last year an important agreement was entered into between this trust and the Bradford Dyers' Association, Limited, whereby it was arranged to transfer to this company the coal merchanting branch of their business, together with the right to supply the whole of the coal consumed by the numerous dyeing firms composing their association. This was a very important move and will materially affect the coal-consuming association.

The consideration for the transfer was agreed at the sum of £50,000, payable by the allotment to the vendors of 20,000 cumulative 5½ per cent preference shares of £1 each, and 30,000 ordinary shares of £1 each. To make sure of the bargain and to consolidate the agreement, the preference shares were allotted on January 1, 1900, and the ordinary shares will be allotted at the convenience of the coal people at different dates after March 31 last. It was further agreed that the directors of the Dyers' Association should have the right to nominate two directors to serve on the board of the coal merchants' directorate, in order to see that their interests did not suffer by using such a tremendous quantity in their various businesses. The benefit of this amalgamation of interests has not so far been very materially felt, as many of the contracts for the supply of coal to the Dyers' Association do not expire until late this year. The directors are, however, fully satisfied that when the full benefit of the whole of the Dyers' Association coal contracts are obtained, considerable profit will result.

The net profits for the first year's working, after providing for bad and doubtful debts, depreciation, maintenance and repairs to wagons, plant, and real estate, managers' salaries, directors' fees, etc., amount to £18,158. From this amount there has been paid the sum of £3,241 for dividend on 5½ per cent preference shares for the year, and £3,593 for dividend on ordinary shares at 3 per cent for six months, and vendors' interests, £646, together with £7,482, leaving a balance of undivided profit which the directors propose to be dealt with as follows, and which has since been carried out: To pay a dividend of 5 per cent for six months ending March 31, 1900 (making 8 per cent for the year), £5,989 17s.; to carry to a reserve fund, £3,000; to reserve for income tax, £372 5s.; and to carry forward to next accounts, £1,313 15s. 3d., making a total of £10,675 17s. 3d. Registered office, 19 Sunbridge Road, Bradford.

YORKSHIRE WOOL COMBERS.

This company was registered on August 25, 1899, to take over numerous wool-combing businesses of private companies and firms. Wool combing is the trade of Bradford, it being an initial process of worsted manufacture, an indispensable part of the woolen industry, which is national in importance, Bradford being the chief center of the trade. There is no question of a doubt that the success of the Dyers' Association was the chief incentive in the formation of this trust. For some years prior to 1895 a working arrangement as to the prices to be charged for combing existed between the principal firms engaged in the business, and during that period satisfactory profits resulted therefrom, but the worsted industry received such a staggering blow as the result of the McKinley and Dingley tariffs that competition and a desire to keep machinery going resulted in wool combers breaking that list in their endeavors to obtain trade, being content to run their factories on "machine profits" alone.

The authorized capital is £2,500,000 in £1 shares, £1,100,000 being preferred ordinary and £900,000 deferred ordinary; the preferred ordinary ranking first for noncumulative dividends of 5 per cent per annum, and are to share ratably in all surplus profits after payment of a similar dividend on the deferred ordinary. Of the preferred ordinary, £650,000, and of the deferred ordinary £531,800, have been subscribed and called up. There is also 4 per cent first mortgage debenture stock for £750,000 (part of £1,000,000 authorized); the stock was issued at par, with interest payable June 30 and December 31, is redeemable at the option of the company on or after June 30, 1919, at par, or before that date at 10 per cent premium on six months' notice, while the stock is secured by first mortgage on the freehold and leasehold properties, and in the event of liquidation the stock is to be repaid at 10 per cent premium. The vendors took all the deferred ordinary (£700,000), £216,666 of the preferred ordinary, and £250,000 of the debenture stock.

The total number of businesses forming the trust is 38, of which the following are the names:

Names and addresses of venders.	
Ackroyd & Ambler	Bradford.
James Alderson & Co.	Bradford.
Alerton Combing Company	Bradford.
Ayrton & Co.	Bradford.
Jonathan Barker & Sons	Bradford.
Bradford Combing Company	Bradford.
Browroyd Combing Company	Bradford.
Campbell & Harrison, Limited	Bradford.
S. Ackroyd & Co.	Rodley.
J. & C. Crabtree	Bradford.
John Cure & Co.	Bradford.
W. C. Dixon & Sons	Bradford.
J. W. Firth	Bradford.
Halifax Wool Combing Company, Limited	Bradford.
J. L. Halliday	Bradford.
Joseph Heaton	Bradford.
T. Howarth & Co	Bradford.
F. Illingworth & Co.	Bradford.
Walter R. Kay	Bradford.
S. & S. Musgrave	Bradford.
Thomas Park	Bradford.
G. H. Pontefract	Bradford.
John Priestman & Co., Limited	Bradford.
John Pickles & Son	Bradford.
H. R. Ramsbottom & Co., Limited	Bradford.
Robinson & Alderson	Bradford.
G. Root & Co.	Bradford.
Thomas H. Shaw	Bradford.
David Smith & Co., Limited	Bradford.
Daniel Smith & Co., Limited	Bradford.
John Smith & Sons, Limited	Bradford.
Shipley Wool Combing Company, Limited	Shipley.
Thomas Speight	Bradford.
Jonathan Taylor	Bradford.
Terry & Co	Bradford.
John Todd & Sons	Bradford.
Wharton & Monies	Bradford.
D. & A. Wilson	Shipley.

The amalgamation of the above firms forms an epoch in connection with the Bradford wool trade proper, and at the time being it was not looked upon with much favor by the trade, though to-day it is recognized as being of considerable benefit to the trade, there now being a uniform list of charges for everybody. But there is one source of weakness in connection with this trust which must ever be a source of danger so long as it exists. Three big firms in Bradford at the time of the flotation saw fit to stand out, the firms being W. H. Greenwood & Co., Isaac Holden & Sons, Limited, and Holden, Burnley & Co., the two latter being of large dimensions and leading houses in the trade. A big effort was made at the time to induce the two last firms to join in the combine, but without success. However, they gave this pledge, that whatever the association charged for combing, they, too, would adopt the same scale and thus prevent undercutting.

Since the flotation, measures have been taken to still induce the above firms to join the trust, and any day it may be announced that they have seen fit to throw in their lot and thus consolidate the whole fabric. When this is done a big combine will have been accomplished, and although prices for combing have not yet been advanced, yet there is no doubt that they will be as soon as a favorable opportunity presents itself.

The principal advantage to be gained by the trust is that prices henceforth will not be cut down to a profitless basis, and all the accounts, both selling and buying, being conducted from one central office, much saving will be effected.

Here again we are not told what profit has been made by each individual firm, but the basis upon which the various undertakings has been united and payment for the good will of the business has been based upon profits computed upon an average of the last four years' working. The total purchase consideration for the land, mills, buildings, and all equipment, including the good will of the 38 amalgamating firms and companies was £1,795,356. Needless to say the trust was floated with a flourish of trumpets and subscribed for many times over. Up to the present the association has not been working a full year, but the audited trading accounts for the six months from June 30, 1899, when the various businesses were taken over to December 31, have been completed and published. The profits shown, subject to depreciation, are £58,887 5s. 11d. After deducting interest to the venders and interest on the debenture stock there remains a surplus of £32,573. This amount has been carried forward to the current half year, the directors not deeming it advisable to make any distribution of dividends until the full year is completed. Registered office, 45 Well street, Bradford.

UNITED INDIGO AND CHEMICAL COMPANY, LIMITED.

This company was registered on September 26, 1899; was formed for the purpose of acquiring, amalgamating, and carrying on, as a going concern, eight businesses comprising some of the leading indigo manufacturers in the United Kingdom, and other important chemicals manufactured by the same firms. It can not be said that this trust stands very high in the opinion of financial and commercial experts, simply because some of the largest manufacturing firms, especially in Huddersfield and Leeds, are not included, this being a source of great weakness. A considerable business is done in exporting indigo extracts from England to America, where there is a very large consumption, despite a duty on the import of this article into the United States. It is the intention of this company to establish a manufacturing branch in the United States, sending some of its skilled staff to prepare and sell in this country, thus saving our duty. The following are the names of the businesses forming the trust:

Established.	Names and address of venders.
1869	G. & J. Boyd, Glasgow.
1882	Clayton, Holdroyd & Co., Huddersfield.
1881	Collinslee Chemical Company, Paisley.
1865	J. Haworth & Co., Lancashire.
1877	William Heywood, Manchester.
1848	J. R. Haas & Co., Leeds.
1879	Ellis Barlow, Huddersfield.
1874	James Emmett, Leeds.

The authorized capital, £250,000 in shares of £1, half being 6 per cent cumulative preference, having a priority also as to capital, and half ordinary, and £120,000 preference and £120,000 ordinary, have been subscribed and called up, the venders having taken £40,000 preference and £40,000 ordinary.

The particular advantages which are expected to accrue from this amalgamation are stated to be:

1. Reduction of travelling and working expenses.
2. Saving carriage and time.
3. Advantage in purchasing raw materials.
4. The combined practical knowledge of the directors and the general adoption by the managers of each works of the most approved system of manufacture, insuring thereby not only regularity of quality but the best results at the least cost.
5. The managers and travelers of each works will have the opportunity of selling the whole list of products of each allied firm, whereas until the time of the flotation one or two firms alone had sold the specialty they manufactured.

The various venders who are the managers of their own works have executed an agreement not to enter into or engage in any competing business for a period of twenty years. The several businesses will be conducted as branches, and where practicable at least one partner or director of each of the undertakings will continue as manager, so as to maintain the continuity of the business together with the individual experience of those now controlling the various concerns.

The books and accounts of the various firms have been gone through by a chartered accountant, and for three years they show the average aggregate profits of £20,110 10s. 6d. per annum. The purchase price of the various businesses, including good will and all equipment, cost £242,399. Registered office, 1 Cooper street, Manchester.

CALICO PRINTERS' ASSOCIATION, LIMITED.

This, the largest trust yet formed in England, commands attention even on the ground of its greatness, no less than 60 businesses being syndicated. The business of calico printing, from its magnitude and its capacity for indefinite variety of development, is one of the most important of the textile industries.

The businesses acquired comprise about 85 per cent of the calico-printing industry in Great Britain. The strength of this association is shown by the fact that it includes nearly every leading house in the trade, and that these supply goods not only to all branches of the home trade, but practically to every open market of the world. It can not be said that the industry for the past few years has been very successful, but the trust is confident that it can remove the principal source of mischief, i. e., internal competition and cutting of prices.

TEXTILE MACHINERY ASSOCIATION, LIMITED.

This company was registered November 15, 1899, to take over certain business of makers of wool washing, carding, combing, and spinning machinery in the West Riding of Yorkshire. The authorized capital is £170,000, in shares of £1, £80,000 being cumulative 5½ per cent preference, having a priority also as to capital, and £90,000 ordinary, and the whole amount has been subscribed and called up, the ordinary shares having been allotted to the vendors. There is also £120,000 4 per cent debenture stock, issued at par; it is secured by a first mortgage on the freehold properties, has interest payable January 1 and July 1, and is redeemable after January 1, 1915, at the company's option, at 105 per cent, on six months' notice, while in the event of voluntary winding up it is to be paid off at the same rate. This combine is a very full and compact one, comprising all the makers of this special line of wool-manufacturing machinery, with the exception of one noted firm, namely, that of Prince Smith & Sons, of Keighley. Registered office, Water Lane, Leeds.

The advantages expected to accrue are summed up as follows: First, the avoidance of undue or excessive competition and of selling of goods below cost. Second, large economies to be effected by the centralization of buying and finance and concentration of production. Third, the prevention of overlapping upon the part of the firms constituting the association.

It will in the future be possible to carry on works in foreign countries under the most favorable conditions as regards design, engraved rollers, etc., and in a way which was not practicable when such action depended solely upon the initiative of individual firms. The association already owns a large factory in France.

The share capital of the company is £6,000,000, divided into 6,000,000 shares of £1 each, 5,000,000 of which have been issued as ordinary shares and the remainder may be issued hereafter, either as 5 per cent cumulative preference shares or as ordinary shares, as the directors think fit. There is also issued 4 per cent perpetual first-mortgage debenture stock to the extent of £3,200,000. Power is also reserved in the trust deed to create further debenture stock in addition to the above to a total not exceeding three-fourths of the nominal amount of the share capital of the company for the time being, but no further amount of the stock beyond the present issue of £3,200,000 can be issued unless additional businesses are acquired. In case the company is at any time wound up the stock is repayable at 120 per cent.

The following are the names of the businesses forming the trust:

Names and addresses of venders.

PRINTERS.

Andrew & Sons, George	Near Manchester.
Ashton & Co., Limited, F. W.	Near Manchester.
Bayley & Craven	Near Manchester.
Black & Co., Limited, Jas	Near Glasgow.
Bradshaw, Hammond & Co., Limited	Near Manchester.
Bennett & Sons, Limited, John	Near Manchester.
Bingswood Printing Company, Limited	Near Manchester.
Birkacre Company, Limited	Near Manchester.
Buckley, Limited, Ed. and Jos	Near Manchester.
Boyd & Co., Thomas	Near Manchester.
Calvert & Bros., Limited, J. H	Near Manchester.
Dalglish, Falconer & Co., Limited	Near Glasgow.
Dalmuir Printing Company, Limited	Near Glasgow.
Gartside & Co., Limited	Near Manchester.
Gateside Printing Company	Near Glasgow.
Grafton, F. W., & Co	Near Manchester.
Gibson & Costobadie	Near Manchester.
Hayfield Printing Company, Limited	Near Manchester.
Hardie, Starkie & Co	Near Glasgow.
Hoyo, E., & Sons	Near Glasgow.
Higginbottom, S., & Co., Limited	Near Glasgow.
Inglis & Wakefield, Limited	Near Glasgow.
Kay, Robert, & Sons, Limited	Near Manchester.
Kennedy, J. L., & Co., Limited	Near Manchester.

Names and addresses of venders—Continued.

Kinder Printing Company, Limited	Near Manchester.
Knowles, S., & Co., Limited	Near Manchester.
Laxton, F., & Co., Limited	Near Manchester.
Low Mill Bleaching and Printing Company, Limited	Near Manchester.
MacNab & Co	Near Glasgow.
MacGregor A. R., & Co	Near Glasgow.
Mill Field Printing Company	Near Glasgow.
Murray, Adam, & Co	Near Glasgow.
Potter Edmund, & Co., Limited	Near Manchester.
Robindale Printing Company	Near Manchester.
Rumney, E. B	Near Manchester.
Rumney, W., & Co., Limited	Near Manchester.
Saxby, Charles	Near Manchester.
Schwabe, S., & Co., Limited	Near Manchester.
Springfield Printing Company	Near Glasgow.
Strines Printing Company	Near Manchester.
Thornliebank Company, Limited	Near Glasgow.
Walker, Robert, & Sons	Near Manchester.
Watson, Wm., & Co., Limited	Near Manchester.
Whalley Abbey Printing Company, Limited	Near Manchester.
Wood, Christopher, Limited	Near Manchester.

MERCHANTS.

Allan Arthur Fletcher & Co	Glasgow.
Black & Wingate, Limited	Glasgow.
Bryce Smith & Co	Manchester.
Gemmell & Harter	Manchester.
Gray, James, & Sons	Glasgow.
Gourlie, William, & Sons	Glasgow.
Hewit & Wingate	Glasgow.
Hoyle's Prints Company, Limited	Manchester.
Mills, J., & Co	Manchester.
Moir & Co., Limited	Glasgow.
Shaw, J., & Co., Limited	Glasgow.
Waters, J., & Co	Glasgow.
Wright & Whittaker	Manchester.

The valuation of all the properties, plant, machinery, debts, and stock in trade, taken over by the association, was £7,693,504. The purchase price for the properties and assets acquired amount in the aggregate to £8,047,031, of which £1,066,606 was payable in fully paid debenture stock and £1,595,170 in fully paid ordinary shares, and the balance in cash.

In a recent issue of the London Investors' Review (a very outspoken paper) was an interesting article on the position of the trust. The writer asserted that a salesman who wishes to put through an indent, however trifling, has to go to the general bureau of the association and fill up 27 "spaces" for every transaction. Then the salesmen of the individual print works are competing with the representative of the general bureau for orders! He goes on to assert that the association is generally detested and the "outside" print works are doing a roaring trade, to the detriment of the "associated" firms. Schemes for establishing new "outside" works are in contemplation, while the chief market, India, is nonexistent by reason of the famine, and the Persian trade is stagnant owing to apprehensions of trouble with Russia. In short, to quote one of the best English financial critics, "when the normal tendency of this particular trade is resumed it is difficult to see how reasonable dividends will be possible."

Registered office, 2 Charlotte street, Manchester.

WALL PAPER MANUFACTURERS, LIMITED.

This company, or trust, has been formed for the purpose of amalgamating amongst others the businesses of the various undermentioned firms and companies engaged in the manufacture of wall papers and raised decorative materials, such as Anaglypta, Cordelova, Lignomur, and Salamander decorations. Here again the object of the trust is to shut off at one stroke all competition and prevent underselling. How far this will be accomplished may be seen from the fact that the trust comprises about 98 per cent of the wall-paper-manufacturing trade of the United Kingdom, and amongst the properties purchased are two paper-making mills, one factory for enameled and chromo-lithographic paper, and the works for the manufacture of Anaglypta, etc.

The share capital of the trust is £3,200,000, including first mortgage debenture stock to the extent of £1,000,000; total, £4,200,000. The debenture stock is redeemable at the option of the company on or after the 1st of September, 1919, at 110 per cent, by giving six months' notice. The company also reserves power to further issue debenture stock if necessary.

The following are the names of the businesses comprising the trust:

Names and addresses of venders.

C. & J. G. Potter	Darwen.
Darwen Paper Staining Company	Darwen.
Potter & Co	Darwen.
Huntington Frères	Darwen.
Almond & Co	Darwen.
The Anaglypta Company, Limited	Darwen.
Lightbrown, Aspinall & Co	Pendleton.
Allan Cockshut & Co	London.
The Lignomur Company	London.
Carlisle & Clegg	London.
Arthur Sanderson & Sons	Chiswick.
Osborne & Shearman	Fulham.
John Trumble & Sons	Leeds.

Names and addresses of venders—Continued.

Willie & Lockhead, Limited	Glasgow.
Walker, Carver & Co., Limited	Pendleton.
W. G. Wilkingson & Co., Limited	Derby.
Mitchell Arnott & Co., Limited	Golborne.
Heywood Paper Staining Company	Heywood.
Barnes, Davidson, Holden & Co., Limited	Ramsbottom.
Yates, Dauncye & Dawson	Ratcliffe.
David Walker	Middleton.
Claremont Paper Staining Company	Pendleton.
Lewis & Co	Lees, Oldham.
Fincham & Co	Wortley, Leeds.
John Dunn & Son	Newcastle-on-Tyne.
Essex & Co	London.
United Cordelova Company, Limited	Edinburgh.
Asbestus Company, Limited	High Wycombe.

The certified aggregate profits, as set forth in most cases for one single year only, and in one instance as far back as 1896, amount to £173,116. No good will is said to be paid to any firm that could not show profits exceeding 5 per cent per annum on their capital.

The valuations of all the businesses, including stock in trade and everything, amounted to £545,735 7s. 11d., and the book debts which were guaranteed by the venders amounted to £393,873 14s. 11d. The total purchase consideration for the whole of the undertaking amounted to £4,216,045 17s. 1d., of which £74,577 17s. 1d. was paid in cash, and the balance, £4,141,468, payable in debenture stock, preference shares, and ordinary and deferred shares of the company on the terms of agreement.

At the time of the flotation it called forth a good deal of criticism, the general feeling being that if ever a business would in the future be monopolized this will be the one. There seems little doubt as to it being a success, as competition is practically killed, and prices have been materially advanced. Registered office, Belgrave Mills, Darwen. London offices (pro tempore), 142 Queen Victoria street, London, E. C.

BRITISH COTTON AND WOOL DYERS' ASSOCIATION, LIMITED.

This association is one of the most recently formed in the United Kingdom, and comprises 46 businesses engaged in dyeing, bleaching, printing, and sizing cotton yarns in warps and hanks, and wool in the loose state, and slubbing and all kinds of worsted yarns. Commonly speaking, this is known in the wool and cotton trades as the "slubbing" dyers. The associated firms, with the two branches of Bradford Dyers' Association engaged in warp and hank dyeing, represent about 85 per cent of the volume of both branches of the trade.

What American is there that has not heard of that new process called mercerizing? This industry, to the city of Bradford, England, has been, the last two years, a veritable godsend, and has kept Bradford looms busy, which were stopped by the enactment of the Dingley tariff. Several firms in this trust have built up this important industry, and it bids fair to maintain a standard of excellence and success that was never dreamed of until the thing became an accomplished fact.

The advantages to be gained by the trust is that of sectionalizing the trade and generally reducing the variety of colors handled in the various works, which will affect a saving in the quantity used of dyestuffs, and by the purchase of these articles by a central authority on a wholesale scale, a reduction in the cost of output will be secured. Other economies will be gained by the centralization of bookkeeping and finance, and by organization of the selling departments.

An important item is that an agreement has been entered into with the Bradford Dyers' Association, under the seal of the respective associations, whereby provision is made for the cooperation of the two associations in matters affecting their mutual interests, and arrangements are made for the acquisition by each of the associations of a considerable holding in the share capital of the other.

The share capital of the trust is £2,000,000, together with £750,000 first-mortgage debenture stock, total £2,750,000. The present issue consists of £620,000 4 per cent first-mortgage debenture stock, part of the £750,000 mentioned above, and 1,200,000 ordinary shares of £1 each. The vendors took £130,000 of the present issue of the debenture stock, and 370,000 ordinary shares as part payment of the purchase consideration. The debenture stock is redeemable at the option of the association on or after the 1st of January, 1920, at a premium of 5 per cent, or before that date at a premium of 10 per cent, six months' notice being required in either case. The unissued balance of the debenture stock can only be issued against the acquisition of additional property.

The following are the names of the businesses comprising the trust:

Names and addresses of venders.

1.	Joseph Balme	Bradford.
2.	Joseph Barlow & Sons	
3.	Bradford Patent Dyeing Company, Limited	Bradford.
4.	David Brown & Co	Dunfermline.
5.	Brownlee & Fyfe	Tillicoultry.
6.	John Buckle & Co	Bradford.
7.	Birton & Slingsby	Radcliffe.

Names and addresses of vendors—Continued.

8. Caldwell & Co	Paisley.
9. Cochrane, Smith & Co	Selkirk.
10. William Cunningham & Co	Paisley.
11. John F. Dawson	Radcliffe.
12. W. Eckersell & Co	Birtle, Bury.
13. Fletcher Bros., Limited	Halifax.
14. Alfred Goodall & Co., Limited	
15. Oliver Greenwood	Bradford.
16. Heppenstall Bros	Huddersfield.
17. W. & J. Hilton	Radcliffe.
18. Holmes & Holdsworth	Bradford.
19. Benjamin Ingham	
20. Jopson, Ashworth & Edmunds	Middleton.
21. Kearns, Allen & Co	
22. Kerr & Hoegger, Limited	Manchester.
23. Edward Lee	Burnley.
24. The Marland Dyeing Company, Limited	Bury.
25. The Marshfield Dyeing Company	Bradford.
26. D. MacFarley & Sons	Paisley.
27. J. & J. McCallum	Paisley.
28. W. McConnell & Co	Glasgow.
29. R. Moir & Co	Accrington.
30. Murgatroyd & Lister	Bradford.
31. Henry North & Sons	Bradford.
32. William North & Co	Bradford.
33. Abraam Peel Brothers, Limited	Bradford.
34. Adam Robinson & Son	Bradford.
35. Robinson Brothers	Bradford.
36. Isaac Robson & Sons	Huddersfield.
37. Rule & Leyden	Hawick.
38. James Scoon	Hawick.
39. John Siddall	Radcliffe.
40. Joshua Siddall & Son	Radcliffe.
41. Thomas Simpson & Co	
42. S. Smethurst & Sons	Bury.
43. Spencer & Exley	Halifax.
44. Matthew Stuttard & Bros., Limited	
45. John Turnbull & Sons	Hawick.
46. W. Woodcock & Co	

The total purchase price payable to the vendors for the works, land, water rights, stock in trade, and good will is £1,779,092, and is payable in debenture stock to the extent of £191,131, and £370,000 in ordinary shares and the balance in cash. Accounts will be made up yearly on December 31.

Registered office, 2 Charlotte street, Manchester.

UNITED VELVET CUTTERS' ASSOCIATION, LIMITED.

This trust was formed for the purpose of combining together four old and well-known firms of good standing, each of them having been established upward of fifty years. Cutting is a process by which the pile is produced in the manufacture of velvets and cords, and the amalgamating firms are the principal ones engaged in this branch of the trade, though what per cent of the firms engaged in this industry who are outside the trust is not stated. The following are the names of the businesses amalgamated:

(1) The business of Nathan Meanock, as carried on at Royton, Rochdale, Small Bridge, and Crewe.

(2) The business of Ernest Platt, as carried on at Wilmslow, Royton, Bradley Green, Mow Cop, and Butt Lane.

(3) The business of Platt, Wilkinson & Co., Limited, as carried on at Patricroft and Warrington.

(4) The business of Robert Shepherd, as carried on at Manchester, Congleton, Bradley Green, Winsford, Royton, and Crewe.

The objects before the trust are to reduce unnecessary competition besides economizing working arrangements, which will enable one staff to obtain orders instead of employing separate ones for each firm, and will effect considerable saving in the collection and redelivery of goods. It is quite unusual to hear it stated that there will be any reduction in the cost of production, but the directors anticipate this under the new arrangement.

The total purchase consideration for the above-mentioned businesses and properties, inclusive of stock of materials, is £126,705 9s. 4d., and is payable as to £14,075 in debenture stock, £14,075 in preference shares, and £13,333 in ordinary shares, and as to the balance either in cash or in shares or debenture stock at par. What the results will be remains to be seen. Registered office, Lythgoes Lane, Warrington.

OTHER TRUSTS FORMING.

Recently there was an unsuccessful attempt made to float what was called the Yorkshire Soapmakers' Association. The capital of the company was £300,000, but the prospectus was full of unattractive features, and the response by the British public was such as not to warrant the directors in going to allotment.

There are arrangements proceeding for the amalgamation of the undermentioned businesses under the name of the Yorkshire Dye Ware and Chemical Company, Limited, which was registered at the end of May. Messrs. Clemons, Marshall, and Carbat, Leeds; Wood & Bedford, Leeds; D. Taylor & Sons, Golcar; B. Crowther, Gomersal; M. Bedforth & Sons, Huddersfield; J. Sugden, Huddersfield; Hawroyd & Holroyd, Dewsbury; Pickles, Smithson & Pickles, branch of the Yorkshire Indigo, Scarlet and Colour Dyers, Limited, Ravensthorpe; Thomas Crossley & Co., Limited, Leeds, and H. K. Beaumont & Co., Huddersfield. The present issue of capital will consist of $120,000 4½ per cent debenture stock, £100,000 of preference shares, and £80,000 of ordinary shares. The preference shares will have a 6 per cent cumulative preferential dividend, and will have a further participation in profits after the ordinary shares have received a similar dividend.

It is the intention of the several firms comprised in the amalgamation to retain as far as possible their respective interests, and the whole of the ordinary shares will be held by the vendors, as well as one-third of the debenture stock and one-third of the preference shares. It is stated that the stock, book debts, and cash are more than sufficient to cover the debentures, without recourse to the land, buildings, plant, machinery, and other assets, which also are stated at a value more than the amount of the debenture stock.

Further trusts are freely talked of, and several are certain to see the prospectus stage. Trusts already projected are the bleachers of the Lancashire cotton trade, Bradford worsted spinners, woolen and worsted card manufacturers, and the shoddy manufacturers of Dewsbury.

In a word, free-trade England has completely gone over to and become intoxicated with the trust mania. That such combinations of capital in that country are not the creation of a protective tariff is self-evident. English laws compel the giving of information to stockholders in a corporation. Upon the payment of a fee of one shilling (25 cents) they can learn at any time the accurate financial condition of the companies in which they are interested. There is no such law in the United States, but, in my opinion, there should be.

Another point, Mr. Speaker, that is worth consideration is this. We are now compelled, in striving for a share of the world's commerce, to make our goods of such a quality and at such a price that we can compete with the manufactures made by these English trusts. And this competition will increase, not decrease. In order, then, to keep our factories busy and to employ our labor, which is the greatest consumer of the products of our mines, forests, and factories, should we not regulate rather than destroy such combinations of capital as are necessary to enable us to compete in the world's markets?

Assuming that we must do this, I believe in and will advocate the proper regulation of all of our large combinations of capital by law. We must preserve in them whatever is good and advantageous to the people at large; but at the same time we must eliminate all that is bad and evil, or which is in any way calculated to interfere with the rights of our citizens.

THE PROSPERITY OF LABOR—PROTECTION AND SOUND CURRENCY HAVE BROUGHT INCREASED EMPLOYMENT, INCREASED EARNINGS, AND INCREASED ACTIVITY AMONG OUR WORKINGMEN AND THEIR ORGANIZATIONS.

Mr. Speaker, I feel quite sure that none of my colleagues in this House will deny this proposition—that the prosperity of a nation is illustrated by the condition of its wage-earners. If the laborer in any country is receiving good wages with steady employment, that country can not be anything but prosperous. That the United States has been prosperous during the past three years is shown by the growth of the labor organizations in this country.

While discussing the growth of corporations, it is in place to point out that the American Federation of Labor has also grown at a surprising rate during the last three years. While capital has been concentrating its power, labor has been doing the same. This means that labor is amply protected and is flourishing under this Republican Administration. Founded in 1886, the American Federation of Labor has conducted its business publicly, with dignity and with success. To-day it employs 12 paid organizers, besides 470 volunteer organizers, who work in Canada, as well as in the United States. I present the following tabulated statement of the membership of the different organizations named on the 1st day of January, 1900.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR.

Enrollment reported January 1, 1900	1,004,000
Gained since January 1, 1900	304,000
Local charters issued in 1900	1,500
International and national unions now enrolled	73
With State unions, 11; city trades councils, 134	145

Record of 1899.

Membership gained	225,000
International and national unions added	9
Union labels authorized	29
Strikes won	425
Strikes lost	48
Strikes compromised	39
Charters issued in 1899 (reported)	2,264
Charters issued in 1899 (not reported)	600

BROTHERHOOD RAILWAY ORGANIZATIONS.

Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers	34,000
Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen	26,000
Brotherhood of Railway Conductors	27,000
Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen	25,000

Not only has this big American consolidation, or federation, of labor issued a large number of charters, but its affiliated organizations

have been equally prosperous, as will be seen from the following table, giving the number of charters issued by the different crafts for the year ending April 1, 1900:

Craft.	Charters issued.	Craft.	Charters issued.
Miners	308	Wood workers	40
Butchers	23	Wood carvers	15
Brewers	25	Coopers	20
Cigar makers	20	Trunk makers	3
Tobacco workers	17	Carriage and wagon makers	10
Tailors	37	Broom makers	28
Garment workers	22	Musicians	12
Shoe workers	24	Bottle blowers	17
Leather workers	20	Window-glass flatteners	12
Granite cutters	12	Textile workers	12
Tile layers	7	Printers	61
Painters	60	Printing pressmen	40
Steam fitters	3	Telegraphers	14
Blacksmiths	32	Steam engineers	9
Machinists	59	Coal-hoisting engineers	4
Iron molders	50	Stationary firemen	24
Iron, steel, and tin workers	80	Street-railway employees	25
Boiler makers	40	Team drivers	78
Electrical workers	20	Longshoremen	49
Sheet metal workers	31	Commercial agents	11
Turners	27	Retail clerks	63
Bicycle makers	10	Stage employees	18
Metal polishers	42	Barbers	52
Stove mounters	12	Hotel and restaurant employees	13
Pattern makers	15		

Nearly every national or international organization of labor has been increasing its membership, and the past three years have been those of greatest success for the consolidation of labor interests. That this is the case will be seen from the following table, showing the relative percentage of increase in membership in the years 1897, 1898, and 1899. These figures of increase are correct, as they are compiled from reports received direct from the various national unions on May 1 of this year.

Craft.	Membership increase.		
	1897.	1898.	1899.
	Per cent.	*Per cent.*	*Per cent.*
Agents	10		40
Bricklayers and stone masons	20	40	50
Broom makers			700
Barbers	10	10	60
Bicycle makers	10	10	50
Boilermakers and iron shipbuilders			75
Brickmakers		10	25
Blacksmiths	Decrease.	5	700
Brewery workers	30	40	45
Bakers and confectioners		8	35
Bookbinders		20	75
Boot and shoe workers		15	40
Conductors (railroad)	10	15	25
Coopers	75	75	80
Curtain operatives (lace)		38	12
Core makers	6	14	27
Carriage and wagon makers			40
Clerks (retail)		100	200
Carpenters	10	25	50
Cigar makers	10	20	40
Engineers (locomotive)	10	15	30
Engineers (coal-hoisting)			300
Electrical workers			40
Engineers (stationary)		20	30
Firemen (stationary)		New.	200
Firemen (locomotive)	11	18	13
Glass-bottle blowers	3	5	3
Glass workers			19
Garment workers	5	10	25
Gold beaters		New.	Doubled.
Horseshoers	10	10	25
Hatters			25
Iron molders	10	15	25
Iron, steel, and tin workers	10	20	60
Longshoremen	30	30	50
Leather workers	30	75	100
Meat cutters and butcher workmen	New.	100	200
Musicians	80	4	16
Metal workers		30	100
Machinists	10	25	80
Miners	40	100	300
Potters	20	30	200
Steel and copper plate printers	10	7	10
Plumbers, gas and steam fitters	5	10	40
Paper makers	15	25	30
Printers	15	20	40
Pattern makers		40	300
Stonecutters			10
Spinners (cotton mule)			8
Stone mounters		25	25
Stage employees	50	25	25
Street-railway employees	5	10	18
Seamen	20	25	60
Tailors		6	15
Tin-plate workers			70
Telegraphers		10	25
Tile layers			25
Trackmen (railroad)	10	15	25
Textile workers		10	25
Tobacco workers	15	40	60
Upholsterers		12	30
Waiters, cooks, bartenders		New.	200
Wood carvers	5	15	50
Wood workers	15	40	70

Records and reports of the American Federation of Labor show no such progress of consolidation under our last Democratic Administration of President Cleveland. Quite the contrary, and I can not do better than quote from the pen of Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor. His remarks I place side by side:

THE DEADLY PARALLEL!

1898.

Since August of this year we have been in the greatest industrial depression this country has ever experienced. It is no exaggeration to say that more than 3,000,000 of our fellow-toilers throughout the country are without employment and have been so since the time named. This lamentable industrial condition is attributed by many to various causes, and it seems to me that the accurate statement of them here is both requisite and appropriate, so that we may be better enabled to so frame our legislation that it may tend to a proper solution of the problem dependent upon the wage-workers for solution.

Never in the history of the world has so large a number of people vainly sought for an opportunity to earn a livelihood and contribute to the support of their fellows. In a society where such abnormal conditions prevail there must of necessity be something wrong at the basic foundation.

1897.

That terrible period for the wage-earners of this country which began in 1893 and which has left behind it such a record of horror, hunger, and misery practically ended with the dawn of the year 1897. Wages had been steadily forced down from 1893 till toward the end of 1895, and it was variously estimated that between two million and two and a half million wage-earners were unemployed.

It is agreed by all that the wage-earners are the principal consumers of American products, and it necessarily follows that a reduction in wages involves a diminution in the power of consumption, and consequently a proportionate decrease in production, and, naturally, also in the force of labor required for the production. A reduction of wages, therefore, results in an increase in the army of the unemployed, and any circumstance or combination of circumstances that will check reductions in wages, and hence the diminution of consumption by the masses, is a humane act, based on the soundest laws of economics and of progress.

1899.

The revival of industry which we have witnessed within the past year is one for general congratulation, and it should be our purpose to endeavor to prolong this era of more general employment and industrial activity. In this effort no power is so potent as organized labor, if we but follow a right and practical course.

It is beyond question that the wages of the organized workers have been increased, and in many instances the hours of labor either reduced or at least maintained.

The report which your officers are enabled to submit to this convention, so far as the growth and progress of our movement during the past year are concerned, is of a most gratifying character. At last we are realizing some of the fruits of the years of unceasing sacrifice, devotion, and uninterrupted work of our fellow-unionists.

The first of these quotations by Samuel Gompers is taken from page 11 of the Proceedings of the American Federation of Labor Convention, held on December 11, 1893, during the last Democratic administration of our national affairs.

The second statement, that of 1897, is taken from a signed article by Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, published in New York on January 1, 1898. I would draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the difference noticed by the president of the American Federation of Labor within less than a year of the inauguration of President McKinley and the present Republican Administration.

The third quotation is from the report of President Gompers at the convention of the American Federation of Labor held at Detroit on December 11, 1899. It is a standing memorial to the benefits derived by American labor under a Republican Administration and Republican laws that are designed to protect our wage-earners and enable them to secure the highest possible rate of wages in return for the labor which they have to sell.

One word more. It is but right to state here that Mr. Samuel Gompers, the president of the American Federation of Labor, is now, and always has been, an uncompromising Democrat. His frank and unsolicited testimony to the better conditions of labor under a Republican Administration should, therefore, have some influence with our friends on the other side of the House. His words speak volumes for Republican policy and for Republican Administration. They show clearly, and without the possibility of a doubt, that this Administration has made hives of industry out of the Democratic haunts of idleness that were created under the Democratic Administration of President Cleveland, when both this House and the United States Senate were under control of the Democratic party.

LABOR AND PROSPERITY.

Mr. Speaker, how different are the conditions to-day among our wage-earning population from those that existed during the last Democratic Administration of President Cleveland. Contrast the earnings of our people now under the Republican protective tariff with those paid during the operation of the Wilson free-trade bill of the Democratic party. Wages have steadily advanced under the present Republican Administration. Organized labor has seen its opportunity to increase its share in the distribution of the general prosperity by the circulation of a larger amount of wages.

The workingman of to-day who does his own thinking has had the proof presented to him that it is to his best interests to stand by the platform and principles of the Republican party. The fact that there have been strikes during this period of prosperity no doubt affords a great opportunity for calamity howling to our Democratic friends, but they always fail to point out that strikes during a Republican Administration are for more wages, and that strikes during a Democratic Administration are against lower wages, and that labor then invariably loses. The American wage-earner wants the present good times and prosperity to continue indefinitely, and he will not vote this good thing away for any bubble of promises, which only means a disturbance of their industrial conditions, with less work, lower wages, idleness, soup-houses, free bread, and the poorhouse.

Wages paid in the United States are from two to four times greater than the wages paid to the corresponding class of labor in the free-trade countries of the world. The purchasing power of a dollar in America is also correspondingly greater. Admitted that rents and the price of native products may be cheaper in foreign countries than they are here, this difference is nothing like the wide disparity in the amount of wages earned. Moreover, the conditions of living must be considered, as well as the nominal cost. Cheap rents and cheap prices mean inferior accommodations and poorer living. To the average worker in foreign countries, most of the comforts and conveniences that are in common use by the American wage-earner are positive luxuries. The American workman and his family are the best-educated, the best-dressed, the best-housed, and in every way the best-situated workers in the world. The American wage-earner is always the most skillful workman. His duties and reponsibilities are privileges possessed by no other laborers, and to his intelligence and achievements are largely due the fact that these United States are to-day the envy of the civilized world.

In order to learn from the executive officers of the national and international labor unions of the United States the exact condition of business in this country, they were asked: "In your opinion, are the prospects favorable for continued and steady employment?" Some of their replies received within the last thirty days are as follows:

REPORTS FROM LABOR UNIONS ON EMPLOYMENT OF THEIR MEMBERS AND PROSPECT OF CONTINUED EMPLOYMENT.

Chas. Sidener, president American Agents' Association: Yes. Our members are all employed. The only question is how much they can sell.

Thos. O'Den, secretary Bricklayers and Stonemasons' International Union: Yes. At no time in the history of this country has so much building been done.

W. J. Gilthorpe, secretary Boiler Makers and Iron Ship Builders: Yes. Our increase in employment is 150 per cent over 1897.

Charles Hank, secretary National Brick Makers' Alliance: Yes. Everybody working who wants to work.

Robert Kerr, secretary International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths: Yes. Demand at present is greater than the supply.

F. H. Harsbecker, secretary Bakers and Confectioners' International Union: Yes. In our trade the slightest change is noticeable. Nearly the full membership now employed.

International Brotherhood of Book Binders: Can not supply the demand for competent workers.

Horace Eaton, secretary Boot and Shoe Makers' Union: Never so prosperous as now.

W. J. Maxwell, secretary Order of Railway Conductors: There is a very small percentage, as far as we know of, who are not employed if it is their desire to work. We further feel that the prospects are very favorable for continued steady employment.

John Paulson, secretary Lace Curtain Operatives: Yes. Very favorable indeed.

Max Morris, secretary Retail Clerks' International Protective Association: Yes. Our efforts are directed now toward shortening the hours of labor, and also to abolish Sunday labor.

Wm. Launer, secretary Glass Bottle Blowers: Yes. The outlook for the future in the glass blowing trade is very bright.

John Kunzler, president Glass Workers: We have no reason to believe that our members will not be steadily employed for another year at least.

E. J. Denney, secretary Iron Molders' National Union of America: Within the last twelve months have secured an increase in wages and many concessions favorable to our members, all of whom have been generally employed.

Chas. L. Conine, secretary Leather Workers on Horse Goods: Yes. Our organization is increasing in membership and all members working.

T. J. Duffy, secretary Potters' National Union: Yes, judging from present conditions.

W. J. Spencer, secretary United Association of Plumbers, Gas Fitters, Steam Fitters and Steam Fitters' Helpers: Yes. If we can enforce our conditions concerning apprentices, we will have steady employment.

George Godsoe, secretary Paper Makers' International Union: They are. Indications point very favorably toward steady employment.

Jas. F. McHugh, secretary Stone Cutters' National Union: Yes, for a few years.

Thos. O'Donnell, secretary Cotton Mule Spinners' National Union: Yes. Prospects are good for this year, as our manufactures are contracted for several months ahead.

H. B. Perham, secretary Order of Railway Telegraphers: As far as I know, there are very few telegraphers out of employment. Prospects are favorable for continued and steady employment for the telegraphers.

Barbers, Cigar makers, Coopers, Hoisting engineers, Brewery workers, Electrical workers, Steam engineers (stationary), Firemen (stationary), Locomotive engineers, Locomotive firemen, Iron, steel, and tin workers, Oil and gas well workers, Longshoremen, Machinists,	Yes.	Mine workers, Steel and copper plate workers, Printers of all languages, Pattern makers, Stove mounters, Theatrical stage employees, Seamen, Tailors, Trunk makers, Railroad laborers, Textile workers, Waiters, cooks, and bartenders, Woodworkers,	Yes.

Within a couple of short years, by the wise administration of the Republican party, the Democratic haunts of idleness have been turned into hives of industry. Owing to the density of the smoke that is pouring from the chimney tops of their factory furnaces it is impossible to see the gloom that is predicted by the Democratic party. I predict, Mr. Speaker, that the eclipse of the sun, visible here on the 28th day of last month, will be followed by another eclipse of a political nature on the 6th day of November next. Then the Democratic party will emerge from the penumbra belittled and depressed by the votes of the American people.

Thanks to the enactment of the Dingley protective tariff, and the wise administration of public affairs by President McKinley, the entire effect of the Democratic free-trade policy has passed away. Millions of persons employed in the thousands of establishments which resumed work within the last three years show only too plainly how far the influence of a business administration has been felt. Side by side with this record of the resumption of work is that of the increase of wages, ranging from 5 to 40 per cent, and the most gratifying fact in this matter of higher wages is that it has been voluntary to a large extent on the part of the employers. High wages encourage the increase of a high class of labor and a high standard of living. I now present to this House a table compiled from the reports of national and international unions, made last month, showing the per cent of increase in wages of 59 different trades or crafts in the years 1897, 1898, and 1899:

Increase of wages in 1897, 1898, and 1899, as reported by labor organizations.

Crafts.	Wage increase.		
	1897.	1898.	1899.
	Per cent.	*Per cent.*	*Per cent.*
Agents	5	10	20
Bricklayers and stone masons	10	12	25
Broom makers	.....	.....	10
Bicycle workers	.....	10	20
Boiler makers and iron shipbuilders	.....	10	25
Brickmakers	.....	.....	10
Blacksmiths	.....	.....	10
Brewery workmen	.....	10	15
Bakers	.....	.....	15
Bookbinders	5	10	25
Boot and shoe workers	.....	5	15
Conductors (railroad)	Very substantial increase.		
Coopers	3	4	10
Curtain (lace) operators	.....	.....	15
Core makers	8	12	25
Carpenters	5	8	15
Cigar makers	.....	6	10
Engineers (locomotive)	Small...	12	30
Engineers (coal-hoisting)	.....	10	50
Electrical workers	.....	25	25
Engineers (stationary)	.....	20	30
Firemen (stationary)	.....	.....	15
Firemen (locomotive)	.....	.....	10
Glass-bottle blowers	.....	.....	8
Glass workers	.....	.....	3
Horseshoers	10	10	10
Iron molders	.....	.....	10
Iron, steel, and tin workers	5	8	17
Longshoremen	10	5	15
Leather workers	15	15	15
Meat cutters and butcher workmen	.....	.....	25
Metal workers	.....	.....	10
Machinists	10	15	40
Mine workers	12	26	40
Potters	12½	.....	.....
Plumbers, gas and steam fitters	.....	.....	5
Paper makers	.....	.....	10
Printers	.....	10	30
Pattern makers	5	15	30
Stonecutters	.....	.....	5
Spinners (cotton mule)	.....	.....	22
Stove mounters	.....	5	10
Stage employees	25	200	300
Street railway employees	.....	5–10	12
Seamen	5	12	33
Tailors	.....	.....	10
Tin plate workers	.....	.....	15
Trunk makers	.....	10	15
Tile layers	.....	.....	10
Railroad laborers	5	7	10
Textile workers	.....	.....	12½
Tobacco workers	.....	8	15
Upholsterers	3	10	20
Waiters and cooks	5	10	10
Wood carvers	.....	5	7½
Wood workers	5	8	15

With this remarkable exhibit of the higher wages paid to American labor the Democratic party will appeal to the wage earners to place the administration of this country in Democratic hands, the sole result of which would be to restore the era of low wages, to extinguish the fires of hope in the workingman's ambition, and to extinguish the fires in the furnaces of their factories.

That the outlook for labor was never brighter in this country is attested by Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, and a Democrat, who frankly acknowledged a year ago that "The demand for labor in some special lines has tended to increase wages." Not alone have wages been increased in the past few years, but there has also been an exceedingly large increase in the number of men employed through the resumption of thousands of factories that were closed down during the Democratic administration. This increase in the number employed is clearly shown in the following table, which has been compiled from reports received on the 1st day of May, 1900, direct from the organizations named:

Membership of labor organizations employed in 1897, 1898, and 1899, from official reports of the unions.

Crafts.	Employment of total membership.		
	1897.	1898.	1899.
	Per cent.	*Per cent.*	*Per cent.*
Agents	100	100	100
Bricklayers and stone masons	70	75	95
Broom makers		80	95
Barbers	70	80	90
Bicycle workers	90	90	95
Boiler makers and iron-ship builders	50	65	95
Brickmakers	50	75	100
Blacksmiths	80	80	98
Brewery workers	90	92	95
Bakers	80	80	90
Bookbinders	70	75	100
Boot and shoe workers	50	75	95
Conductors (railroad)	90	95	98
Coopers	95	95	95
Curtain (lace) operators	90	95	98
Core makers	40	65	97
Carpenters	70	75	90
Cigar makers	80	85	95
Engineers (locomotive)	75	88	95
Engineers (coal-hoisting)		75	96
Electrical workers	100	100	100
Engineers (stationary)		90	95
Firemen (stationary)			96
Firemen (locomotive)	90	95	98
Glass-bottle blowers	100	100	100
Glass workers		90	90
Garment workers	50	60	85
Gold beaters			100
Horseshoers	75	75	75
Hatters	75	75	75
Iron molders	70	80	90
Iron, steel, and tin workers	80	85	100
Longshoremen	100	100	100
Leather workers	100	100	100
Meat cutters and butchers			50
Musicians			30
Metal workers			90
Machinists	70	75	100
Mine workers	60	80	98
Oil and gas well workers			99
Potters			100
Steel and copper plate printers	95	95	98
Paper makers	80	90	100
Printers	70	80	98
Pattern makers	70	85	100
Stonecutters	80	66	95
Spinners (cotton mule)	90	100	100
Stove mounters			75
Stage employees	75	85	100
Street railway employees	75	75	90
Seamen	70	80	100
Tailors	60	75	95
Tin-plate workers		80	90
Telegraphers	90	95	98
Tile layers			75
Railroad laborers	70	80	95
Textile workers	85	Strike.	100
Tobacco workers	60	75	95
Upholsterers	50	70	90
Weavers (elastic gore)		97	98
Wood carvers	55	70	85
Wood workers	80	80	98

That the conditions, wages, and employment of the wage-earning classes in the United States are better to-day than at any period since 1893 can not be doubted by any reasoning mind, after a careful examination of the two statistical exhibits which I have presented, and which have been furnished by labor organizations themselves. The industrial situation in this closing year of President McKinley's first Administration is exceedingly satisfactory to the entire people; and, Mr. Speaker, this prosperity will remain here for another term of four years, provided the American people reelect as their President Mr. McKinley, an honor that is due him for his constant and determined efforts as a public man to improve the condition of labor in this country of his birth.

LABOR AND THE TRUSTS.

"Down with the trusts," is one of the slogans of the Democratic party this year, and its agents will endeavor to capture the laboring man's vote because they say that trusts lower the wages of the workers.

But what is the truth? Not one single instance can be cited where a large industrial institution, employing hundreds or thousands of people, has attempted to reduce their wages. Neither can it be shown that a single one of the hundred national and international trade and labor unions of this country is fighting the large combinations. Instead of fighting them, they are getting closer together every day. The growing tendency between labor and capital has been toward annual conferences to determine wage scales, hours of work, and conditions of employment. The tendency is to employ arbitration and conciliation in the settlement of differences. This method has long been in vogue between the railways and their employees, with the steel-rail makers, with the wire-nail makers, with tin-plate manufacturers, with the steel-beam producers, with the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers, with the newspaper publishers, with the employing book and job printers, and with the International Typographical Union. The more that labor and capital concentrate their interests individually, so much the more are they endeavoring to concentrate their interests collectively. Large and small labor unions, instead of fighting industrial combination, find it to their interest to join hand in hand with them. There is no better combination in the United States to-day than the American Federation of Labor.

Speaking for the vast army of wage-earners employed in the iron, steel, and tin industry, Theodore Schaffer, president of the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers, before the Federal Industrial Commission, has declared that the effect of trusts had been beneficial to them. "As a general rule," he said, he believed that the members of his organization "would prefer to deal with combinations and large corporations rather than with smaller independent mills." His experience was that he always received fair treatment in negotiating with these combinations, and he was certain "they did not prevent competition."

Democratic politicians "point with pride" to the fact that there have been more labor disturbances and strikes in the past year or so than in the four years of Democratic administration. Why all these strikes then?

The average wage-worker never thinks of going on strike on a falling market, and certainly not on a falling market under Democratic rule. When business is stagnant and factories are silent and the land is full of unemployed labor, the voice of the agitator is lost in the general murmur of distress and there are no strikes, because there is little employment.

Every labor organization in the country, be it large or small, for the past two years reports steady employment for its full membership, increased pay, shorter working hours, and a general improvement in all its conditions. At the eve of President McKinley's reelection the whole world is engaged in paying tribute to the wonderful productivity of our farms and factories—telling a marvelous tale of American prosperity, proving conclusively the general distribution of the flood of wealth being poured into this favored land.

It is scarcely four years since labor in the United States was crying out for work at any price. Its pockets were empty and its children went hungry to bed.

These events are significant because, by their unprecedented intensity, they have called public attention as never before to what is known as "the labor movement." The problem of the relations between employer and employed is not of easy or quick solution. The promises for this country, inaugurated by the protective policy of the Republican party when it came into power in 1896, were for a restoration of prosperity. This we have had, and now it is to be hoped that good sense and prudence will, through the votes of the people, direct its continuance.

"LEST WE FORGET"—A FEW FACTS ABOUT 1893–1896 WHICH WORKINGMEN SHOULD REMEMBER IN 1900.

Mr. Speaker, the voters of the United States are about to be called upon to determine which party shall control the affairs of the Government during the next four years. It seems scarcely possible that the terrible experiences of free trade coupled with a threat of free silver could be so soon forgotten, but as this seems to be the only assumption upon which their votes can again be asked for those dangerous propositions I propose to put on record a few extracts from that generally accepted and always accurate authority, the American Cyclopedia, on conditions which existed during the Democratic period, 1893–1896, in which the actual experiment of free trade was made, and coupled with its closing years the threat of free silver.

[From Appleton's Annual Cyclopedia, 1893, 1894, and 1895.]

July 13, 1893: Denver, Colo; four banks close their doors and there are runs on other financial institutions.

July 19: More banks close their doors.

July 20: Kansas; fight between strikers and nonunion miners at Weir City.
July 22: Two bank failures in Milwaukee and runs on banks in many other places.
July 24: More bank failures in the West.
July 26: New York; two stock exchange firms fail.
July 27: Ten banks suspend, most of them Northwestern. Other business failures reported.
July 28: More failures and suspensions, including nine banks in the West and one in Kentucky.
August 1: Collapse of the Chicago provision deal. Many failures of commission houses. Great excitement in the board of trade.
August 8: The Chemical Bank, one of the strongest in the country, is unable to fill its weekly orders for small currency.
August: Madison Square Bank suspends.
August 17: Much excitement on east side New York among Hebrew laborers. Police called out.
August 22: Encounter between anarchists and socialists averted by police in New York.
August 23: Meeting of anarchists broken up by police.
August 30: Kansas coal miners strike ended with nothing gained.
January 15, 1894: Secretary of the Treasury Carlisle announces his intention to issue bonds.
January 17: The Secretary of the Treasury offers a $50,000,000 loan for public subscription, according to his announced intentions.
January 24: Strike in Ohio of 10,000 miners.
January 27: A mob of foreign miners destroy property at Brantville, Pa., and elsewhere.
February 16: Many New York silk factories close on account of strike.
February 18: In Ohio all the mines of the Massillon district closed by strike.
February 20: In Boston a riotous assemblage of unemployed workmen dispersed by police.
March 2: Six thousand miners in Jackson County, Ohio, out of employment.
Paterson, N. J.: General strike among the silk weavers.
March 3: In West Virginia striking miners burn the railroad bridge and commit other lawless acts.
March 13: At Paterson, N. J., riotous proceeding on the part of the striking silk weavers.
March 17: In Colorado Governor Waite orders State troops to Cripple Creek to suppress mining troubles.
March 20: In Boston a large body of unemployed workingmen march to the State House and demand employment.
March 24: A movement inaugurated in various parts of the Northern States, known as the Army of the Commonweal, Coxeyites, etc., proposing marching to Washington and demanding help at the hands of Congress.
March 31: Coxeyites are a source of terror to certain Western towns upon which they quarter themselves.
April 1: In South Carolina a large force of State militia is dispatched to the scene of the whisky war in Darlington and Florence.
In Ohio a mob of strikers at East Liverpool becomes riotous and several persons are injured.
April 2: In Chicago 5,000 plumbers, painters, etc., go on a strike.
At Connellsville, Pa., 5,000 coke workers strike.
April 3: In South Carolina the governor assumes control of the police and declares martial law in all the cities of the State.
April 4: In Pennsylvania 6 men killed and 1 wounded in coke riots.
April 13: General strike for higher wages on Great Northern Railway.
In Alabama: The general council of United Mine Workers orders a strike affecting 8,000 men.
April 16: Strike on the Great Northern spreads to the Northern Pacific.
April 20: In Omaha a mob sieges a train of box cars and attempts to deport Kelly's industrial army, but the army refuses to go.
April 21: About 150,000 miners stop work in sympathy with the coke strikers of Pennsylvania.
April 28: Arrival of a division of the Coxey army at Washington.
A division of the Coxeyites arrested at Mount Sterling for holding up a railway train.
United States troops ordered to assist the civil authorities in the far West.
On the Great Northern Railroad system the Knights of Labor are called out on strike.
April 29: Kelly's army, 1,200 strong at Des Moines.
April 30: Strike of 2,000 painters in Chicago.
May 1: Attempted demonstration of Coxey's army on the steps of the Capitol. Leaders arrested.
May 2: In Ohio a mob of Italians and Poles attack the iron mills, but the riot is subdued by the police.
May 4: Further bloodshed in the coke regions of Pennsylvania; killed and wounded on both sides.
May 9: Kelly's army sails from Des Moines on flatboats.
May 10: Several deputy marshals and citizens shot in a conflict with Coxeyites.
May 11: Two thousand Pullman car employees strike at Chicago for last year's wages.
May 12: The captured Coxey army is removed to Leavenworth, where there is a strong garrison of regulars.
May 13: Arrest of a commonweal army by United States marshal at Greenriver, Wyoming.
May 19: Several hundred employees of the Government Printing Office dismissed.
May 19: Considerable detachments of commonweal armies are suffering from cold and hunger in the neighborhood of Cincinnati.
May 25: In Ohio more conflict between striking miners and deputy sheriffs.
May 26: In Pennsylvania the governor goes to the coke regions to use his personal influence toward allaying the disturbances.
In Colorado the governor orders out militia to suppress riotous miners at Cripplecreek.
May 27: In Illinois the governor orders troops to Minonk, where a mob has taken possession of a railway train.
May 30: In Pennsylvania the governor issues a warning to coke rioters.
In Ohio: Governor McKinley orders out the militia to prevent interference with coal trains.
At Washington: The commonweal armies hold a public parade in the streets.
June 1: At St. Louis 1,000 carpenters strike.
General Kelly and his industrial army leave the city.
June 4: At Washington destitution among the commonwealers.
June 5: Militia ordered out to quell striking miners.
In Idaho a number of commonwealers sentenced to imprisonment for train stealing.
June 7: In Ohio trains move under the protection of the militia.
Kelly and his commonwealers abandon their boats at Cairo and resume their march on Washington.
June 9: Nineteen commonwealers sentenced to jail for various offenses.
June 10: Coal strikers in Pennsylvania killed and wounded in an encounter with sheriffs at Lamont.
State troops on both sides of the Ohio River harassed by strikers.
June 11: Continued destruction of railroad property in Ohio and Alabama.
June 17: The Indiana miners continue to strike. Striking miners in Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia decide to return to work.
Twenty-three commonwealers in Illinois sent to jail for train stealing.
June 18: In Wisconsin General Cantwell's industrial army captures a train and rides 200 miles.
At Leavenworth 121 commonwealers sentenced and sent to various county jails.
June 20: On the Gogebic range, Mich., 2,000 miners go on a strike.
June 21: Governor of Pennsylvania orders out troops to suppress disorders in Jefferson County.
In Illinois: Twenty-five strikers indicted by grand jury.
June 25: In St. Louis and Ludlow, Ky., about 500 employees strike work from Pullman Car Company.
June 26: Boycott against Pullman cars goes into effect.
June 27: The Pullman boycott extends to all roads that run to Chicago.
Industrial army disturbances are thus far reported in 14 States and 2 Territories.
June 28. The railway strike spreads so as to include nearly all the great railroads between the Mississippi and the Pacific.
July 30: The month closes with a most threatening state of affairs in the West and the Northwest; violence continues to increase at all the strike centers.
July 1: The Federal Government takes active steps to protect mails in transit through the region of disturbance.
July 2: United States courts at Chicago issue a general order against strikers, and United States troops are called out.
July 3: Strikers block the operations of all railways from Chicago westward. Regulars and State troops in strong force ordered to the scene of action.
July 5: Great destruction of property by rioters at Chicago.
Encounters with militia at Sioux City, Iowa, and Asbury Park, N. J.
July 6: Hundreds of cars burned by rioters in Chicago Governor Altgeld protests against the intervention of United States troops.
July 7: State troops fire on mob at Chicago.
United States regulars assume control of the Northern Pacific and Union Pacific railroads.
July 8: Regulars disperse mob at Hammond, Ind., 1 killed and 4 wounded.
July 10: Debs and other labor leaders arrested at Chicago, but released on bail.
General call upon all Knights of Labor to strike.
Regulars start for Sacramento, Cal., which has been for several days under mob rule.
July 11: About 15,000 workingmen strike at Chicago.
Strikers wreck a train at Sacramento, Cal., killing the engineer and 3 soldiers and injuring others.
July 13: Regulars fire upon a mob at Sacramento.
A detachment of Kelly's industrial army captures a train in Ohio.
July 15: Strikers wreck a freight train at Indianapolis.
July 17: Debs and other leaders sent to jail by Federal court.
August 10: Two companies of State militia ordered to South Omaha to restrain packing-house strikers.
August 11: An industrial army at Roslyn, Va., dispersed by State troops.
August 13: Adoption of the amended Wilson tariff bill by both houses of Congress.
August 23: Lockout of 25,000 mill operatives at Fall River, Mass.
September 15: Strike of 38,000 mill operatives at Fall River, Mass.
September 20: A general strike of garment workers in Boston ordered.
September 24: Strike of 3,000 shirt makers in New York.
October 23: Residents of Indian Territory ask the Government to detail troops for the protection of private property.
Resumption of strike among the textile workers at Fall River, Mass.
November 13: Secretary of the Treasury Carlisle issues a call for another loan of $50,000,000 on five-per-cent ten-year bonds.
January 19: Brooklyn troops disperse mob at bayonet's point.
January 20: Many conflicts, some of them fatal, between troops and riotous strikers.
January 25: The Nebraska legislature appropriates $50,000 for seed for distressed farmers.
January 27: In Ohio an encounter takes place between glassworkers and troops called out to preserve order.
February 21: A strike of the building trades of New York begins.
February 24: Strike among New York electrical workers becomes serious.
March 12: A labor and race riot occurs on the levees at New Orleans, with six negroes killed and an officer of a British steamship wounded.
April 9: Extended strike of coat makers in Cincinnati and vicinity.
April 10: A number of rioters arrested during the trolley strike are sent to the penitentiary.
April 19: Strike of St. Louis garment makers.
April 30: Strike of Baltimore garment-makers' union.
May 1: Strike of 10,000 West Virginia coal miners.
May 3: West Virginia Federal court issues an injunction against striking miners for interference with United States mails.
May 4: Joint conference of Ohio miners and operators at Columbus; about 24,000 miners now on strike.
May 19: The Pennsylvania miners decide to continue their strike.
May 22: General strike in the Chicago brickyards.
May 25: Two men taken from jail at Danville, Ill., and lynched because mob determined that Governor Altgeld should never have a chance to pardon them.

THE TARIFFS OF EUROPE—THE FREE-TRADE EXPERIMENT BEING ABANDONED BY THE LEADING COUNTRIES OF CONTINENTAL EUROPE AND THE PROTECTIVE SYSTEM SUBSTITUTED.

Mr. Speaker, the tariff experiences of the great nations of Europe should interest every voter of the United States. For, however silent the Democracy may be upon that subject, its real attitude and intentions in favor of free trade are so well known that there can be no doubt as to what its course would be in case it should again obtain control of the Government. It is interesting, therefore, at this time, when the Democratic party is asking to be again placed in power in Congress and in the White House, to determine what has been the experience of the nations of Europe which have, within a comparatively short time, tested free trade as well as protection. It is by the experiences of others as well as of ourselves that we learn. True, the experience of the low-tariff period through which the country passed but a few years ago would seem to be sufficient warning against a return to that experiment, but it may be interesting and profitable to review briefly the experiences of the great nations from whose population the United States has drawn so large and valuable an element of its present citizenship.

Nearly every European nation has, within the last half century, following the example of Great Britain and yielding to the various plans set on foot by the free traders of that country and elsewhere, tested the low-tariff or free-trade proposition; and practically all, save England, have, after experiments as disastrous in many cases as those of the United States, within the past few years, abandoned free trade and returned to protection. Germany, France, Russia, Sweden, Austria-Hungary, and Belgium have, within the lifetime of a generation, adopted tariffs intended to protect and foster manufactures, some of them with rates of protection strongly marked and clearly defined for this specific purpose. The facts which are here presented are drawn chiefly from the work of Mr. George B. Curtiss, entitled Protection and Prosperity, of which President McKinley said:

We try nations as they appear on the balance sheet of the world. We try systems by results; we are too practical a people for theory. Those of us who believe the American policy of protection is best adapted to our citizenship and civilization are naturally glad to claim the experiences of other nations, when they sustain, beyond the question of doubt, the judgment of our own people, though our own belief is sustained by the highest American authorities from Washington down and by a hundred years of experience.

GERMANY.

The German Empire was organized in 1871 by a political union of Prussia and the German States of central Europe. Prior to that time they had been drawn into closer relationship by a zollverein or customs union based upon the tariff law of Prussia, in which the schedule of duties was fixed by a congress of representatives appointed from the various States. This zollverein parliament continued in charge of the tariff regulations of the union until the adoption of the constitution for the Empire in 1871, and between 1843 and 1850 advanced duties very materially. After the abandonment of the policy of protection in England, however, a campaign against protection on the Continent was begun, headed by Mr. Cobden, and by cooperation with the free traders of Germany. The first step in the reduction of tariff schedules of the zollverein was accomplished in 1865, when many of the duties were reduced and others repealed. Further reductions were made in 1868, 1869, 1870, and 1873, and by 1877 the entire protective system had been swept away and the German Empire passed to a free-trade policy.

The experiment, however, was of comparatively short duration. Immediately after the establishment of the Empire in 1871 a protectionist party was organized to combat the theories of free trade and soon found a strong supporter in Prince Bismarck. By 1875 the strength of the protection policy had greatly increased. There was the usual cry of "robber barons," "monopolists," and "plutocrats," but such arguments did not deceive Bismarck.

He knew well—

Says Mr. Curtiss—

that the cry was raised as a sham; that any undue and improper encroachments of capital, as well as combinations of all sorts detrimental to the common people, could be stamped out or controlled only through State action, while under the individualism of free trade the hand of the Government would be kept off, and there would be no delay as to the law of the survival of the fittest or check to the aggression of improper combinations. With a well-directed government, Bismarck did not fear the wealth of the people, but saw the great benefit of capital when directed to the development of the resources of a country and the employment of labor.

In a speech in the Reichstag Bismarck said:

I wish we could immediately create a few hundred millionaires. They would spend their money in the country, and this expenditure would give fruit to labor all around. They could not eat their money themselves; they would have to spend the interest of it. Be glad, then, when people become rich with us. The community at large, and not only the tax authority, is sure to benefit.

A conference was held at Heidelberg to consider financial conditions, and an increase in duties was recommended. An address from the throne shortly after (February 12, 1879) said:

I am of the opinion that the country's entire economic activity has a right to claim all the support which right adjustment of duties and taxes can afford, and which in the lands with which we trade is perhaps afforded beyond actual requirement. I regard it as my own duty to adopt measures to preserve the German market to national production so far as is consistent with the general interest, and our customs legislation must gradually revert to the true principles on which the prosperous career of the zollverein rested for nearly half a century, but which have in important particulars been deserted in our economic policy since 1865. I can not deem that actual success has attended this change in our customs policy.

On May 28 of the same year Prince Bismarck, in a speech in the Reichstag which lasted for more than an hour, said that the German market had become the mere storage space for the overproduction of other countries. Countries which were inclosed, he said, had become great, and those which had remained open had fallen behind.

Were the perils of protectionist rule so great as sometimes painted France would long ago have been ruined, instead of which it is more prosperous, after paying the five millions, than Germany to-day. And protectionist Russia, too—look at her marvelous prosperity. Manufacturers there have lately been able to save from 30 to 35 per cent, and all at the cost of the German market. Let us close our doors and erect somewhat higher barriers—

Said the chancellor—

and let us take care to preserve again at least the German market and German industry.

Speaking of the depression in agriculture as a result of free trade, he said:

Not only agriculture, but the present state and the German Empire itself would go to ruin.

He regarded the German farmers, however, as wise enough to take care of their own interests, and added:

Twenty million farmers will not allow themselves to be ruined. It is only necessary that they should become conscious of what is before them and they will try to defend themselves by legal and constitutional methods.

On another occasion, Prince Bismarck recommending still higher protection, said:

The success of the United States in material development is the most illustrious of modern times. The American nation has not only successfully borne and experienced the most gigantic and expensive war of all history, but immediately afterwards disbanded its army, found work for all its soldiers and marines, paid off most of its debt, given labor and homes to all the unemployed of Europe as fast as they could arrive within the territory—and still by a system of taxation so indirect as not to be oppressive, much less felt. Hence it is my deliberate judgment that the prosperity of America is due mainly to its system of protective laws. I read that Germany has now reached that point where it is necessary to imitate the tariff of the United States.

His advice was accepted. Germany became a thoroughly protective country, and the world knows the result in the fact that Germany is now one of the most prosperous—perhaps the most prosperous—of the industrial and exporting countries of all Europe, pushing her commerce to every part of the world, competing keenly and successfully with that of her older and long-experienced neighbor, Great Britain, while within the Empire busy workshops and prosperous and contented people are everywhere found. Of its prosperity a British official representative at Berlin, Mr. Gastrell, the commercial attaché to the British embassy at that capital, in a communication to the British Government on January 29, 1899, said:

After completing his famous political work, Prince Bismarck directed himself to directing the energies of the people to peaceful and commercial aims, and he achieved a success beyond his most sanguine hopes. When it is realized that in 1897 the value of German exports of domestic produce was only 58,000,000 pounds less than similar exports of British origin, and that the proportion thereof per head of population has tended to rise in Germany and fall in England, perhaps the British public will begin to devote closer attention to commercial and industrial development on the continent.

Aided by the state and protected by a moderate tariff from severe foreign competition, German industries and commercial enterprises of all kinds came into existence, developed, and flourished. This took place much more rapidly than in most other countries, particularly because the Germans benefited by the knowledge and experience of older industrial States. After a period of so-called free-trade principles, protection was again adopted in Germany with the introduction of a tariff which effected many sweeping changes at the instance of both the agricultural and industrial parties. In manufactured articles the value of imports fell from 49,000,000 pounds in 1889 to 46,000,000 pounds in 1896, while that of exports rose from 104,000,000 pounds to 115,000,000 pounds in the same period. There is in the above two comparisons ample demonstration of the satisfactory state of manufacturing industries, which have not only developed an increased export value of about 10,000,000 pounds ($50,000,000) during that time when prices for manufactures generally have been falling, but they have also to an enormous extent replaced the formerly imported manufactured goods.

The above tribute to German prosperity under protection, coming from a British official representative at the German capital, fully sustains the reports which come through other sources of the phenomenal prosperity of Germany under protection.

RUSSIA.

Russia, after a series of experiments with free trade, has recently adopted a thoroughly protective tariff system. The Russian tariff at the beginning of the century was moderately protective, but this feature was abandoned in 1819, but after a comparatively short experiment protective duties were again adopted until 1849, from which time until 1876 more moderate duties prevailed, while from 1877 to the present time duties have been levied with a view to protecting Russian productions and Russian industries. That the protective system has been successful there can be no doubt. The wonderful prosperity of Russian manufacturing and industrial interests in the last few years is well known, and an official testimonial to that fact is found in the report of M. Witte, the Russian minister of finance in his report of 1897, commenting on the new tariff rates adopted from time to time since 1880. In that report he said:

All these measures which have exerted such a favorable influence on the development of Russia's productive forces were taken by three of my predecessors. During a period of twenty years the Government has remained firm in its protection of national production, and the results obtained during this period by Russian industry fully justify such a policy. From the recent extensive labors of the committee of experts, in which several hundreds of scientists and practical specialists took part, the Government obtained a plentiful supply of materials for forming an opinion of the present condition of our industries. The experts' verdict showed that almost every branch of industries has progressed greatly in quantity and quality; many new branches of industry have sprung up and expanded, while those which already existed have developed and grown stronger. It is enough to speak of the vast progress in metallurgy, manufacture of machinery, coal mining, and the petroleum, chemical, and cotton industries, in the cultivation of cotton, in wine making, and in many other branches. Such cheering results are the consequence of the protective policy recently adopted by the Government.

FRANCE.

The industrial development of France from the close of the Napoleonic wars to 1860, says Mr. Curtiss, is without parallel in any continental country. Under the protection which then existed the growth of manufactures was rapid and successful in every particular.

In 1860, however, a commercial treaty was entered into between England and France, by which France removed all prohibitions from imports and substituted duties ranging from 20 to 30 per cent on competing manufactures. The experiment of this duty, which continued until 1882, was unsatisfactory, and the French Government refused to renew it in that year and a more vigorous protective policy was restored. In 1885 the duties on foreign products were raised, and in 1891 a thoroughly protective tariff was enacted, under which the great prosperity and industrial activity which now exist have come to that country.

OTHER EUROPEAN COUNTRIES.

The tariffs of several other of the continental countries of Europe, except Netherlands, are now protective in their character. In Austria-Hungary, where duties were lowered after the war of 1866, the protective system was resumed in 1882 and was supplemented in 1887 by higher rates, of which Mr. Curtiss says:

Three hundred and fifty-seven articles are enumerated, of which 56 are free of duty. The decrease of imports has been regular; new establishments are being founded by Austrian firms and Austrian money; the rate of wages is on the increase, and skilled labor is in great demand.

Belgium, prior to 1844, was a free-trade country. In that year, as the result of an investigation and report made in 1842 upon the state of industry and commerce, Belgium adopted a protective tariff, of the effect of which a Belgian writer said: "If anyone had left the country in 1835, after having visited our principal manufacturing centers, and were to come back to it now, he would be struck with the transformation they have undergone, the advance they have achieved. He would find a numerous, intelligent population of working people, where a quarter of a century ago he would have seen nothing but a few houses scattered at wide intervals over extensive plains. As a consequence, production—except of articles of food—has outrun the needs of population, and we are obliged to seek for foreign outlets." The British secretary of legation at Brussels, speaking of the "astounding productiveness of industry and the purchasing power of the people," says:

Wages have risen absolutely and in a proportion quite remarkable;

and he quoted authorities to the effect that while in 1840 they amounted to 500,000,000 francs, they now exceed 1,625,000,000 francs.

The tariff of Denmark is similar to that of Belgium, and that of Sweden and Norway is described by the British consul at Copenhagen, who says:

The chief characteristic of the producing and commercial conditions of Sweden and Norway are the marked development of native industries, shielded by protective duties; the development of direct communications by sea between Sweden and other countries thus greatly diminishing the importation or transit of goods from England.

Sweden and Norway—

Says Mr. Curtiss—

are now enjoying a thoroughly protective tariff—perhaps on the whole more protective than that of any other European country. The protection of years gave way to lower duties in both countries for several years preceding 1890, but duties were gradually increased until, in 1892, was enacted what has been termed the "McKinley bill of Sweden." To Sweden and Norway, least of all, can the United States look for a market, because the people of that country are practicing our own methods of protecting and promoting home industries with great success.

Numerous other instances might be given of the steady growth of the protective system in all parts of the world. The tariff of many of the British colonies is now thoroughly protective. This is true not only of Canada, but of several of the colonies of Australia, while recent changes in the rates of duty in India have been protective in their tendency. This example is extended still farther to the East, until Japan, in the new tariff which was recently adopted as an accompaniment to the gold standard, advanced her rates of duties materially, making some of them protective in character, and finding as an immediate result a reduction of imports and, according to the latest reports, renewed activity in manufacturing and domestic industries.

This review of the tariff situation in European countries indicates that the long period of low tariffs produced low wages and depressed labor; but this extremely unsatisfactory condition was followed by a reaction in favor of the protective system, and it is the result of the bitter experiences with free trade that the people of those countries are now building up their own industries and establishing the improved conditions for labor which are beginning to make themselves apparent in increased wages and increased commercial activity with other parts of the world.

SOME FACTS ABOUT SUGAR—AMERICAN FARMERS NEED NOT FEAR COMPETITION OF THE TROPICS.

Mr. Speaker, no subject interests the farmers of the United States more than that of the possibility of their being able to supply the $100,000,000 worth of sugar which our people consume annually, and some facts which have recently been presented showing the rapid growth in the percentage which beets are now supplying of the world's sugar shows that they are fully justified in their ambition.

I desire to present herewith a series of tables showing the production of cane and beet sugar in the world for a term of years and the production and consumption of sugar in the United States. They present a series of important facts with reference to sugar, of which the United States is the world's largest consumer as to quantity, and in which the people are largely interested, both because of the large amount of money now expended abroad for that article, the possibility of its production at home, and the relative prices of raw and refined sugar at the present time and in earlier years. The table shows the per capita consumption in the United States, the imports, the home consumption of cane and beet sugar, the per cent which home consumption forms of the total consumption, the world's production of beet sugar, the per cent produced from beet and cane respectively, and the price per pound of raw and refined sugar respectively in each year from 1879 to 1899. It will be seen that the imports of sugar during the twenty-year period have doubled in quantity and that the home production has but to keep pace with the increased consumption, the percentage of the total consumption which is supplied by the home producers differing little in 1898 and 1899 from that of the beginning of the period under consideration.

Some interesting facts regarding the beet-sugar production of the United States and in the world are shown by this and a subsequent table. It will be seen by an examination of the statement regarding the world's production of sugar that beets produced, in 1879, 45 per cent of the world's sugar, and in 1899–1900, 66 per cent. An examination of another smaller table which follows will show that in 1840, when slave labor produced nearly all the cane sugar of the world, beets, which were grown in the temperate zone and chiefly by free labor, were only able to produce 4.35 per cent of the world's sugar, although the world had then known for a hundred years that sugar could be produced from beets. Between 1840 and 1870 slavery ceased to exist, and cane-sugar production was necessarily carried on by free labor, placing it in that particular on a level with beet sugar.

Simultaneously with this development of the withdrawal of slave labor from the production of cane sugar, beets increased their percentage of the world's sugar supply from 4.35, in 1840, to 14 per cent, in 1850; 20 per cent, in 1860; 34 per cent, in 1870, and, as above indicated, they now produce 66 per cent, or two-thirds of the world's sugar. This fact shows that the farmers of the Temperate Zone need no longer fear the competition of the Tropics in the production of sugar, and especially if a reasonable protection is granted them, as is the case in the United States, as is indicated by the rapid growth of beet-sugar production in the United States shown in the accompanying table. The farmers of the country have been encouraged by the Republican party in their ambition to produce the sugar of the country. The experience of other nations and of other parts of the Temperate Zone has shown that sugar can be produced from beets in great quantities and at very small cost and can successfully compete with cane sugar under the most favorable circumstances. Under the stimulus given to the beet-sugar production by Republican legislation, beet-sugar factories sprang up all over the United States, and the production of beet sugar has already reached large proportions and is increasing with wonderful rapidity.

The first thought which came to the minds of the farmers when the events following the war for the liberation of Cuba brought under our control certain tropical areas was whether or not the possession or control of tropical territory by the United States would injure, or perhaps destroy, the opportunities which they believed they had almost within their grasp for supplying the $100,000,000 worth of sugar which the people of the United States annually consume. This fear—if it reached the stage in which it could be called by that name—was answered in the negative by the Republican party when it passed the Porto Rican bill. The Democratic party fought with all of its power to prevent the enactment of that measure which placed a duty upon articles coming into the United States from Porto Rico. That duty was small, but it was an explicit declaration by the Republican party that it would not concede the power to fix such tariff as it might deem judicious against the products of cheap tropical labor wherever located and under whatever conditions. In other words, it was a distinct promise to the farmer that he need not fear that the Republican party would permit the cheap labor and cheap sugar of any tropical territory to be brought in in a manner which would destroy the infant industry of beet-sugar production which the farmers of the United States have, under the fostering care of the Republican party, been building up during the last few years.

The farmers of the Temperate Zone can produce beet sugar successfully in competition with the sugar cane of the Tropics when both are handled by free labor, and this advantage which the farmer of the Temperate Zone has will be strengthened in the United States so long as the Republican party retains its control and is enabled to apply the protective principle in the interests of its farmers as it did in the case of the Porto Rican bill, but against which the Democrats turned their every energy. With a few years of moderate protection against the cheap labor of the Tropics, the beet-sugar industry in the United States will be placed fairly and squarely upon its feet

and will be fully able to contend with the cane-sugar industry of the Tropics, while meantime the improved condition of labor in the Tropics and the opportunities for better earnings which the guidance of the United States will give them will more nearly equalize the two systems of production.

One further fact in regard to the world's production and producing capacity is worthy of consideration in this connection, and that is that nearly two-thirds of the sugar now being imported into the United States comes from the islands of the Pacific. The total importation of sugar into the United States in the ten months ending with April, 1899, amounted to 3,303,026,763 pounds, and of this amount 1,180,442,362 pounds were from the East Indies, the Hawaiian Islands, and the Philippine Islands, thus indicating the possibilities of our Pacific territory to supply that portion of our consumption which it will be necessary to import until the farmers of the country are able to supply the home demand; and thus, instead of sending to other countries and other peoples the $100,000,000 per year which we have been annually expending for foreign-grown sugar, it may be expended under the American flag and in a manner which will benefit the people of those islands, and incidentally those of our own people who may enter upon business enterprises in them.

The final columns of the accompanying table, which show the average prices in New York of raw and refined sugar, are especially interesting in view of the current belief that the people of the United States are required to pay an excessive price for refined sugar as compared with the cost of the raw material imported. A comparison of the prices of raw and refined in each year from 1879, prior to the organization of the sugar trust, with those of recent years shows that the margin between raw and refined has been steadily reduced, and averaged in 1899 just one-half cent per pound against nearly 2 cents per pound in 1879 and 1880 and more than 2 cents per pound in 1881 and 1882.

The table which follows shows the production of cane and beet sugar in the principal producing countries of the world in the sugar year 1899–1900. It will be seen that Java, which lies just alongside the Philippines, is by far the largest cane-sugar producer of the world, but that Germany, Austria, France, and Russia produce greater quantities from beets than the most successful of the cane-growing countries of the world, thus suggesting our own possibilities in this line.

The following table shows the production of cane and beet sugar in the principal producing countries of the world in the sugar years 1898–1900:

Countries.	Cane-sugar production.	Countries.	Beet-sugar production.
	Tons.		*Tons.*
Java	*722,000	Germany	1,780,000
Cuba	400,000	Austria	1,120,000
Hawaiian Islands	275,000	France	960,000
Brazil	175,000	Russia	885,000
Mauritius	150,000	Belgium	290,000
Australia	140,000	Holland	170,000
Louisiana	132,000	All other	275,000
All other	868,000		
Total	2,862,000	Total	5,480,000

*Exports.

The following table shows the world's production of beet and cane sugar, respectively, and the grand total in each year from 1872 to 1899, also the average price of sugar in foreign markets, the figures of cane-sugar production being those of Willett & Gray, of New York; beet sugar, those of Licht, of Europe, and those relating to price being obtained from statements supplied by importers into the United States of the cost in foreign countries of the sugars which they import. The figures relating to production are the crop years; those of price, fiscal years. The statements of quantity in each case are in thousands of tons:

World's production of beet and cane sugar and average price per pound, 1871–1899.

Years.	Beet, 1,000 tons.	Cane, 1,000 tons.	Total, 1,000 tons.	Price, cents.
1871–72	1,020	1,599	2,619	5.37
1872–73	1,210	1,793	3,003	5.35
1873–74	1,288	1,840	3,128	4.95
1874–75	1,219	1,712	2,931	4.35
1875–76	1,343	1,590	2,933	4.04
1876–77	1,045	1,673	2,718	4.91
1877–78	1,419	1,825	3,244	5.06
1878–79	1,571	2,019	3,581	4.16
1879–80	1,402	1,852	3,244	4.18
1880–81	1,748	1,911	3,659	4.41
1881–82	1,782	2,060	3,842	4.41
1882–83	2,147	2,107	4,254	4.37
1883–84	2,361	2,323	4,684	3.61
1884–85	2,545	2,351	4,896	2.67

World's production of beet and cane sugar and average price per pound, 1871–1899—Continued.

Years.	Beet, 1,000 tons.	Cane, 1,000 tons.	Total, 1,000 tons.	Price, cents.
1885–86	2,223	2,339	4,562	2.84
1886–87	2,733	2,345	5,078	2.50
1887–88	2,451	2,465	4,916	2.75
1888–89	2,725	2,263	4,988	3.21
1889–90	3,633	2,069	5,702	3.28
1890–91	3,710	2,555	6,265	3.03
1891–92	3,501	2,852	6,353	2.93
1892–93	3,428	3,045	6,473	3.09
1893–94	3,890	3,490	7,380	2.92
1894–95	4,792	3,530	8,322	2.15
1895–96	4,315	2,830	7,155	2.29
1896–97	4,954	2,864	8,818	2.01
1897–98	4,872	2,898	7,770	2.55
1898–99	4,977	2,995	7,973	2.39
1899–1900	5,510	2,904	8,414	.....

RESULTS ACCOMPLISHED BY WAR DEPARTMENT INCIDENT TO SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR.

Mr. Speaker, I want now to speak briefly of the work which has been accomplished under the various Departments of the Government during the past three years.

Prior to the outbreak of the Spanish-American war the strength of the Regular Army was 2,143 officers and 26,040 enlisted men. Under the President's first and second calls, April 23 and May 25, respectively, and the recruitment of the Regular Army to the maximum allowed by law, the strength of the Army, Regular and Volunteer, in August, 1898, was 11,108 officers and 203,609 enlisted men.

In the meantime a vast amount of work, which words fail to describe, was performed by the various staff departments, after day and night conferences with the chiefs thereof, in organizing, equipping, arming, disciplining, and advancing the volunteers to a state of efficiency for active field service, and later transporting the various organizations to the camps or rendezvous to which they had been assigned.

On May 30, 1898, instructions were issued by the Department directing an expedition, under command of Maj. Gen. Wm. R. Shafter, to proceed to Cuba to "capture the garrison at Santiago and assist in capturing the harbor and fleet of the enemy." This expedition sailed on June 14, 1898, from Tampa, Fla., with 815 officers and 16,072 enlisted men on 33 transports, which had been collected with extraordinary dispatch and energy by the Quartermaster's Department, and arrived at Daiquiri on June 21 and proceeded to disembark the next day. The troops immediately advanced and captured Siboney, the only resistance being a few scattering shots, thus establishing a base of supplies 8 miles nearer Santiago.

On the morning of June 24, 1898, a dismounted cavalry brigade advanced on and attacked the enemy at La Guasima, and, after a stubborn resistance, carried their intrenchments.

On July 1 an attack was made on El Caney, and, after a battle of varying intensity during most of the day, the place was carried by assault about 4 p. m. In the meantime preparations for an attack on San Juan Hill were completed, and, after a fierce encounter, the American forces drove the enemy from his intrenchments and blockhouses, thus gaining a position that sealed the fate of Santiago.

On July 8 the commander of the Spanish forces offered to march out of the city of Santiago with arms and baggage provided he would not be molested before reaching Holguin, and to surrender to the American forces the territory then occupied by him. This proposition was rejected. On the morning of July 11 the surrender of the city was again demanded and reply made that the demand had been communicated to the general in chief of the Spanish forces. On the morning of the 14th General Toral agreed to surrender upon the basis of his army, the Fourth Army Corps, being returned to Spain. The terms of surrender finally agreed upon included 22,789 Spanish troops; of these 22,137 were repatriated at the expense of the United States.

The formal surrender took place on the 17th of July, 1898, and at noon of that date the American flag was raised over the governor's palace with appropriate ceremonies.

The total number of Spanish troops on the island of Cuba, as shown by September, 1898, rolls, was 10,956 officers and 215,134 enlisted men, classed as follows: Regulars, 5,093 officers, 115,355 enlisted men; volunteers, 5,258 officers, 80,504 enlisted men; irregular volunteer troops, 605 officers, 19,275 enlisted men.

On August 4, 1898, orders were issued for the repatriation of the troops in General Shafter's command, and after arrival in the United States they went into camp at Montauk Point, Long Island, N. Y., which, in the meantime, had been fitted up for their reception.

On July 7, 1898, Congress ratified and confirmed the cession of the Hawaiian Islands, made by the government of that republic, and on July 29, 1898, a force of 57 officers and 1,464 enlisted men, commanded by Col. Thos. Barber, First New York Volunteer Infantry, sailed for Honolulu to garrison that place.

The first expeditionary force sailed for Manila, P. I., on May 25

and arrived June 30, 1898; the second sailed June 15 and arrived July 17, and the third left on June 29 and arrived July 25. The total number of officers and men in these three expeditions was 10,920, and they were under the command of Maj. Gen. Wesley Merritt. The city of Manila was captured, with the assistance of the Navy, August 13, 1898, and the American flag raised the same date. Subsequently, between this date and February 19, 1899, 17 other expeditions were sent to the Philippine Islands, making a total of 1,054 officers and 28,340 enlisted men on those islands in March, 1899. This force, comprised mostly of volunteers, has since been repatriated, and Regular Army organizations and United States volunteers to the number of 63,000 comprise the force at present in the Philippines.

On July 21, 1898, an expedition sailed for Porto Rico, Maj. Gen. Nelson A. Miles, Commanding General United States Army, in command, with 3,554 officers and enlisted men, for the purpose of attacking that island, which was garrisoned by 17,340 Spanish soldiers, regular and volunteer. This expedition arrived at Guanica July 25, and after a short skirmish the American flag was raised at that place. Subsequently five other expeditions sailed for Porto Rico, making a total of 641 officers and 16,332 enlisted men of the United States Army, regular and volunteer, on that island in August, 1898. Porto Rico was practically subjugated when the peace protocol was signed, and instructions issued for the cessation of hostilities August 13, 1898.

Between August 14, 1899, and April 2, 1900, 11,292 tons of food stuffs, the value of which was $737,397.26, have been sent to Porto Rico for indigent Porto Ricans by the Commissary Department, and an additional $1,000 worth distributed to them from the subsistence depot on that island. Hundreds of tons have also been contributed by the general public and distributed under the supervision of the military authorities on the island.

The signing of the peace protocol, August 12, 1898, inaugurated the work of discharge of about 30,000 war enlistments of the Regular Army and the muster-out and distribution throughout the country of State volunteer organizations, involving the repatriation, exclusive of regular troops, of 63,198 officers and enlisted men from Porto Rico, Cuba, Philippine Islands, and Hawaii, causing the recruitment, mobilization, and movement to those islands of fresh regular troops and the organization of 25 regiments of United States volunteers and the Porto Rican battalion, all under command of officers of the Regular Army.

In Cuba the military government has reorganized the insular police (rural guards) and placed that of each muncipality upon a new basis; it has cleaned the cities, and by the introduction of modern sanitation has secured a most satisfactory decrease in the mortality. The customs and insular taxation system have been placed upon such a basis that the island is not only self-supporting, but is enabled to make important improvements. Much progress has recently been made in establishing a modern school system, while the United States postal system has superseded the former inefficient service.

In Porto Rico boards of health have been appointed in municipalities and sanitation has made great strides; the building of good roads has been conducted on an extensive scale. The schools have been reorganized, modern methods and text-books being introduced. The burdens of taxation upon the people have been greatly reduced, while the efficiency of the governmental service has been greatly argumented. An up-to-date postal service is now enjoyed by the people, while the judiciary and police systems are in much more satisfactory condition than formerly.

In the Philippines, in addition to the former ports of Manila, Iloilo, Cebu, and Zamboango, there are now open to the commerce of the world twenty-five other ports. Initial steps have been taken, under Army officers, for the civil reorganization of municipalities. The United States postal service has closely followed the troops. Public schools are being opened, in which the most approved American text-books are in use.

The Signal Corps has performed its work with unequaled promptness, ability, and success. The telephone, telegraph, and flag have kept the President in touch, through commanding generals, not only with every Army corps and their advanced skirmish lines, but with cooperating squadrons of the Navy.

In constructive work the corps has built nearly seven thousand miles of telegraph, and is to-day operating these lines in Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines with an efficiency and economy hitherto unknown in those countries.

Immediately preceding the outbreak of the war with Spain there were available for the defense of the seacoast 63 heavy guns and 88 mortars. The work was pushed rapidly by the Engineer Department, with the result that by August 1, 1898, there were mounted for defense a total of 121 heavy guns, 144 mortars, and 26 rapid-fire guns. In addition, 25 of the principal harbors of the United States had been effectively defended by submarine mines. On June 30, 1899, there had been mounted 169 heavy guns, 176 mortars and 46 rapid-fire guns, and a large number of additional batteries were under construction, and the principal harbors of the United States rendered fairly secure against a naval attack.

Notwithstanding the additional exacting duties necessitated by this war, the numerous river and harbor improvements and other public engineering works in the charge of the Corps of Engineers, representing an annual expenditures of over $25,000,000, were administered without the slightest interruption or sacrifice of the public interests.

The sudden expansion of the Army imposed a most difficult task upon the Medical Department—a task which was worked out with the greatest success and the highest credit. War inevitably entails disease, suffering, and death, but, it can be safely said, in no war have the sick and wounded received so many comforts and been so tenderly nursed.

The health of our troops serving in the newly acquired territory has been guarded by every provision that modern science can provide, and the sickness and mortality from disease has been kept far below what was to be expected. The ratio of deaths per thousand of mean strength for the first year of the war was but 25.73, while that for the first year of the war of 1861–65 was 45.87.

It is a fact well worthy of consideration to state that the Quartermaster-General's Office, which at the outbreak of the war did not have a transport that was fitted for the transportation of troops, has to-day the finest transport service in the world, and has transported about 300,000 passengers many thousands of miles at sea without the sacrifice of a single life due to any fault of the Army transport service.

This service is a revelation in the method of transporting troops, and the representatives of other nations have requested and been furnished data upon which to pattern after it.

The Ordnance Department armed and equipped the troops for the Spanish war with a rapidity which must be regarded as gratifying. The arms and equipments were ready as soon as the troops could be mustered in and organized, and the material distributed. The productive capacity of the arsenals was quickly expanded and contracts were made with private manufacturers, so that in one hundred days after the first call for troops, the Ordnance Department had made or purchased 250,000 sets of infantry equipments and 26,000 sets of horse equipments. It had also provided the cannon and complete outfit of 30 mounted batteries of 6 guns each, and could easily have provided twice that number if they had been required. It had also provided, or was in a position to furnish at once, a large variety of mountain guns and machine guns, with their ammunition and equipments, but not many of these were called for.

The work of the Pay Department, from the commencement of the Spanish-American war to its close and during the continuance of hostilities in the Philippines in suppression of insurrection, has been phenomenally laborious and exacting, but the officers of this department have met every requirement of duty and zeal and promptitude and to the satisfaction of the Army.

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1899, this department of the military service has been charged with the care of nearly $92,000,000, about $77,000,000 of which was, up to June 30, 1899, disbursed on account of the war without loss to the Government on any account whatever and without complaint of any character from the Army.

When war with Spain became imminent great efforts by the Military Information Division of the Adjutant-General's Office were made to ascertain the strength, the composition, the location, and fortifications of the Spanish forces in Cuba. This was successfully done. Maps of Cuba and Porto Rico on a large scale were prepared, and books were compiled giving all obtainable information in regard to these islands.

Later, when it became evident that military operations in the Philippines would be carried on, a pamphlet (illustrated) giving information in regard to those islands was prepared, and maps compiled from the best sources obtainable were prepared and issued.

There have been mustered in, organized, mobilized, distributed at home and abroad, and finally repatriated and mustered out of the service, and sent to their homes, 223,235 volunteers. There have been enlisted by the general recruiting service 35,000 United States volunteers, organized into 25 regiments, 22 of which have been transported to the Philippine Islands, the remaining 3 having been organized there from the discharged volunteers and regulars.

There have been enlisted and reenlisted for the Regular Army between May 1, 1898, and January 31, 1900, 99,024 men, the present status being approximately 64,000 Regular Army and 35,000 United States volunteers.

Commissions have been issued since the beginning of the war to 632 officers of the Regular Army, 66 of which were for the various staff departments, and 3,874 United States volunteer officers.

This Department has received, carefully considered, acted upon, and sent since the beginning of the war 400,806 telegrams, and approximately 2,000,000 written communications.

WORK OF THE NAVY DEPARTMENT.

Mr. Speaker, under the present Administration the Navy has shown itself worthy of its best traditions. The great victories at

Manila Bay and Santiago, which shed undying fame upon this arm of the national defense, were in no sense accidents. They were the results of years of careful training of officers and men and the thorough preparation of the fleets for the crucial test of war. For this preparation, this readiness to meet the supreme moment for which a navy is constructed and maintained, those who administer the affairs of the Navy should have credit. The glory goes to our heroes who are in command afloat, and to those officers and men who seize the opportunities of war to render conspicuous service; but in remembering them, let us not forget those who labor without ceasing to secure the fleet in condition of high efficiency and to place at the disposal of the commanding officers an abundance of the supplies, without which the fleet is powerless.

As early as January 11, 1898, more than a month before the *Maine* was destroyed in the harbor of Havana, the Secretary of the Navy began to mobilize the ships of the Navy and to take such measures as would place at the disposal of the officers in command the full measure of our naval force.

Immediately upon the passage of the bill appropriating $50,000,000 for the national defense, a board was organized for the purchase of auxiliary ships, and after careful examination 102 ships of various types were secured at a total cost of $17,956,850. Of these vessels but two, the *New Orleans* and the *Albany*, were strictly vessels of war. The others were merchant ships, pleasure yachts, tugs, etc., which were rapidly overhauled at the different navy-yards, provided with such light-armor protection as was practical, and suitably armed.

Between March 16 and June 30 all these vessels were purchased and as rapidly as overhauled were placed in commission and put into active service. They were used not only as auxiliary war vessels, but to supply the fleets with coal and ammunition and with fresh water and fresh provisions. For the care of the sick and wounded the *Solace* was fitted out as a complete hospital, and to make repairs to vessels at sea the *Vulcan* was fitted out as a modern machine shop. In order to meet the increased demands on the navy-yards it was necessary to practically double the force between February 15 and the middle of April.

In addition to the ships which were added to the Navy by purchase, 15 revenue cutters and 4 light-house tenders were transferred from the Treasury Department to the Navy, and 4 of the great steamers of the International Navigation Company and 1 of the Pacific Mail Steamship Company were chartered. There were in all 128 ships added to the regular naval establishment, and it became at once necessary to provide officers and men to man them. For this purpose 225 officers on the retired list were ordered to active duty, 856 officers were appointed for temporary service, and the enlisted force was increased from 12,500 to over 24,000 men.

It was an enormous undertaking to make all these additional ships ready for war service, to secure the necessary guns for them, and to keep the fleets supplied with coal, ammunition, and provisions. But this was only a part of the work which the Navy Department had in hand. For the protection of the coasts of the United States an auxiliary naval force was created, which was officered and manned by the Naval Militia of the United States. A coast signal service was established, which kept practically our entire coast line from Maine to Texas under observation, to give warning of the approach of an enemy's vessel or of suspicious craft of any kind.

The operations of the fleets of the Asiatic and North Atlantic squadrons are so well known that it is hardly necessary to speak of them in any detail. Their work was so well done that the power of Spain was swept from the sea, and Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines, which she had misgoverned for centuries, were taken from under her dominion.

But the claims of the administration of the Navy to the approval of the people rest not alone on its war record. The upbuilding of the new Navy has gone steadily forward, and Congress has cooperated with the Department in the desire to materially increase our naval strength.

Since the 4th of March, 1897, Congress has authorized the construction of 49 ships, with a total displacement of 155,484 tons. This includes 6 battle ships of the first class, 3 armored cruisers of the first class, 4 monitors, and 6 protected cruisers. If the present naval bill becomes a law as it passed the House we must add to this formidable list 2 battle ships of the first class, 3 armored cruisers of the first class, and 3 protected cruisers, with a total displacement of 90,000 tons. There have been completed and placed in commission in the same time a total of 32 vessels, with an aggregate displacement of 52,681 tons. It is an unexampled record.

A strong Navy not only adds to our prestige abroad, but makes the rights of our country respected wherever they may exist. The money expended does its part in lending a stimulus in many branches of trade and manufacture and in the employment of labor.

It is difficult to form an intelligent idea of the number of people who are furnished employment by the creation and maintenance of our Navy. One would have to examine the rolls of the great private establishments which make the steel and build the ships, and furnish ammunition and supplies. But some idea of the importance of the navy-yards to the laborers of the country can be formed from the fact that in 1898 over 21,000 men were certified for employment by the labor boards at the various navy-yards. This number, however, is in excess of the number usually employed, as 1898 was the year of the war with Spain. In 1899, on the other hand, over 12,000 men were certified by the boards of labor at the various yards.

To this Administration must also go the credit for the reorganization of the personnel of the Navy. For years the effort had been made to secure legislation to increase the flow of promotion of officers of the line, so that they might reach command rank at a suitable age. But the efforts had borne no fruit until the present Administration took the matter in hand. They succeeded in drawing a bill consolidating the line and the Engineer Corps. This bill met with the approval of the service and of Congress, and became a law on the 3d of March, 1899.

This bill also provided for an increase of over 50 per cent in the number of officers and enlisted men in the Marine Corps, and brought this branch of the service up to a total strength of 211 officers and 6,000 men. The enlisted force of the Navy has also been largely increased during the past three years, the quota now allowed by law being 17,500 men and 2,500 apprentices.

It has been the desire of the Administration that the Navy should grow, not alone in the number of ships, but in all its branches. Probably the most pressing need of the service when Mr. Long took charge of the Department was for additional docking facilities, and Congress, in response to his recommendations, authorized the construction of four stone and concrete docks and one steel floating dock capable of docking vessels of the largest size. (If the present naval bill becomes a law, two other docks, or six in all, will have been provided for.) Coaling stations equipped with modern appliances for the economical and rapid handling of coal have been established or are in process of establishment at Portsmouth, N. H.; Boston, Mass.; New London, Conn.; New York, N. Y.; League Island, Pa.; Port Royal, S. C.; Pensacola, Fla.; Dry Tortugas, Fla., and in San Francisco Bay.

Suitable coaling stations are also in process of erection at Honolulu, H. I.; Pago Pago, Samoan Islands; the island of Guam; at Manila, in the Philippines, and at the naval station, San Juan, Porto Rico. These coaling stations in our new possessions, especially in the Pacific, furnish greatly increased facilities to our naval vessels, and, in the event of war, would prove of inestimable advantage. It has, indeed, been the aim of the Administration to extend our naval power in every direction. The upbuilding of the navy-yard plants has been pursued with great vigor, and the Department has had the hearty cooperation of Congress in this work. The electric plants have been materially increased and modern machinery has been installed wherever the needs of the service demanded.

It is, of course, impossible to enter into the detailed work which has been done in this connection; but it is not too much to say that the efforts of the Administration will result in putting our navy-yards in a condition to meet every demand which may be made upon them. They are capable of making the most extensive repairs to ships of all classes, and with the increased docking facilities which are in process of construction, this branch of the naval establishment will be brought to a point of efficiency where it is in keeping with the fleet in being, and with such increases as may be made in the near future.

The value of the coaling and repair stations established under Secretary Long, especially at outlying points in the Pacific, must constantly increase as commerce with our new possessions grows.

At the beginning of the war with Spain Honolulu was the only port out of the United States in which we possessed coaling facilities. When we recall the great distances in the Pacific, and the fact that under the rules of international law a belligerent ship is permitted to take on board in a neutral port only sufficient coal to enable her to reach her nearest home port, we begin to realize the importance of these provisions for furnishing supplies and making the necessary repairs to our ships of war.

It is to be hoped that the efforts in this direction are but the beginning of a policy under which provision will be made for the maintenance of the fleets of this Government whenever naval operations may occur. May the coming years see this policy amplified and enlarged, so that the ships of war of the United States may find suitable depots of supplies in all quarters of the globe.

OUR NATIONAL FINANCES.

Mr. Speaker, four achievements in the management of the public finances and revenues under the Administration of President McKinley stand out with marked prominence:

First, in point of success, is the Dingley tariff; second, the reform in the currency; third, the war loan of 1898; and fourth, the settlement of the Pacific Railroad indebtedness.

Perhaps never before in the history of this country have so many important fiscal achievements been accomplished in so brief time. With the exception of the Pacific Railroad settlement, these events

bear, to a considerable degree, relationship to each other. Underlying the success of the war loan of 1898 and the reform in the currency was the basis of prosperity established by prompt and effective tariff legislation. The President well understood the necessity for speedy modification in the tariff. Within forty-eight hours after his inauguration he issued a proclamation for an extra session of Congress to assemble March 15, 1897. The brief message sent to Congress when it convened on that day clearly demonstrated the urgent necessity for prompt action. Said the President:

> Congress should promptly correct the existing condition. Ample revenues must be supplied not only for the ordinary expenses of the Government, but for the prompt payment of liberal pensions and the liquidation of the principal and interest of the public debt. In raising revenue, duties should be so levied upon foreign products as to preserve the home market, so far as possible, to our own producers; to revive and increase manufactures; to relieve and encourage agriculture; to increase our domestic and foreign commerce; to aid and develop mining and building; and to render to labor in every field of useful occupation the liberal wages and adequate rewards to which skill and industry are justly entitled. The necessity of the passage of a tariff law which shall provide ample revenue need not be further urged. The imperative demand of the hour is the prompt enactment of such a measure, and to this object I earnestly recommend that Congress shall make every endeavor. Before other business is transacted let us first provide sufficient revenue to faithfully administer the Government without the contracting of further debt or the continued disturbance of our finances.

The House of Representatives promptly responded to the President's message. On the same day in which it was read in the House, the late Mr. Dingley, of Maine, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, introduced the new tariff bill. Such unusual expedition had been made possible only by the untiring work of the members of the Committee on Ways and Means for several months previous.

The bill was passed in the House of Representatives March 31, 1897, less than a month after the inauguration of President McKinley and two weeks after Congress had convened in extra session. It passed the Senate July 7, 1897, with amendments. Two days later its consideration was begun by a conference committee of the two Houses, and it finally passed the House July 19 and the Senate July 24. It became a law on the latter day when the President signed the bill. Thus, within five months (no other tariff law was ever passed in so short a time) after the inauguration of the President a new tariff law was placed on the statute books. Under its beneficent influences the United States has enjoyed a commercial and industrial revival the greatest in its history. The hopes of the President as expressed in his message have been realized; ample revenues were provided for the ordinary expenses of the Government, and in providing them duties were levied upon foreign products so as to preserve the home markets; manufactures have revived and increased; agriculture has been relieved and encouraged; domestic and foreign commerce have been increased; mining and building have been aided and developed, and more liberal wages have been paid to labor.

Under the operation of the Wilson Act, from September 1, 1894, to July 24, 1897, a period of thirty-five months, there was a total deficit of $108,003,243. This deplorable state of the revenues was largely responsible for that lack of confidence which prolonged the hard times inaugurated by the panic of 1893.

The Dingley tariff became a law July 24, 1897. Under its operation ample revenues have been provided, as urged by President McKinley. During the period of thirty-two months the law has been in force, July 24, 1897, to April 1, 1900, the receipts of the Government from all sources, exclusive of Pacific Railroad items, were $1,224,326,608. Deducting from these receipts the Treasury Department's estimate of collections under the War Revenue Act, amounting to $183,708,538, there were net receipts of $1,040,618,070. The expenditures for the same period aggregated $1,366,663,406, and deducting the Treasury Department's estimate of war expenditures of $372,000,000, the net expenditures for the period stand at $994,663,406, leaving for the thirty-two months' operation of the Dingley tariff an excess of net receipts over net expenditures of $45,954,664.

It is proper to compare this surplus under the Dingley law with the deficit of $108,003,243, which was shown at the end of thirty-five months' operation of the Wilson Act.

"In raising revenue," said the President in his message, "duties should be so levied upon foreign products as to preserve the home market, so far as possible, to our own producers." That the home market has been preserved to our own producers is shown by the great reduction in the importation of manufactured articles. In the fiscal year 1896 the imports for consumption of manufactured articles were $328,937,228, and in the fiscal year 1897, all of which elapsed prior to the enactment of the Dingley law, they were $323,324,920. In the fiscal years 1898 and 1899 they averaged about $240,000,000 per year, being in 1898, $227,467,249, and in 1899, $259,801,751. Thus, in manufactured articles the reduction in importations immediately following the enactment of the Dingley law has averaged $75,000,000 per annum, while the amounts consumed by the home market have greatly increased, as is shown by the great increase in the importation of raw material for use of manufacturers, stated in the paragraph which now follows:

The President urged that the new duties be so levied as "to revive and increase manufactures." In the fiscal year 1897 the imports for consumption of articles in a crude condition which enter into the various processes of domestic industry amounted to $207,268,155, and in the three years 1895, 1896, and 1897 averaged less than $200,000,000 annually, while in the calendar year 1899 the imports of this class amounted to $267,493,950, an increase of nearly $70,000,000 over the average for the three years of low tariff, in which many of these articles, notably wool, were upon the free list. At present the importation of manufacturers' materials is running at the rate of $28,000,000 per month, or more than 50 per cent higher than the monthly average in the year prior to the enactment of the Dingley law and to the recommendation above quoted.

The President also urged that the new duties should be so levied as "to relieve and encourage agriculture." That agriculture has been relieved and encouraged is shown by the increased prices for agricultural products, all of which have materially advanced in the home market, and by the large increase in exportation in the products of agriculture, which in the fiscal year 1899 were $100,000,000 greater than in the fiscal year 1897, and in 1898 were $200,000,000 in excess of those of 1897.

The message also recommended that the new duties should be so levied as "to aid and develop mining." That mining has been greatly encouraged is amply shown by the figures relating to the two great mining industries, coal and iron. The coal production of 1899 exceeds 200,000,000 tons, against 179,000,000 in 1897 and 171,000,000 in 1896, and has placed the United States at the head of the world's producers of this article, our product in 1899 being greater than that of any other country of the world. The pig-iron production in 1899 was 13,620,703 tons, against 9,652,680 tons in 1897 and 8,623,127 tons in 1896. In pig iron, as in coal, the United States now holds the first place in the world's production.

And, finally, the President urged that in raising revenue duties should be so levied as "to render to labor in every field of useful occupation the liberal wages and adequate rewards to which skill and industry are justly entitled." That the wages of labor have been greatly increased in every line of industry is evidenced by the frequent reports of increased wages published from time to time. In an address before the Trades League of Philadelphia, January 25, 1898, Hon. Lyman J. Gage, Secretary of the Treasury, reviewed in general the increase in wages which had taken place under the administration of President McKinley, as follows:

> Only a few weeks ago worsted manufacturers in Rhode Island restored the wage scale of 1893 in their mills, thus granting an increase of 20 per cent in the pay of about 25,000 operatives. * * * In the city of Philadelphia numerous woolen mills have restored the wages of 1893, and are so active that it is difficult and sometimes impossible to secure the help required to operate them; and, in contrast to the depression in cotton textiles, woolen manufactures are booming all over the country. * * * Within a few weeks after the November election of 1896, 15,000 men, idle for a long time, were put to work in the window-glass industry. Since then, as the revival has progressed, instances of advances in wage rates and of increases in numbers employed have multiplied. The resumption of work in rolling mills during the summer in Alabama, Maryland, and Ohio gave employment to thousands of men. Indeed, in iron and steel and the industries directly dependent upon the consumption of iron as material I have it upon authority that there is an increase of at least 267,000 men employed over the preceding year. In addition to this large increase in the working forces employed in iron and steel and dependent branches, advances in wages ranging from 10 to 20 per cent have been made, and in some cases much greater, as the result of wages paid on a tonnage basis.
>
> Since the passage of the tariff bill the tin-plate industry has wonderfully revived, and wages in this line have since the summer been increased by rates varying from 8 to 12 per cent. The weekly output of coke at the end of 1897 was more than double what it was at the close of 1896, and in the Connellsville coke works there has been an increase in the number actually engaged of from 10 to 20 per cent. The voluntary advance in wages by the leading companies in the coke industry has benefited thousands of men. The advance in wages of glass workers, determined upon at the close of the year, is so recent that Mr. Bryan must know of it. The pottery industry of Trenton during recent years has been greatly depressed, with many failures, and not half the hands have been employed until recently. Wages have now been advanced more than 12 per cent, and there is a great increase in the number employed in this district, to the extent at this time of probably 5,000 or more. It was made public so recently as last September by an official report of the New York trades union that there was then an increase of 34 per cent in the number of their men employed, compared with the previous year.
>
> Near the close of November last the wage scale of the Missouri Pacific in its shops at Fort Scott was restored to what it was before the reduction of 1893. I have an accurate list of more than 250 mills, factories, and enterprises that have during the last six months resumed work, many of them having been idle since 1896, when the depression became more acute as the result of the agitation for the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, "without the aid or consent of any other nation." Most of them have advanced wages over the old scale. All of them are running full time, most of them double time, and in many fires are now never drawn nor the wheels stopped, three shifts being required to meet the heavy demands. This all indicates a great increase in working forces.

Some recent reports, selected at random, covering various sections of the country, show that the movement toward higher wages has continued. The report of the Michigan Bureau of Labor and Industrial Statistics states that a canvass of the factories in that State shows that in 1,382 factories the number of employees was 24,262 greater than in the year 1898, the average increase in these factories being 17.6 per cent, while the wages paid were found to be higher

than in 1898 and greatly in excess of 1897 and 1896. A canvass of several hundred shops and factories in the State of Ohio shows the number of hands employed in 1899 to be 68 per cent in excess of the number in 1896 and the total monthly pay roll 80 per cent greater than in 1896, the earnings of the workers in the shops and factories of the State of Ohio being estimated at $3,000,000 per month in excess of those received in 1896.

The twenty-first annual report of the bureau of labor statistics (1899) of Missouri shows that "the total amount of wages paid during 1898 (in the State) was $25,627,837, an increase over last year of $3,917,482, and the report, in giving the average wages earned by skilled and unskilled labor of both sexes, states that there is a slight average increase over the previous year."

The thirteenth annual report of the bureau of labor and industrial statistics (1899) of Maine shows that in average annual earnings of employees engaged in manufacturing cotton goods there was from 1890 to 1898 a decrease of $41.59, and during the past year (1899) an increase of $29.09.

CURRENCY REFORM.

The reform in the currency laws is the second great achievement in the administration of public finances under President McKinley. The act approved by the President March 14, 1900, firmly establishes the United States on a gold basis. Confidence in respect to the money standard is now at the highest, and the integrity of all our various forms of money has been declared by law. The uncertainties and misgivings of more than twenty years have been dispelled, and a broad foundation of stability and security laid, upon which may be reared the structure of enduring prosperity.

The task has been a difficult one. It was a problem which required patience and courage in its solution. The fact that three years elapsed before the measure became a law reveals the difficult road over which the workers for the reform movement passed. At the beginning of the first regular session of Congress under the Administration of President McKinley the Secretary of the Treasury submitted a plan the essential features of which are to be found in the act of March 14, 1900.

From December, 1897, until the bill became a law no opportunity was lost to advance the cause of currency reform. Notwithstanding an adverse majority in the Senate, the Committee on Banking and Currency in the House considered several measures. The work thus done in committee, while resulting in nothing definite, was yet of great value, for the long and trying discussion served to bring about a better understanding of the intricate questions to be settled. In anticipation of a Republican Senate and House in the Fifty-sixth Congress caucus committees were organized for the purpose of preparing, during the summer months of 1899, such a bill as would receive the support of the sound-money majority in both Houses. When the first session of the Fifty-sixth Congress was convened the first bill introduced was that agreed upon by the House caucus committee. It took its place upon the Calendar as House bill No. 1. With all reasonable expedition the measure was then considered by both branches of the National Legislature, and so became a law March 14, 1900.

This currency law does something more than remove all doubt concerning the standard of value. It directs that all forms of money issued or coined by the United States shall be maintained at a parity of value with this standard, and it is made the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to maintain such parity. A reserve fund of $150,000,000 in gold coin and bullion is set apart in the Treasury for the redemption of United States notes and Treasury notes of 1890, instead of $100,000,000, formerly recognized as the gold reserve. Such fund is required to be used for redemption purposes only. Ample provision is made for restoring the reserve fund in case it should fall below the $150,000,000 required to be maintained.

The act also contains provisions which give greater liberty to the organization of national banks. Under the old law no national bank could be organized with a capital less than $50,000. Under the new law the minimum capital required for organization is $25,000 in places the population of which does not exceed 3,000 inhabitants. The object of this provision is to extend better banking facilities to those smaller communities heretofore denied the privilege of organizing national banks. At the same time, the law contains a provision authorizing the banks to issue their circulating notes to the par of the United States bonds deposited as security, instead of only 90 per cent, as formerly. This illiberal requirement either resulted in meager profits to national banks issuing circulating notes, or, as was the case in some localities, in actual losses, the effect of which was to restrict the issuing of circulating notes. Such restriction was most severely felt in those communities where currency wants were greatest. Under the operation of the new law, from March 14 to April 30, 244 applications to organize national banks have been approved by the Comptroller of the Currency. The aggregate capital of these banks is $10,380,000. The total of national bank note circulation has been increased by the sum of $29,692,363.

Perhaps the most notable feature of the new currency law is that which relates to the refunding of the national debt. The 5 percents of 1904, the 4 percents of 1907, and the 3 percents of 1908, the principal of which aggregates $839,146,400, are authorized to be refunded into 2 per cent bonds, payable at the pleasure of the United States after thirty years from the date of their issue, and payable, principal and interest, in gold coin of the present standard value. The act contains a provision that the new 2 per cent bonds to be issued in exchange for the old threes, fours, and fives shall not be issued at less than par. The Secretary of the Treasury was authorized to conduct the refunding operations so that the old threes, fours, and fives should be received in exchange for the 2 percents on a basis of 2½ per cent. May 1, 1900, almost one-third of the outstanding threes, fours, and fives had been converted into 2 percents of the new issue, thus practically securing the success of the refunding plan. No other nation of the earth can boast of such an achievement as is the exchange of these old, high-rate interest bonds for bonds issued upon so low a basis as 2 per cent. Hitherto Great Britain has been regarded as the financial Gibraltar of the world, but while British consols bearing interest at the rate of 2¾ per cent per annum were selling 2 points below par, the United States was able to float a 2 per cent bond at par with ease. Such fact speaks volumes for the present financial strength of the United States. To float a 2 per cent bond at par of this kind means that the integrity of the dollar has been recognized in the law of the land, and there is faith in the honesty of our intentions and purposes for the future.

But faith in the public credit not alone supports the success of the refunding operations; that success is supplemented by the present national banking system, and without which it is doubtful if a 2 per cent bond could ever have been floated in this country. National banks are required to deposit bonds of the United States as security for circulating notes. Such bonds constitute an essential element of the national banking system. The competition which results from the necessities of the banks in this respect is, perhaps, the most potent reason why the United States can dispose of its bonds bearing so low a rate of interest.

The operations of the refunding provisions of the law from March 14 to May 1, 1900, are set forth in the following table:

	Amount refunded.	Saving in interest.	Premium paid.	Net saving.
Threes of 1908	$60,989,200	$5,080,415	$3,465,587	$1,614,828
Fours of 1907	158,791,700	22,998,909	18,522,306	4,476,603
Fives of 1904	40,239,850	4,619,841	4,046,878	572,963
Total	260,020,750	32,699,225	26,034,771	6,664,454

The "net saving" shown above represents the difference between the amount of interest the Government will pay upon the bonds refunded to the date of their respective maturities and the amount of interest the Government would have been obliged to pay had not the bonds above described been thus refunded.

It has been estimated that, should the total amount of bonds subject to the refunding provisions of the law be offered in exchange for the new 2 percents, the net savings of the Government will be in the neighborhood of $22,000,000. As noted, the net saving in refunding $260,020,750 to May 1, 1900, was $6,664,454.

FINANCES OF THE SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR.

The war with Spain served to demonstrate something more than the military and naval strength of the United States; it brought to light the vast resources in wealth of this country. In a general way it had been understood that the United States was a nation of great wealth, perhaps richer than any other country; but it needed the necessities of war to give an exhibition of our real financial strength. While it was recognized in the spring of 1898 that the Dingley tariff, under normal conditions, would produce ample revenues for the ordinary requirements of the Government, it was apparent that means must be taken at once to provide for the heavy war expenditures. April 25, 1898, two days after the declaration of war, a bill to provide additional revenues was introduced in the House of Representatives. It passed that body April 29 and the Senate June 4. The report of the conference committee was agreed to in the House June 9 and the Senate June 10. The bill became a law June 13, 1898, when it received the signature of the President. The necessities of the hour required that the Treasury should be supplied immediately with funds. The task was to raise a large sum, available for immediate use, in such a manner as to avoid injury to the rapidly reviving business of the country. The act recognized a true principle in public finance by making provision to borrow at once a sum sufficient to provide for war expenses, while at the same time additional taxes were levied in order that the loan might be supported by an increase in revenue. No better explanation of the tax features of the bill has been given than that made by the late Hon. Nelson Dingley on the occasion of its introduction in theHouse, as follows:

They [the Committee on Ways and Means] naturally have had recourse to the legislation of the period of the civil war, when so large an amount had to be

raised, and they have found, after a careful consideration of the question of taxation, that on the whole it is better at the present time, and we trust that that may be all that may be necessary, that about $100,000,000 additional revenue should be raised, and that entirely through internal-revenue legislation. Hence the war-revenue bill which has been reported provides for internal-revenue taxes exclusively. These taxes have been selected, first, because we have the machinery for the collection of them now, and they can be collected with but slight additions to the force and with but slight increase of expense. We have selected them also because they were a source of revenue successfully seized upon during the civil war, and because they are taxes either upon articles of voluntary consumption or upon objects where the tax will be met by those who are ordinarily able to pay them; and we have refrained from putting a tax in a direction where it would be purely upon consumption, unless the consumption were an article of voluntary consumption, so that the consumer might regulate his own tax, following what is the accepted rule of taxation in all countries, with a view of imposing the least burden and disturbing the business of the country as little as possible.

The act authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to borrow $400,000,000, or as much thereof as might be necessary, to defray the expenses of the war. Under this authority it was decided to borrow $200,000,000. The success which attended the floating of this loan is a memorable one. It was a popular loan in every sense of the word. The act itself directed that "the bonds authorized by this section shall be first offered at par as a popular loan under such regulations, prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, as will give opportunity to the citizens of the United States to participate in subscriptions to the loan, and in allotting said bonds the several subscriptions of individuals shall be first accepted, and the subscriptions for the lowest amounts shall be first allotted." The Secretary of the Treasury utilized every agency at his command to comply with this direction of Congress. All State and national banks were requested to cooperate with the Department; the express companies tendered their services free of cost in the handling of subscriptions; the Postmaster-General directed that all money-order post-offices be charged with the duty of receiving the orders of subscribers, and all the newspapers of the United States were invited to disseminate information concerning the loan. All these great agencies combined to place before the people the fullest information that could be given.

For a period of thirty-one days subscriptions were received, at the end of which time it was found that the total of subscriptions aggregated only a little under $1,400,000,000, or almost seven times the amount of bonds offered to the public. This was a remarkable demonstration in favor of the public credit, and it showed to other nations the tremendous resources which the people of the United States were able to command almost at a moment's notice. The success of the war loan had an effect, both at home and abroad, scarcely less important than were the naval victories at Manila and Santiago. Doubtless the purpose of the people thus expressed to give abundant support to the war was one of the factors which brought about its speedy termination.

The withdrawal of so large a sum as $200,000,000 from active employment in commerce and industry without deranging any of the vast business interests of the country was a feat successfully accomplished. By the end of the calendar year 1898 almost every dollar of this great sum had been paid into the Treasury, yet under the plan adopted by the Secretary of the Treasury such payment was made without occasioning the slightest injury to business. In fact, the entire management of the war finances was conducted with such skill that not for a moment was there any interruption to the returning tide of prosperity. Industrial and commercial expansion continued as if in fact there had been no war, and at its close the business of the country was greater in volume than at the beginning, and the national credit, both at home and abroad, had been raised to the highest point in our history. It may be said with truth that this increased faith in the public credit laid the foundation for the achievement of that currency reform which was accomplished by the act of March 14, 1900, fixing the standard of value and providing for the refunding of the national debt at the lowest rate of interest on public securities ever effected in this or any other country.

The following table, compiled in the office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, exhibits the collections by items under the war-revenue act from the date of its passage to April 1, 1900:

Statement showing the amount of internal revenue collected under the war-revenue act from June 13, 1898, to March 31, 1900.

Objects of taxation.	Amount collected.
Cigars	$5,202,691.00
Cigarettes	2,442,020.53
Snuff	1,641,281.51
Tobacco, chewing and smoking	27,070,113.79
Dealers in leaf tobacco	127,170.79
Dealers in manufactured tobacco	30,637.50
Manufacturers of tobacco	39,183.57
Manufacturers of cigars	446,724.89
Miscellaneous collections relating to tobacco	773,175.30
Fermented liquors	56,936,631.83
Additional collections on fermented liquors stored in warehouse	197,936.13
Mixed flour	14,154.75

Statement showing the amount of internal revenue collected, etc.—Continued.

Objects of taxation.	Amount collected.
Bankers, capital not exceeding $25,000	$712,456.19
Bankers, capital exceeding $25,000, for each additional $1,000 in excess of $25,000	6,066,155.02
Billiard rooms	583,443.08
Brokers, stocks, bonds, etc	559,356.13
Brokers, commercial	277,016.66
Brokers, custom-house	11,860.52
Brokers, pawn	71,756.33
Bowling alleys	80,626.46
Circuses	28,929.11
Exhibitions not otherwise provided for	148,759.50
Theaters, museums, and concert halls	97,729.39
Legacies	2,896,396.81
Schedule A	66,781,776.80
Schedule B	8,693,881.17
Excise tax on gross receipts	1,463,547.69
Total	183,405,292.45

NOTE.—The above statement embraces all the items it is practicable to specify.

THE PACIFIC RAILROAD SETTLEMENTS.

The settlement of the Pacific Railroad indebtedness is also to be ranked as one of the great achievements of President McKinley's Administration. This indebtedness had for years been a subject of fruitless endeavor; all efforts, either by Congress or the Executive Departments, prior to 1897, were of little avail in protecting the Government's interests in these roads, in fact there were grave doubts whether the Government would succeed in being reimbursed, even in part, the vast sum expended by the United States in aid of their construction.

The discovery of gold in California, the rapid increase in wealth and population in the territory west of the Rocky Mountains, and a movement on the part of the older States to establish closer connections during the civil war with those outlying communities, led Congress in 1862 to authorize the construction of a railroad to the Pacific Ocean. The direct benefit to be derived by the Government was the use of the same for postal, military, and other purposes. The act of July 1, 1862, chartering the Union Pacific Railroad Company, was not sufficiently liberal, and therefore nothing was accomplished under its provisions. The Union Pacific Company was organized as provided by the act, but no one was found who would venture money in the construction of the road.

Congress was impressed with the urgent necessity of completing such a road to the Pacific Ocean, and with the immense economic advantages which would follow the construction of a transcontinental line. It, therefore, on July 2, 1864, amended the act of 1862, by making provisions more favorable to the companies. The act of 1862 provided that the Government should have a first mortgage on the property of the company, while the act of 1864 provided substantially that for the bonds the Government should issue in aid of the construction of the road it should take a second mortgage. Two companies were organized under the provisions of the act of 1864, and entered energetically upon the work of construction. The road was built from the California end eastward by the Central Pacific Railroad Company, and from the Missouri River westward to the common meeting point at Ogden by the Union Pacific Company.

Their lines were united May 10, 1869, anticipating by more than seven years the time required by Congress therefor. The Union Pacific Company constructed 1,034 miles and the Central Pacific 743 miles. The road of the latter company was subsequently extended 140 miles, and the lines of the two companies from the Missouri River to San Francisco represented a mileage of 1,917 miles.

In aid of these roads and connecting branches the United States issued bonds to the amount of $64,623,512. The United States failing to be reimbursed for the interest paid on these bonds, it became necessary, in protection of the interests of the Government, to pass the act of May 7, 1878, known as the "Thurman Act." This act provided that the whole amount of compensation which might, from time to time, be due to the several railroad companies for services rendered the Government should be retained by the Government, one-half thereof to be applied to the liquidation of the interest paid and to be paid by the United States upon the bonds issued to each of the companies, the other half to be turned into a sinking fund.

But it soon became apparent that with the approaching maturity of bonds issued in aid of the roads the provisions of the "Thurman Act" were not adequate to the protection of the Government's interests. Efforts in and out of Congress were persistently made looking to a settlement of this vast indebtedness, but without success. So recently as the Fifty-fourth Congress an effort was made to pass a bill to refund the debts of the Pacific Railroad companies, but such a bill was defeated in the House by a vote of 167 nays and 102 yeas.

On January 12, 1897, the day following the defeat of the funding bill, the Attorney-General was informed by the President that default had occured in the payment of the Union Pacific and the Kansas Pacific indebtedness to the Government, and he was directed to make such arrangements as were possible to secure, as far as practicable, the payment of their indebtedness. An agreement was entered into between the Government and the reorganization committee of the Union Pacific Railroad by which the committee guaranteed, should the Government undertake to enforce its lien by sale, a minimum bid for the Union and Kansas Pacific lines that would produce to the Government over and above any prior liens and charges upon the railroads and sinking fund the net sum of $45,754,059.99. In performance of this agreement the bid was guaranteed by a deposit of $4,500,000.

Pursuant to the agreement with the reorganization committee, bills were filed in the United States circuit courts for the foreclosure of the Government lien. The decrees entered for the sale of the roads not being satisfactory to the Government, the propriety of an appeal was considered and papers were prepared for this purpose. At this juncture the reorganization committee came forward with an offer to increase its bid, making the total $50,000,000 instead of $45,754,059.99.

Subsequently, to settle all points in dispute, the reorganization committee decided to abandon this second bid, and to increase the minimum amount to be offered for the property to the sum of $58,448,223.75, being the total amount due the Government on account of the Union Pacific road, as stated by the Secretary of the Treasury, including the sum of $4,549,368.26 cash in the sinking fund. Such an amount was bid by the reorganization committee on November 1, 1897, and the sale was confirmed by the court on November 6, 1897. After the confirmation of the sale the whole amount was paid into the Treasury of the United States in convenient installments, thus relieving the Government from any loss whatever upon its claim for principal and interest due upon its subsidy, and bringing to a final and most satisfactory termination a long-standing and troublesome question.

In the case of the Kansas Pacific indebtedness, by decree of the court an upset price on the sale of the property was fixed at a sum which would yield to the Government $2,500,000. The reorganization committee in conference with the Government declared its purpose of making no higher bid than that fixed by the decree of court, so that the Government was confronted with the danger of receiving for its total lien upon this line, amounting to nearly $13,000,000, principal and interest, only the sum of $2,500,000.

Believing the interests of the Government required that an effort should be made to obtain a larger sum, and the Government having the right to redeem the incumbrances upon the property which were prior to the lien of the Government subsidy, by paying the sums lawfully due in respect thereof out of the Treasury of the United States, so that the United States should thereupon become subrogated to all rights and securities theretofore pertaining to the liens and mortgages in respect of which such payments should be made, the President, on February 8, 1898, authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to pay out of the Treasury, to the person or persons lawfully entitled to receive the same, the amounts lawfully due upon the prior mortgages upon the eastern and middle divisions of said road.

Steps were taken by the Government looking to the fulfillment of this direction, whereupon the reorganization committee offered to bid at the sale for said road a sum which would realize to the Government the whole amount of the principal of the debt, $6,303,000. It was believed that no better price than this could be obtained at a later date if the sale should be postponed, and it was deemed best to permit the sale to proceed upon the guaranty of a minimum bid which would realize to the Government the whole principal of its debt. The sale thereupon took place, and the property was purchased by the reorganization committee. The sum yielded to the Government was $6,303,000. It will thus be perceived that the Government secured an advance of $3,803,000 on account of its lien over and above the sum which the court had fixed as the upset price, and which the reorganization committee had declared was the maximum which they were willing to pay for the property.

The result of these proceedings against the Union Pacific system embracing the main line and the Kansas Pacific line, is that the Government has received on account of its subsidy claim the sum of $64,751,223.75, which is an increase of $18,997,163.76 over the sum which the reorganization committee first agreed to bid for the joint property, leaving due the sum of $6,588,900.19 interest on the Kansas Pacific subsidy. The prosecution of a claim for this amount against the receivers of the Union Pacific Company in 1898 resulted in securing to the Government the further sum of $821,897.70.

The indebtedness of the Central Pacific Railroad Company to the Government became due January 1, 1898, when default in payment was made by the company. The deficiency appropriation act of July 7, 1898, appointed the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Attorney-General a commission with full power to settle the indebtedness to the Government growing out of the issue of bonds to aid in the construction of the Central Pacific and Western Pacific roads upon such terms and in such manner as might be agreed upon by them, or by a majority of them, and the owners of said railroads, subject to the approval of the President.

An agreement for the settlement of this indebtedness was entered into between the said commissioners with the railroad companies on February 1, 1899. At that date the amount due the United States for principal and interest upon its subsidy liens upon the Central Pacific and Western Pacific railroads was $58,812,715.48, more than one-half of which was accrued interest upon the principal debt.

The agreement for settlement provided for the funding of this amount into twenty promissory notes bearing date February 1, 1899, payable, respectively, on or before the expiration of each successive six months for ten years, each note being for the sum of $2,940,635.78, or one-twentieth of the total amount due, the notes to bear interest at the rate of 3 per cent per annum, payable semi-annually, and having a condition attached to the effect that if default be made either in the payment of principal or interest of either of said notes or any part thereof, then all of the said notes outstanding, principal and interest, to immediately become due and payable notwithstanding any other stipulation of the agreement of settlement.

It was further agreed that the payment of principal and interest of the notes should be secured by the deposit with the United States Treasury of $57,820,000 face value of first refunding mortgage 4 per cent gold bonds, to be thereafter issued by the Central Pacific or its successor having charge of the railroads then owned by said company, such bonds to be part of an issue of not exceeding $100,000,000 in all, and to be secured by mortgage upon all railroads, equipments, and terminals owned by said Central Pacific Railroad Company, such mortgage to be a first lien upon such property, or to be secured by the deposit as collateral of certain percentages of the outstanding bonds upon such property or on the different divisional parts thereof.

The notes provided for by this agreement were duly executed and delivered to the Treasurer of the United States in conformity with the terms of the agreement. In pursuance of another provision of the agreement, the four earliest maturing notes were purchased by Speyer & Co., March 10, 1899, and the proceeds, amounting to $11,762,543.12, and accrued interest to the date of payment, $35,771.02—in all, $11,798,314.14—were received and covered into the Treasury March 27, 1899, as part payment of the indebtedness of the Central Pacific and Western Pacific Railroad companies. The properties of the various companies comprising the Central Pacific system were subsequently conveyed to a new corporation called the Central Pacific Railway Company, which latter company executed the mortgage and bonds provided for by the agreement of settlement.

On October 7, 1899, bonds were delivered to the Treasury Department by the Central Pacific Railway Company to secure the outstanding notes held by the Treasury in conformity to the terms of the agreement of settlement. The United States therefore holds the notes of the Central Pacific Railroad Company, guaranteed by the Southern Pacific Railroad Company, to the amount of $47,050,172.36, bearing interest payable semiannually at the rate of 3 per cent per annum, and secured by the deposit of an equal amount of first-mortgage bonds of the Pacific Railway Company, thus providing, beyond doubt or peradventure, for the sure and gradual payment of the whole of this subsidy debt, and providing in the meantime for the payment of interest at the rate of 3 per cent upon the unpaid balances. The United States, through the settlement agreement thus entered into, will be reimbursed the full amount of the principal and interest of the Central Pacific and Western Pacific debt, aggregating $58,812,715.48.

The amounts now remaining due the United States (March 1, 1900) from Pacific railroads on account of bonds issued in aid of their construction is shown in the following statement:

Name of road.	Principal.	Interest.	Total.
Central Branch Union Pacific	$1,600,000	$2,152,359.54	$3,752,359.54
Sioux City and Pacific	1,628,320	2,578,677.68	4,206,997.68
Total	3,228,320	4,731,037.22	7,959,357.22

Efforts are now pending looking to the collection of this indebtedness.

So that it appears out of an indebtedness of about $130,000,000, more than one-half of which consists of accrued interest, the Government has realized in cash or its equivalent the sum of $124,421,670.95 within a period of less than two years.

No other Administration in the history of the United States has ever so quickly, so thoroughly, and so satisfactorily enforced the

settlement of large claims held by the Government against business corporations, nor has any similar settlement ever previously been made by the Government to such good financial advantage. The claims were due, the President insisted upon their collection, and this was done in a prompt and business-like manner.

THE GROWTH OF GOLD PRODUCTION—MORE GOLD PRODUCED SINCE MR. BRYAN WAS BORN THAN IN THE FOUR PRECEDING CENTURIES—TWICE AS MUCH GOLD MINED SINCE 1850 AS IN THREE HUNDRED AND FIFTY YEARS PRIOR TO THAT DATE.

Mr. Speaker, the currency question was so thoroughly discussed in 1896 and the assertions of the adherents of silver as a standard money metal have been so thoroughly disproven by the events since that date that a detailed discussion of the question seems now unnecessary. It is not improper, however, to call attention to some great facts which account in some degree, at least, for the course of the great nations in one by one abandoning the double, fluctuating standard and adopting the single and now almost universal standard—gold. The general movement among nations for the adoption of the single gold standard began about 1870 (except in the case of England, which took this action in 1816), and since that time all the nations of the world, excepting Mexico, China, Korea, Siam, Persia, and some of the smaller republics of Central and South America, have adopted the single gold standard. Recent statements indicate that China is pushing for the introduction of the gold standard in her customs service, which, if accomplished, will doubtless be the initial step toward similar action with reference to the currency of that country. The consular statements recently published indicate that Siam is preparing to adopt the single gold standard. Even in the short four years since the campaign of 1896 the gold standard has been adopted in Japan, with a population of 40,000,000; Russia, with a population of 125,000,000; India, with a population of 300,000,000, and several of the Central and South American republics.

The causes which have led to this almost universal change in the standard of currency in a comparatively short time are, at least, suggested by a study of the following table showing, the production of gold in the world, by half centuries and by decades, since 1492, the date of the discovery of America. The tables usually presented, showing the production of gold during that period, are misleading, in the fact that in the period prior to 1850, which was the beginning of an enormous increase in gold production, the statements cover decennial periods, while in the later years the statements are usually made in quinquennial and annual periods, and a casual examination of the table fails to indicate the enormous growth in production in the last half century, in which the periodical statements cover a less number of years than those exhibiting the earlier period. In the table which follows, the production in each decade from 1492 to 1900 is shown; and an examination of the column showing the actual production by decades will in this way be more readily noted.

In the three hundred and fifty-seven years prior to 1850 the gold production of the world averaged less than $10,000,000 per annum; in the fifty years since 1850 the gold production of the world has averaged $135,000,000 per annum, and in the year 1899 was $315,000,000. In the four closing years of the nineteenth century the gold production will be greater than that of the entire first half of the century. In the single year 1899 the gold production was as great as that of the first thirty-three years of the century.

This enormous increase in the production of gold as compared with that of previous centuries began with the discovery of gold in California in 1847, followed by similar discoveries in Australia in 1853, then by later discoveries in Colorado a few years later, then by the enormous discoveries in South Africa, which have proved the greatest gold-producing mines ever known, and within the past three years the great discoveries in Alaska; and all these have been supplemented and their results multiplied meantime by the development of new means of extraction, through which mines formerly abandoned as worthless again became valuable. These wonderful discoveries and developments account for the fact that the gold production of the world in the last fifty years has been more than twice as great as that of the preceding three hundred and fifty years.

As a consequence, the gold in existence to-day, accepting the statistics of such eminent statisticians as Tooke, Newmarch, and Mulhall, and adding to these the later statements of the Director of the Mint, is more than three times as great as in 1850. During that time the population has increased 50 per cent, being, according to equally eminent statisticians, 1,075,000,000 in 1850 and 1,500,000,000 at the present time. This would give twice as much gold for each person to-day as in 1850. In addition to this, however, Mulhall shows that two-thirds of the gold of the world to-day is coined and used as money, while in 1850 only one-third of the gold was coined. This again doubles the amount of gold money, making, therefore, more than four times as much gold currency for each individual in the world to-day as in 1850.

Of the world's silver, according to the same authority (Mulhall), 40 per cent was coined in 1850 and 53 per cent in 1890.

Gold, unlike most commodities produced, is for the most part retained permanently—not eaten, or worn out, or destroyed—and each year's addition from the mines thus increases the world's permanent stock of the money metal, excepting the small proportion which is used in the arts, the proportion thus used averaging perhaps 15 to 20 per cent of the world's product. Keeping this in mind, it will be seen that the result of the last half century of gold production in the total amount mined is more than twice as great as that in three hundred and fifty years preceding, has enormously increased the world's permanent stock of this accepted money metal, and seems of itself to offer an important, if not a complete, explanation of the fact that during that half century in which the product has so greatly increased practically all the nations of the world have abandoned the double standard and adopted this rapidly increasing and generally accepted measure of value.

A further study of the table shows that there has been also an enormous increase in the production of silver during the same period, the total of the last fifty years being, in round numbers, $5,000,000,000, against $6,000,000,000 in the three hundred and fifty years preceding. That this silver has also gone largely into use as a money metal and that the amount of silver money in circulation as a full circulating medium has greatly increased is shown by a table attached, compiled from the records of the United States Mint and presented by Hon. E. J. Hill, of Connecticut, in the House of Representatives in the discussion of the currency bill of 1900.

Stocks of money in thirteen principal countries of the world in 1873 and 1899.

Countries.	Stock of gold.		Stock of silver.		Uncovered paper.		Per capita.							
							Gold.		Silver.		Paper.		Total.	
	1873.	1899.	1873.	1899.	1873.	1899.	1873.	1899.	1873.	1899.	1873.	1899.	1873.	1899.
United States	$125,000,000	$945,300,000	$6,150,000	$639,000,000	$749,445,000	$329,700,000	$3.24	$12.56	$0.15	$8.48	$17.97	$4.38	$21.36	$25.42
Great Britain	160,000,000	462,300,000	95,000,000	111,900,000	59,300,000	111,600,000	5.03	11.50	2.99	2.78	1.88	2.77	9.90	17.05
France	450,000,000	810,600,000	500,000,000	420,100,000	385,300,000	161,100,000	12.47	21.05	13.85	10.92	10.67	4.18	36.99	36.15
Germany	160,200,000	672,800,000	206,235,000	208,200,000	90,800,000	156,700,000	3.91	12.86	7.47	3.98	2.21	3.00	13.59	19.84
Russia	149,100,000	740,400,000	18,600,000	81,900,000	618,400,000	.....	1.81	6.69	.23	.68	7.52	.....	9.56	6.32
Italy	20,000,000	98,000,000	23,000,000	43,900,000	87,800,000	174,900,000	.75	3.09	.86	1.38	3.27	5.52	4.88	9.99
Belgium	25,000,000	30,000,000	15,000,000	45,000,000	35,100,000	82,500,000	4.81	4.54	2.88	6.82	6.75	12.50	14.44	23.86
Netherlands	12,000,000	80,200,000	37,300,000	56,400,000	15,300,000	47,200,000	3.08	6.04	9.56	11.28	3.92	9.44	16.56	26.76
Austria-Hungary	35,000,000	221,400,000	40,000,000	147,300,000	265,800,000	103,000,000	.93	4.82	1.11	3.21	7.40	2.24	9.49	10.27
Australasia	50,000,000	132,100,000	8,000,000	7,000,000	.....	22,500,000	19.22	25.90	1.15	1.37	.....	4.41	20.38	31.68
Denmark	4,100,000	16,900,000	7,500,000	5,400,000	6,500,000	5,900,000	2.22	7.35	4.16	2.35	3.61	2.56	10.05	12.26
Sweden	1,800,000	13,000,000	4,300,000	6,500,000	6,000,000	29,500,000	.41	2.60	.98	1.30	1.36	5.90	2.75	9.80
Norway	7,600,000	8,600,000	1,600,000	2,300,000	2,300,000	5,100,000	4.22	4.10	.89	1.09	1.28	2.43	6.39	7.62
Total	1,209,800,000	4,182,100,000	1,057,685,000	1,774,900,000	2,322,545,000	1,229,700,000	3.89	9.50	3.25	4.03	7.36	2.79	14.54	16.32

Net monetary increase	$2,596,700,000
Increase of gold	2,972,300,000
Increase of silver	717,200,000

The arguments made in 1896 that there could be no sufficient addition to the currency of the United States without the free coinage of silver, and the assertion of Mr. Bryan that the Republican party had made no provision for the necessary increase of millions of currency per annum which Secretary Sherman had asserted would be necessary to correspond with the increasing population, have been more than answered by the events since that time. When Mr. Bryan was making these assertions the amount of gold and gold certificates in circulation in the United States was $498,449,242 (July 1, 1896), and on May 1, 1900, was $814,063,155; the total money in circulation on July 1, 1896, was $1,509,725,200, and on May 1, 1900, $2,060,525,463; and the money in circulation per capita, July 1,

1896, $21.15; May 1, 1900, $26.58. Thus the per capita of money in circulation has increased 25 per cent; the total money in circulation 33 per cent, and the gold in circulation 62 per cent since the supporters of the silver theory were telling the country that the only method of increasing the currency of the country and bringing about prosperity was by the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. The following table shows the amount of money in circulation at the date of Mr. Bryan's nomination and at the beginning of each month since that date:

Money in circulation in the United States on the first day of each month from July 1, 1896, to May 1, 1900.

[From official reports of the Treasury Department.]

Date.	Gold coin and gold certificates in circulation.	Total money in circulation.	Money in circulation per capita.
1896.			
July	$498,449,242	$1,509,725,209	$21.15
August	484,587,423	1,514,903,142	21.18
September	502,863,608	1,539,169,634	21.48
October	517,508,129	1,582,302,189	22.05
November	564,588,288	1,627,065,614	22.63
December	554,746,631	1,646,444,746	22.86
1897.			
January	555,630,058	1,650,223,400	22.87
February	558,054,758	1,665,977,688	23.05
March	553,860,515	1,675,694,963	23.14
April	554,582,096	1,669,000,694	23.01
May	554,743,505	1,666,560,383	22.98
June	557,609,702	1,659,733,895	22.80
July	556,432,594	1,646,028,246	12.57
August	556,301,181	1,646,471,139	22.53
September	558,866,352	1,665,680,098	22.76
October	564,997,312	1,678,840,538	22.89
November	576,088,062	1,706,732,904	23.23
December	581,220,157	1,721,084,537	23.39
1898.			
January	584,126,049	1,721,100,640	23.34
February	588,079,683	1,729,991,228	23.42
March	590,325,671	1,726,376,659	23.33
April	618,448,941	1,756,058,645	23.69
May	652,990,509	1,806,761,442	24.33
June	685,456,090	1,839,898,256	24.73
July	696,780,519	1,843,435,749	24.74
August	680,939,733	1,809,198,344	24.23
September	666,166,175	1,792,086,545	23.96
October	658,043,721	1,816,590,392	24.24
November	685,185,636	1,866,575,782	24.87
December	694,207,162	1,886,879,504	25.09
1899.			
January	702,996,888	1,897,301,412	25.19
February	730,027,389	1,918,260,567	25.42
March	735,272,108	1,928,842,612	25.51
April	727,748,591	1,927,846,942	25.45
May	733,922,471	1,933,867,892	25.49
June	757,068,366	1,955,501,009	25.73
July	734,716,728	1,932,484,239	25.38
August	732,850,173	1,931,117,204	25.31
September	741,022,181	1,942,131,141	25.41
October	745,234,744	1,948,703,186	25.45
November	762,244,252	1,963,716,148	25.60
December	778,388,803	1,978,528,733	25.85
1900.			
January	779,100,627	1,980,398,170	25.73
February	801,330,065	2,008,149,355	25.98
March	793,509,830	2,002,931,791	25.93
April	785,845,649	2,021,274,506	26.12
May	814,063,153	2,060,525,463	26.58

ENORMOUS INCREASE IN THE WORLD'S GOLD PRODUCTION—TWICE AS MUCH PRODUCED SINCE 1850 AS WAS PRODUCED IN THREE HUNDRED AND FIFTY YEARS PRIOR TO THAT DATE.

The following statement showing the rapid increase in gold production, prepared by the chief of the Bureau of Statistics, Mr. O. P. Austin, shows that more gold has been produced since 1850 than in three hundred and fifty years prior to that time.

We have scarcely realized, it seems to me, the relative increase in gold production during the time in which the world has generally adopted it as the standard—namely, the half century 1850–1899.

The active gold production of the world began about the middle of the present century, and has since that time increased by leaps and bounds. And while the marvelous growth of production was in progress, the nations of the world, one by one, but in quick succession, adopted as their standard the metal generally accepted by the world as such, and which they found now becoming so plentiful that they could rely upon obtaining a sufficiency to serve as a basis for and standard of their circulating medium. The great gold production of California, which began in 1848, was quickly followed by the discoveries in Australia, then those of Colorado, then those of South Africa, then the Klondike and Cape Nome, and as a consequence the half century just ended has made a record almost past belief.

Why is the whole world abandoning silver as a standard money metal and adopting gold as the basis of its currency?

Many answers have been offered to this question, but it seems to me that a partial if not a complete explanation is found in the following statement of gold production of the world by half-century periods since 1492:

World's production of gold, 1492 to 1899, by fifty-year periods.

Period.	Coining value.
1492–1550	$256,092,000
1551–1600	245,350,000
1601–1650	281,840,000
1651–1700	324,440,000
1701–1750	587,580,000
1751–1800	675,240,000
1801–1850	787,460,000
1851–1899	6,665,632,000
Total	9,823,634,000

Look carefully at the table, which states the gold product by half-century periods, and you will see the enormous, the actually startling, increase in production in the half century just closing. One might easily believe that the production of the last fifty years was double or treble that of the preceding half century, or even a full century. But who would have said, without a close examination of the subject, that the last fifty years have produced twice as much gold as was produced in the three hundred and fifty years prior to that time? Yet it is a fact, if we are to accept the figures of Soetbeer for the earlier period and our own Mint Bureau for the later years. In adopting Soetbeer's figures to my attempt to show the production of gold by decades, in my second table I have found it necessary to divide his twenty-year periods, but in so doing have adopted the annual average which accompanies the tables usually published.

I have made no reference to the increased production of silver. Of course it has been great, though an examination of the table which follows suggests that its increase may have been given undue weight in seeking a cause for the monetary events of the past half century.

Gold and silver production of the world by fifty-year periods, 1492 to 1899.

Period.	Gold.	Silver.
1492–1550	$256,092,000	$222,400,000
1551–1600	245,350,000	726,780,000
1601–1650	281,840,000	831,060,000
1651–1700	324,440,000	716,660,000
1701–1750	587,580,000	875,720,000
1751–1800	675,240,000	1,496,080,000
1801–1850	787,460,000	1,360,240,000
1851–1899	6,665,632,000	4,958,162,000
Total	9,823,634,000	11,186,102,000

World's production of gold, 1492 to 1899, by decennial periods.

Period.	Production.	Period.	Production.
1492–1500	$30,840,000	1711–1720	$85,200,000
1501–1510	38,550,000	1721–1730	126,810,000
1511–1520	38,550,000	1731–1740	126,810,000
1521–1530	47,590,000	1741–1750	163,560,000
1531–1540	47,590,000	1751–1760	163,560,000
1541–1550	52,972,000	1761–1770	137,610,000
1551–1560	56,560,000	1771–1780	137,610,000
1561–1570	45,460,000	1781–1790	118,230,000
1571–1580	46,460,000	1791–1800	118,230,000
1581–1590	49,050,000	1801–1810	118,150,000
1591–1600	49,050,000	1811–1820	76,060,000
1601–1610	56,620,000	1821–1830	94,480,000
1611–1620	56,620,000	1831–1840	134,840,000
1621–1630	56,160,000	1841–1850	363,930,000
1631–1640	56,160,000	1851–1860	1,332,980,000
1641–1650	58,280,000	1861–1870	1,263,015,000
1651–1660	58,280,000	1871–1880	1,150,815,000
1661–1670	61,540,000	1881–1890	1,060,054,000
1671–1680	61,540,000	1891–1899	1,858,768,000
1681–1690	71,540,000		
1691–1700	71,540,000	Total	9,823,634,000
1701–1710	85,200,000		

A further examination of these tables will show that the entire gold production of the world from 1492 to 1850, a period of three hundred and fifty-seven years, was but $3,158,000,000, or an average of less than $9,000,000 per year, while that of the period 1850–1899 was $6,665,632,000, or an average of over $135,000,000 per annum. This makes the annual average rate of production in the last half century more than fifteen times as great as the annual average of the preceding three and a half centuries, a ratio of present to former production which is startlingly near 16 to 1.

Follow the comparison down farther. The production of the decade 1890–1899 was $1,977,616,000 (this refers to the full ten years, not the period 1891–1899 shown in the table). Now, if you contrast this with that of earlier periods you will find that the single decade 1890–1899 produced as much gold as the fifteen decades from 1700 to 1850; again a startling suggestion of 16 to 1.

One more comparison: Take the three calendar years which have made their record of gold production since the campaign of 1896. The world's production of gold in 1897 was $238,812,000; in 1898, $287,422,000, and in 1899, $315,000,000, a total of $841,240,000 in three years. Compare this with the table and you will see that the production in the three years since the nomination and defeat of Mr. Bryan on a free-silver issue has been more than that of the half century ending with 1850. The average production of the half century 1801–1850 was less than $16,000,000 per annum; that of the years since 1896 $280,000,000 per annum; this time more than 16 to 1.

I do not assert that the fact that the world is now producing gold sixteen times as fast as it did in the first half of the century means that there is no further use for silver, but it will be at least conceded that the rate at which gold is now being produced, as compared with earlier periods, is both startling and suggestive. The world's production of gold since the fateful year in which Mr. Bryan was born, 1860, has been greater than in the three hundred and sixty-seven years prior to that date, the accurate figures being: 1492 to 1860, $4,491,032,000; since 1860, $5,332,602,000. Divide the world's production since 1492 into two equal sums, and you will find that one-half of it has been produced since 1863, so that it may fairly be said that the past thirty-seven years have produced as much gold as the three hundred and seventy years which preceded them.

Production of gold per capita in the world, from 1804 to 1894.

Year.	World's population. Estimator.	Millions.	Production of gold.	Gold per capita.
1804	Malte Brun	640	$11,815,000	$0.018
1828	Balli	847	9,448,000	0.011
1845	Michelot	1,009	36,339,000	0.036
1874	Behm Wagner	1,391	90,000,000	0.062
1883	do	1,433	99,116,000	0.069
1891	Royal Geographic Society	1,488	130,000,000	0.091
1896		1,491	202,000,000	0.135
1899		1,500	315,000,000	0.210

There are several causes of this rapid increase, (1) a general fall in the cost of production and distribution, (2) greater activity and greater intelligence in the search for this metal, (3) improved mechanical devices for mining and for crushing the rock in which the ore is embedded and in methods of extracting it from the rock, (4) improvements in the science of metallurgy in the development of the cyanide and chlorination processes. These processes have made profitable the working of ores which ten years ago could not be worked without loss. At that time only such ores were available as were rich, or such ores as could be easily amalgamated, namely, the so-called free-milling ores. Much ore, although containing from $10 to $40 of gold to the ton, was not exploited, for the reason that it could not be amalgamated or did not contain enough extractable gold to permit of heavy freight charges and smelting expenses. Now, with the use of the chlorination and cyanide processes, all such ores are available. In the chlorination process the ore is roasted to free it of sulphur, and then placed in large rotating cylinders, in which it is treated with a solution of chlorine and water. The gold is precipitated out of this aqueous solution by the use of sulphurated hydrogen. The process costs from $3 to $5 a ton. The cyanide process is much cheaper and requires a plant of much smaller dimensions to operate it on a large scale. The cost of the treatment per ton of ore is about $2. Such low-grade ores as contain nothing that will decompose the solution for continuous use can be treated by cyanide. Finely divided free gold is readily extracted. The solution contains about 1 per cent of cyanide of potash, which is a potent ingredient for extracting the gold. To-day these processes are being used very extensively. About one-third of the gold produced in the Transvaal last year was extracted from the low-grade ore by the cyanide process.

COMMERCE OF THE GOLD AND SILVER STANDARD COUNTRIES OF THE WORLD, RESPECTIVELY, AND THE SHARE OF THE UNITED STATES THEREIN.

The following table, prepared by the Bureau of Statistics of the Treasury Department, shows the population and total commerce of each of the gold and silver standard countries of the world, respectively, and their commerce with the United States, and especially their imports from the United States. It shows that only 5 per cent of the world's commerce is carried on by silver-standard countries, and that the silver-standard countries take less than 5 per cent of the exports of the United States.

Commerce of the gold and silver standard countries of the world and the commerce of the United States with each country.

[Compiled from official reports of the United States.]

Gold standard countries.	Population.	Total commerce.	Commerce with United States. Total.	Imports from United States.
Algeria	4,429,000	$108,417,000	[1]$811,000	[1]$147,000
Austria-Hungary	41,359,000	[1]833,606,000	14,413,000	6,359,000
Belgium	6,567,000	659,197,000	57,549,000	45,816,000
British Africa	35,160,000	203,282,000	16,800,000	15,406,000
British Australasia	4,794,000	556,567,000	27,670,000	24,140,000
British Honduras	34,000	2,826,000	771,000	367,000
British North America	5,031,000	305,714,000	124,164,000	88,285,000
British West Indies	1,501,000	58,345,000	25,247,000	10,382,000
Bulgaria	3,311,000	27,987,000	No data.	No data.
Costa Rica	295,000	10,088,000	4,832,000	1,283,000
Cuba	1,632,000	135,120,000	54,481,000	24,861,000
Denmark	2,185,000	201,398,000	19,125,000	18,474,000
Dutch East Indies	34,090,000	146,539,000	33,961,000	1,653,000
Egypt	9,734,000	113,318,000	9,109,000	525,000
France	38,518,000	[2]1,564,518,000	140,512,000	70,107,000
Germany	52,280,000	[2]2,186,918,000	250,965,000	161,406,000
Great Britain	40,189,000	[2]3,969,876,000	652,280,000	509,958,000
Hawaii	109,000	27,577,000	33,494,000	11,306,000
India and Ceylon	290,514,000	495,717,000	42,896,000	4,510,000
Japan	42,708,000	186,114,000	54,808,000	20,605,000
Netherlands	5,004,000	1,292,138,000	98,879,000	83,601,000
Peru	2,622,000	23,240,000	3,492,000	1,395,000
Roumania	5,800,000	113,000,000	145,000	145,000
Russia	108,721,000	460,008,000	14,462,000	9,172,000
Servia	2,315,000	19,734,000		
South African Republic	1,096,000	158,234,000	No data.	No data.
Sweden and Norway	7,011,000	305,509,000	14,904,000	11,817,000
Switzerland	3,083,000	362,418,000	16,505,000	216,000
Uruguay	828,000	50,492,000	3,215,000	1,702,000
United States	75,000,000	[2]2,074,345,000		
On a paper basis.				
Argentina	3,955,000	192,477,000	17,322,000	11,325,000
Brazil	14,334,000	235,149,000	11,055,000	11,454,000
Chile	3,049,000	47,445,000	7,474,000	2,240,000
Greece	2,434,000	38,051,000	1,229,000	227,000
Haiti	960,000	18,252,000	3,220,000	2,358,000
Italy	31,668,000	444,769,000	52,222,000	25,763,000
Portugal	5,050,000	76,856,000	8,888,000	5,113,000
Spain	17,566,000	334,480,000	16,871,000	11,529,000
Turkey	22,534,000	165,685,000	7,267,000	563,000
Venezuela	2,444,000	94,751,000	8,311,000	2,641,000
Total gold standard countries	929,934,000	18,295,410,000	1,909,339,000	1,197,067,000

Commerce of the gold and silver standard countries of the world, etc.—Continued.

Silver standard countries.	Population.	Total commerce.	Commerce with United States. Total.	Imports from United States.
China	402,680,000	$285,738,000	$39,421,000	$15,225,000
Guatemala	1,535,000	16,971,000	3,041,000	843,000
Honduras	400,000	5,908,000	1,919,000	1,039,000
Hongkong	222,000	90,000,000	10,128,000	7,788,000
Korea	10,529,000	19,041,000	129,000	128,000
Mexico	12,620,000	102,673,000	53,935,000	29,310,000
Nicaragua	420,000	5,547,000	3,081,000	1,486,000
Persia	9,000,000	43,798,000	No data.	No data.
Salvador	804,000	10,833,000	1,118,000	635,000
Straits Settlements	512,000	413,947,000	No data.	No data.
Siam	5,000,000	27,681,000	No data.	No data.
On a paper basis.				
Bolivia	2,020,000	22,557,000	27,000	27,000
Colombia	4,000,000	26,617,000	8,448,000	2,986,000
Ecuador	1,272,000	11,008,000	2,278,000	1,180,000
Paraguay	600,000	7,883,000	11,000	11,000
Total silver standard countries	451,614,000	1,029,302,000	124,136,000	60,658,000

[1]1897. [2]1899.

Commerce of the gold standard countries	$18,295,410,000
Commerce of the silver standard countries	$1,029,302,000
Per cent, silver countries	5.33
Commerce of United States with gold standard countries	$1,909,339,000
Commerce of United States with silver standard countries	$124,136,000
Per cent, with silver standard countries	6.15
Exports of United States to gold standard countries	$1,197,067,000
Exports of United States to silver standard countries	$60,658,000
Per cent to silver standard countries	4.82

NOTE.—The above includes 97 per cent of the world's commerce at the latest available date.

JAPAN'S EXPERIENCE WITH THE GOLD STANDARD.

Report on the Adoption of the Gold Standard in Japan, by Count Matsukata Masayoshi, His Imperial Japanese Majesty's minister of state for finance, is the title of a volume issued by the Japanese Government, which has just reached the Treasury Bureau of Statistics. It discusses in great detail the history of the currency of Japan, and closes with a chapter entitled, "Effect of coinage reform upon the economic condition of our country." In this chapter the writer, Count Matsukata, discussing the effect of the new law which went into operation October 1, 1897, says:

Since the adoption of the gold standard our currency has been freed from constant fluctuations in its exchange rate, to which it was subject before. Owing to this latter fact, moreover, the relations between the claims of the creditor and the liabilities of the debtor became less subject to sudden and unexpected changes; business transactions were made safe; an improvement in credit took place in the community at large; prices became more constant; in a word, the way was now opened for the steady and orderly growth of our commerce and industry.

Leaving out of account in this section the questions concerning the effect of the coinage reform on the foreign trade of the country, it can be very clearly seen that since October, 1897, the prices of commodities have kept comparatively even; that while there have been some changes, yet, when compared with the sudden and great changes which used to occur formerly, we must say that the fluctuations were remarkably small. Besides, these small changes in the price of commodities can be amply explained by referring to the partial failure of rice crops, to the sudden expansion of industry and then to its as sudden depression, to a stringency in the money market, as well as to some other causes. These changes in the price of commodities were due, therefore, to the natural working of the economic law of supply and demand in the commodities themselves. If we notice the fact, moreover, that the amount of checks and bills cleared at the clearing houses in Tokyo and Osaka has remarkably increased during these recent months, notwithstanding the fact that during this very time there prevailed much business stagnation everywhere, we can not but conclude that business transactions on credit have come to prevail more widely and freely than before.

The beneficial result of the coinage reform is seen in another direction. Since now that the capitalists of the gold standard countries have become assured that they will no longer be in constant danger of suffering unexpected losses from investments made in this country, on account of fluctuations in the price of silver, they seem to show a growing tendency to make such investments at low rates of interest. This tendency, if encouraged, will doubtless bring about a closer connection between this country and the central money markets of the world—a state of things which I believe we shall be able to see realized more and more fully as years go on.

So far as our trade with gold standard countries is concerned, our adoption of the gold standard, which made us use the same standard of value as those countries, has proved to be a source of great benefit. This may be inferred from the fact that changes which have since taken place in the rate of foreign exchange have been very slight, and these all traceable to changes in the condition of the foreign trade of the country and not all traceable as formerly to sudden changes in the price of silver. For this reason there was eliminated from our foreign trade much of that speculative element which was caused by constant changes in the value of our currency, so that the way was at last opened for the steady and natural development of the foreign trade of the country. Again, concerning our commerce with silver standard countries, contrary to the gloomy prospects indulged in by some critics, our trade with those countries has not ceased to make a steady growth, and this in the face of certain events occurring in the interior of China, our greatest customer among the silver countries, events such as natural calamities and disturbances which have greatly hindered the commercial activity of that country.

Since our coinage reform enabled us to avoid all the evil effects of fluctuations in the price of silver, we stand now no longer, as formerly was the case, under the necessity of making plans for financial matters with the currency constantly changing in value, and sometimes suffering unexpected losses and evils in times when those fluctuations are unusually violent. All those fears of mis-

calculation and losses have now become things of the past. Most particularly in the last few years when national expenditures for things bought abroad, such as war ships, etc., have greatly increased in amount, we have doubtless been able to avoid, on account of our coinage reform, great losses on the part of the national treasury. Besides, since our adoption of the gold standard, our Government bonds have been sold in no small amount in the European market, so that their names appear regularly in the price list of the London Stock Exchange. This fact at once converted our bonds into an international commodity, and will no doubt lead to a closer relationship between our home and the foreign money markets.

The discussion also quotes a report of the higher commission on agriculture, commerce, and industry, which, after an elaborate discussion on the effect of the monetary system, closes by saying:

We believe that the beneficial effect of our coinage reform on our foreign trade has already been great, and we do not notice any material evil in connection with it. Besides, our adoption of the gold standard has made it easier for our country to enter into the economic community of the world at large, so that henceforth it will become practicable for us to invite capital from other countries where it is plentiful to be invested in our country. This will doubtless be another of the benefits conferred upon the country by our coinage reform. We conclude, therefore, that the effect of the coinage reform upon our foreign trade has been beneficial, without a trace of evil.

FOREIGN RELATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES MARCH 4, 1897–MAY 1, 1900—A REVIEW OF AN EVENTFUL PERIOD IN OUR NATIONAL HISTORY—THE WAR WITH SPAIN—THE SAMOAN, HAWAIIAN, AND ALASKAN INCIDENTS—THE OPEN DOOR IN CHINA—THE SOUTH AFRICAN WAR.

Mr. Speaker, at the time of President McKinley's inauguration the most important problem confronting the new Administration in its foreign relations was the long-continued insurrection in the island of Cuba, with the inconvenience and cost imposed upon the Government of the United States by the endeavor to enforce its laws and protect the property of its citizens.

Throughout a period of extreme tension of public feeling caused by the horrors of the conflict in Cuba, the Government continued its policy of patience in dealing with the trying situation.

THE WAR WITH SPAIN AND THE PEACE OF PARIS.

The instructions given to Minister Woodford for his guidance at Madrid directed him to impress upon the Government of Spain the sincere wish of the United States to lend its aid in securing a peace honorable alike to Spain and the people of Cuba. A new administration in the Spanish Government encouraged the hope that a change of policy might be adopted which would result in the pacification of Cuba, but this hope was doomed to disappointment. After long and patient negotiation in the interest of peace, to the evils which had so long pressed upon this country in consequence of the insurrection was added a series of incidents that rendered necessary, on April 21, 1898, an armed intervention to terminate the humiliation imposed by the condition of affairs. The brief and brilliant period of war with Spain was followed by preliminaries of peace, signed on August 12, providing for the relinquishment of sovereignty over Cuba, the cession of Porto Rico and other islands belonging to Spain in the West Indies, together with an island in the Ladrones, to be selected by the United States, and the occupation of territory in the city and vicinity of Manila, pending the conclusion of a treaty of peace which should determine the control, disposition, and government of the Philippines.

When the Commissioners of the United States, sent to Paris to negotiate a treaty of peace with the representatives of Spain, confronted the problem of settlement, it became evident that the interests of the population of the Philippine Islands, the peace of the world, and the consistent completion of the task of pacification undertaken by the Government alike demanded the cession of the entire Philippine Archipelago to the United States. At the same time justice to a foreign foe and the magnanimous spirit of the American people seemed to require a recognition of the actual expenditures of Spain in the internal improvement of the islands, and the sum of $20,000,000 was agreed upon as a suitable compensation for the transfer of this great archipelago, whose extensive public lands, estimated at one-half the whole area of the islands, rich in mineral wealth and forests of valuable timber, will prove abundantly sufficient to justify this expenditure and to provide resources for a future government.

THE HAWAIIAN, SAMOAN, AND ALASKAN QUESTIONS.

The annexation of the Hawaiian Islands to the United States, the cession of Guam, and the acquisition of the Philippines extend the sovereignty of this Government across the Pacific Ocean and provide a series of valuable naval stations and entrepôts of commerce which promise to facilitate incalculably the oriental trade and secure the pathway to an opening market of increasing importance. The settlement of the Samoan question by the dissolution of the tripartite protectorate which had proved so fertile in embarrassments, and the undisputed sole occupation of the island of Tutuila, with its admirable harbor, the best in the South Pacific, by the United States, add greatly to the influence and security of this country in that ocean.

The exorbitant claims of the Canadian government with reference to the Alaskan boundary, unreasonable and unhistorical in their extent, though impeding and for the time thwarting the efforts of this Government to adjudicate in a mutually advantageous manner the differences with the Dominion, which had been referred to a joint commission, have nevertheless been firmly met by the President, who has thus far preserved our important territorial rights by the modus vivendi of October 20, 1899, and defeated the attempt to destroy the continuity of our Alaskan coast line and to divide the control of the Northern Pacific.

THE INTEROCEANIC CANAL.

Thus extended and maintained in the Pacific, the territorial jurisdiction of the United States has been augmented in the Atlantic by the cession of Porto Rico, which, with the occupation of Cuba, held in trust for the future, serves to guard the Gulf of Mexico and to extend our influence in the West Indies.

The necessary link to connect our Atlantic and Pacific interests, continental as well as insular, has seemed to be an interoceanic canal, owned and controlled by the Government of the United States. An apparently irremovable barrier to the accomplishment of this object has existed in the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, which since 1850 has bound this Government not to undertake such a project as a national enterprise.

Through all the political administrations since the negotiations of that convention no American President or Secretary of State has ever denied the existence and the consequent obligation of that treaty during its continued recognition. Whatever may be said of its "voidability," its existence as a solemn compact binds the conscience and honor of the American Government and people until it is legally annulled. In a convention dated February 8, 1900, this Government procured the voluntary consent of Great Britain to modify essentially the terms of that agreement, thereby liberating the United States from its previous engagement not to construct or own an interoceanic canal. As the canal must of necessity lie wholly within territory foreign to the United States, it is evident that it must be of a neutral character and not be employed as an agency of war. This convention is now before the Senate of the United States awaiting its action.

THE PEACE CONFERENCE AT THE HAGUE.

Following immediately after the brilliant naval and military achievements of the Spanish-American war, the Peace Conference at The Hague afforded the Government of the United States an opportunity of expressing the pacific disposition and the love of justice which animate the American people by proposing, through its delegates, a plan for international arbitration, which, reinforced by other similar propositions, resulted in a convention for the pacific settlement of international disputes signed by the plenipotentiaries of twenty-two sovereign States, including all the great powers of Europe.

The United States, in signing this great compact, at the same time insisted on reaffirming, in the document itself, our adherence to the Monroe Doctrine, and thus gained for that vital principle of our policy the recognition of the world.

Without cherishing illusions with regard to the practicability of universal peace, it is yet possible to believe that the existence of a permanent international tribunal before which differences may be adjudicated in their incipiency and before their accumulation becomes serious will exercise a profound influence toward a better and more rational solution of disputes between nations. The numerous arrangements for the arbitration of special questions which the Department of State has recently been able to effect give evidence of a growing disposition to apply the principles of peaceful adjudication to the solution of controversies wherever practicable.

THE QUESTION OF THE "OPEN DOOR" IN CHINA.

The diplomatic history of our country affords no better example of successful endeavor to secure by mutual consent an evident right than that offered by the recent correspondence carried on under the President's direction for maintaining the "open door" of trade in China. The establishment of spheres of influence in that ancient Empire by European States, supported by the control of important seaports, has seemed to many to forebode the practical partition of that country among foreign powers and the effective appropriation of commercial privileges in China to the exclusion of all not able or willing to claim a portion for themselves. By a timely series of diplomatic notes Secretary Hay has obtained assurances from the Governments of Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, and Russia, by which they pledge themselves not to interfere with the perfect freedom of trade in those portions of China where their influence may prevail. The unobstructed enjoyment of the privileges of trade is thus secured to American manufacturers and merchants by the free consent of the powers.

Perhaps the most important fruit of this unprecedented negotiation may prove to be that all the powers, feeling the assurance of unrestricted commerce, may be disposed to accentuate to a less degree, or even to abandon, that policy of commercial annexation which has apparently been promoted by the absence of such a just and reasonable understanding. The American claim to unrestricted facilities of trade in China is not a special favor asked and granted, or demanding reciprocity. It is based on treaty rights which promise equal treatment to Americans with the citizens or subjects of the most-favored nation. The recognition of these rights have

been obtained at a moment when they were apparently about to be ignored.

THE SOUTH AFRICAN WAR.

Regarding the unfortunate conflict between Great Britain and the Republics of South Africa, this Government has faithfully observed the laws of neutrality and strictly followed the traditional policy of nonintervention which has always characterized the conduct of the United States with respect to foreign wars. In a declaration offered to the peace conference at The Hague by the American delegation, effectually obtaining the first recognition of the Monroe doctrine by an international body, the "traditional policy of not intruding upon, or interfering with, or entangling itself in the political questions or policy * * * of any foreign State" is reaffirmed, together with a new avowal of the attitude of the United States toward purely American questions. This consistent neutrality, steadily maintained in spite of the impulses of sentiment which often endanger public interests, has rendered more available the mediatorial action of the United States upon the joint request of both belligerents in case an opportune occasion should arise.

In his message to Congress of December 5, 1899, President McKinley was able to say:

> Had circumstances suggested that the parties to the quarrel would have welcomed any kindly expression of the hope of the American people that war might be averted, good offices would have been gladly tendered.

As these circumstances did not arise, no occasion was presented for tendering good offices until a request was received from the Republics of South Africa (March 10, 1900) that the United States should intervene to procure a cessation of hostilities. A similar request was simultaneously sent to the leading European governments, but no action was taken by them. The Government of the United States, whose attitude rendered it peculiarly available for mediatorial services, immediately addressed an offer of good offices to Lord Salisbury, expressing "the earnest hope" of the President that a way to bring about peace might be found, and adding that the President—

> would be glad to aid in any friendly manner to promote so happy a result.

The indisposition of Great Britain to accept the good offices of the United States shows how futile were the proposals of philanthropic persons in urging, unaware of the nature of international relations, the mandatory intervention of the United States, which would have destroyed its usefulness as a mediator and, if insisted upon by this Government, would have placed it in a belligerent attitude toward Great Britain in violation of its principle and policy of neutrality. It is not to be presumed that any patriotic person could seriously entertain the desire of involving his country in the obligations and consequences of actual war on account of circumstances entirely foreign to the interests of the United States. The discretion of the American Congress in refusing to take sides by passing resolutions of sympathy with either belligerent has rendered the United States still available as an ultimate mediator in this conflict, provided its services should ever be invoked by both combatants. Until they are thus desired interference of any kind could only give offense and render nugatory the benevolent intentions of this Government.

"THERE IS NO ALLIANCE WITH ENGLAND"—SECRETARY HAY ON THE FALSE CHARGES MADE AGAINST THE M'KINLEY ADMINISTRATION—LACK OF REAL AND ACCEPTABLE ISSUES FORCES THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY TO PRESENT FALSE ONES, BASED ON GROUNDLESS ASSERTIONS.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that there has been repeated in this House, during recent discussions, the false and unjust charge that the present Administration has entered into a secret alliance with England leads me to present and make a part of the public record a letter written to me on this subject by a man who is in position to know the truth, and the whole truth, and whose words will not be doubted by any who know him or his honorable career. I allude to Hon. John Hay, the present Secretary of State. His letter is as follows:

NEWBURY, N. H., *September 11, 1899.*

Hon. CHARLES DICK,
Chairman State Executive Committee, Columbus, Ohio.

DEAR MR. DICK: I am sorry that my engagements are such as to render it impossible for me to accept your kind invitation to be present at the opening of the Ohio Republican State campaign at Akron on the 23d of September. I regret this the more as the occasion promises to be one of unusual interest. A stirring campaign and, I doubt not, a great victory await you.

Our opponents this year are in an unfortunate position. They have lost, for all practical purposes, their political stock in trade of recent years. Their money hobby has all collapsed under them. Their orators still shout 16 to 1 from time to time from the force of habit, but they are like wisdom crying in the streets in one respect at least, because "no man regardeth them." With our vaults full of gold; with a sufficiency of money to meet the demands of a volume of business unprecedently vast and profitable; with labor generally employed at fair wages; with our commerce overspreading the world; with every dollar the Government issues as good as any other dollar; with our finances as firm as a rock and our credit the best ever known it is no time for financial mountebanks to cry their nostrums in the market place, with any chance of being heard.

It is equally hopeless to try to resuscitate the corpse of free trade. The Dingley tariff, the legitimate successor of the McKinley bill—that name of good augury—has justified itself by its works. It is not only true that our domestic trade has reached proportions never before attained, but the American policy of protection, the policy of all our most illustrious statesmen, of Washington and Hamilton, Lincoln, Grant, and McKinley—has been triumphantly vindicated by the proof that it is as efficacious in extending our foreign commerce as in fostering and stimulating our home industries. Our exports of domestic manufactures reached in this last fiscal year the unexampled total of $360,000,000, an amount more than two hundred millions in excess of our exports ten years ago. These figures ring the knell of those specious arguments which have been the reliance of our opponents for so many years, and which are only fruitful in times of leanness and disaster.

What is left, then, in the way of a platform? The regulation of trusts, which the Republicans can themselves manage, having all the requisite experience both of legislation and business; and, finally, the war, which—it seems—was too efficiently carried on and has been too beneficial to the nation to suit the Democratic leaders. We have been able to give in our time some novel ideas to the rest of the world—and none are more novel than this—that a great party should complain that the results of a war were too advantageous. It will be hard, however, to convince the bulk of our people that we are the worse off because our flag has gained great honor, our possessions have been extended, our position in the world increased, and our opportunity for work for usefulness enormously widened through the fortunes of war and the valor of our soldiers and sailors.

Being in this desperate need of arguments, it is not strange that they should have recourse to fiction. An attempt is made in the Ohio Democratic platform to excite the prejudice of certain classes of voters against the present Administration by accusing it of an alliance with England. The people who make this charge know it to be untrue; their making it is an insult to the intelligence of those whose votes they seek by this gross misrepresentation. But as one of their favorite methods of campaign is to invent a fiction too fantastic for contradiction, and then to assume it to be true because it has not been contradicted, you may permit me to take one moment to dispose of this ghost story, as it refers to the department with which I am connected. There is no alliance with England, nor with any power under heaven, except those known and published to the world—the treaties of ordinary international friendship for purposes of business and commerce. No treaty other than these exists; none has been suggested on either side; none is in contemplation. It has never entered into the mind of the President nor of any member of the Government to forsake, under any inducement, the wise precept and example of the fathers which forbade entangling alliances with European powers.

I need not dwell upon this fact. Even the men who wrote the Ohio platform know there is no alliance. But they seek to make capital in this campaign out of the undeniable fact that our relations with England are more friendly and more satisfactory than they have ever been before. It is hard to take such a charge seriously; and if it is taken seriously, how can it be treated with patience? In the name of common sense, let me ask what is the duty of the Government, if not to cultivate, wherever possible, agreeable and profitable relations with other nations? And if with other nations, why not with that great kindred power which stands among the greatest powers of the world? What harm, what menace to other countries, is there in this natural and beneficent friendship? Only a narrow and purblind spirit could see in it anything exclusive. It is a poor starved heart that has room for only one friend. It is not with England alone that our relations are improved. We are on better terms than in the past with all nations. With Russia, our old-time friend; with the great German Empire, to which we are bound by so many ties; with our sister Republic of France; with Italy, Austria, and in short every European, every Asiatic nation, our relations are growing in intimacy and cordiality every year; and our friendship with our neighbors to the south of us, from the Rio Grande to Cape Horn, grows firmer, more genuine, day by day.

And why should it not be so? Everyone likes to be on good terms with the peaceful and the prosperous, especially if their prosperity is of that nature that other people profit by it, and this is precisely our condition. Our trade is taking that vast development for which we have been preparing through many years of wise American policy, of sturdy American industry, of thoughtful invention and experiment by trained American intelligence. We have gone far toward solving the problem which has so long vexed the economists of the world—of raising wages and at the same time lowering the cost of production—something which no other people have ever accomplished in an equal degree.

We pay the highest wages which are paid in the world; and we sell our goods to such an advantage that we are beginning to furnish them to every quarter of the globe. We are building locomotives for railways in Europe, Asia, and Africa; our bridges can be built in America, ferried across the Atlantic, transported up the Nile, and flung across a river in the Soudan in less time than any European nation, with a start of 4,000 miles, can do the work. We sell ironware in Birmingham; carpets in Kidderminster; we pipe the sewers of Scotch cities; our bicycles distance all competition on the Continent; Ohio sends watch cases to Geneva. All this is to the advantage of all parties; there is no sentiment in it; they buy our wares because we make them better and at lower cost than other people. We are enabled to do this through wise laws and the American genius for economy. Our working people prosper because we are all working people; our idle class is too meager to count. All the energies of the nation are devoted to this mighty task—to insure to labor its adequate reward and so to cheapen production as to bring the product within the reach of the greatest number for least money.

Of course, our prosperity would not bring us friends if we held an attitude of menace to other nations. But this we have never done, and I hope and believe we never shall do. We have great latent military power; we are capable at short notice of remarkable military efficiency; but the habit and spirit of the American people is essentially peaceful. The vast majority of our people would be glad to think that the era of wars was over; that not another battle anywhere in the world should ever stain the earth with carnage or break the heart of a mother. No other nation would ever have shown the long-suffering patience with which we watched for so many years the scenes of waste and disorder which make the recent history of Cuba. When the state of things at our door had become intolerable, we took up arms to redress wrongs already too long endured, without a thought in any mind of conquest or aggression. But no one can control the issues of war. Porto Rico and the Philippines are ours, and the destinies of Cuba are for the moment intrusted to our care. It is not permitted us to shirk the vast responsibilities thus imposed upon us without exhibiting a nerveless pusillanimity which would bring upon us not only the scorn of the world, but what is far worse, our own self-contempt. But as we did not seek these acquisitions—which came to us through the irresistible logic of war—we are not striving anywhere to acquire territory or extend our power by conquest. It is no secret that in more than one quarter outlying territory only awaits our acceptance; but every overture of this nature has been and, I am confident, will be declined. The whole world knows we are not covetous of land; not a chancery in Europe sees in us an interested rival in their schemes of acquisition. What is ours we shall hold; what is not ours we do not seek. But in the field of trade and commerce we shall be the keen competitors of the richest and greatest powers, and they need no warning to be assured that in that struggle we shall bring the sweat to their brows.

It was written of old that a man's foes shall be of his own household. The simple fact is that at this moment the whole world is our friend, except certain leaders of the Democratic party. All countries crowd into our markets, though our opponents say our tariff is barbarous. Our achievements in war have received the ungrudging praise of foreign nations and meet with unjust and carping criticism only at home. All other countries bid us godspeed in the work of bringing order and civilization to the Philippines, and it was left to a man in Cincinnati the other day to wish that "Otis and his army might be swept into the sea." It is hard to exterminate a rooted tendency—the Proverbs say something about braying in a mortar. The party which by unwise leadership in 1861 was made to place itself across the path of freedom and progress should take care not to follow the lead this year of men as lacking in sagacity as they are in patriotism.

But we may take comfort in the reflection that no leaders can carry all their party into courses their judgment must condemn and their hearts reject. There are, thank God, many Democrats in Ohio who do not desire the humiliation of their country or the dishonor of their flag.

Yours, faithfully, JOHN HAY.

COLONIES AND COLONIZATION—SOME LESSONS FROM THE EXPERIENCES OF OTHER PEOPLES AND OTHER NATIONS—A PLAIN STATEMENT OF THE EFFECT OF COLONIZATION UPON THE PEOPLE AFFECTED AND UPON THE GOVERNING NATION.

Mr. Speaker, an unexpected incident of the war with Spain, a war for humanity, undertaken at the demand of all classes of our people irrespective of party, brought under the control of the United States the Philippine Islands, the island of Guam, and the island of Porto Rico, while other events have also brought other islands of the Pacific under the control and care of the United States Government; and for the present we are also charged with the direction of affairs in Cuba.

It is proper, then, that we study, as far as we may, the methods by which the older nations and those of long experience in the management of noncontiguous territory govern such territory and administer that government in the manner for the best interests of the people governed, and incidentally best for the nation which governs and thus becomes responsible for that government.

With that purpose I desire to present such information as I have been able to bring together as to the methods by which colonies and noncontiguous territory is governed by other countries, the effect upon the country and people so governed, and the benefit or otherwise of this relationship to the governing country and its commerce.

THE WORLD'S COLONIES.

An official publication of the Bureau of Statistics, issued some months ago, discussed in detail the colonies of the world, and its accuracy and fairness has never been called in question. It shows that the colonies, protectorates, and dependencies of the world number 126. They occupy two-fifths of the land surface of the globe and their population is one-third of the entire people of the earth. Their total imports average $1,500,000,000 worth of goods annually, and of this vast sum more than 40 per cent is purchased from the mother country. Of their exports, which considerably exceed imports, 40 per cent goes to the mother country. Large sums are annually expended in the construction of roads, canals, railways, telegraphs, postal service, schools, etc., but in most cases the present annual expenditures are produced by local revenues or are represented by local obligations. The revenues of the British colonies in 1897 were $755,000,000 and their expenditures $745,000,000. While the public debt in the more important and active of these communities aggregates a large sum, it is represented by canals, railways, public highways, harbors, irrigation, and other public improvements intended to stimulate commerce and production, the railroads in operation in the British colonies alone aggregating 55,000 miles, and is in no instance assumed by or a charge upon the mother country.

Of the 126 colonies, protectorates, dependencies, and "spheres of influence," which make up the total list, two-fifths belong to Great Britain, their area (including the native feudatory states of India) being one-half of the grand total of colonial territory and their population considerably more than one-half the grand total of colonial population. France is next in order in number, area, and population of colonies, etc., though the area controlled by France is but about one-third that of Great Britain, and the population of her colonies less than one-sixth of those of Great Britain. Commerce between the successful colonies and their mother countries is in nearly all cases placed upon practically the same basis as that with other countries, goods from the home countries receiving in the vast majority of cases no advantages over those from other countries in import duties, and other exactions of this character.

I especially call attention to the fact that in this particular we have given to Porto Rico and Hawaii vastly better treatment than is usual with colonies, since we make the ratio of duty on commerce between Porto Rico and the United States but 15 per cent of that with other countries, and even that but temporary, while in the case of Hawaii, which voluntarily asked admission, we have continued and enlarged the freedom of interchange which already existed under reciprocity.

EFFECT OF COLONIZATION UPON THE PEOPLE OF THE COUNTRIES COLONIZED.

I want to first discuss the effect of "colonization," so called, upon the countries colonized, and the people and interests of those countries. The tendency, it seems to me, has been to look at the question first from the selfish standpoint of its effect upon our own commerce and people; but I desire first to determine the effect of judicious, proper, and humane colonial control upon the people controlled.

The effect of "colonization" or control of noncontiguous territory by an established and well-managed government of intelligent people is so carefully discussed in a recent article in the Forum by the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics that I shall take the liberty of quoting it, feeling as I do that its statements, which have never been questioned as to accuracy in the months since its publication, will prove of value to all desiring to give this feature of the question a thoughtful and conscientious consideration. It is as follows:

To answer the question whether the people of the territory colonized are advantageously affected, the inquiry must be conducted along broader lines than those of mere commerce. The questions which would naturally determine the benefit or the injury which colonization brings to the people of the territory colonized are: (1) Whether a more permanent and stable form of government is given them; (2) whether control by the colonizing country brings with it improved internal conditions; (3) whether the producing capacity of the country is increased; (4) whether commercial intercourse with other parts of the world is quickened, and (5) whether enlarged intercourse with the outside world proves advantageous.

That local improvements along all these lines has followed successful colonizing enterprises, especially in the tropical and subtropical territories, is well recognized. Those who have observed the developments in the past few years in various parts of the world can not doubt that advantages have come in at least a majority of the cases. No one who has followed the course of events in Africa and witnessed the developments which, under various nations, have brought order out of disorder, peace among warring native tribes, the opening of the great rivers, the construction of roads, the building of railways and telegraphs, the introduction at initial points of educational facilities, and the development of commerce and general intercourse with the world can doubt the advantages to the people occupying the territory; while the vast supplies of tropical products, and of precious stones and metals, which Africa is now contributing to the commercial world, show that the advantages are reciprocal. The improvements now made under French rule in Indo-China—the building of roads and of railways, the introduction of modern civilization and business communication—illustrate in another part of the world the advantages to the population of the territory colonized.

Probably the most striking example, however, of the advantages accruing to a population from a government supplied by experienced people of other blood and climate is in the case of India. From the very beginning of British control there came a gradual cessation of the bloody and devastating wars—between native rulers or by foreign invaders—which had sacrificed so many lives and destroyed cities and homes from the earliest history of that great and densely populated peninsula.

With this, and especially with the direct British control of the last half century, came other improvements. One of the first improvements undertaken was the construction and maintenance of roads. "No native prince in India ever built a road," says a distinguished writer on the history and conditions of that country; and when the British Government assumed control, it found communication between the various sections almost impossible, by reason of an absence of routes of travel over which vehicles could pass. Now there are 150,000 miles of roads in India maintained by the government, of which no less than 35,000 miles are "metalled," or macadamized, as the term is used in this country. In 1854, there were in India 21 miles of railway, and in 1899, 22,000 miles—uniting province with province, city with city, penetrating the native states, bringing them into closer relationship with the territory under direct control of the British Government, carrying the native products to the seaboard, and in turn bringing to the natives the products of other parts of the world and proving especially useful in distributing supplies in famine years.

In 1897 the net earnings of the railways in India were 130,000,000 rupees, being an average return of 5.04 per cent on the capital invested. The number of passengers carried in 1898 was 159,374,114. In nearly all cases these railways are the result of investment of British capital, induced by a guaranty of interest made by the government of British India. In 1856 there were in all of India only 753 post-offices and letter boxes; in 1898 there were 27,984. In that year the postal system handled 476,683,000 pieces of mail, the revenue of the postal service being 18,823,000 rupees, and the charges 13,271,000 rupees; supplying a service of which Sir John Strachey, who has spent nearly thirty years in India, says: "There is no country where the rates of postage are so low or the offices better managed." In addition to the postal service there are over 50,000 miles of telegraph lines, which in 1898 handled 5,713,000 paid messages.

Still another of the great internal improvements which has proved of inestimable value to the people in times of great distress is the system of irrigating canals. Sir John Strachey says: "Altogether there are in India, under the management or supervision of the British Government, some 36,000 miles of canals and other works irrigating nearly 14,000,000 acres." "These canals," he adds, "yielded, in 1876, 5¼ per cent on their cost of 320,000,000 rupees, and this falls far short of the annual value of the crops they protect. In the single year of 1891–92 the estimated value of the produce of the land irrigated by works constructed by the government was more than 540,000,000 rupees."* The value of these great irrigating works can only be appreciated when it is remembered that in certain years of drought the area which they supply would be absolutely nonproductive, and that in a single year of drought the value of the crops grown far exceeds the entire cost of the canals which supply the territory.

Another equally interesting and important result of British control in India is found in the increased educational facilities now offered to the people. The system of educating the masses began in 1854, when the department of public instruction was established, the government allowance for the purpose being, in 1858, but 394,000 rupees, increased by 1897 to 15,250,000 rupees. In 1897–98 the number of schools in India was 150,000, with an attendance of 4,285,000 pupils. Of these 106,527 were public schools, with an attendance of 3,706,000.

Regarding the commercial advantages which have followed the establishment of order, the creation of highways and methods of internal transportation, the construction of irrigating canals, and the general stimulation and activity, it may be said that the exports of merchandise from British India have grown from $64,784,000, in 1848, to $346,000,000 in 1897, making India now the sixth exporting country of the world. The increased earning and consuming capacity of the people meantime is indicated, in some degree at least, by the fact that the imports have grown from $41,842,000, in 1848, to $240,000,000 in 1897.

Regarding the standing army in India of 225,000 men, of which we hear so much, when we consider the service it performs, and its relative size as compared with the area and population of the territory in which it maintains order and prevents possible invasion by other nations, it dwindles into comparative insignificance. Of its 225,000 officers and men, one-third are Europeans and two-thirds are natives of India. When this number is compared with the population of the Indian Empire and Feudatory States, it will be found that there are less than 250 Europeans and 500 natives employed in the military service for each million people. The entire expense of the army—whether natives or Europeans, privates or officers of high rank—is borne not by the Government of the United Kingdom, but by the Indian government.

On the subject of expense of the Indian colony to the home Government, it is not improper again to quote Sir John Strachey, whose lifetime of experience in India, in various branches of the public service, renders him a valuable authority. In his recent work upon India he says: "India has become one of the greatest powers of the world, and so far as her finances are concerned, she has no

*The exchange value of the rupee ranged between 47 and 50 cents prior to 1870; since that time it has steadily declined, and averaged in 1898–99, 32.4 cents, while the bullion value in 1898–99 was about 21 cents.

dependence upon Great Britain. This country (United Kingdom) does not contribute a single farthing to the maintenance of her Indian Empire. For all the work that she undertakes for India, whether it be for the British army by which India is garrisoned, the charges for the Indian office at home, or for any other service, great or small, she exacts full payment." In another chapter of the same work he shows that, though the gross revenues of India in 1857 were only 320,000,000 rupees, and are now 964,420,000 rupees, of which sum by far the largest item is derived from the land revenues, and though the land revenue has, in fifty years, more than doubled, the rates are actually lower, because of the enlarged area of cultivation and the increase in value of the product of the land. "There has never been, so far as my knowledge goes," he says, "a government in India which has taken so small a share of the profits of the soil as ourselves, and this is true of every province in British India."

ARE COLONIES ADVANTAGEOUS TO THE COMMERCE OR PEOPLE OF THE GOVERNING COUNTRY?

Having shown that colonization or control of a comparatively unorganized and badly governed country by an experienced and intelligent country and government results advantageously to the people so governed, it is proper to now consider whether it proves advantageous to the people of the governing country.

In doing this we must consider two things—first, whether they can furnish us the goods which we must import, and so enable us to spend our money among their people instead of sending it to absolutely foreign countries; and second, whether they will become a market for our surplus products, or prove a doorway through which we may find a market in other countries.

Both of these questions I think may properly be answered in the affirmative, as relates to the territory which has recently come into closer relationship to us. The people of the United States pay over $350,000,000 annually, or practically a million dollars in each day of the year, for tropical products, all of which can be produced, and most of which are now produced in some degree, in the islands under consideration. Some of these are for use in manufacturing and some as foodstuffs. A careful study of the imports into the United States during 1899 shows that the importations of tropical and subtropical products in the full years are over $350,000,000.

This compilation, it is proper to add, includes raw silk, tea, and rice, and the small proportion of our sugar importations which is manufactured from beets; but even if these be omitted the total which would be clearly entitled to be classed as tropical products would exceed $250,000,000, annually. Sugar, coffee, india rubber, fibers, tropical fruits and nuts, cacao, tobacco of the finer grades, spices, gums, indigo, dyewoods, and cabinet woods form the important features of this large importation, and all of them articles for which the United States is absolutely dependent, with the possible exception of sugar, upon other parts of the world, and for the present at least for the larger proportion of our sugar.

Curiously, all of these articles can be produced, and are now produced, to a greater or less extent, in the islands in question. Sugar, as everybody knows, is produced in large quantities in Cuba, Porto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippines. Of our sugar importations in the ten months just ended, Cuba has furnished 683,000,000 pounds, other West Indies 514,000,000 pounds, the Hawaiian Islands 534,000,000 pounds, the Philippine Islands 50,000,000 pounds, while the East Indies have, in the present year, furnished a larger share of our sugar importations than any other single part of the world, the total number of pounds from the East Indies alone being, for the ten months ending with October, 1,078,907,548 out of a total of 3,767,756,981 pounds. Coffee, of which our importations are growing constantly and rapidly, amounting to about 850,000,000 pounds annually as against an average of about 550,000,000 pounds in the earlier years of the decade, is successfully grown in all of the islands in question, and at one time was a very important crop in Cuba as well as at present in Porto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippines. Fiber, of which the importations in the present year will amount to $20,000,000 in value, can readily be grown in all of the islands, the Philippines already supplying that most important feature of our fiber importations, manila hemp, which alone will amount to about $6,000,000 in value.

While two or three of the larger items of our tropical and subtropical imports—rubber, silk, and tea—are not produced in any considerable quantities in the islands in question at present, experiments which have been made in those islands, especially in tea and silk, indicate at least that their production is possible and may prove entirely practicable with further experiment. Even without these items the list of importations of tropical products which it is well known can be produced in these islands suggests the possibility that fully $200,000,000 which the United States has been heretofore expending outside her own territory and population for products which her people must have and do not produce can, in no distant future, be distributed in these islands in exchange for their supplies, whose production will doubtless be stimulated by the introduction of American capital and American methods.

The following table shows the imports of tropical and subtropical products into the United States in the year 1899, arranged in the order of magnitude:

Imports of tropical and subtropical products into the United States in 1899.

[Compiled from official reports of the Treasury Department.]

Sugar	$108,124,877	Spices	$2,934,850
Coffee	56,068,980	Indigo	1,816,828
Silk	43,546,872	Licorice root	1,550,106
India rubber	34,219,019	Olive oil	1,199,607
Fibers	21,308,904	Ivory	801,408
Fruits and nuts	20,553,022	Dyewoods	805,719
Tobacco	11,654,893	Sponges	519,814
Tea	10,934,061	Corkwood	481,520
Gums	6,126,343	Miscellaneous	12,000,000
Cotton	6,608,395		
Cacao and chocolate	5,788,738	Total	350,438,066
Rice	3,894,110		

It is thus apparent that we must expend constantly vast sums of money for tropical products; and if so, why not expend it among people under our own flag?

I do not mean, by including sugar in the above list, to indicate that we must always continue sending money abroad for sugar. On the contrary, I believe we shall soon be producing it from beets; but until this is the case why not pay the $100,000,000 a year which we send abroad for sugar to people under the American flag, and where American capital will be invested and thus benefited.

Now, to consider colonies as a market for our surplus products. It is above shown that we can expend many millions in those islands which we should otherwise have to spend elsewhere, and if so, we may reasonably expect them to in return buy from us the articles which they must import.

We do not need to merely argue that we might with propriety expect these islands to buy of us if we buy from them, for we have the experience of France, Germany, and England to show that this has been their experience.

French colonies show a rapid increase in the proportion of their importations which they take from the governing country. An elaborate report on the colonies of France, their government, finances, and commerce, has been published by the Treasury Bureau of Statistics. It shows that the total value of imports into French colonies, exclusive of Algeria and Tunis, amounted in 1898 to $47,741,416, the imports from France and French colonies alone being $22,853,921.

The following table shows the value of imports of French colonies during the year 1896, by principal articles:

Textiles	$10,104,917	Live animals	$728,252
Spirits, wines, etc	4,858,154	Vegetables, fruits, and seeds	644,388
Cereals and flour	4,654,325	Arms and ammunition	606,818
Colonial products	3,144,032	Furniture and woodwork	520,754
Machinery, hardware, etc	2,977,700	Dressed skins and furs	488,985
Building stone, combustibles, etc	2,477,472	Drugs	322,814
Animal products, hides, etc	2,162,551	Coloring matters	184,518
Yarns and threads	1,812,207	Clothing	119,638
Oils and vegetable essences	1,536,537	Matting, wickerwork, etc	119,594
Metals	1,485,202	Dyes	111,375
Chemical products	1,268,507	Vegetable fibers, etc	99,174
Fish	917,754	Musical instruments	38,110
Paper, printed matter, etc	862,504	Sundry products and manufactures	3,190,283
Pottery and glassware	747,621		
Timber	733,041	Total	46,917,236

Another and broader way of looking at it than the mere study of articles imported is to see the total commerce which the various nations have with their colonies, and the relation which their colonial commerce has to that with other parts of the world. A recent London letter to the Philadelphia Inquirer has the following:

The world has been very wide-awake lately to the fact that the colonies of the British Empire have been of vast service and importance to England in facing the surprise party which has been substituted for the "picnic to Pretoria" which was expected to take place in South Africa. It will, however, amaze a very large number of the mercantile public, even though they be well posted in trade statistics, to learn what an enormously valuable asset in England's trade is the colonial business. A leading journal that battles strongly for British trade and which is kept busy in pointing out to British traders what their American and German rivals are doing to best them in the race for commercial supremacy, says that it must again call attention to the great subject of union with the colonies.

"We advert to it once again," writes the editor, "because we think the present a favorable opportunity to take a long step forward. Interested in the question in its commercial aspect chiefly there seems to us two reasons, overpowering in their nature, why policy no less than patriotism demands the closest possible combination among the peoples of the Empire. In the first place, the colonies, taken as a whole, occupy the second place among the traders of the world. Without going into detail, confining ourselves to the chief participants in the traffic, and assuming for the present that the total of their interchanges may be represented by round numbers, say 2,000, the shares of the several holders stand thus:

Great Britain and Ireland	594
The British colonies	407
Germany	354
The United States	348
France	297
Total	2,000

"In these circumstances can anyone entertain a doubt where lies the chief interest of England as a mercantile community? The merest exigencies of trade call upon us to cultivate by all means the closest relations with the Empire over sea. High as is the position they have now attained, we should not forget that the British colonies are that portion of the world which is developing most rapidly in all things that make for national greatness, and that their resources, far from being exhausted, are but beginning to be exploited. Is it not patent that, if we had shown one-half the zeal in gaining the affections of the colonies and binding them to us that we have lavished on France, the United States, and Germany dur-

ing the last thirty years—the Empire, vast as it is, would be to-day immeasurably richer, immeasurably more powerful?

"The colonies, I may add, most certainly are England's best customers, as is shown in Mr. Mulhall's paper on 'British Trade' in the March Contemporary. Take some figures for the last decade, 1889–1898. England's aggregate interchanges, export and import, with great industrial communities were as follows:

The British colonies	£1,788,000,000
The United States	1,399,000,000
Germany	824,000,000
France	682,000,000
Total	4,693,000,000

"Thus England's colonial trade shows an excess of £389,000,000 over her United States trade, an excess of £924,000,000 over that with Germany, and of £1,106,000,000 over the French trade in the space of ten years. The contrast is still more striking if one divides the aggregates according to exports and imports. It is well known how England's sales to European nations dwindle year by year under the operation of hostile tariffs and commercial restrictions. Take the United States for the period under review. Her account gives the following result:

Purchases from the United States	£1,019,000,000
Sales to the United States	380,000,000
Total	1,399,000,000

"The reports for the British colonies indicate much more equal conditions of trading and a freer access to their markets:

Purchases from the colonies	£949,000,000
Sales to the colonies	839,000,000
Total	1,788,000,000

TRADE OF EUROPEAN COUNTRIES WITH THEIR COLONIES.

The commercial benefits of colonization are indicated in some degree by the following tables, which show the exports of the United Kingdom, France, Netherlands, and Spain, respectively, to their colonies in recent years, and the percentage which these exports form of the total exports of the countries in question; also, the percentage of their total imports which the colonies take from the mother countries, and the share of their imports which other parts of the world take from the conntries in question.

It will be seen from an examination of these tables that the United Kingdom in 1897 exported to her colonies goods valued at $423,212,102 out of a total exportation of $1,431,598,345; thus 30 per cent of her total exports were sent to the colonies. The total imports of her colonies in the year were $1,216,284,637, and the amount which they took from Great Britain, $423,212,102, formed 34.8 per cent of their total imports. To the non-British world the United Kingdom sold in the same year goods valued at $1,008,386,243, and this amounted to only 13 per cent of the imports of the non-British world in that year. Or, to put it in other words, Great Britain was, through her relations with her colonies, able to supply them with 34.8 per cent of their imports, while to the non-British world she was only able to supply 13 per cent of its imports. Even the case of the United States, from which her purchases are enormous, whose people speak the same language and have extremely close business relations with her, she only supplied in 1899, 17 per cent of its total imports; while supplying 34.8 per cent of the imports of her colonies.

The imports of the British colonies, as already indicated, are $1,216,284,637, and had Great Britain supplied to them only the proportion—13 per cent—of the imports she was able to supply to the non-British world it would have amounted to but $158,106,000 instead of the $433,212,102 which she actually did send to them.

Thus in the year in question, upon this estimate, she made a market in her colonies for $265,000,000 worth of goods in excess of what she would have sold them had they held the same relation to her that does the non-British world generally. Even had she been able to supply them as large a proportion of their imports as she supplies of the imports of the United States her sales to them under such extremely favorable circumstances would have fallen $218,000,000 below those actually made.

In the case of the other countries the study is equally interesting, France supplied to her colonies 22.5 per cent of their total imports, while the non-French world took from France but 9.3 per cent of its imports; the Netherlands supplied to its colonies 31.7 per cent of their imports, while the non-Netherland world took from that country less than 6 per cent of its imports; Spain supplied to her colonies 84.6 per cent of their total imports, while the non-Spanish world took from that country less than 2 per cent of its imports.

It is apparent from this study of the commercial relations of Great Britain and her colonies and of the non-British world, respectively, that her sales to her colonies were more than twice as large as they would have been had the colonies not held this relation to her. Now, let us apply this general fact to Great Britain's commerce with her colonies during a term of years. The table which follows shows the exports of the United Kingdom to her colonies in each year from 1868 to 1898, a term of thirty years. It will be seen by this table that her exports to her colonies during that time have amounted to $11,580,000,000, and applying to this vast sum the estimate already made that she sells to her colonies more than double the amount which they would buy did not the colonial relationship exist, it will be apparent that she has by her colonial enterprise made for her manufacturers and producers a market during the last thirty years for more than $6,000,000,000 in clear excess of that which they would have had with this same territory had not the colonial relationship existed.

Now, to take the other side of the case: All manufacturing countries and countries of the temperate zone now find it necessary to import large quantities of tropical products, partially for manufacturing and partly for consumption of their people—coffee, sugar, cocoa, spices, hemp, jute, rubber, etc. By making these purchases in the colonies the mother country benefits those of her own citizens whose capital is invested in great producing enterprises in the colonies, and at the same time obtains a permanent and regular supply of the articles which she must have for her factories and breakfast tables. Of the total imports of the United Kingdom in the last thirty years, more than $12,000,000,000 worth, or 23 per cent, has been taken from her colonies, while of her exports in the decade 1869 to 1878, 25 per cent went to the colonies, and in the following decade 29 per cent, while in 1898 more than 30 per cent went to the colonies.

Thus in the past thirty years the United Kingdom has, through her colonial enterprises, made a market for fully six thousand million dollars worth of goods in excess of what she would have sold to the same territory had not the colonial relationship existed, while she has expended among the people of those countries $12,000,000,000 in the purchase of articles required by her population for food or manufacturing, and thus benefited to a great extent both the people of the colonies and those of her own people having business relations in the colonies.

Total exports of colonizing countries of the world, the amount and percentage exported to their colonies and to the foreign world, respectively, and the percentage of their total imports supplied.

Nationality of colonies.	Total exports.			Exports to colonies.		Exports to foreign world.	
	Value.	Per cent of exports sent to colonies	Per cent sent to foreign world.	Value.	Per cent of total imports of colonies supplied by mother country.	Value.	Per cent of total imports of foreign world so supplied.
United Kingdom	$1,431,598,345	29.56	70.44	$423,212,102	34.80	$1,008,386,243	13.04
France	894,190,176	7.42	92.58	66,393,000	22.54	827,797,176	9.36
Netherlands	542,079,435	4.16	95.84	22,548,582	31.76	519,830,853	5.65
Spain	209,235,168	34.06	65.94	71,266,215	84.64	137,968,953	1.43

Statement showing the total imports of the colonies of the world, and the percentage from the mother country and the foreign world, respectively; also the percentage supplied by the United States, United Kingdom, and Spain for 1897; France and Netherlands for 1896.

Nationality of colonies.	Total imports of colonies.			Imports of colonies from the mother country.		Imports of colonies from foreign world.		Imports of colonies from United States.	
	Value.	Per cent taken from mother country.	Per cent taken from foreign world.	Value.	Per cent of total imports from mother country.	Value.	Per cent of total imports from foreign world.	Value.	Per cent of total imports from the United States.
United Kingdom	$1,216,284,637	34.80	65.20	$423,212,102	34.80	$793,072,535	65.20	$111,364,396	9.16
France	294,571,646	22.54	77.46	66,393,000	22.54	228,178,646	77.46	2,918,185	.99
Netherlands	71,011,692	31.76	68.24	22,548,582	31.76	44,463,110	68.24	2,560,734	3.20
Spain	84,192,510	84.64	15.36	71,266,215	84.64	12,926,295	15.36	10,645,879	12.64

Statement showing the total imports and exports of the United Kingdom, and the amount imported from and exported to her colonies during the past thirty years—1869 to 1898.

Year.	Imports.		Exports.	
	Total imports.	Imports from colonies.	Total exports.	Exports to colonies.
1869	$1,437,857,131	$342,681,854	$1,153,433,760	$252,581,187
1870	1,475,802,590	315,506,908	1,187,818,128	269,561,917
1871	1,610,886,833	334,984,010	1,380,016,278	270,389,037
1872	1,726,116,521	386,267,989	1,530,946,561	319,287,259
1873	1,806,809,906	394,235,799	1,513,504,699	346,240,316
1874	1,801,007,465	399,845,456	1,448,515,988	379,149,151
1875	1,819,776,951	410,849,255	1,370,466,370	373,041,611
1876	1,825,690,362	410,404,481	1,249,603,334	341,384,435
1877	1,919,445,383	435,814,531	1,228,041,906	368,647,838
1878	1,794,622,816	379,810,859	1,194,647,195	350,352,514
1879	1,706,499,900	384,174,348	1,210,704,241	323,665,917
1880	2,001,248,678	450,242,765	1,303,835,990	396,758,915
1881	1,932,109,943	445,477,755	1,445,758,324	421,834,021
1882	2,009,959,922	483,880,400	1,492,364,365	449,361,013
1883	2,077,467,869	480,238,544	1,496,409,501	439,983,016
1884	1,898,025,886	466,275,531	1,440,326,242	429,729,630
1885	1,805,315,558	410,741,034	1,321,129,726	416,034,710
1886	1,702,610,586	398,488,695	1,308,891,227	400,184,346
1887	1,762,780,440	407,806,203	1,368,765,830	402,367,265
1888	1,886,429,343	422,975,439	1,453,027,603	446,393,791
1889	2,061,098,356	473,345,335	1,565,831,772	442,053,886
1890	2,047,297,603	467,968,548	1,507,438,932	459,993,595
1891	2,119,074,911	484,045,000	1,504,301,909	454,229,956
1892	2,062,392,927	475,779,718	1,419,266,868	395,215,964
1893	1,909,415,018	446,506,048	1,348,695,391	382,425,688
1894	1,987,210,018	457,023,556	1,332,378,922	382,498,613
1895	2,027,820,221	464,807,767	1,391,003,409	370,205,123
1896	2,150,063,031	453,506,873	1,442,329,445	441,148,230
1897	2,194,982,434	457,543,137	1,431,598,345	423,212,102
1898	2,289,097,374	483,895,391	1,430,819,072	428,523,897
BY DECADES.				
1869–1878	$17,218,074,048	$3,830,401,132	$13,256,994,194	$3,270,585,265
Per cent with colonies		22.25		24.67
1879–1888	18,842,447,660	4,350,293,774	13,921,208,062	4,124,257,024
Per cent with colonies		23.09		29.63
1889–1898	20,928,401,893	4,664,691,423	14,433,662,065	4,189,447,054
Per cent with colonies		22.29		29.02

Total exports of United Kingdom to colonies from 1869 to 1898, $11,584,289,943.

Principal articles imported into and exported from the United Kingdom in its commerce with the British colonies during the year 1898.

IMPORTS INTO UNITED KINGDOM FROM COLONIES.		EXPORTS FROM UNITED KINGDOM TO COLONIES.	
Articles of food and food products:		Manufactured articles:	
Breadstuffs	$48,508,173	Cotton manufactures	$132,310,290
Tea	44,871,556	Iron and steel manufactures	20,000,000
Meats of all kinds	29,036,143	Machinery	25,518,860
Dairy products	22,634,367	All other	47,795,585
Rice	7,489,407	Woolen manufactures	25,707,062
Vegetables	5,125,164	Apparel and slops	19,623,875
Fruits	5,112,801	Liquors	12,822,575
Fishes	4,957,357	Carriages, etc	8,893,689
Spices	4,344,164	Leather manufactures	8,244,279
Sugar	3,774,311	Paper and stationery	7,085,697
Coffee	3,300,821	Chemical and medicinal preparations	7,604,259
All other	4,480,426	Haberdashery and millinery	6,163,033
Total food products	184,722,782	Arms, ammunition, etc	5,062,518
Per cent of total	38.17	Linen and jute manufactures	5,491,913
Raw and partially manufactured materials:		Telegraph and electric apparatus	4,543,476
Wool	99,471,484	Pickles and sauces	4,245,978
Wood and lumber	27,791,739	Books	4,040,592
Fibers, unmanufactured	20,881,426	Painters' colors	3,610,802
Leather	14,968,162	Earthenware	3,208,634
Seeds	11,581,613	Hats of all kinds	3,211,992
Skins and furs	11,204,299	Copper manufactures	3,126,361
Dyestuffs, etc	12,694,017	Silk manufactures	2,702,907
Oils	6,659,357	Glassware	2,646,257
Caoutchouc	6,470,051	Soap	2,641,103
Tin in bars and pigs	6,329,438	Total	344,359,735
Hides	6,149,402	Per cent of total	78.59
Copper in ore and pigs	6,105,720	Total exports to colonies, 1898	438,523,897
Tallow and stearine	5,400,574	Total exports to colonies from 1869 to 1898	11,584,289,943
Feathers	3,966,032		
Lead in ore and pigs	3,926,122		
Gutta percha	2,868,870		
Nuts and kernels for oil	2,571,233		
Shells	2,217,435		
Raw cotton	1,913,512		
Raw silk	1,483,840		
Total raw materials	254,684,956		
Aggregate	439,377,738		
Per cent of raw materials	52.63		
Total imports from colonies	483,895,391		

The class of goods which the British colonies take from the United Kingdom and supply to her is shown by the above table. It will be seen that the important articles which the colonies take from the mother country are of precisely the class which the manufacturers of the United States are now sending abroad and for which they are desiring to find or create a market—cotton goods, manufactures of iron and steel, machinery, manufactures of wool, manufactures of leather, paper and stationery, clothing, haberdashery, arms, ammunition, carriages, telegraph and electrical apparatus, books, and other articles of this character. These form the bulk of Great Britain's exports to her colonies, while her imports from them include fibers, cabinet wood, hides and skins, dyestuffs, pig tin, rubber, tropical fruits, tea, coffee, sugar, spices, and many other articles of this class.

Now, to apply these facts to the islands with which we have come into closer relations under the Administration of President McKinley: The imports of these islands under normal conditions have ranged in the vicinity of $100,000,000 a year, and it is reasonable to believe that they will, within a comparatively short time, double that purchasing power. Their imports are almost exclusively of the class of goods which the people of the United States desire to sell, and judging from Great Britain's experience with her colonies, it may be expected that the share which we have in the past supplied of their imports will be greatly increased. That our exports to them are already rapidly increasing is indicated by statements which follow, showing the value of the exports to each of the islands in question during the past few years.

COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES WITH CUBA, PORTO RICO, AND THE HAWAIIAN, PHILIPPINE, AND SAMOAN ISLANDS.

Exports from the United States to Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Hawaiian, Philippine, and Samoan islands, amounted, in round numbers, to $45,000,000 in the fiscal year 1900, and were more than three times as much as in 1896 and more than twice as much as in any year of our commerce with those islands except in the years 1892, 1893, and 1894, when reciprocity greatly increased our exports to Cuba and Porto Rico. To Cuba the total for the fiscal year was, in round figures, $25,000,000, against $7,530,000 in the fiscal year 1896 and $24,157,000 in the great reciprocity year 1893, when exports to that island were more than double those of five years earlier. To Porto Rico the exports of the year were, in round terms, $2,600,000, against an average of $2,750,000 in the reciprocity years 1892, 1893, and 1894, when exports to that island were double those of earlier years. To the Hawaiian Islands the total for the year were about $15,000,000, or five times as much as in 1893, nearly four times as much as in 1896, and more than double the total for 1898. To the Philippines the total for 1900 was about $2,500,000, or more than in the entire fifteen years since 1885, the date at which the first record of our exports to the Philippines was made by the Treasury Bureau of Statistics. To the Samoan Islands the exports of the year were about $125,000, or nearly as much as in all the years since 1896, at which date the official records of our exports to those islands began.

On the import side, Cuba begins to show something of her old-time strength as an exporting island, as the total imports into the United States from Cuba for the full year show a total of $31,000,000, against $15,000,000 in 1898 and $18,500,000 in 1897, though they still are less than half the average for the reciprocity years 1892, 1893, and 1894, when our imports from that island averaged over $75,000,000 per annum. From Porto Rico the imports of the year are but $1,350,000, which is less than the total for any preceding year since 1880, and is due to the destruction by last year's tornado of the crops which supply Porto Rico's chief articles of export. From the Hawaiian Islands the imports for the full fiscal year are $21,000,000, or double the average annual importation for the period prior to 1896, and 20 per cent higher than in any preceding year, while from the Philippines, despite the war conditions which reduce producing and exporting power, the imports are larger than in any year since 1894.

The following table shows the exports to and imports from Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Hawaiian and Philippine islands in each fiscal year since 1885, the figures for May and June, 1900, being estimated:

Year.	Exports from the United States to—			
	Cuba.	Porto Rico.	Hawaiian Islands.	Philippine Islands.
	Dollars.	*Dollars.*	*Dollars.*	*Dollars.*
1885	9,006,160	1,569,205	2,787,922	
1886	10,409,170	1,710,569	3,192,698	132,993
1887	10,546,411	1,738,492	3,622,029	147,682
1888	10,053,560	1,969,618	2,085,203	165,903
1889	11,691,311	2,224,981	3,575,611	170,647
1890	13,084,415	2,297,588	4,711,417	122,276
1891	12,224,838	2,155,234	5,107,212	124,572
1892	17,953,570	2,856,003	3,781,628	60,914
1893	24,157,698	2,510,607	2,827,663	154,378
1894	20,125,321	2,720,508	3,306,187	145,466
1895	12,807,661	1,838,544	3,723,057	119,255
1896	7,530,880	2,102,094	3,985,707	162,466
1897	8,259,770	1,983,888	4,690,075	94,597
1898	9,561,656	1,506,046	5,907,155	127,804
1899	18,619,377	2,685,843	9,305,470	404,193
1900*	25,000,000	3,000,000	14,500,000	2,500,000

Year.	Imports into the United States from—			
	Cuba.	Porto Rico.	Hawaii.	Philippines
1885	$42,306,093	$6,104,263	$8,857,497	.....
1886	51,110,780	4,594,544	9,805,707	$9,566,912
1887	49,515,434	4,661,690	9,922,075	8,614,830
1888	49,310,087	4,412,483	11,060,379	10,268,278
1889	52,130,623	3,707,373	12,847,740	10,593,172
1890	53,801,501	4,053,626	12,312,908	11,592,626
1891	61,714,395	3,164,110	13,895,597	5,167,209
1892	77,931,671	3,248,007	8,075,882	6,308,653
1893	78,706,506	4,008,623	9,146,767	9,150,857
1894	75,678,251	3,135,634	10,065,317	7,008,342
1895	52,871,259	1,516,512	7,888,961	4,731,366
1896	40,017,730	2,296,653	11,757,704	4,982,857
1897	18,406,815	2,181,024	13,687,799	4,383,740
1898	15,232,477	2,414,356	17,187,380	3,830,315
1899	25,408,828	3,179,827	17,831,463	4,409,774
1900[1]	31,000,000	1,350,000	21,500,000	5,800,000

[1] May and June, 1900, estimated.

IMPORTS OF CUBA, PORTO RICO, AND THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines afforded a market for over $40,000,000 worth of Spanish goods per annum, according to a recent statement of the British consul at Barcelona. About three-fourths of this amount was in manufactured goods, and considerable more than one-half of this market was that of Cuba alone. According to the statement which Mr. Consul Roberts sends to the British foreign office, dated June 18, 1899, the exports of Spain to Cuba in 1896 amounted to $26,882,335; to Porto Rico, $7,532,162, and to the Philippines, $4,671,551, making a total of $42,096,048, accepting the value of the peseta at 20 cents. Of the $26,892,335 value of goods exported to Cuba in 1896, $16,530,418, according to Consul Roberts, consisted of manufactured goods, $10,170,111 provisions, and $191,805 of raw materials. Of the $7,532,161 value of goods exported from Spain to Porto Rico in 1896, the value of $5,821,595 was manufactured goods, $1,680,300 provisions, and $20,264 raw materials. To the Philippines, of the $7,671,551 value of goods exported from Spain, the value of $6,850,178 was manufactured goods, $814,111 provisions, and $7,261 raw materials. Totalizing the three colonies, Consul Roberts finds that of the $42,096,048 value of goods exported from Spain to Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines in 1896, the value of $29,202,192 was manufactured goods, $12,664,525 provisions, and $229,331 raw materials.

To this market for $42,000,000 worth of Spanish produce, which the three colonies supplied, Mr. Consul Roberts adds $4,600,000 for money paid to the Spanish steamship companies for the carrying trade to and from the colonies. The imports into Spain from the colonies, he says, amounted in 1896 to 260,877 tons from Cuba, 26,071 tons from Porto Rico, and 40,985 tons from the Philippines, and computes that the amount paid in freight amounted in the commerce with Cuba to $1,565,262; Porto Rico, $156,426, and the Philippines, $450,835, or a total of $2,172,523, and says:

> If to this be added the value of passage money to and from the colonies, putting it at the low average of $50 a head, it shows a further $2,600,000 per annum, giving a total of $4,600,000 per annum paid in freight and passage giving to the steamship companies for the carrying trade to and from the colonies.

Consul Roberts intimates that other nationalities have in the past participated in the so-called Spanish trade with these islands by locating in Spain and thus getting the advantage of low tariff rates into the islands which were originally given to commerce originating in Spain. On this subject he says:

> In the year 1892 the Spanish customs tariff on manufactured goods was very considerably increased with the view of virtually giving a monopoly to goods manufactured here for exportation to the colonies. This, of course, gave an enormous impetus to manufacture in this province. Factories increased largely in number and the Catalan manufacturers grew rapidly rich. The only way in which foreigners who had good clients in the colonies could meet this competition and retain their markets was by starting factories in the country, the goods thus being manufactured in the Peninsula entering the Spanish colonies on the same terms as those of the Spanish manufacturers, whereas if shipped from England or elsewhere the prohibitive duty rendered competition impossible; or by having a resident agent in this city, who, purchasing from the Catalan manufacturers, exported the merchandise from here free of duty.

The following tables indicate the classes of articles exported from Spain to Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines in 1896, the year discussed by Consul Roberts, including all articles or classes of articles in which the value exceeded $200,000:

Principal exports from Spain to the Philippines in 1896.

Cotton fabrics	$5,094,146
Paper, and manufactures of	314,260
Leather, and manufactures of	202,580

Principal exports from Spain to Porto Rico in 1896.

Cotton, and manufactures of	2,487,953
Shoes	1,076,148
Sandals	720,276
Rice	530,522
Soap	251,163
Oil, common	240,415

Principal exports from Spain to Cuba in 1896.

Wheat flour	4,065,376
Cotton manufactures	3,744,257
Leather shoes	3,449,952
Sandals	2,686,702
Firearms	1,872,240
Wine	1,488,161
Preserved foods	948,472
Flax, hemp, etc., and manufactures of	740,017
Oil, common	663,244
Soap	635,369
Wood, manufactures of	451,568
Wax and stearin	419,124
Beans	375,604
Onions, garlic, and potatoes	241,023
Smoking paper	377,046
Packing paper	284,047
Rice	298,970
Corn	286,563
Pressed meat	316,314
Soup pastes (vermicelli, etc.)	287,200
Saffron	234,252
Woolen blankets	219,971

Imports into Porto Rico from the United States and Spain, 1888 to 1898.

Year.	From United States.	From Spain.
1888	$1,909,618	$3,012,725
1889	2,224,931	3,277,086
1890	2,297,528	4,512,123
1891	2,155,234	3,425,122
1892	2,856,003	3,945,681
1893	2,510,607	4,808,985
1894	2,720,508	5,706,407
1895	1,833,544	5,444,910
1896	2,102,094	7,532,121
1897	1,988,888	.....
1898	1,505,946	.....

Trade of the Philippine Islands, by countries, during the calendar year 1893.

Countries.	Imports.			Exports.			Total imports and exports.	
	Pesos.		*Per cent.*	*Pesos.*		*Per cent.*		*Per cent.*
United Kingdom	6,929,662	$4,247,883	26.73	16,247,877	$9,959,949	44.90	$14,207,832	27.32
China (including Hongkong)	3,659,340	2,237,471	14.08	7,939,054	4,866,640	21.94	7,104,111	18.66
Spain	8,327,691	5,104,875	32.13	3,130,919	1,919,253	8.65	7,024,128	18.45
United States	1,560,695	956,706	6.02	4,885,639	2,994,897	13.50	3,951,603	10.38
Germany	2,033,031	1,246,248	7.84	32,182	19,728	.09	1,265,976	3.32
Egypt (Port Said)	5,195	3,185	.02	1,887,056	1,156,765	5.21	1,159,950	3.05
France	778,183	477,026	3.00	394,525	241,844	1.09	718,870	1.89
Singapore	254,707	156,135	.98	831,831	509,912	2.30	666,047	1.75
French Indo-China[a]	844,915	517,933	3.26	9,840	6,725	.03	523,658	1.38
Japan	298,006	182,678	1.15	498,666	305,682	1.38	488,360	1.28
Russia	428,965	262,956	1.66	.....	.....	.....	262,956	.69
Switzerland	327,357	206,800	1.30	.....	.....	.....	206,800	.54
Belgium	127,801	78,342	.49	74,034	45,383	.20	123,725	.32
Australasia	106,687	65,399	.41	75,985	46,579	.21	111,978	.29
Dutch East Indies	.....	.....	.....	154,277	94,572	.43	94,572	.25
Austria-Hungary	102,725	62,970	.40	350	214	.....	63,184	.17
Netherlands	66,230	40,599	.26	18,012	11,041	.05	51,640	.14
Italy	52,831	32,385	.20	1,150	705	.....	33,090	.09
British India	4,250	2,605	.02	6,480	3,972	.02	6,577	.02
Sulu Islands	8,645	5,299	.03	.....	.....	.....	5,299	.01
Sweden and Norway	2,375	1,456	.01	.....	.....	.....	1,456	.....
Denmark	2,205	1,352	.01	.....	.....	.....	1,352	.....
Portugal	325	199	.....	590	362	.....	561	.....
Total	25,922,515	15,890,502	100.00	36,187,966	22,183,223	100.00	38,073,725	100.00

[a] Through Saigon.

The following table shows the imports into Porto Rico from Spain in 1891 and 1896, by principal articles:

Articles.	1891.	1896.
Cotton, manufactures of	$539,113	$2,487,953
Shoes	717,824	1,076,148
Sandals	33,957	720,276
Rice	97,434	530,522
Soap	249,493	226,162
Oil, common	170,463	240,414
Preserved food	112,567	168,804
Felt hats		165,989
Flax and hemp manufactures	84,212	162,582
Wax and stearin	51,835	140,315
Soup pastes, etc	31,433	104,969
Wheat flour	156,724	95,637
Wood, manufactures of	67,824	92,639
Beans	114,270	90,273
Wool, and manufactures of	23,025	87,737
Chocolate and sweets	70,057	77,502
Leather	22,940	68,416
Packing paper	33,105	70,112
Wine	202,432	120,692
Oils and paints		25,852
Chemicals and drugs	8,325	26,298
Perfumery	57,219	61,420
Silk manufactures	37,525	45,847
Writing paper	12,153	21,414
Books, music, etc	14,117	24,025
Other paper	15,614	35,349
Saddlery	10,176	21,024
Hams and meats	7,313	22,062
Butter	17,434	46,783
Other dried vegetables	11,139	28,365
Glass and earthenware	5,579	16,302
Playing cards	11,512	13,817
Umbrellas	38,395	18,713

The prospective value of Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Hawaiian, Philippine, and Samoan islands as markets for the products of the farm and factory in the United States is illustrated by a recent publication in the Moniteur Officiel du Commerce, an official publication of the French Government, which discusses at considerable length the consuming powers of those islands and their consequent economic value to the United States, and the prospective increase in their consuming powers through enlarged production under American capital. The statement is as follows:

At present the imports of these countries amount to about $100,000,000. Those of Cuba were in 1892 (which was an average good year), $52,101,682; of the Philippines in 1896, $28,815,075; of the Hawaiian Islands in 1898, $11,650,890, and of Porto Rico in 1896, $8,656,578. The imports, however, show already an increase, as is seen by the American export figures to these islands, those to the Hawaiian Islands for 1899 being $9,905,470, as against $5,907,155 for 1898 and $4,690,075 for 1897; those to Cuba, $18,616,317 in 1899, as against $9,561,656 in 1898 and $8,259,776 in 1897; the respective figures of exports to Porto Rico being $2,685,848 for the year 1899, as compared with $1,505,946 for 1898 and $1,988,888 for 1897. There is no doubt that with an increased productive power which must naturally be followed by increased consumption, the volume of the foreign trade of these islands is likewise bound to increase considerably.

The consumption of foreign products by these islands is made up almost equally of articles of manufacture and of agriculture of the temperate zone. Out of $20,125,321 worth of products exported from the United States to Cuba in 1894, the value of $9,440,953 was in products of agriculture, and out of $18,616,377 worth of exports for the year 1899, $9,799,512 worth belonged to the same category. The exports from the United States to the "Pearl of the Antilles" are made up principally of cereals, live animals, salt meat, cotton goods, machinery, foot wear, instruments, etc.

Spain, under normal conditions, sold annually to Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines, about $40,000,000 worth of goods, principally manufactured articles, besides wines, oils, flour, meats, and vegetables. Out of 135,000,000 pesetas' worth of merchandise shipped from Spain to Cuba in 1896, about 50,000,000 represented the value of products of agriculture. The proportion was nearly the same in the case of Porto Rico and the Philippine Islands.

Speaking generally, we may assume that under normal conditions the surplus production of Cuba and the Philippines before the war amounted to about $125,000,000 annually, and their consumption to $100,000,000, but that their productive power is capable of great increase, which in turn will cause a similar increase in consumption. About one-half of the imports into these islands was of Spanish origin and the other half came from other countries proportionate to their proximity or distance. Thus the United States furnished the greater part of the imports into Cuba and Porto Rico, while the Philippine Islands received whatever Spain was unable to furnish them with from Hongkong, Shanghai, Yokohama, Singapore, Calcutta, and Australian ports.

The following statement, prepared by the Treasury Bureau of Statistics, shows the exports from the United States, by principal articles, to each of the islands mentioned in the above discussion. The statement covers the seven months ending with January, 1900, and compares that period with the corresponding period in earlier years, thus indicating the growth in exports from the United States to those islands since 1897:

Articles.	Cuba.	Porto Rico.	Hawaii.	Philippines.
Animals*	$2,050,232	$1,104	$167,941	$407,300
Breadstuffs†	1,738,905	460,270	605,490	116,543
Chemicals	256,135	81,661	110,712	32,600
Coal and coke	308,456	22,502	67,545	60,134
Cotton manufactures	445,382	122,731	252,580	14,393
Iron and steel	2,090,801	340,790	2,728,522	291,706
Liquors	503,955	62,853	201,850	192,653
Mineral oil	254,897	30,522	76,427	4,567
Provisions‡	2,945,139	416,346	246,494	22,980
Vegetables	$672,125	$45,773	$41,492	$44,128
Wood§	905,476	218,044	705,883	58,963
Other articles‖	9,239,251	511,616	2,196,283	297,061
Total seven months of—	15,405,754	2,264,213	7,501,219	1,552,122
1897	4,793,754	1,126,732	2,548,929	88,091
1898	6,522,579	1,102,998	3,508,016	67,328
1899	8,467,696	1,059,044	4,754,430	97,492
1900	15,405,754	2,264,213	7,501,219	1,552,122

* Chiefly cattle.
† Chiefly flour and corn.
‡ Chiefly lard, bacon, hams, and fresh meat.
§ Chiefly lumber and furniture.
‖ Includes exports of foreign merchandise.

Imports of principal articles into the United States from Cuba during the years ending June 30, 1898, 1896, and 1898.

Articles.	1898.	1896.	1898.
Sugar	$60,637,631	$24,102,835	$9,828,607
Tobacco, leaf	8,940,058	10,613,468	2,883,260
Tobacco manufactures	2,787,030	2,096,884	1,450,818
Fruits and nuts	2,389,523	1,214,994	45,326
Molasses	1,061,034	128,474	85,941
Wood, unmanufactured	1,071,123	531,349	17,576
Iron ore	641,943	521,310	$25,818
Chemicals, drugs, and dyes	377,269	32,312	2,004
Hides and skins	279,153	184,281	88,147
Vegetables	67,042	40,265	0,612
Asphaltum	25,992	7,028	
Spirits, distilled	19,419	7,493	8,995
Textile grasses	2,314	442	
All other articles	386,975	574,996	540,373
Total	78,706,506	40,017,730	15,232,477
Imports free of duty	66,049,369	2,074,763	276,000
Imports dutiable	12,657,137	37,942,967	14,956,477

NOTE.—The decrease in free and increase in dutiable imports in 1896 and 1898, compared with 1893, are due to the transfer in 1894 of sugar and molasses from the free to the dutiable list.

Imports of principal articles into Spain from Cuba, 1895.

Sugar	$2,080,987	Cooperage	$37,823
Tobacco, unmanufactured	2,030,485	Paraffin, wax, etc	29,016
Tobacco, manufactured	1,148,587	Perfumery and extracts	26,253
Cocoa	531,607	Leather and hides, undressed	24,945
Rum	191,376	Fruits	9,488
Coffee	153,816	All other articles	101,196
Cabinet woods	75,201	Total	6,551,204
Sweets and conserves	71,599		
Sacks and bags	38,825		

NOTE.—The imports from Cuba and Porto Rico are not separately stated in the commercial reports of France, Germany, and the United Kingdom. The total imports from both islands in 1896 were: Into the United Kingdom, $179,225; into Germany, $3,837,205, and into France, $3,204,670. The principal imports of France from the islands were coffee, manufactured tobacco, and sponges; those of Germany, tobacco, manufactured and unmanufactured; United Kingdom, mahogany.

Imports of principal articles into the United States from Porto Rico, during the years ending June 30, 1895, 1896, and 1898.

Articles.	1898.	1896.	1898.
Sugar	$3,228,993	$1,708,318	$1,913,742
Molasses	708,905	520,275	264,781
Coffee	23,814	24,101	24,217
Fruits and nuts	26,628	63	11,532
All other articles	20,343	43,896	100,084
Total	4,008,623	2,296,653	2,414,356
Imports free of duty	3,994,673	48,608	50,667
Imports dutiable	13,950	2,248,045	2,363,689

NOTE.—The decrease in free and increase in dutiable imports into United States from Porto Rico in 1896 and 1898, compared with 1893, are due to the transfer in 1894 of sugar and molasses from the free to the dutiable list.

Imports of principal articles into Spain from Porto Rico, 1896.

Coffee	$3,278,253	Fruits	$21,933
Sugar	1,610,826	Tobacco, manufactures of	12,574
Cacao	196,240	All other articles	46,146
Tobacco, leaf	88,740	Total	5,376,457
Leather and manufactures	77,051		
Sacks and bags	44,694		

NOTE.—The imports from Cuba and Porto Rico are not separately stated in the commercial reports of France, Germany, and the United Kingdom. The total imports from both islands in 1896 were: Into the United Kingdom, $179,225; Germany, $3,837,205, and France, $3,204,670. The principal imports of France from the islands were coffee, manufactured tobacco, and sponges; those of Germany, tobacco, manufactured and unmanufactured; United Kingdom, mahogany.

THE PHILIPPINES AS A DOOR TO THE COMMERCE OF THE ORIENT—AN IMPORTANT DISTRIBUTING POINT TO HALF THE EARTH'S POPULATION—A MARKET FOR MORE THAN A BILLION DOLLARS WORTH PER ANNUM OF PRODUCTS OF OUR FARMS AND FACTORIES.

The market which the people of the United States will be able to make in the Philippines, while amounting to many millions of

dollars is, however, a small item compared to that which opens to them through the possession of the Philippines as an entrepôt for the distribution of American goods in the Orient. Grouped around Manila, as a point of distribution, lies the most densely populated part of the world. More than 800,000,000 of people form the population of Japan, Asiatic Russia, China, French Cochin China, Siam, British India, Australasia, the Dutch East Indies, etc., all of which are nearer to Manila, as a point of distribution, than any other great commercial center, while such cities as Canton, Shanghai, and others are as near Manila as Havana is to the city of New York. The commerce of this section, of which Manila may be made a great commercial center, now amounts to more than $2,000,000,000 per annum, and its annual purchases $1,200,000,000 per annum, or an average of $100,000,000 a month. Practically all this vast sum which it sends to other parts of the world is expended for the class of goods for which the people of the United States are now seeking a market. Cotton and cotton goods, breadstuffs, provisions, dairy products, manufactures of iron and steel and wood, the products of the farm and factory, are demanded by the people of that part of the world.

In most cases the apparent disposition is of these countries to purchase from the people of the United States rather than from any other section or people. China, which in 1880 took only 2.5 per cent of her imports from the United States, in 1898 took 8.2 per cent of her imports from this country. Japan, which in 1893 took only 6.8 per cent of her imports from the United States, took 14.4 per cent of her imports from this country in 1898. Our exports to China, which in the fiscal year 1893 were but $3,900,457, were in 1899 $14,493,440. Our exports to Japan, which in 1893 were $3,195,494, were in 1899 $17,264,688, and in the fiscal year of 1900 will reach $25,000,000. To British Australasia our exports, which in 1894 were $8,131,939, were in 1899 $19,777,129, and will reach $25,000,000 in 1900. To the Hawaiian Islands our exports in 1893 were $2,827,663, and in 1899 $9,305,470, while those of the fiscal year 1900 will reach $14,000,000. To the Philippines our exports in 1897 were less than $100,000, and in the year 1900 will exceed $2,000,000. Taking Asia as a whole, our exports, which in 1893 were but $16,222,354, were in 1899 $48,360,161, and in 1900 will reach $65,000,000, or four times those of 1893, while to Oceania our exports, which in 1893 were $11,199,477, will in 1900 exceed $40,000,000. Thus our exportations to Asia and Oceania, which in 1893 were $27,000,000, will in 1900 be upward of $100,000,000, or four times those of seven years ago.

That such fields still remain open to us in the Orient is, however, shown by the following table, prepared by the Treasury Bureau of Statistics from the latest available data, showing the value of the imports and exports of the Orient and the share of the United States therein:

	Imports.	Per cent from United States.	Exports.	Per cent to United States.
British East Indies	$221,552,305	2.0	$365,217,000	4.6
British Australasia	277,879,000	5.8	278,708,000	4.6
China	146,077,000	5.6	110,849,000	8.4
Japan	138,751,000	12.4	82,877,000	32.1
Straits Settlements	109,955,000	.....	97,822,000	.....
Dutch East Indies	66,458,000	1.7	80,061,000	9.6
Russia, Asiatic	21,579,000	.7	29,456,000	1.2
Siam	19,384,000	.....	25,280,000	.....
Philippine Islands	14,300,000	1.1	16,550,000	30.1
Hawaiian Islands	7,165,000	76.2	15,436,000	90.7
Mauritius	15,010,000	1.9	15,652,000	5.6
Persia	25,476,000	.....	15,054,000	.....
Ceylon	20,722,000	.2	14,641,000	5.7
Hongkong*	20,000,000	30.0	10,000,000	9.1
French East Indies	790,595	8.7	3,088,000	.....
Korea	8,088,000	.....	2,482,000	.....
Total Asia and Oceania	1,114,067,000	5.3	1,163,193,000	8.6

*Estimate: Statesman's Year Book.

WE CAN'T TURN BACK—BISHOPS POTTER AND THOBURN ON OUR DUTY IN THE PHILIPPINES—CONDITIONS IN THE ISLANDS EXHAUSTIVELY REVIEWED BY ONE WHO HAS NO POLITICAL BIAS, AND A CONVINCING STATEMENT MADE OF THE REASONS FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE GOING FORWARD WITH THE WORK OF ESTABLISHING PEACE.

Mr. Speaker, there has been much criticism of the course of the present Administration in the Philippines. While most of it is clearly for partisan purposes, by men who would even sacrifice national honor as well as national duty to bring about Democratic success, some part of it may be due to a misunderstanding of the situation and of the facts in the case. For their information and for the information of all who want to be sure beyond a peradventure that we are right—as all should desire to be—I desire to present statements by two eminent men whose standing with the people of the United States is such that no man will call into question their integrity, while the fact that they make their statements after a careful personal study of the country and the people affected will give equal assurance of their ability to reach accurate and just conclusions.

The two distinguished men to whom I refer are Bishop Potter and Bishop Thoburn, men well known to the public, and men whom two of our great religious organizations have given the highest honors and highest evidence of confidence.

BISHOP POTTER'S VIEWS.

Both these men speak after a personal study of the people of and situation in the Philippines; and Bishop Potter says frankly that he reaches his conclusion in the face of what was at first an adverse opinion on this subject. His first view was that the course of this Government in the Philippines was of doubtful wisdom, but after a visit to those islands and a study of the situation and people he returned to the United States, and in an interview in March of the present year said:

There is but one thing for us to do now: that is to hold on to the islands and assume the responsibility for their future.

BISHOP THOBURN'S VIEWS.

Bishop J. M. Thoburn, of the Methodist Church, is also a man of high standing in this great religious organization, and if his name is less known to the people of the United States than that of Bishop Potter it is because of his long absence in the Orient, where he has been for years engaged in missionary work, and where he had especial opportunities to study the Philippines and the Filipino. He went to India as a missionary in 1859, and was chosen missionary bishop of India and Malaysia in 1888. He has written a book, entitled India and Malaysia, which is an exhaustive study of the peoples and languages of his immense diocese. He has visited the Philippines a number of times within the past fifteen years and has devoted much time to study of the Filipinos. His last visit was made this year, just previous to his return to America.

Bishop Thoburn is a quiet, unobtrusive man, a keen observer and scholar, and broad in his religious views. The Thoburn family is proud of its loyalty to the flag. Col. Joseph Thoburn, a brother of the bishop, was killed in the civil war at the battle of Cedar Creek while leading a division. Bishop Thoburn, then, knows what he is talking about, and therefore the following statement, made on the eve of his journey to the Far East, is of immense value to all students of present conditions in the Philippines.

In reply to an inquiry the bishop said:

The destruction of the Spanish fleet in the harbor of Manila was a surprise to the whole world, and our worst enemies can not accuse our Government of having deliberately declared war against Spain with a view to gaining possession of the Philippine Islands.

Those islands were so far away and had so long been under the close restraint of Spain that the world had for many years ceased to give them any attention, and when Admiral Dewey left Hongkong for Manila, no doubt he did so for the sole and sufficient reason that a powerful Spanish fleet lay there, and that the Pacific coast of the United States would be exposed to grave danger so long as that fleet was afloat in Pacific waters. This fact completely answers the question so often asked: "Why did the Americans go to Manila?" Admiral Dewey would have been fatally negligent if he had not done so. It was his duty to protect the American ports on the Pacific coast, and the surest and most effective way of doing this was to capture or destroy the Spanish fleet. This fleet chanced to be lying in the bay of Manila and this fact alone directed Admiral Dewey's course to that port.

When this explanation is brought forward, many objectors ask why the admiral did not leave after accomplishing this purpose. And why, if they were obliged to remain, the Americans did not keep their vessels at anchor, without disturbing the people of Manila.

A child ought to know that this question is simply foolish. Some 20,000 Spanish soldiers were present on the shore and war had been declared between the American and Spanish nations. No fleet can lie quietly at peace with such an armed force within cannon range of them and ignore a war which was going on between the two countries represented by the fleet in the harbor and the soldiers on shore. It ought to be clear to the understanding of any child that hostile proceedings were inevitable under the circumstances. If Admiral Dewey had been supported by land forces, he would undoubtedly have thought it his duty to capture the city of Manila the day after destroying the fleet, and the whole world would have condemned him if he had failed to do so.

It thus becomes clearly evident that the embarrassing situation in which the Americans found themselves placed at Manila was inevitable from the very hour that war was declared against Spain. They could not have done less than they did do, and it is morally certain that if they had pursued the extraordinary course which their critics now advocate, and refrained from any hostile proceedings, the very men who now find fault with them would probably have been the first to censure them for their inactivity.

A still more extraordinary question is asked, even by men who are sometimes called statesmen: "Why did the United States insist that the Philippine Islands should be ceded to the American Goverment when peace was made with Spain? Why did they not leave the islands in charge of Spain and let her settle her troubles as best she could?"

It seems unreasonable that such an unreasonable question should be asked by intelligent men, but there are those—and they are not few in number—who persist in assuming that the United States had an option in this matter.

The Americans had gone to war to remedy a grievous state of things in Cuba, which had its parallel in the Philippines, and they would simply have stultified themselves before the world if, while delivering the people of an island in the West Indies from unspeakable tyranny and misery, they had at the same time left a much larger population in the East Indies in a state of social and political misery equally deplorable with that which existed in the west. To have pursued such a course as is advocated by opponents of the present war would have been not only politically inconsistent and unwise to the last degree, but morally wrong from every point of view. The people of the Philippines had as much claim upon the Americans as the people of Cuba had, the only difference being that one people were near at hand and the others removed to the other side of the globe.

Still another question is asked: Why not, after expelling the Spaniards from the Philippines, leave the people of the islands alone in peace? Why meddle

with them further? Why deprive them of the liberty of choice, which belongs to every people on earth? In other words, why not let them organize a government of their own and live under its protection?

These questions involve several impossibilities. To leave the people of the Philippine Islands to themselves would be to proclaim general anarchy for years and generations to come, and had such an attempt been made the confusion which would have resulted, with all its attendant bloodshed and misery, would have created such a spectacle that the whole civilized world would have execrated us.

A great many extraordinary mistakes are made by writers and speakers when discussing this subject, owing to the very limited knowledge which the outside world possesses concerning the actual status of the people of the islands. It seems impossible for many intelligent persons to comprehend the fact that there are at least eighty different tribes or races of people inhabiting the Philippines. The islands as a whole have never been subjugated by Spain. Her title to many of the more southern islands has been only nominal.

The class of persons known as the Filipinos belong almost exclusively to the island of Luzon. They are by no means popular among the other islands, nor has Aguinaldo or any other man ever succeeded in winning the confidence of the islanders generally.

Like all Mohammedan Malays, the people inhabiting the southern portions of the archipelago are treacherous, warlike, and turbulent. In the more civilized islands, inhabited by the Visaya race, the Filipinos constitute a very small minority, and if the parties were left to themselves in a short time a bitter enmity would manifest itself even among the most civilized portions of the northern and central islands. At every hazard and every cost it becomes the solemn duty of the American people, a duty from which the civilized world will never absolve them, to put down all warlike opposition and give peace to the island of Luzon, and also provide for a good government throughout the whole archipelago.

In any and every case there should be no mention of our retiring from the field. We did not seek this great responsibility, but it was thrust upon us. To retire now would be to shrink from a manifest duty, to make a confession of national timidity, and to call down upon us as a nation the ridicule and contempt, if not indeed the execration, of the civilized world.

We have taken up our burden and we must carry it patiently and fulfill the task which the providence of God, as I verily believe, has thrust upon us. A few years hence the whole situation will wear a different aspect. Peace will be restored to these disturbed islands and a new career set before a people who have been carrying grievous burdens and suffering unspeakable wrongs for more than three hundred years.

EXPANSION OF THE UNITED STATES—THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY HAS ALWAYS FAVORED EXPANSION—IT ADDED PRACTICALLY EVERY FOOT OF TERRITORY, AND SOUGHT TO ANNEX CUBA, HAWAII, THE DANISH WEST INDIES, AND YUCATAN—ADDITIONAL SLAVE TERRITORY AND SLAVE POWER WAS THEIR AMBITION, AND WHEN SLAVERY ENDED THEIR INTEREST IN EXPANSION CEASED.

Mr. Speaker, while the expansion which has occurred under the McKinley Administration is now generally commended even by a large majority of those opposing the party in power, it may not be amiss to answer some of the criticisms of this policy which have been offered by leading Democrats.

It did not take long when this question came up for public discussion to bring to the surface the fact that Democrats who attempted to criticise the expansion policy of the Republicans were at the same time criticising the continuous policy of their own party during all of the years in which it administered the affairs of the nation prior to the birth of the Republican party. A few moments' reflection was sufficient to show that the enormous additions to our territory which were made beginning with the Louisiana purchase by Jefferson in 1803 were accomplished by Democratic administrations. The reply to this, however, was that the Democratic party's policy with reference to expansion had been only to add contiguous territory while that which the Republicans were now adopting contemplates the addition of noncontiguous territory—islands of the sea, which contain a population dissimilar to that of our own. Let us see about that. The fact is—and a fact easily sustained by historical and official documents—that nearly every Democratic President from Jefferson to Buchanan expressed a desire for the addition of Cuba to the territory of the United States, several of them hinting at a similar desire with reference to Porto Rico, and at least one of them actively pressed for the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands to the United States, while schemes looking to the addition of noncontiguous territory in Central America and upon the Isthmus of Darien were favored by leading Democrats. Jefferson, both while President and afterwards, in correspondence with Madison and Monroe, frequently expressed a desire that Cuba should some time become a part of the United States, and the Democratic handbook as late as 1898, issued as an official document of the Democratic party, quotes extracts from his letters in support of that statement. President Monroe also expressed himself in favor of making Cuba a part of the United States. Polk favored the annexation of Cuba, and Hon. James D. Richardson, the present member of Congress from Tennessee, who now holds up his hands with holy horror at the thought of this kind of expansion, says in his index to the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, page 332, volume 10:

President Polk made a proposition in 1840 for the purchase of the island by the American Government for $100,000,000. In 1854 the Ostend manifesto claimed the right of the United States, should Spain refuse to sell Cuba, to take and annex it.

The Ostend manifesto, it will be remembered, was an announcement made by President Pierce's ministers to England, France, and Spain (Buchanan, Madison, and Soulé), in which they suggested that an earnest effort be made to purchase Cuba at a price not to exceed $120,000,000 and if this should be refused by Spain "we should be justified by every law, human and divine, in wresting it from Spain if we possess the power," a proposition of which Lossing, the historian, says: "The bald iniquity of this proposition amazed honest men in both hemispheres." Spain having refused to sell, and the sentiment of the world failing to sustain the Democratic proposition to seize the island, Pierce's Administration failed, but that of Buchanan immediately took it up again, and President Buchanan in three of his annual messages to Congress urged that Cuba ought to be made by purchase a part of the United States. During his term a bill for that purpose was introduced in Congress by Senator Slidell, whose name is well remembered in connection with the Confederate Government, and was sustained by Southern Democrats generally, while the general proposition for obtaining control of the island of Cuba by some process was publicly commended by Jefferson Davis in a speech in his own State during that time. The efforts of the various Democratic Presidents for the purchase of Cuba having been rejected by Spain, the Democratic national convention took up the question, and in the platforms upon which two of its candidates, Douglas and Breckinridge, ran in 1860 it declared pointedly in favor of the annexation of Cuba.

It is also on record that at least one Democratic President attempted to make Hawaii a part of the United States, although within the memory of the present generation a Democratic President hauled down the United States flag in that island and withdrew from the Senate a treaty of annexation which a Republican President had sent to that body. Under President Pierce an active effort was made to annex Hawaii, and probably would have been successful but for the death of the King after the treaty of annexation had been prepared and forwarded to the United States. It is a matter of official record in the State Department that negotiations were opened by President Pierce, through his Secretary of State, Marcy, and the minister to the Hawaiian Islands, David L. Gregg, for the annexation of Hawaii; that a treaty for that purpose was drawn and forwarded to the United States in 1854, and that while President Pierce objected to certain of its features, his Secretary of State responded to Minister Gregg that—

This Government will receive the transfer of the sovereignty of the Sandwich Islands with all proper provisions relative to existing rights of the people thereof, such as are usual and proper to territorial sovereignty. The President directs me to say that he can not approve of some of the articles of the treaty; there are in his mind strong objections to the immediate incorporation of the islands in their present condition into the Union as an independent State. It was expected that the Hawaiian Government would be willing to offer the islands to the United States as a Territory and leave the question in relation to their becoming a State to the determination of this Government, unembarrassed by stipulations on that point. * * * The President desires me to assure you that he takes no exception whatever to your course in this difficult and embarrassing negotiation, but, on the contrary, it is highly approved. Your efforts have been properly directed and your ability is appreciated and commended.

In addition to the above evidence of Democratic efforts to add island territory to that of the United States, a part of it thousands of miles away, it may be further remarked that President Polk in a message to Congress, on April 29, 1848, intimated strongly a desire to send troops to Yucatan and take possession of that territory, suggesting that this might be advisable in order to prevent that territory from falling into the hands of a European power, while President Johnson, after severing his allegiance to the Republican party and receiving the support of the Democrats, recommended, in a message to Congress, the purchase of the Danish West Indies.

COMMERCIAL EXPANSION.

The Republican policy of expansion differs widely from that which controls the Democrats in their ambitions for adding territory, and especially tropical territory. What they desired, especially in the case of Cuba, was additional slave territory and additional power in Congress through increased number of slave States. The Republican policy of expansion is to secure footholds by which our commerce will be protected and extended. The territory which has come under the control of the Government in the Gulf of Mexico is of supreme importance in guarding that approach to the mouth of the Mississippi River and to a great isthmian canal, which the Republican party is pledged to bring into existence, and a bill for which has already passed the House of Representatives. The Hawaiian and Samoan islands are of equal importance in relation to the commerce of that great Pacific Ocean which is now attracting so much attention as a highway of transportation between the Orient and the Occident. The Hawaiian Islands form the only way station and satisfactory harbors in the central Pacific, while the harbor of Tutuila in the Samoan group, which has recently become a part of the United States, is recognized as the finest in the southern Pacific, and probably the finest in the entire Pacific Ocean.

With these two islands as way stations for coaling, watering, repairing, and receiving telegraphic orders vessels can satisfactorily engage in commerce between the United States and the Orient, and by making the Philippine Islands a great entrepôt for American products, can command the trade of the Orient as Great Britain commanded it in former years, and much more successfully than she now does by reason of greater proximity and greater facilities for producing articles which the people of that country desire. The countries lying within easy reach of Manila as a point of distribution—China, Japan, Asiatic Russia, French Indo-China, Siam, India, and Australasia—contain half the population of the earth and

have an annual commerce of more than $2,000,000,000. Their purchases alone amount to $1,200,000,000 annually, or an average of $100,000,000 per month, and at the present time the United States supplies but 6 per cent of their purchases. Yet their wants include all the articles which we have to sell. Not only is this the case, but they are rapidly coming to recognize the fact that they can obtain more satisfactorily from the United States the articles they desire than from any other part of the world. American flour, provisions, tobacco, cotton and cotton goods, and manufactures of all kinds are rapidly making their way into the Orient and are as rapidly excluding those which the European countries have been supplying them.

Our exports to Japan have increased from $5,275,501 in 1889 to $20,604,774 in 1899; to China, from $3,254,034 in 1889 to $15,225,294 in 1899; to Hongkong, from $3,864,224 in 1889 to $778,719 in 1899; to British Australasia, from $7,576,890 in 1893 to $24,142,591 in 1899; and to all Asia, from $21,534,847 in 1889 to $53,843,554 in 1899; and to all Oceania, from $16,081,021 in 1889 to $37,542,936 in 1899. With this rate of increase we are, as already indicated, supplying but about 6 per cent of the total purchases of that enormous population grouped around Manila as an entrepôt and point of distribution for our merchants and manufacturers.

To the islands with which we have come in closer relations during the last two years our exports show a rapid growth. To Porto Rico the exports of 1899 were $3,677,564, against $1,955,814 in 1896; to Cuba in 1899, $24,861,261, against $7,296,613 in 1896; to the Hawaiian Islands in 1899, $11,305,589, against $4,184,351 in 1896 and to the Philippine Islands, $1,663,213 in 1899, against $69,459 in 1897.

This opportunity for expansion affects every producer, every individual engaged in any form in agriculture, in mining, in manufacture, in transportation; and in commerce the people of the Orient demand flour, meats, and dairy products, cotton and cotton goods, and manufactures of all kinds, and they have clearly shown in recent years a preference for the products of the United States, a preference which will give to us a large share of their enormous market, with the control of Hawaii and Manila, the opening of the Nicaraguan Canal, and the establishment of American shipping with which to carry American products.

State Ownership of Railways.

Its Effect upon Wages, Freight Rates, and Convenience of Travel—Lower Wages; Higher Freight Rates; Inferior Accommodations of Travel.

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES H. GROSVENOR,

OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, June 4, 1900.

The House having under consideration the bill (H. R. 11598) making appropriations for the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901—

Mr. GROSVENOR said:

Mr. SPEAKER: The recent pronouncement of political platforms in support of State ownership of railways suggests some facts which have been developed by a careful study of the experiments made in this line by nations of Europe. These studies, which have been made by the United States Department of Labor, may be summed up in a single sentence: Lower wages for employees, higher freights for shippers, poorer accommodations for travelers.

It is a direct insult to the millions of employees of the country, and at least indirectly so to the millions of other working people, to propose to substitute for our present system, in which wages are high and employees prosperous, one which pays from $23 to $35 per month for engineers; from $17 to $23 per month for firemen and brakemen, and from 39 to 58 cents a day for ordinary labor.

These are the figures quoted by an official report of the United States Department of Labor regarding the rates of wages paid on the State-owned railways in Belgium, while in the machine shops tool hands range from 39 to 85 cents per day, turners from 39 cents to $1, while blacksmiths, masons, and others of this class receive from 58 cents to 70 cents per day. In Prussia, where railways are completely owned and managed by the State, the average yearly wages of workshop employees is $256, or a little over $20 per month; track men, $182 per annum, or $15 per month; and this is pointed out as a marked advance over wages of earlier years.

The state ownership of railroads is a proposition which is opposed to the established policy of this country and adverse to the most fundamental interests of the community. For the United States the State ownership of railroads at this time would mean higher rates for shippers, lower wages for employees, an obstacle in the way of future progress, and it would lead to anarchy in the field of production and to an unparalleled carnival of corruption in our political life.

It would be well, before committing our country to this policy, to glance at some of the results which have been obtained in other countries. In most of the countries of continental Europe, especially in Germany, Belgium, Austria, Sweden, Portugal, Russia, and Spain, the state ownership of railroads has been adopted, either entirely or in part. In all of these countries the field for the adoption of such a policy was the more favorable owing to the fact that they are all monarchical, and the control of the railroads was placed directly in the hands of the king, or in those of his ministers, and not intrusted to the legislative body.

Thus in Prussia and Saxony, as in Belgium and other countries, the representatives of the people have no voice in the determination of rates or other questions of railroad policies, this being placed in the hands of the minister, who is appointed by the king. Even in these countries, however, the results of railroad ownership have not brought their management up to the high level which the full play of competition has produced in the United States.

HIGHER FREIGHT RATES UNDER STATE OWNERSHIP.

A comparison of rates will show that in no country in the world is transportation so cheap or wages of railway employees so high as in the United States. The countries with state ownership of railroads have not been able to operate them at as low a rate as has been the case with the railroads of the United States under the competition which has arisen among our own roads. Nor is the service on the European railways in any way comparable with that of the American railways.

The American traveler is immediately disenchanted when he attempts to journey on the Continent of Europe. Not only are the cars small and uncomfortable, the speed of the trains slow, the accommodations for comfort, health, and cleanliness insufficient, and station accommodations totally inadequate, but in other respects—in the number of cars run, in the opportunities to use sleeping cars, in the urbanity and complaisance of the railway employees, etc.—the American railways are incomparably superior.

The railways under state management seem to adopt the catch-penny policy of having a traveler pay for every trifle, and for treating him as a child or a criminal; and in every respect the service rendered is much inferior to that in the United States. The fares, moreover, are higher for the first-class traffic in all continental countries than they are in the United States.

LOWER WAGES FOR EMPLOYEES UNDER STATE OWNERSHIP.

The effect of the nationalization of the railroads on the wages of employees is one which should not be overlooked. There are at present in the United States almost a million persons earning their living directly from the railroads, and a population of about 5,000,000 is directly supported from this source. This population of 5,000,000 does not include the persons employed by electric railways or by builders of railway materials, but those persons only who are supported directly by work in the operation of steam railways.

This vast army of employees, which comprises some of the most intelligent and skilled workmen of the country, is now paid annually an immense sum of money, aggregating many hundreds of millions of dollars. The countries with state ownership of railways, however, pay wages which are considerably lower than those in the United States, and thus the wages of railway employees in Belgium, Germany, Austria, Norway and Sweden, where state ownership in the main prevails, wages are much lower than in the United States, England, and France, where private ownership prevails. In every branch of the railway service the wages paid by the Governments owning their railways are pitifully small, as will be shown later.

The advocates of the State ownership of railroads fail to realize, also, the immense political dangers which such a revolution in transportation would produce. The effect that the patronage of an additional million Government employees would have upon the Government may easily be imagined.

FREIGHT RATES CAN NOT BE PROPERLY CONTROLLED UNDER STATE OWNERSHIP.

It would also be a dangerous experiment to attempt to regulate rates with our present political machinery. It would be dangerous to vest the power of making rates for billions of dollars' worth of traffic in the hands of a single person, such as a secretary of railways, since it would be in his power to ruin not only industries, but cities, States, and whole districts. The power to fix rates is the power to fix prices, and the power to fix prices is the power to determine what industries shall flourish and what industries shall die.

The question whether wheat and grain shall be shipped to New York, or to Baltimore, to Philadelphia, or to Newport News is one entirely of comparative rates, and there would inhere in

the person controlling this vast machinery the power to destroy the prosperity of any State or of any producing community. It would introduce a new and incalculably powerful corrupting force into our politics to place the fate of various parts of the country in the hands of a single man, or a body of men, instead of allowing it to be regulated by the law of competition.

The advocates of State ownership of railroads also fail to perceive the effect which this acquisition would have upon the finances of the country. The immediate effect would be to increase the national debt by more than tenfold, and to add the sum of over twelve thousand million dollars to the burden of our debt. It is by no means certain that the Government would be able to manage the railroads profitably, and the burden which would be involved by annually paying interest upon a new debt of twelve to fifteen billions of dollars would embarrass the finances of the country and bring us dangerously near the verge of bankruptcy.

The effect, therefore, of the acquisition of the railroads by the State would be to vastly increase the debt of this nation; to involve us in the most perilous financial straits; to imperil our political institutions by creating an immense amount of new patronage; and by vesting despotic power in the hands of a single man or body of men to introduce immense pressure on the Government for favors for various interests or sections; to stop abruptly the rapid increase in the efficiency and improvements in the technical processes of railway operation; to put a check upon the continued improvement of the service; to evoke a considerable increase in freight rates, and to reduce over a million wage-earners to the low wages and the low standard of living prevailing among the employees of continental state-owned railways.

The following table from the report of the Department of Labor shows the statistics of wages of employees on the railways of Prussia, which may be classed as the most successful of all the state-owned railway systems of Europe:

Average yearly wages for workshop employees and track men, Prussian state railways, 1888 to 1897.

Year.	Workshop employees.	Track men.
1888	$201.04	$145.49
1889	206.32	150.25
1890	215.53	160.41
1891	224.27	165.46
1892	226.17	166.91
1893	245.64	174.55
1894	246.57	174.88
1895–96	252.14	180.88
1896–97	256.42	182.31

With the exception of these two classes, workshop employees and track men the gross sum of $65,131,080 was expended during 1896–97 on all the Prussian State railway employees. This amounted to $318.68 per head, 9,925 marks per kilometer of line ($8,801.53 per mile), 803 marks per 1,000 locomotive kilometers (30.8 cents per locomotive mile), 26 marks per axle kilometer ($9.96 per axle mile), and 20.7 per cent of the gross receipts from traffic. The estimated expenditures for 1897–98 were about 10 per cent greater, and a still further increase was provided for in the budget of 1898–99, the annual average wages of employees anticipated for 1898–99 being 1,408 marks ($335.10), as compared with 1,339 marks ($318.68) in 1896–97 and 1,330 marks ($316.54) in 1895–96. These averages, however, are too inclusive and general to give a definite idea of the real state of wages.

The increase in wages is indicated in a very general way by the increase of the scale of wages between 1888–89 and 1897–98. The statistics give the lowest, the highest, and the average wage, but the average wage considered is not the true average of all wages paid in that class, but merely the arithmetical mean between the highest and lowest wage, and is therefore useless and may be discarded. The comparative valuelessness of such wage statistics may be shown by the fact that the average rate of wages may decline while the minimum and maximum wage may both increase.

While it is, therefore, evident from other sources that the wages have quite considerably increased on the Prussian State railways, the following figures are shown less in support of the statement than as showing the higher wages which may now be attained than under the old régime and the rising of the minimum wage offered to the younger and less efficient workers. The general tendency may be traced in over forty classes of employment, but only three or four will be mentioned in this connection.

The workshop foremen commence now, as in 1888–89, with 2,100 marks ($499.80) per year, but the maximum wages that they may obtain have been raised from 3,200 marks ($761.60) in 1888–89 to 3,600 marks ($856.80) in 1890–91 and to 4,200 marks ($999.60) in 1897–98. The station masters of the first class now begin with 2,400 marks ($571.20) instead of 2,100 marks ($499.80), and may attain to 4,200 marks ($999.60), instead of 3,200 marks ($761.60); those of the second class still begin with 1,800 marks ($428.40), but now reach 3,000 marks ($714), instead of 2,100 marks ($499.80).

The locomotive engineers begin now, as before, with 1,200 marks ($285.60), but may attain to 2,200 marks ($523.60), instead of 1,800 marks ($428.40). The initial wages of the firemen have increased from 900 to 1,000 marks ($214.20 to $238), their maximum wages from 1,200 to 1,500 marks ($285.60 to $357); conductors who had a minimum wage of 780 and 690 marks ($185.64 and $164.22), respectively, now commence with 800 marks ($190.40), while the highest salary they may obtain has been increased from 900 to 1,200 marks ($235.62 to $285.60); and the wages of the night watchmen, which formerly were uniformly 600 marks ($142.80), range since 1890 between 700 and 900 marks ($166.60 and $214.20).

The increase in wages and salaries took place largely in the years 1890–91 and 1897–98. In connection with the increase in the former year, the administration adopted the plan of granting "Stellenzulagen," which are supplementary payments to the employees in places where the work is peculiarly difficult or responsible. These "Stellenzulagen" are of growing importance, the budget of 1898–99 calling for an extra credit of 2,500,000 marks ($595,000) for this item alone. The wages are also supplemented by so-called "Ortszulagen," which are granted in consideration of the greater cost of living in and near the larger cities and towns.

The Prussian railways publish the average daily wages for a number of classes of employees in the intermediate and lower ranks of the service. These statistics are obtained by dividing the total amount of wages paid to a certain group of employees by the total number of single days of work obtained from the group, overtime being converted into days of work. These statistics, which take into account neither the contributions of the employees to the pension funds nor the payments by the funds to the employees, show the average scale of wages to be comparatively low in Prussia.

In 1896–97 the pay for 63,799,517 days of work amounted to 153,694,077 marks ($36,579,190.33), which equals 2.41 marks (57.3 cents) per day. These wages differ, however, very greatly in the various departments, varying with the amount of skill and intelligence required for the work. The highest wages are received by the technical clerks, whose wages average 5.78 marks ($1.38) per day; the assistant draftsmen receive 4.13 marks ($0.98). The wages range highest in the workshops and lowest for the purely clerical work.

Trusts.

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN S. WILLIAMS,
OF MISSISSIPPI,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Thursday, May 15, 1900,

On the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 138) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I insert for the information of the House and the country the following list of trusts:

TRUSTS AND COMBINES IN THE UNITED STATES.

[List prepared for The Commercial Yearbook, by Byron W. Holt.]

Attention is particularly requested to the following definition:

As popularly used, the word "Trust" is now applied to any consolidation, combine, pool, or agreement of two or more naturally competing concerns which establishes a partial or complete monopoly, in certain territory, with power to fix prices or rates in any industry. Viewed from the standpoint of the consumer, the informal agreement and the iron-clad combine look alike if the one has the same effect as the other upon prices.

Present name of trust.[1]	Where incorporated.	Location principal office.	Capitalization.[2] Common stock.	Preferred stock.
Adams Express Company	New York	New York City	[3]$12,000,000	
American Automatic Weighing Machine Company (three companies—all in U.S.)	England	New York (?)	£135,000	£135,000
American Axe and Tool Company (16 plants)	Kentucky	New York City	$2,872,500	
American Beet Sugar Company			15,000,000	$4,000,000
American Bell Telephone Company (owns American Telephone and other telephone companies).	Massachusetts	Boston	25,886,300	
American Birch Company (to control New York market)	New Jersey		4,000,000	6,000,000
American Brass Company	Connecticut	Waterbury	20,000,000	
American Bridge Builders' Association (trust forming 13 firms)	Pennsylvania	Philadelphia	[4]30,000,000	
American Caramel Company (all export trade of United States)	do	do	1,000,000	500,000
American Car and Foundry Company (railroad cars)	New Jersey		27,600,000	27,600,000
American Cereal Company (much larger company forming)	Ohio	Chicago	3,400,000	
American Cotton Oil Company (123 properties)	New Jersey	New York City	20,237,100	10,198,600
American District Telegraph Company[5]	New York	do	3,844,700	
American Electric Heating Corporation		Boston	10,000,000	
American Express Company (not incorporated)[6]	New York	New York City	18,000,000	
American Felt Company (nearly all companies in United States)	New Jersey	do	2,500,000	2,500,000
American Fisheries Company (menhaden oil, 15–18 companies)	do	do	8,000,000	2,000,000
American (Window) Glass Company (majority in United States)	do	Pittsburg	20,000,000	
American Glucose Sugar Refining Company (opposition company)	do		3,000,000	
American Glue Company		Boston	1,400,000	700,000
American Hay Company	Michigan		[7]5,000,000	
American Ice Company (forming; to control ice output of Maine)	Maine		60,000,000	

Present name of trust.[2]	Where incorporated.	Location principal office.	Capitalization.[3]	
			Common stock.	Preferred stock.
American Indies Company (gas, electric, etc., new colonies)	New Jersey		$13,000,000	$5,000,000
American Jute Bagging Manufacturing Company			2,800,000	
American Lamp Chimney Company (one-third total United States)	West Virginia		500,000	250,000
American Last Company	Ohio		2,000,000	1,500,000
American Linseed Oil Company (82 plants; 85 per cent of all in country)	New Jersey	Chicago	14,250,000	14,250,000
American Lithograph Company	do	New York	8,000,000	3,500,000
American Machine Company (sewing)	Ohio	Cleveland	[1]10,000,000	
American Malting Company (30 companies; nearly all in United States)	New Jersey	New York City	13,750,000	12,540,000
American Ordnance Company (guns, projectiles, etc.)		Washington	2,500,000	
American Pegamoid Company			5,000,000	
American Pipe and Foundry Company (5 plants in South; bigger trust forming)			[4]10,000,000	
American Potteries Company (forming; nearly all in United States)	New Jersey	New York City	17,000,000	16,000,000
American Powder Company		Chicago	1,500,000	
American Preservers' Company	West Virginia	do	2,500,000	
American Radiator Company (4 companies; 75 per cent United States product)	New Jersey	do	5,000,000	3,000,000
American Saddle Company (bicycle saddle consolidation)	do		1,000,000	800,000
American Screw Company	Rhode Island	Providence	3,250,000	
American Sewer Pipe Company (forming, with 51 big companies)	New Jersey (?)	Pittsburg (?)	12,500,000	12,500,000
American Silk Manufacturing Company (silk thread)	Connecticut	New London	7,500,000	5,000,000
American Skewer Company (all manufacturers in United States)	Indiana (?)		300,000	
American Soda Fountain Company	New Jersey	New York	1,250,000	2,500,000
American Spirits Manufacturing Company (whisky; 18 distilleries)	New York	do	28,000,000	7,000,000
American Steel and Wire Company of New Jersey (controls wire industry, etc., in United States).	New Jersey	Chicago	50,000,000	40,000,000
American Steel Casting Company	do		4,200,000	
American Stove Board Company (7 manufacturers)	West Virginia	New York	81,100	
American Strawboard Company (19 plants)	Illinois	Chicago	6,000,000	
American Sugar Refining Company	New Jersey	New York City	36,968,000	36,968,000
American Telegraph and Telephone Company (controls long-distance lines)	New York	do	25,000,000	
American Thread Company (13 cotton-thread companies)	New Jersey		6,000,000	6,000,000
American Tin Plate Company (281 mills—95 per cent of all)	do	Chicago	28,000,000	18,000,000
American Tobacco Company (plug business sold in 1898)	do	New York City	21,000,000	14,000,000
American Type Founders' Company (23 companies in United States)	do	do	4,000,000	
American Whip Company (20 manufacturers)	Massachusetts	do	250,000	
American Woodworking Machinery Company (14 firms)	New Jersey		2,000,000	2,000,000
American Woolen Company (men's woolens—mills in New England; forming)		New York City	30,000,000	20,000,000
American Wringer Company	Rhode Island	Rhode Island	850,000	1,650,000
Ammunition Manufacturers' Association (cartridges)		New York City	[5]4,000,000	
Anaconda Copper Mining Company	Montana		30,000,000	
Associate Wine Dealers (agreement with California Winemakers' Corporation		San Francisco	[5]5,000,000	
Association of Boat Oar Manufacturers of United States; (agreement on prices)			[5]500,000	
Association of Fire Underwriters for Arkansas (44 companies)[6]	Arkansas	Little Rock (?)	39,694,226	
Atlantic Dynamite Company (giant powder, etc.)	New York	New York City	[5]2,500,000	
Atlantic Passenger Steamship Pool (renewed in 1899)			[5]100,000,000	
Atlantic Snuff Company (all but 2 companies)	New Jersey	Nashville	2,000,000	8,000,000
Atlas Tack Company	Massachusetts	Boston	700,000	
Atwood-Morrison Company (consolidation of 3 silk and cotton machinery companies).	New Jersey		300,000	
Baltimore Electric Light Company (3 electric companies of Baltimore)			5,000,000	
Barber Asphalt Paving Company (pools with other companies)[6]		New York City	5,000,000	
Bay State Gas Company (several gas companies in and near Boston)	Delaware		100,000,000	
Bessemer Ore Association		Cleveland	[5]20,000,000	
Bolt and nut (several associations—carriage, stove, tire, etc.)			[5]10,000,000	
Booth, A., & Co. (fish and oysters; 43 concerns)	Illinois	Chicago	3,000,000	2,500,000
Borax Consolidated, Limited (absorbing Pacific Borax, etc., Company)			£600,000	£300,000
Boston Fruit Company (4 companies, controlling output from West Indies)		Boston (?)	[5]10,000,000	
Boxmakers' Combine (of California-Oregon)		San Francisco	1,000,000	
Brass Foundry and Machine Company (iron and brass castings)	New Jersey	Jersey City	6,000,000	
Brooklyn Rapid Transit (most streets, ways, elevated and Brooklyn)		New York	45,000,000	
Brooklyn Union Gas (7 companies)	New York	Brooklyn	15,000,000	
Brooklyn Wharf and Warehouse Company[6]	do	do	5,000,000	$7,500,000
Broom Manufacturers' Association of United States (regulates prices)		Chicago	5,000,000	
Broom Twine (selling combine)			[5]500,000	
Brunswick-Balke-Collender Company (billiard tables, etc.)	Ohio	New York City	1,500,000	
Buffalo City Gas Company (4 companies; consolidated with People's Gas in 1898).[6]	New York	Buffalo	5,500,000	
Buffalo Traction Company (consolidation pending)		do	5,370,500	
California Raisin Growers' Association (2,000 growers and 60 packing houses; controls 95 per cent of crop).			[5]5,000,000	
California Winemakers' Corporation (allied with California Wine Association)[6]	California	San Francisco	10,000,000	
Cambria Steel Company (owns Cambria Iron Company; plants in five counties in Pennsylvania).	Pennsylvania	Philadelphia	16,000,000	
Cedar Shingles Manufacturers' Association (Washington State; limits production).			[5]5,000,000	
Celluloid Company	New Jersey	Newark	3,000,000	
Central Coal and Coke Company (selling agency)[6]	Ohio	Columbus	500,000	
Central Coal and Coke Company of Kansas City, Mo.[6]	Missouri	Kansas City	1,500,000	1,500,000
Central Electric Railway of Kansas City, Mo. (all companies)		do	500,000	
Central Lumber Company of California[6]			[5]$70,000,000	
Central New York Brewing Company	New Jersey		2,200,000	1,800,000
Central Union Telephone Company (consolidation of Bell Telephone in Indiana, Illinois, and Ohio, except certain cities).			6,605,300	
Central Union Gas Company (17 gas and electric lighting companies in Ohio and Indiana).	Virginia		5,000,000	9,000,000
Central Walnut Association (California; fixes prices)			[5]2,000,000	
Chain Manufacturers' Association (trace, wagon, etc.)			[5]3,000,000	
Charleston (South Carolina) Consolidated Railway, Gas and Electric Company (forming with all in city).			1,500,000	
Chemical (Pharmaceutical Manufacturers') Combine		Philadelphia	[7]50,000,000	
Chicago and Northwestern Granaries Company (agreements with other companies).		Chicago	£120,000	£120,000
Chicago City Railway Company (cable, electric, and horse lines)		do	$14,000,000	
Chicago Consolidated Traction Company (8 suburban companies)	Illinois	do	14,400,000	
Chicago Edison Company (absorbed 4 companies)		Chicago	4,975,100	
Chicago Junction Railway and Union Stock Yards Company (meat packing and cattle; consolidation 3 companies).	New Jersey	do	6,500,000	$6,500,000
Chicago Milk Company (forming to supply three-fourths of city's milk)		do	3,000,000	3,000,000
Chicago Packing and Provision Company (Limited)		do	£200,000	£200,000
Cincinnati Gas-Light and Coke			$9,000,000	
City of Chicago Brewing and Malting Company (English and American companies).		Chicago	£625,000	£625,000
Cleveland and Sandusky Brewing Company (11 breweries)			$3,000,000	$3,000,000
Colorado Fuel and Iron (connected with Colorado Coal and Iron Company)	Colorado	Denver	11,000,000	2,000,000
Columbia Electric Car Lighting and Brake Company	New Jersey		10,000,000	
Columbia River Canneries Company (fish packers; re-forming, 1899)		Portland	[5]2,000,000	
Columbia Spring Company	Ohio	Cleveland	2,000,000	
Columbus (Ohio) Gas-Light and Heating Company (will own 2 big companies)	West Virginia	Columbus	1,700,000	3,300,000

Present name of trust.[a]	Where incorporated.	Location principal office.	Capitalization.[a]	
			Common stock.	Preferred stock.
Commercial Chemical Company, United States (paris-green manufacturers form selling agency).	.....	New York City	[b]$2,000,000	.....
Commonwealth Electric Company (12 companies; pools with Edison)	.....	Chicago	3,000,000	.....
Consolidated City Water Company (3 companies, Los Angeles, Cal)	.....	Los Angeles	2,480,000	.....
Consolidated Gas of Baltimore City[c]	Maryland	Baltimore	10,770,968	.....
Consolidated Gas Company of Newark, N. J. (all gas companies between Passaic and Elizabeth).	New Jersey	Newark	6,000,000	.....
Consolidated Gas of New York City (all but New Amsterdam Company)[c]	New York	New York City	9,078,000	.....
Consolidated Gas of Pittsburg (5 companies in west Pennsylvania)	.....	Pittsburg	4,000,000	$2,500,000
Consolidated Ice (10 or 12 companies in New York and Maine)[d]	Maine	New York City	6,500,000	3,500,000
Consolidated Packing Companies (Beef)	.....	.....	5,000,000	.....
Consolidated Smelting and Refining Company (forming with 11 big companies in United States and Mexico).	New Jersey	.....	27,000,000	27,000,000
Consolidated Street Railway Company	.....	Grand Rapids	1,600,000	1,419,000
Consolidated Traction of New Jersey[a]	.....	Newark	15,000,000	.....
Consumers' Ice Company (all dealers of Indianapolis)	.....	Indianapolis	[b]1,000,000	.....
Continental Cement Company	New Jersey	.....	5,000,000	5,000,000
Continental Tobacco Company (7 plug companies and plug interests of American Company).	.....do	New York City	30,000,000	30,000,000
Copper Sheets and Bolts, Manufacturers' Association (fixes prices)	.....	Pittsburg	[b]5,000,000	.....
Denver City Tramway Company (consolidated street lines)	.....	Denver	5,000,000	.....
Denver Union Water Company (complete plant)[c]	Colorado	.....do	5,000,000	2,500,000
Derby Hat Pool (4 big companies sell together)	.....	.....	[b]3,000,000	.....
Detroit Citizens' Street Railway Company[c]	.....	Detroit	2,650,000	.....
Detroit City Gas (all natural and artificial gas companies in city)[c]	Michigan	.....do	4,560,000	.....
Diamond Match Company (mills all over United States)	Illinois and England	Chicago	11,000,000	.....
Dry Dock Trust (Philadelphia syndicate)[c]	.....	.....	1,000,000	.....
Dynamite Pool (3 big California companies)	.....	San Francisco	[b]2,000,000	.....
Eastern Burial Case Association (big trust forming in 1899)	.....	.....	[b]4,000,000	.....
East Jersey Electric Company	.....	.....	1,000,000	.....
Edison Electric Illuminating Company of Boston	New Jersey	.....	3,744,000	.....
Edison Electric Illuminating Company of New York[c]	.....	New York City	9,200,000	.....
Electric Boat Company	New York	.....	5,000,000	5,000,000
Electric Company of America (gas and electric companies just outside of Philadelphia).	New Jersey	.....	25,000,000	.....
Electric Storage Battery Company (absorbed other companies in 1895)	.....do	Philadelphia	8,500,000	5,000,000
Electric Vehicle Company	.....do	.....	5,000,000	1,000,000
Electrotypers, New York city and vicinity[c]	.....do	New York City	[b]5,000,000	.....
Erie Telegraph and Telephone Company (controls 4 telephone companies in 7 Western and Southern States).	.....	Cleveland	5,000,000	.....
Factory Insurance Association, 29 companies††	.....	Hartford	34,655,000	.....
Federal Steel Company (owns many mills and properties)	.....	New York City	46,484,000	52,767,600
Fire-Proofing (9 Ohio companies sell together)	New Jersey	.....	[b]3,000,000	.....
Five States Milk Producers' Association (farmers to keep prices of milk up, as against the trust.)	.....	.....	[b]20,000,000	.....
Fox River Birch and Tile Company (consolidated 15 birch yards in Wisconsin)	Wisconsin	.....	200,000	.....
Francis Gowdy Distilling Company (combination Eastern gin companies)	Connecticut	.....	100,000	.....
General Chemical Company	New York	.....	12,500,000	12,500,000
General Electric; pools with other companies	New York	Schenectady	18,276,000	2,551,200
General Electric Company of Minneapolis; light, heat, and power	New Jersey	.....	2,100,000	.....
Glucose Sugar Refining Company; nearly all in United States	.....do	Chicago	24,027,300	12,619,000
Granite Ware Trust; 4 companies combining	.....	.....	[b]20,000,000	.....
Grape Growers' Pool; agree on prices in northern Ohio	.....	.....	[b]2,000,000	.....
Havana Commercial Company (Cuban tobacco, etc.)	New Jersey	.....	10,000,000	6,000,000
Havana Electric Railway; electric, gas, telephone, etc	.....do	.....	5,000,000	.....
Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company	.....	.....	2,312,755	.....
Hecker-Jones-Jewell Milling Company[c]	New Jersey	New York City	2,000,000	3,000,000
Herkimer County Light and Power Company; companies in 3 cities in county	.....	Herkimer (?)	400,000	.....
Herring-Hall-Marvin; reorganizing	New Jersey	New York City	1,650,000	1,650,000
Illinois State Board of Fire Underwriters; 72 companies[a]	.....	.....	49,430,700	.....
Indiana League of Fire Underwriters; 27 companies[a]	.....	.....	10,028,568	.....
Indurated Fiber Industries Company	New Jersey	New York City	1,000,000	.....
International Air Power Company; plants in Massachusetts and Rhode Island	.....do	.....	6,400,000	600,000
International Cement Company; forming	.....do	.....	25,000,000	25,000,000
International Heater Company; 4 companies	New York	.....	900,000	900,000
International Paper Company; 25 news and printing paper manufacturers east of Chicago.	.....	.....	16,040,400	20,530,700
International Silver Company; 24 companies—75 per cent silver plate companies	New Jersey	.....	11,000,000	5,000,000
International Steam Pump Company; 5 biggest companies in United States	.....do	.....	12,500,000	15,000,000
Kansas City (Mo.) Gas Company	Missouri	Kansas City	5,000,000	.....
Kentucky Distilleries and Warehouse Company; 57 "bourbon" plants	New Jersey	.....	18,500,000	10,500,000
Kings County Electric Light and Power Company; all electric companies in Brooklyn except one.	.....	Brooklyn	1,968,000	.....
Knickerbocker Ice Company, Chicago; 28 companies, all in Chicago	.....	Chicago	4,000,000	3,000,000
Kodak Limited Company; consolidated English, French, German, and American companies.	.....	.....	£1,000,000	£600,000
Laclede Gas Light Company;[c] controls all in St. Louis since 1889	Missouri	St. Louis	$7,500,000	$2,500,000
Lake Carriers' Association; 3 lines; pool prices	.....	.....	[b]10,000,000	.....
Lake Dredgers' Association; 123 owners of dredges on Great Lakes	Illinois	.....	$5,000,000	.....
Lake Superior Consolidated Iron Mines[c]	.....	New York City	28,450,000	.....
Lanyon Zinc Company	New Jersey	.....	1,000,000	$2,000,000
Lexington (Ky.) Railroad; 4 companies	.....	.....	800,000	.....
Linen Thread Company; selling agency 3 manufacturers	New Jersey	Paterson (?)	[b]4,000,000	.....
Lumber Carriers' Association; vessels on Great Lakes	.....	Detroit	[b]6,000,000	.....
Manhattan Spirit Company; wood alcohol	.....	.....	5,000,000	.....
Manufacturers' Paper Company of Chicago; selling agency for many mills	.....	.....	[b]10,000,000	.....
Maple Flooring Manufacturers' Association; fixes prices	.....	.....	[b]2,000,000	.....
Marsden Company of Philadelphia (cellulose trust)	.....	.....	30,600,000	1,500,000
Martin Kalbfleisch Chemical Company	New York	New York City	1,450,000	.....
Maryland Brewing Company; 17 brewery companies of Baltimore	.....	Baltimore	3,250,000	3,250,000
Mass Consolidated Company; 5 copper properties in Michigan belt	.....	.....	2,500,000	.....
Metropolitan Street Railway Company[c]	.....	Kansas City	5,586,800	.....
Metropolitan Street Railway; most in New York city	.....	New York City	40,000,000	.....
Metropolitan Tobacco Company; selling combine	New York	.....do	500,000	500,000
Michigan Salt Association	.....	.....	[b]4,000,000	.....
Milk Combine of Scranton, Pa.; entire supply	.....	Scranton	[b]1,000,000	.....
Milwaukee and Chicago Breweries Company; English and American companies	.....	.....	£775,000	£775,000
Milwaukee Electric Railway and Light Company; all in city	.....	Milwaukee	$5,494,500	.....
Minneapolis General Electric; plants in city	New Jersey	Minneapolis	1,500,000	$500,000
Minnesota and Dakota Fire Underwriters; 53 companies[a]	.....	.....do	45,119,740	.....
Mississippi River Steamboat Pool; 3 companies pool	.....	.....	[b]10,000,000	.....
Missouri Edison Electric Company[a]	Missouri	St. Louis	[b]4,000,000	.....
National Abrasive Manufacturing Company; controls corundum and other abrasive materials.	.....	.....	1,000,000	.....
National Association of Axle Manufacturers	.....	Pittsburg	[b]5,000,000	.....
National Biscuit Company (90 per cent of large bakeries in United States)	New Jersey	Chicago	20,000,000	23,000,000
National Carbon Company (all companies in United States and three-fourths in world).	.....do	Cleveland	5,500,000	4,500,000

Present name of trust.[1]	Where incorporated.	Location principal office.	Capitalization.[2]	
			Common stock.	Preferred stock.
National Casket Company		New York City	[3]$10,000,000	
National Electric Car Lighting Company			2,000,000	(?) $500,000
National Enameling and Stamping Company (consolidation of 4 principal companies in United States).	New Jersey		20,000,000	10,000,000
National Harrow Company (spring-tooth harrows)	New York		[4]2,000,000	
National Lead Company (28 white lead, etc., plants)	New Jersey	New York City	14,905,400	14,904,000
National Mirror Manufacturers' Association (40 companies; fix prices, etc.)			[5]5,000,000	
National Rice Milling Company	New Jersey	New Orleans	1,867,000	1,320,000
National Salt Company of New Jersey (forming to control salt interests in the East).		New York City	[5]5,000,000	
National Saw Company (controlled by Diston)	Kentucky	do	[2]2,000,000	600,000
National Shear Company	New Jersey	Newark	1,500,000	1,500,000
National Starch Manufacturing Company (20 plants; price agreement with other companies in 1898)	Kentucky	New York City	3,233,000	4,006,200
National Tin Plate and Stamped Ware Company (opposition to National Enameling Company).	New Jersey		10,000,000	10,000,000
National Steel Company; expects to control 20 plants	New Jersey		32,000,000	27,000,000
National Tube Company; forming with 17 companies	do	Pittsburg	30,000,000	30,000,000
National Wall Paper Company; 28 companies in 1892, absorbing 2 or more in 1899; forming.		New York City	27,931,500	7,500,000
New Amsterdam Gas Company; consolidates 3 companies in New York City		do	12,000,000	9,000,000
New England Gas and Coke Company of Boston; all in Boston except Bay State.[6]	Massachusetts	Boston	14,000,000	
New England Dairy Company; milk companies	New Jersey		600,000	250,000
New England Telephone and Telegraph Company		Boston	11,986,400	
New England Insurance Exchange; 84 fire-insurance companies[6]		do	58,537,167	
New Orleans Water Works Company[6]		New Orleans	2,000,000	
New York and New Jersey Telephone		Brooklyn (?)	4,662,400	
New York Arch, Terra-Cotta Company; allied with other companies	New York	New York City	[4]2,000,000	
New York Gas, Electric Light, Heat and Power Company of New York City	do	do	36,000,000	
New York Suburban Gas Company (5 companies in Westchester County)	do		1,500,000	
Nicholson File Company; 5 plants—70 per cent product		Providence	[4]2,000,000	
North American (owns street railways and electric companies)	New Jersey	New York	39,733,000	
North Carolina Pine Timber Association; fixes prices			[6]20,000,000	
North Jersey Street Railway Company; consolidated trolleys and 2 ferries	New Jersey		5,000,000	
North River Light, Heat and Power Company	do	Hoboken	300,000	
North Shore Traction Company; controls railways around Boston	do	Boston	4,000,000	2,500,000
Oilcloth Pool (table, enamel, etc.)			[6]1,500,000	
Oil Well Supply Company	Pennsylvania	Pittsburg	1,000,000	
Omaha Street Railway Company[6]		Omaha	5,000,000	
Otis (Passenger) Elevator Company; 13 companies—85 per cent of product	New Jersey		6,000,000	4,000,000
Pacific American Fisheries Company	do	Chicago	5,000,000	
Pacific States Telephone Company; 4 telegraph and telephone systems of Pacific coast.			[6]10,000,000	
Paducah (Ky.) Railway and Electric Light Company; all railway and electric-light plants of Paducah.			200,000	
Paterson and Passaic Gas and Electric Company; consolidation of 4 companies	New Jersey		5,000,000	
Pennsylvania Central Brewing Company; 12 breweries in Wyoming Valley	Pennsylvania		2,800,000	2,800,000
Pennsylvania Manufacturing Light and Power; all electric companies of Philadelphia.[6]	New Jersey	Philadelphia	15,000,000	
People's Gas Light and Coke Company of Buffalo; consolidated		Buffalo	4,975,000	3,025,000
People's Gas Light and Coke Company of Chicago; took in new Chicago companies in 1898.[6]	Illinois	Chicago	28,750,000	
People's Light and Power Company; 14 companies in New Jersey		Newark	20,000,000	
Petersburg, (Virginia), Railway and Electric; consolidation of all companies		Petersburg	500,000	
Photographic Paper; 26 companies, manufacturers of sensitized paper			2,000,000	
Pillsbury-Washburn Flour Mills Company (Limited)	Minnesota	Minneapolis	£500,000	£500,000
Pittsburg Brewing Company			$6,500,000	$6,500,000
Pittsburg Plate Glass Company		Pittsburg	9,850,000	150,000
Postal Telegraph Cable Company		New York City	15,000,000	
Pressed Steel Car Company; consolidates Fox and Schoen companies and has a monopoly.	New Jersey	Pittsburg (?)	12,500,000	12,500,000
Print Cloth Pool; 30 mills; restrict production and fix prices			50,000,000	
Pueblo Traction and Electric Company; owns 3 electric light companies of city	California	Pueblo	500,000	
Reading Company (Anthracite Coal Trust)			[6]150,000,000	
Refrigerator Trust; 36 firms; 80 per cent of trade			[6]8,000,000	
River Coal Operators' Company; Pittsburg to New Orleans			[6]11,000,000	
Royal Baking Powder Company; consolidation of all companies	New Jersey	New York	10,000,000	10,000,000
Rubber Goods Manufacturers' Company; consolidation of mechanical goods companies.	do	New York city	25,000,000	25,000,000
Saginaw Valley Traction Company; consolidation of 4 companies		Saginaw	700,000	400,000
San Francisco Breweries, Limited (agreement with other breweries)		San Francisco	[6]20,000,000	
Santy-Kalsomine Company (Plaster Trust)	Michigan	Grand Rapids	[6]3,000,000	
Sash and Door Combine; 26 companies; fix prices		Chicago (?)	[6]15,000,000	
Shelby Tube Company; weldless tubes		Shelby, Ohio	5,000,000	
Shot and Lead Manufacturers' Association; fixes prices			[6]2,000,000	
Shovel Makers of United States and Canada; international agreement			[6]6,000,000	
Southeastern Tariff Association; 67 fire insurance companies[7]		New Orleans (?)	$41,424,318	
Sperry Flour Company; California	California		10,000,000	
Spirits Distributing Company; selling agency for American Spirits and Southern Distributing companies.	New Jersey		3,675,000	3,676,000
Springfield Coal Association; 10 companies	Illinois	Springfield	[6]4,000,000	
Standard Distillingland Distributing Company; whisky	New Jersey	New York City	16,000,000	8,000,000
Standard Oil; controls petroleum refineries, etc., in United States		do	97,250,000	
Standard Rope and Twine Company; sells through Union Selling Company	New Jersey	do	12,000,000	
Standard Sardine Company			5,000,000	
Standard Telephone Company; bought Central Missouri Company in 1898	Missouri (?)	Kansas City	[6]10,000,000	
Steel Beams Association; fixes prices		Pittsburg	[6]20,000,000	
Steel Rail Manufacturers' Association; all big companies agree			50,000,000	
Steel Steamers; forming with all manufacturers on Great Lakes			[6]15,000,000	15,000,000
Steel Tired Car Wheel Company; 6 or 7 car-wheel companies		Trenton	2,000,000	
Swift and Company (beef)	Illinois	Chicago	20,000,000	
Syracuse Rapid Transit Railway Company; all in Syracuse		Syracuse	2,750,000	1,250,000
Temple Iron Company; consolidated 7 anthracite coal companies in Pennsylvania.				
Tennessee Coal, Iron and Railroad Company; plants in Tennessee and Alabama		Birmingham	20,000,000	1,000,000
Theatrical Trust; 50 big ones work together			[6]30,000,000	
Tidewater Oil Company; consolidation of 4 companies	New Jersey	New York City	5,000,000	
Torrington Needle Company			1,500,000	1,500,000
Trenton Gas and Electric Company; 4 companies		Trenton	[6]2,000,000	
Tubular Dispatch Company; consolidated 2 companies			2,100,000	
Twin City Rapid Transit; all street railways in Minneapolis and St. Paul[6]	New Jersey	Minneapolis	15,000,000	2,462,200
Umbrella Hardware Company	do		2,000,000	
Underwriters' Association of State of New York; 72 companies		Syracuse	56,423,711	
Union Bag and Paper Company	New Jersey		16,000,000	11,000,000
Union Carbide Company (acetylene consolidated)	Virginia		6,000,000	
Union Light and Power Company; 4 companies of Salt Lake and Ogden, Utah	Utah		4,250,000	300,000

Present name of trust.[3]	Where incorporated.	Location principal office.	Capitalization.[4]	
			Common stock.	Preferred stock.
Union Switch and Signal Company; consolidated with National Switch and Signal Company.	.....	.....	$997,950	$997,600
Union Tobacco Company; absorbed Durham Company	New York	New York City	12,000,000	
Union Traction Company; all trolleys in Philadelphia[6]	Pennsylvania	Philadelphia	30,000,000	7,350,000
Union Typewriter; 5 leading companies	New Jersey	New York City	10,000,000	
United Breweries Company; 13 breweries, Chicago	....do	Chicago	5,463,000	8,015,000
United Electric Company of New Jersey; to unite all companies in North, New Jersey.	....do	.....	20,000,000	
United Gas Improvement Company	Pennsylvania	Philadelphia	15,000,000	
United Ice Cream Company; 4 companies in Chicago	Illinois	Chicago	300,000	
United Lighting and Heating Company; 8 companies; oil lighting interests of United States.	New Jersey	.....	6,000,000	6,000,000
United Paper Company (tissue)	....do	Paterson	1,500,000	1,500,000
United Railways and Electric Companies of Baltimore; all in city	Maryland	Baltimore	24,000,000	14,000,000
United Shoe Machinery Company	New Jersey	.....	8,625,000	8,625,000
United Traction Company; controls all electric roads in Reading, Pa	.....	Reading	1,400,000	
United Traction and Electric Company; all roads in and near Providence[8]	New Jersey	Providence	8,000,000	
United States Cast Iron Pipe and Foundry; 13 companies, practically all in South and West.	.....	.....	12,000,000	12,000,000
United States Dyewood and Extract Company; to unite all in United States	New Jersey	.....	4,000,000	6,000,000
United States Eaves Trough and Conductor Pipe Association	.....	Pittsburg	[8]2,000,000	
United States Envelope Company; 10 companies; 90 per cent product in United States.	Maine	.....	750,000	3,750,000
United States Express; not incorporated	New York	New York City	10,000,000	
United States Furniture Company (school; enlarging and reforming in 1899)	.....	Chicago	[8]10,000,000	
United States Glass Company; flint glass	Pennsylvania	Pittsburg	3,458,100	600,000
United States Leather Company	New Jersey	New York City	62,854,600	62,254,600
United States Oil Company	.....	Boston (?)	1,250,000	
United States Playing Card Company; allied with 3 other companies	.....	Cincinnati	3,600,000	
United States Rubber; controls boot and shoe output of United States	New Jersey	New York City	23,666,000	23,525,500
United States Varnish Company; organizing with all in United States	....do	.....	18,000,000	18,000,000
Vermont Marble Company [8]	New York	New York City	3,000,000	
Virginia-Carolina Chemical Company; 27 fertilizer factories	.....	.....	4,363,900	5,085,000
Virginia Electric Company of Norfolk; consolidated all companies in city	Virginia	Norfolk	450,000	
Virginia Iron, Coal, and Coke Company; properties in Virginia	.....	.....	7,500,000	
Welsbach Commercial Company; owns Welsbach light; 8 companies	Colorado	Philadelphia (?)	3,500,000	3,500,000
Wells-Fargo Express	.....	.....	8,000,000	
Western Elevator Association; 40 leading in Buffalo	.....	Buffalo	[8]15,000,000	
Western Factory Insurance Association; 23 companies[9]	.....	Chicago (?)	23,862,500	
Western Live Stock and Land Company	Colorado	New York City	408,000	
Western Strawboard Company; plants not in American Company	.....	.....	2,500,000	2,500,000
Western Union Fire Insurance Association; 50 companies in Western and Southern States.[9]	.....	Chicago	47,902,368	
Western Union Telegraph; consolidated other companies in 1881, 1887, and 1894.	New York	New York City	97,370,000	
Westinghouse Air-Brake Company; bought American and Boyden companies in 1898.	Pennsylvania	.....	10,950,000	
Westinghouse Electric and Manufacturing Company; pools with General Electric and owns United States Electric Locomotive Company and Walker companies.	....do	Pittsburg	8,987,950	
Wholesale Druggists' National Association; 25 firms. [9]	.....	Philadelphia	[8]25,000,000	
Wholesale Grocers of New England. [10]	.....	Boston	[8]75,000,000	
Window Shade Manufacturers' Association; nearly all in country	.....	.....	[8]2,000,000	
Wire Cloth Manufacturers' Association of America; 12 firms agree on prices	.....	.....	[8]5,000,500	
Writing Paper Trust; forming with 35 mills in Connecticut Valley	.....	.....	[8]40,000,000	
Yarn (cotton hosiery) Manufacturers; fix prices	.....	Philadelphia	[8]3,000,000	
Yellow Pine Company [8]	New Jersey	New York City	2,500,000	
Totals	.....	.....	4,247,918,981	870,575,200

[3] A few of the trusts included in this list are not at this particular time in full force. In most such cases new agreements are pending, and it is unlikely that, having realized the benefits of combination, capital in these industries will long continue to compete with itself. Some trusts, like the Michigan Salt Association, are renewed every five years, or at other regular or irregular periods. The Paris Green Combine is likely to make its appearance during, or previous to, the potato-bug season.

[4] When a trust is incorporated the amount of capital reported as issued is usually taken, though it is often far above or below the actual capital employed. When not incorporated, the capital employed in the allied concerns is estimated.

[5] Unincorporated trusts pay no dividends, though they often make profits to the constituent companies. Sometimes the rate of dividends on preferred stock is averaged for two or more kinds of such stock. In bonded indebtedness several kinds of bonds are often grouped together.

[6] Estimated.

[7] Only typical trusts are taken in these industries. Such trusts are duplicated in many other cities or sections of the country.

[8] This association maintains prices of proprietary medicines by refusing to handle goods sold to wholesalers who cut prices. Similar local associations cover all sections of the United States and regulate prices of most leading articles. Jobbers and retailers have similar combinations in States, counties, and cities.

[9] Wholesale grocers' associations exist in all parts of the country. By means of rebates, etc., they assist the manufacturers of sugar, starch, baking powder, and of hundreds of other leading articles in maintaining uniform prices.

ADDITIONS TO TRUSTS AND COMBINATIONS.

The following are some of the industrial trusts formed and projected since about the middle of March to May 27:

Present name of trust.	Where incorporated.	Location principal office.	Capitalization.	
			Common stock.	Preferred stock.
Amalgamated Copper Company; to acquire copper properties	New Jersey	.....	$75,000,000	
American Agricultural Chemical Company; 23 fertilizer plants	Connecticut	.....	17,000,000	$17,000,000
American Bicycle Company; 100 plants—95 per cent in country	New Jersey	.....	45,000,000	35,000,000
American Chicle Co.; forming with 6 chewing-gum plants	....do	.....	6,000,000	3,000,000
American Gas and Electric Lighting Fixture Company; forming with 14 plants	....do	.....	9,000,000	6,000,000
American Hide and Leather Company; 30 companies—85 per cent upper leather output.	....do	.....	40,000,000	30,000,000
American Plow Company; forming—17 agricultural implement manufacturers, Chicago.	.....	Chicago	[1]65,000,000	
American Plumbing Supply and Lead Company; 45 companies	.....	.....	25,000,000	10,000,000
American Railways Company; to control electric railway companies in United States.	New Jersey	.....	25,000,000	
American Railway Equipment Company; forming—18 freight-car equipment companies.	....do	Chicago	9,730,000	7,730,000
American School Furniture Company; school and church furniture	....do	.....	10,000,000	
American Shipbuilding Company; shipbuilding, etc., on Great Lakes	....do	.....	10,000,000	10,000,000
American Smelting and Refining Company; controls many big companies[1]	New Jersey	.....	27,400,000	27,400,000
American Steel Hoop Company; 10 hoop, tie, and band companies	....do	.....	19,000,000	14,000,000
American Stoneware Company; forming—25 potteries companies east of Mississippi River.	Delaware	Akron	2,500,000	
American Window Glass Company; forming to control 80 or 90 per cent of all	.....	.....	30,000,000	

Present name of trust.	Where incorporated.	Location principal office.	Capitalization.	
			Common stock.	Preferred stock.
American Writing Paper Company; forming with 21 mills in Massachusetts[2]	.....	Holyoke	$12,500,000	$12,500,000
Automobile Machine and Screw Company; forming—9 screw manufacturers in United States.	.....	.....	6,000,000	4,000,000
Boston Breweries Company; forming—6-10 breweries	New Jersey	Boston	3,250,000	6,500,000
Carnegie Steel Company; forming—includes 15 Carnegie & Frick iron, steel and coke companies.[3]	....do	Pittsburg	125,000,000	125,000,000
Central Hudson Steamboat Company; 9 Hudson River boats[4]	....do	.....	1,000,000	.....
Consolidated Street Car Company; 5 of largest manufacturers	....do	.....	10,000,000	8,000,000
Chamber Furniture Manufacturers' Association; 50 manufacturers of sideboards, etc.; fixes prices.	.....	.....	[1]10,000,000	.....
Chicago Laundry Combine; forming with 75 steam laundries	.....	Chicago	[1]4,000,000	.....
Chicago Sash, Door, and Blind Company; 35 Chicago companies	New Jersey	.....	3,500,000	2,500,000
Columbian Car Lighting and Brake Company; 3 companies	....do	.....	10,000,000	.....
Consolidated Ice Company; all artificial companies in Pittsburg	.....	.....	2,000,000	2,000,000
Continental Cotton Oil Company; 7 Southern companies	New Jersey	.....	3,000,000	3,000,000
Continental Packing Company; with Standard Company; controls sardine output.	....do	.....	3,000,000	.....
Cotton Yarn Combination; forming—7 mills in Massachusetts	.....	.....	8,460,000	.....
Encaustic Tile Company; to control all companies	.....	.....	4,000,000	3,000,000
Federal Sewer Pipe Company	Delaware	.....	10,750,000	10,750,000
Hot Air Furnace Manufacturers' Association; fixes prices	.....	Pittsburg	[1]5,000,000	.....
International Automobile and Vehicle Tire Company; 3 rubber-tire companies.	New Jersey	.....	1,500,000	1,500,000
Ledger Paper Combination; forming with 4 Massachusetts companies	.....	.....	[1]1,000,000	.....
Macbeth-Evans Glass Company; forming—5 chimney concerns, all in the United States.	.....	.....	2,000,000	.....
Manufactured Rubber Company; to control output	New Jersey	.....	5,000,000	1,000,000
National Association of Wagon Manufacturers; fixes prices	.....	.....	[1]40,000,000	.....
National Car Equipment Company; forming in California	California	.....	10,000,000	.....
National Carpet Company; forming—nearly all mills in United States	.....	.....	[1]50,000,000	.....
National Dining Table Association; 39 firms; fixes prices	.....	Chicago	[1]2,000,000	.....
National Glass Company; 17 flint bottle, etc., companies	.....	.....	4,000,000	8,000,000
National Screw Company; forming—includes American and 13 other companies.	.....	.....	10,000,000	.....
National Strawboard Company; forming; will act with American Company	New Jersey	.....	2,000,000	2,000,000
Pacific Coast Biscuit Company; forming with 7 big companies[5]	....do	.....	2,500,000	1,500,000
Patent Leather Combination; forming; 95 per cent of United States product	.....	Newark	[1]20,000,000	.....
Pittsburg Laundry Company	.....	.....	1,750,000	1,750,000
Puget Sound Packers' Association; 8 big salmon packers; fixes prices	.....	Seattle	[1]1,000,000	.....
Republic Iron and Steel Company; 31 bar and forge iron companies, etc	New Jersey	Chicago	30,000,000	25,000,000
Soapmakers' Combination; most of big Western companies	.....	.....	[1]25,000,000	[1]25,000,000
Southern New England Brick Manufacturers; trust forming	.....	.....	[1]5,000,000	.....
Springfield (Mass.) Breweries Company; 4 breweries[7]	.....	.....	1,150,000	1,150,000
Standard Metal Company; forming—10 companies, car-journal bearings, etc	.....	.....	4,000,000	1,800,000
Standard Chain Company; forming—95 per cent machine-made chains	.....	.....	3,250,000	3,250,000
Union Steel and Chain Company; forming	Delaware	.....	30,000,000	30,000,000
United Fruit Company; 10 big companies; tropical fruits	New Jersey	.....	20,000,000	.....
United Power and Transportation Company; to control street railways in Pennsylvania.	....do	.....	12,500,000	.....
United States Dry Paint Company; forming—mineral paints	New Jersey	.....	[1]3,000,000	[1]4,500,000
United States Flour Milling Company; forming—19 mills[8]	.....	.....	3,500,000	5,000,000
United States Glue Company; forming to control glue product	New Jersey	.....	15,000,000	10,000,000
United States Worsted Yarn Company; forming to unite 19 largest mills	....do	.....	20,000,000	16,000,000
United Zinc and Lead Company; to unite mills in Missouri and Kansas	....do	.....	5,000,000	1,000,000
Western Drug Jobbers; forming—Western combination	.....	.....	[1]15,000,000	[1]15,000,000
Total	.....	.....	962,740,000	490,830,000

[1] Estimated. [2] $2,133,000 bonds. [3] $17,000,000 bonds. [4] $100,000,000 5 per cent bonds. [5] $500,000 bonds. [6] $1,500,000 6 per cent bonds. [7] $1,150,000 bonds. [8] $7,500,000 6 per cent bonds.

In the above list only the capital stock and bonds actually issued or proposed to be issued at once are given, when known. Some of the trusts in this list include trusts in the main list. Thus the United Fruit Company includes the Boston Fruit Company; the United States Flour Milling Company includes the Hecker-Jones-Jewell Milling Company, etc. Some of the trusts are under different names, since being formally organized. Thus the Chicago Sash, Door, and Blind Company probably includes but little more than the Sash and Door Combination; the American Shipbuilding Company is the incorporated name of the Steel Steamers Combination. Some of the trusts marked "forming" are so far advanced that retraction is hardly possible. Others have simply secured options on plants and are attempting to float the bonds and stocks.

Prosperity of the Farmer—More than $4,000,000,000 added to his Wealth in Three Years—Testimony of the American Agriculturist to the Prosperity of the American Farmer under Protection.

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES H. GROSVENOR,

OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, June 4, 1900.

The House having under consideration the bill (H. R. 11538) making appropriations for the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901—

Mr. GROSVENOR said:

Mr. SPEAKER: The disposition of our friends of the Democratic party to try to make it apparent that the prosperity of to-day is not real leads me to present and make a matter of permanent record the views of a well-known publication, the American Agriculturist, on the prosperity which has come to that substantial and deserving class of our people, the farmer. It is published in its issue of March 17, 1900, and therefore presents a view of their present condition. It will be seen that it shows a gain of more than $4,000,000,000 in the value of their farms, their crops, and their live animals, and a reduction of three hundred millions in farm mortgages, compared with three years ago. Is the reduction of a hundred millions a year in mortgages and an increase of over a billion dollars a year in values of property owned by a single class "fictitious prosperity?" If so, let us have more of it.

AGRICULTURAL PROSPERITY IS HERE—FARM PRODUCTS ADVANCED IN VALUE NEARLY 23 PER CENT—A GAIN TO FARMERS OF OVER $1,600,000,000 A YEAR—FARM REAL ESTATE FULLY RECOVERED IN VALUE—UNITED STATES FARMERS OVER $4,000,000,000 BETTER OFF—UNPRECEDENTED IMPROVEMENT IN THE GREAT LIVE-STOCK INDUSTRY—FARM PRODUCTS OF EVEN LARGER VALUE FOR 1899 THAN DURING THE BOOM OF 1889—INCREASE IN NUMBER AND VALUE OF FARMS—OVER $300,000,000 OF FARM MORTGAGES PAID OFF—GRATIFYING CONDITIONS THROUGHOUT THE NATION'S BASIC INDUSTRY.

Advance in farm values for 1900.

[Compared to the depths of depression.]

	Amount.	Per cent.
Gain in live stock	$998,000,000	38
Gain in staple crops	401,000,000	23
Gain in live-stock produce	370,000,000	40
Gain in other produce	200,000,000	25
Total gain	1,969,000,000	31
Gain in real estate	2,550,000,000	21
Aggregate advance	4,219,000,000	24

The astounding improvement in agricultural conditions now contrasted with the depths of depression in 1894–1896 is as little appreciated by the outside public as was the farmers' conditions during the hard times. It is conservative, however, to say that the produce of United States farms in 1899 will realize to the farmers over $1,600,000,000 more than their produce was worth in either of the depressed years of 1894–1896. This is an average advance of 31 per cent in values compared to the low point.

These values show an increase of 6 per cent, or nearly $400,000,000, over the census returns for 1889, which was a fairly prosperous period. Quite likely the comparison with ten years ago is really more favorable than this, but glaring errors in census returns, even when corrected as much as possible, admit of no more definite data for 1889. In all cases some duplication of figures

is unavoidable; for instance, the increase in live stock or its products representing much grain consumed; but the basis is the same in all cases.

Farm values now compared with the low point and 1889.

[In millions of dollars.]

	Present values, 1900.	Low point, 1895-96.	Highest previous, 1889.
Value of land, buildings, etc	$14,500	$11,950	$13,280
Live stock	2,558	1,860	2,210
Implements and machinery	500	450	494
Total investment	17,558	14,260	15,984
Staple crops	2,180	1,779	2,141
Live-stock produce	1,300	920	1,100
Other produce	1,000	800	1,000
Total product	4,480	3,500	4,241

Staple crops show a total value for the past season some 23 per cent greater than during the hard years of 1895 and 1896, or a gain of $401,000,000. Other produce, including the great poultry industry, the minor staple crops, and other sources of farm income (including all products consumed by the family, etc.), show a gain of at least 20 per cent compared with the low point, or a total of $200,000,000. These figures look large to the uninitiated; but when it is remembered that the income from the sales of the single item of poultry (including eggs) in the United States amounts to over $300,000,000 a year, the conservative nature of our statistics can be better understood.

The produce from live stock, including milk, butter, cheese, hogs, and pork products, beef cattle, mutton sheep and lambs, hides and pelts, the increase of horses, mules, etc., amounts to about one-half of the value of the live stock at the beginning of each year. This conclusion is based on a careful inquiry covering a series of years.

Farm lands, buildings, etc., depreciated terribly during the hard times, but have more than recovered in value. Together with the new farms and the improvements thereon, the value of the agricultural real estate in the United States to-day probably amounts to fourteen thousand five hundred millions of dollars, or an increase from the low point of two thousand five hundred and fifty millions and of one thousand two hundred and twenty millions over values in June, 1889, as determined by the Federal census.

The value of live stock on farms in January of this year was two thousand five hundred and fifty-eight millions of dollars, an increase of six hundred and ninety-eight over 1895-96, or 27 per cent. Implements and machinery show a natural gain within the past six years, but owing to the fact that these goods have been sold at such low prices of late years their total value to-day is probably about the same as a dozen years ago.

The total investment in American agriculture at the present time is thus set down as having a value of seventeen thousand five hundred and fifty millions of dollars, or a gain of some three thousand three hundred over the extreme depths of depression, and a gain of nearly one thousand six hundred millions over the comparatively high basis of values indicated by the Federal census taken in June, 1889.

IMPROVEMENT IN STAPLE CROPS.

This table compares the average farm price of leading staples during the period of extreme depression with the farm value per bushel, pound, or ton of the same crops grown last year.

	December.	Low point.		Crops of 1899.		Per cent advance.	
		Farm price.	Total value.	Total value.	Farm price.	Per unit.	In total value.
Corn	1896	$0.215	$488,000,000	$963,000,000	$0.303	41	98
Wheat	1894	.491	236,000,000	334,000,000	.584	19	42
Oats	1896	.187	134,000,000	218,000,000	.249	33	55
Buckwheat	1896	.992	6,000,000	7,000,000	.557	42	17
Barley	1896	.323	23,000,000	39,000,000	.403	25	70
Rye	1896	.406	10,000,000	13,000,000	.51	25	30
Potatoes	1895	.27	77,000,000	96,000,000	.39	44	25
Cotton	1894	.046	259,000,000	338,000,000	.053	65	31
Tobacco	1894	.068	28,000,000	44,000,000	.08	18	17
Hay	1896	6.00	408,000,000	425,000,000	7.27	21	49
Aggregate			1,669,000,000	2,180,000,000			33

Wheat is low compared to some other things, owing directly to the large visible supply throughout the world. Yet the current comparatively low level of wheat values is nearly one-fifth higher than in 1894 when wheat went "almost out of sight," and the total value of the crop, by reason of the larger production, was 48 per cent greater for the past season than during the year cited.

Oats are also one-third higher than the low point, while last year's crop of oats was so much greater in volume that the total value of oats is more than half as large again. Corn is some 40 per cent higher, and though its market price is comparatively low, it is now better than at this season for six years past, with the single exception of the 1898 crop. Many feeders claim that corn and oats put into hogs and cattle have yielded a higher return per bushel for the grain than for several years.

Hay shows a considerable increase in aggregate value in spite of last year's short crop and the large supply of old hay carried over. Tobacco is materially better than during the hard times, although the past crop in the heavy leaf sections is lower than for several years, due in a measure to manipulation by the tobacco trust. Potatoes have been fairly profitable for a series of years.

Cotton is on a veritable boom. Its price is now about 50 per cent higher than a few months ago, and may yet go to 10 cents per pound at New York, having already passed 9½ cents. The world's visible supply is now some 1,200,000 bales (27 per cent) less than a year ago, value half again increased. Of course much of the crop left planters' hands before the big advance, yet it is safe to say that many millions of dollars more have gone into the South for 1899's short crop than for the big crops of the two preceding years.

Doubtless the New York price of the 1899 crop will average above 8 cents, so that only three recent crops (those of 1894, 1897, and 1898) have been phenomenally low—6 and 6¼ cents at New York. The other seven crops during the decade since cotton values went below 10 cents have averaged quite 8 cents per pound. In other words, since 1889 the South has suffered less from the decline in cotton than the West suffered from the decline in cereals—another remarkable fact that is known to but few. With an enormously increasing consumption for cotton it is only necessary to restrict the area within reasonable limits to make the New York price average around 10 cents per pound for the next ten years, as it did from 1880 to 1890.

STRENGTH IN LIVE-STOCK INTERESTS.

Live stock has advanced nearly 40 per cent in value above the low point of 1896, and exceeds the high point of the boom that reached its zenith in 1889. The gain during the past five years has been phenomenal, both in numbers and total values. The facts are emphasized by this little table (taken from our own reports, which are much more reliable than the Government's figures), stated in round millions:

	Values.		Advance.	Numbers.		Advance.
	1896.	1900.		1896.	1900.	
			Per ct.			Per ct.
Cattle	$364	$796	41	33	32	(*)
Horses	551	679	23	16	15	(*)
Milch cows	394	603	53	18	19	6
Mules	94	100	14	2	2	
Sheep	53	127	140	33	43	33
Hogs	204	246	21	46	49	7
Total	1,660	2,556	38	148	160	8

*Decrease.

Sheep are higher than for twenty years, worth about double on the farm what they were five years ago, and are fully 20 per cent higher than during the early eighties—a period that has long been a milestone in the prosperity of the sheep industry. Almost as much can be said of wool, while mutton sheep are selling at quotations 50 per cent above the low point.

The extreme depression in cattle five and six years ago has been followed by a 50 per cent advance in farm values. Indeed, cattle are worth more to-day than at any time since the industry assumed large proportions. The value of cattle on farms this January averaged within a few cents of $25 a head, compared to $14 in 1895, from $15 to $19 per head between 1894 and 1887. Even in the then unprecedented boom of 1884-85 cattle averaged $2 per head, or 8 per cent less than to-day. This strength in stockers and beef cattle is confirmed by the extraordinary demand for thoroughbred stock of the favorite beef breeds at almost unlimited prices, as well as by the great activity in the range industry and farm feeding.

In milch cows the same is true. Cows are worth 50 per cent more now than during the ten years preceding 1897, and are fully as high as during the boom of 1884-85. Last summer cheese got back to old-time prices. Butter has of late sold much above the low quotations of four or five years ago. Even milk sold in market is stiffening in prices and may go up to the values of the early eighties, and will go there with organized persistency by producers and reasonable cooperation from the trade.

Hogs have also advanced heavily, and though they have been worth more on the farm than now in occasional years since the early eighties, they are worth more to-day relatively to the price of corn than for a long time. Hogs are to-day no greater in number than a dozen years ago, while population has increased 23 per cent, to say nothing of the growth of export trade. Few realize this fact, but it means good prices for hogs and pork product for several years to come, unless there should be sudden overproduction.

Average farm prices, per head, United States.

	Low point.		Advance.	
	Date.	Am't.	Jan., 1900.	Per cent.
Horses	1897	$33.65	$45.60	36
Mules	1898	39.66	48.67	23
Cows	1862	21.40	31.12	45
Cattle	1896	14.15	24.83	76
Sheep	1896	1.60	2.97	86
Hogs	1897	4.13	4.99	21

FARMERS PAYING UP MORTGAGES.

The extensive inquiry conducted by the American agriculturist weeklies in 1896-97 as to the movement of farm mortgages has been kept up since, so far as feasible. Our work affords the only basis for an opinion on this subject since the Federal census returns for January, 1890, and the latter were at best somewhat conflicting and unsatisfactory. Condensed into a brief comparison we get this table, showing—

United States farms, number owned and mortgaged.

	1900.	1890.
Occupied by owners	3,450,000	3,012,663
Occupied by tenants	1,550,000	1,551,978
Total number of farms	5,000,000	4,564,641
Of the farms occupied by owners there were:		
Owned free of debt	3,750,000	3,286,542
Owned but mortgaged	1,250,000	1,278,099
Total	5,000,000	4,564,641
Amount of incumbrance	$800,000,000	$1,086,000,000
Value of mortgaged farms	$2,963,000,000	$3,055,000,000
Per cent of value covered by mortgage	27	36
Average value of each encumbered farm	$2,750	$3,444
Average amount of mortgage	$1,000	$1,224
Per cent of value covered by mortgage	27	36
Average rate of interest, per cent	6	6.3
Proportion of mortgage incurred for purchase and improvement	78	74

The number of farms has increased by some 400,000 during the past ten years, against a gain of nearly 600,000 in the previous decade, and an increase of nearly 1,500,000 from 1870 to 1880.

A larger proportion (69 per cent) of these farms are occupied by their owners now than ten years ago, tenants occupying 31 per cent of them against 32 per cent in 1890. This is contrary to the general impression, but is partly due to the buying of farms during the late period of low values by those who had previously been tenants. In spite of this, the number of farms now under mortgage that are occupied by their owners is certainly no greater than ten years ago—another remarkable fact.

Just how much mortgages on farms have been actually paid off since 1890 it is almost impossible to say. From 1893 to 1896 many millions were foreclosed, especially in the semiarid region, and the farms merged into large holdings for stock ranges. As near as we can get at it, the amount of mortgages on farms occupied by their owners is now about $300,000,000 less than ten years ago. The great bulk of this vast sum apparently represents the paying off of mortgages by actual owners, who now own their farms free and clear of all incumbrance. This movement has been strongest in the great corn and wheat States of the central West.

The value of farms shows a gain, while the existing mortgages average smaller in amount. Thus mortgages now average only about 27 per cent of the value of the farms they are on, compared to 30 per cent formerly. The rate of interest has also fallen materially. The great bulk of mortgages now in force was incurred to buy the farm or to improve it—praiseworthy objects.

American National Red Cross Association.

SPEECH
OF
HON. TOWNSEND SCUDDER,
OF NEW YORK,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Wednesday, May 16, 1900.

The House having under consideration the bill (S. 2931) to incorporate the American National Red Cross Association, and for other purposes—

Mr. SCUDDER said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I shall occupy the attention of the House for only a few moments.

This bill is one which has in different forms, but all having the same general purpose, been favorably reported to both Houses of Congress, but failed to receive consideration, and has once passed both Houses, reaching the President too late to become a law. The importance and magnitude of the work of the American National Red Cross for the past sixteen years is such as entitles it to recognition and its work and insignia to the protection of the Government, which it is organized to serve in cases of national calamity or emergency.

The work of the Red Cross in the different civilized countries of the world is carried out under a compound treaty between forty-three of the civilized nations. It was the outcome of a conference which convened in Geneva, Switzerland, October 26, 1863, at which fourteen governments were represented by delegates, and there were also present five members of the Geneva committee, six delegates of different associations, and some unaccredited visitors. Its object was to find out and agree upon humane and reasonable methods for the treatment of the unfortunate and helpless victims of war, and a series of resolutions looking to this object and providing methods by which they should be carried out were adopted. These resolutions were the basis of the Red Cross treaty of August 22, 1864, which was entered into at Geneva, Switzerland, by the plenipotentiaries representing Italy, Baden, Belgium, Denmark, Spain, Portugal, France, Prussia, Saxony, Wurtemburg, and the Federal Council of Switzerland.

This treaty has been found of incalculable usefulness in every war which has occurred in Europe since its adoption. During the first ten years of its existence there were five great wars, and in all of them the National Red Cross of each signatory country was the capable agent which carried succor to the wounded and sick of the opposing armies.

Miss Clara Barton, whose public work for humanity began in our own civil war, was in Europe at the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian war and was asked to join the relief corps of the Red Cross in the field, which she did, and her heroic service on the battlefields of France during that war are matters of history. When she returned to her native country, by request of the International Committee of the Red Cross at Geneva, Switzerland, she presented the subject of the Geneva treaty to the President in 1877, and four years later President Garfield in his first message to Congress recommended the accession of the United States to the treaty. President Arthur in his first message to Congress made the same recommendation; the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate reported favorably, and it was ratified by the Senate, and received the signature of the President March 1, 1882, making the United States the thirty-second country to come into the Red Cross treaty.

While originally formed to give its aid in times of war, through the efforts of Miss Clara Barton there has been added an article enlarging the work of the Red Cross to all cases of national emergency and disaster, known in foreign countries as the "American amendment," and in accordance with this article this country has already, under the leadership of this same woman, given its aid to Russia at the time of the famine in 1892, to Armenia and Turkey in 1896. In our country the Red Cross has led in ameliorating and relieving the sufferings arising from the fires in Michigan in 1881; the Mississippi floods in 1882 and 1883; the Mississippi cyclone in 1883; the Ohio and Mississippi floods in 1884; the Charleston earthquake in 1886; the Mount Vernon, Ill., cyclone of 1888; the Florida yellow-fever epidemic of 1888; the Johnstown disaster of 1889; the Pomeroy, Iowa, cyclone of 1893, and the South Carolina islands hurricane of 1893 and 1894.

At the request of the President of the United States and with the permission of Spain the American National Red Cross carried the bounty of the people of this country to the suffering reconcentrados of Cuba in 1897, 1898, and 1899.

The work done by the Red Cross in the late Spanish-American war in Cuba and in the hospitals and camps in the United States was far-reaching in its benefactions, including, as it did, officers and men, friend and foe alike, and many a man to-day owes his life to the Red Cross.

All meetings of the international conferences of the Red Cross have recommended to the governments concerned the importance of the protection of the Red Cross as the sacred insignia of this humane work and also urged the necessity of the incorporation of their National Red Cross committees. In pursuance of this recommendation every signatory country except ours has so protected its National Red Cross, most of them with measures much stronger than those embraced in the accompanying bill.

Our delay in this matter has resulted in the unauthorized use of the Red Cross to collect money from the people of the United States which has never reached the American National Red Cross or any auxiliary Red Cross body. There should be an incorporated national body to carry out the provisions of the treaty, and the insignia of the treaty, the red cross on a white ground, is entitled to legislation which will give it legal protection for its humanitarian work.

It seems to me that honor should fall to those to whom honor is due. This Red Cross Society has built up for itself the enviable name which it now bears, and that name and the work of the society are so closely identified with this emblem—the red cross—it seems to me both fair and equitable that the emblem be preserved to it and not paraded about, taken or used by anybody and everybody for any or every purpose, thereby detracting from the honor inseparably connected with the Red Cross Society through its work of humanity for humanity.

The committee has given this matter very careful consideration. I sincerely hope that its action and its report upon this bill will be accepted and adopted by the House. This society has won for itself, not alone in this country, but also beyond the seas, an honorable, enviable record. Foreign countries pay it their tribute. Pray why should the emblem which is so closely and honorably associated with its work be used to raise funds or advertise by any who may choose to take it, any more than the trade-mark of a corporation or business man should be taken so likewise and used? The action of the committee should be sustained by this House, that the bill as reported and amended should be passed, and the emblem of the Red Cross preserved to and handed down to future generations associated with the work of this noble organization.

The Colored Citizen—His Share in the Affairs of the Nation in the Years 1897-1900—Fifteen Thousand Participated in the War—The President's Generous Treatment of Colored Men in the Military and Civil Service of the Government.

SPEECH
OF
HON. CHARLES H. GROSVENOR,
OF OHIO,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Monday, June 4, 1900.

The House having under consideration the bill (H. R. 11538) making appropriations for the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901—

Mr. GROSVENOR said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I can not let pass this opportunity, at the close of a long session of this Congress and the end of three years of this Administration, without putting into permanent form for a record to enlighten future generations the history of the part which the colored citizen has had in the stirring events of this remarkable period. It is a period in the history of the country of which future generations will be proud, as are those of to-day, and as the colored citizens of the United States have participated nobly in it, it is but justice to them that the facts be put on record.

In civil duties in Washington and throughout the States, in the Army, in the Navy, in the heat and labor of the campaign, and on the battlefield he has been active, earnest, faithful, even unto death, risking his life fearlessly in defense of that country in which too many States permit his exclusion from the rights of citizenship. But in spite of his wrongs by those whom he faithfully served as a slave, he has gone confidently forward, trusting in the continued and increasing control of the party which gave him freedom and has always stood for his rights as a citizen.

HIS PART IN THE WAR.

I want first to speak of his part in the war—in Cuba, in Porto Rico, in the Philippines. "Would a war with Spain benefit the negro?" was a popular question for debate. Some thought it would benefit; others thought not. In many respects it has been a godsend, and beyond dispute a great benefit. If in no other way, 15,048 privates have shown their patriotism and their valor by offering their bared breasts as shields for their country's honor; 4,114 (the regulars) did actual, noble, and heroic service at El Caney, San Juan, and Santiago, while 266 officers (261 volunteers and 5 regulars) did similar service and demonstrated the ability of the American negro to properly command even so well as he does readily obey.

When we have learned to appreciate that three years ago the negro had in the Army only 5 officers and 4,114 privates and that one year ago he had 266 officers and 15,048 privates, we must know that inestimable benefit has come to the race. Among the officers are to be found many of the brightest minds of the race. Fully 80 per cent of those in authority come from the best-known and most influential families in the land. Their contact with and influence upon their superior officers will be sure to raise the negro in the popular esteem and do incalculable good. Some of these men are colonels at $3,500 per annum, lieutenant-colonels at $3,000, majors at $2,500, captains (mounted) at $2,000, captains (not mounted) at $1,800, first lieutenants (mounted) at $1,600, first lieutenants (not mounted) at $1,500, etc.

There were in 1899 in the service the following:

Regiment and company.	Officers.	Enlisted men.
REGULARS.		
Ninth United States Cavalry	1	1,177
Tenth United States Cavalry	2	1,016
Twenty-fourth United States Infantry	1	1,080
Twenty-fifth United States Infantry	1	841
Total	5	4,114
VOLUNTEERS.		
Eighth Illinois Infantry	46	1,234
Third Alabama Infantry		1,141
Third North Carolina Infantry	40	1,059
Twenty-third Kansas Infantry	29	648
Sixth Virginia Infantry	28	623
Ninth Ohio Battalion	16	419
A and B, Indiana Infantry	7	213
Seventh United States Volunteer Infantry	24	981
Eighth United States Volunteer Infantry	23	984
Ninth United States Volunteer Infantry	24	990
Tenth United States Volunteer Infantry	23	978
Total volunteers	260	10,670

Total regular officers	5
Total regulars	4,114
Paymasters	2
Officers	266
Grand total	15,050

IN THE CIVIL SERVICE.

In the civil service of the Government the colored man has participated more fully than ever before. President McKinley, who has always shown a disposition to honor the race and to grant it a fair and just share of the honors he had the power to bestow, has called the colored man to many positions of honor—to a larger number than any other President in the history of the country. On this point I desire to quote the Hon. Judson W. Lyons, the efficient and honored Register of the Treasury, who, in a speech delivered at the annual dinner of the Republican leaders of the city of New York, January 27, 1900, said:

I am prepared to prove from the records of the Government, beyond all possibility of dispute and cavil, that more colored men have employment in the service of the Government to-day than at any time since the close of the civil war. I am further prepared to show that President McKinley has sent the names of more colored men to the Senate for confirmation to office than any of his predecessors; that more colored men have received original appointments under this Administration than under any previous one; that the colored race is better represented in every branch of the Federal service to-day than at any time during the past third of a century, and that in the classified service of the Government at Washington, covered by the civil-service law of 1883, colored men have been promoted to higher average grades than ever before.

The facts themselves, taken from the records of the Government, so far as obtainable, bear out each one of these statements. There are on the pay rolls of the Federal Government, in all of its branches, the names of 18,267 colored persons who receive regular employment and pay. This is a greater number than at any time since the close of the civil war. This great army of employees is distributed as follows: In the service of the Government in the District of Columbia, 2,517; in the various branches of the service outside of Washington, 7,500; in the Army and Navy, 8,250.

As proof of my second statement that President McKinley has sent the names of more colored men to the Senate than any one of his predecessors I submit the following facts: Nominations of all classes, 233, divided as follows: Commissions in the Army, 186; collectors of internal revenue, 2; consuls, 9; receivers of public moneys, 4; register of lands, 1; surveyor-general, 1; naval officer, 1; collectors of customs, 9; postmasters, 15; ministers to foreign countries, 2; recorder of deeds, 1; supervisors of census, 2; secretary of legation, 1, and Register of the Treasury Department.

As to original appointments, there have been upward of 7,000 of all classes, or slightly more than one-third of the sum total.

A hasty survey of the situation shows that the colored race has more consuls abroad, more commissioned officers in the Army, more collectors of customs and deputy collectors of customs, more collectors and employees in the Internal-Revenue Service, more postmasters and postal employees than at any time heretofore in the history of the Government.

In the classified service at Washington there has been an unprecedented number of promotions of colored employees. The average grade of colored clerks is at least one step higher than has ever before been attained. In one very large bureau of a Department every colored clerk has received a promotion, and in some instances clerks have received two promotions since the beginning of the present Administration. This is in marked contrast to the conduct of the preceding Democratic Administration, when reductions and dismissals were the order of the day. I might here add that under the President's civil-service order of May 29, 1899, a number of colored men, dismissed from the service during the preceding Democratic Administration, have been reinstated.

Our people draw in salaries and pay from the Federal Treasury $5,538,612. Nor are these millions of dollars and these thousands of places the sum total of benefit that the race receives from this recognition. Far outweighing these mere material advantages is the moral influence proceeding from the fact that colored men given the opportunity are showing capacity of no mean order in the administration of grave and responsible trusts. By this means the critics and detractors of the race are silenced, the friends of the race are encouraged, and the masses of the race itself are inspired with hope, and are encouraged to put forth their utmost exertions to rise from unfortunate conditions. Opportunity is the one word that needs to be written in the lexicon of our race, and the Republican party has well-nigh completed the writing of that word.

Upon this record the Administration of President McKinley has no fears in appealing to the colored Republicans of the country. President McKinley has at all times been entirely frank and sympathetic toward us. He has listened to our representatives at all times when they came to present the cause of the race. He has discharged his duties in the love of man and in the fear of God. The colored race in the United States has had no steadier friend in the White House at Washington than William McKinley.

Take this question of lynching as an example. In his inaugural address on the 4th of March, 1897, when he was just entering upon his responsible duties as President of the United States, he spoke out firmly and decidedly against this growing evil, and put the moral influence and weight of his office against it. He has since renewed and confirmed the opinions uttered in his inaugural address in his recent message to the Fifty-sixth Congress. Every man who runs may read his utterances on lynching and know where he stands with reference to this question.

In the case of the assassination of Postmaster Baker at Lake City, S. C., every resource of the Administration was exhausted to secure the apprehension and conviction of the assassins. An ample reward was offered, skilled detectives were employed, the culprits were arrested, ample evidence to convict was secured, able counsel was employed; but a mistrial resulted only because the public sentiment of the vicinity from which the jury was selected was averse to a verdict of guilty, nor would he reestablish that office where Postmaster Baker had been so foully assassinated until the colored citizens of that town came forward under a petition and asked for its reestablishment and presented the name of a person who had had no part, either actively or passively, in the assassination of Postmaster Baker. An old proverb says, "Love is acts, not words." Judged by this standard, President McKinley fills the full measure of reasonable expectation, and stands out in the full light of public opinion and conscience as the ideal embodiment of a firm and just ruler.

FINANCIALLY CONSIDERED.

Now let us consider the financial side of the question. The colored citizens had during the war 266 officers, approximated, and a fair average of salaries, at $1,600, $425,600; 14,784 privates, at $208, $3,075,472; 5,000 men employed as drivers, cooks, servants, laborers, etc., at $250 per year, $1,250,000. Total, $4,751,072.

Add to this the honor attached to the following names and positions: Col. J. R. Marshall, of Illinois; Col. James Young, of North Carolina; Col. J. M. Brown, of Kansas; Lieutenant-Colonel Taylor, of North Carolina; Maj. John R. Lynch, of Mississippi; Maj. R. R. Wright, of Georgia; Maj. Charles Young, of Ohio; Major Haywood, of North Carolina; Major Walker, of North Carolina.

Below follow other figures kindly furnished by the respective Departments:

POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

1 at	$2,500	$2,500
1 at	1,200	1,200
1 at	1,000	1,000
2 at	900	1,800
1 at	840	840
6 at	720	4,320
17 at	660	11,220
2 at	480	960
1 at	360	360
2 at	240	480
34		24,680

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT.

Secretary's office:		
1 at $1,400		$1,400
3 at 840		2,520
4 at 720		2,880
8 at 660		5,280
1 at 480		480
1 at 240		240
18		12,800
General Land Office:		
1 at $3,000		3,000
1 at 2,776		2,776
1 at 2,222		2,222
1 at 1,986		1,986
1 at 1,600		1,600
1 at 1,000		2,800
2 at 1,400		4,800
4 at 1,200		1,800
2 at 900		5,280
8 at 660		
21		26,264

STATE DEPARTMENT.

Consular service:		
1 at $5,000		5,000
1 at 4,000		4,000
2 at 2,500		5,000
2 at 2,000		4,000
4 at 1,500		6,000
1 at 1,000		1,000
11		25,000

INDIAN AFFAIRS.

1 at $1,000		1,000
1 at 840		840
1 at 720		720
1 at 660		660
2 at 240		480
6		3,700

PENSION OFFICE.

1 at $2,000		2,000
7 at 1,400		9,800
2 at 1,300		2,600
21 at 1,200		25,200
31 at 1,000		31,000
7 at 900		6,300
4 at 840		3,360
1 at 720		720
8 at 660		5,280
4 at 400		1,600
3 at 240		720
89		87,740

PATENT OFFICE.

1 at $1,400		1,400
3 at 800		2,400
7 at 720		5,040
9 at 600		5,400
15 at 480		7,200
3 at 360		1,080
38		22,520
Geological Survey:		
1 at $720		720
8 at 600		4,800
1 at 520		520
1 at 480		480
4 at 180		720
15		7,240
Miscellaneous:		
1 at $3,000		3,000
1 at 900		900
1 at 720		720
1 at 480		480
1 at 400		400
1 at 360		360
6		5,860

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE.

168 men, at an average salary of $700 per annum	117,600

RECORDER OF DEEDS OFFICE.

1 at $4,000		4,000
2 at 1,200		2,400
1 at 900		900
16 at 400		6,400
1 at 240		240
1 at 120		120
22		14,060

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

District building,	10 at $720	7,200
District courts,	15 at 600	9,000
Miscellaneous,	50 at 500	25,000
	75	41,200

Add to these figures the following reasonable estimates: State Department, $20,000; Navy Department, $20,000; War Department, $30,000; Treasury Department, $200,000; Agricultural and Executive Departments, $25,000, and we have the following:

RECAPITULATION.

Army	$4,751,073
Post-Office Department	24,080
Interior Department	271,000
Printing Office	117,600
District of Columbia	55,260
Consular Service	25,000
State Department (estimated)	20,000
Navy Department	20,000
War Department	30,000
Treasury Department	200,000
Agricultural and Executive Departments	25,000
Total	5,538,012

Then, when we shall have added the salaries of the hundreds of postmasters, deputy postmasters, collectors of customs, collectors of internal revenue, with their thousands of deputies, the numerous watchmen, custodians of public buildings in many States, three supervisors of census, and at least 150 enumerators with an average pay of $50 each, we can readily figure the enormous sum of $6,000,000 salary drawn by the negro under the openhanded and generous Administration of William McKinley!

PROMINENT COLORED MEN IN THE COUNTRY'S SERVICE.

The following is a partial list of colored men and women in the service of the country, appointed in every instance by President McKinley or those acting under his instructions. And here it is proper to say that while Mr. McKinley has been deeply engrossed with the most intricate problems of statecraft, he has not been unmindful of the just claims of the race. He has distributed the official rewards with rare tact and judgment, and no element which assisted in the masterful triumph of 1896 is without representation. The negro vote has fared handsomely at his hands. Colored men of intelligence and character have been selected from every section of the country to fill positions of trust and profit under the Administration, and the instance has yet to be recorded where the honor has been bestowed unworthily.

Indeed, while it is a fact of great significance that the President has within nineteen months appointed fully twice as many negroes as any previous Administration, developments are now being so shaped by him, through a revision of the civil-service regulations, that the number of negro officeholders will be increased fourfold. Not only this, but the constitutional rights of the negro will continue to be sacredly regarded and his future in the new possessions will be surrounded by every guaranty calculated to insure his peace and material well-being. The great work which the Administration has done in the line of negro recognition is graphically illustrated by the subjoined roster, which gives some of the more important positions to which eminent negroes have been assigned since the advent of the present régime. From this roster is omitted dozens of Army appointments, scores of civil-service appointments, promotions, and retentions, State recognition, and hundreds of minor departmental positions, which are the legitimate fruits of the great victory of 1896, and which should be placed to the credit of the Administration.

FEDERAL APPOINTMENTS GIVEN TO COLORED MEN.

J. W. Lyons, Register of the Treasury.
H. A. Rucker, collector internal revenue, Atlanta, Ga.
J. H. Deveaux, collector of customs, Savannah, Ga.
C. C. Wimbish, collector of port, Atlanta, Ga.
I. J. McCottrie, collector of port, Georgetown, S. C.
Budd Coffee, St. Marys, Ga.
R. R. Wright, paymaster in Army.
Rev. C. T. Walker, chaplain in Army.
Dr. George C. Stoney, surgeon in Army.
E. R. Belcher, deputy collector customs, Brunswick, Ga.
M. P. Morton, postmaster, Athens, Ga.
I. H. Lofton, postmaster, Hogansville, Ga.
J. T. Jackson, postmaster, Darien, Ga.
Mrs. E. L. Bamfield, postmistress, Beaufort, S. C.
Dr. A. M. Curtis, surgeon in chief, Freedmen's Hospital.
Rev. B. W. Arnett, jr., chaplain in Army.
John R. Lynch, paymaster in Army.
James Hill, register of lands, Jackson, Miss.
Frank P. Brinson, postmaster, Duncansville, Miss.
Thomas Keys, postmaster, Ocean Springs, Miss.
H. P. Cheatham, recorder of deeds, District of Columbia.
John C. Dancy, collector of port, Wilmington, N. C.
Dr. J. E. Shepard, Internal-Revenue Service, North Carolina.
Rev. O. L. W. Smith, minister to Liberia.
John T. Williams, consul, Sierra Leone, Africa.
Mrs. S. E. Jones, postmistress, Bladen County, N. C.
Colin Anthony, postmaster, Scotland Neck, N. C.
Joseph E. Lee, collector of internal revenue, Florida.
D. N. Pappy, collector of port, St. Augustine, Fla.
Dr. L. W. Livingston, consul, Cape Haitien, Haiti.
W. F. Powell, minister to Haiti.
Robert Pelham, special Indian agent.
J. C. Leftwich, receiver of public money, Montgomery, Ala.
H. V. Cashin, receiver of public money, Huntsville, Ala.
R. A. Parker, Internal-Revenue Service, Alabama.
Dr. A. M. Brown, surgeon in Army.
Rev. I. Dawson, postmaster, Eutaw, Ala.
M. W. Gibbs, consul, Tamatave, Madagascar.
J. E. Bush, receiver of public money, Little Rock, Ark.
Fred. Havis, postmaster, Pine Bluff, Ark.
M. B. Van Horn, consul, St. Thomas, Danish West Indies.

Dr. George H. Jackson, consul, La Rochelle, France.
John P. Green, superintendent of stamp division, Post-Office Department.
C. L. Maxwell, consul, Santo Domingo.
W. T. Anderson, a Regular Army chaplain.
H. Y. Arnett, comparer, office of recorder of deeds, District of Columbia.
E. P. McCabe, Oklahoma.
N. T. Velar, postmaster, Brinton, Pa.
J. H. Jackson, postmaster, Pennsylvania.
J. N. Ruffin, consul, Asuncion, Paraguay.
Gen. Robert Smalls, collector of port, Beaufort, S. C.
F. J. Baker, postmaster, Lake City, S. C.
J. E. Wilson, postmaster, Florence, S. C.
T. C. Walker, collector of port, Tappahannock, Va.
B. T. Greener, consul, Vladivostock, Russia.
Dr. H. W. Furniss, consul, Bahia, Brazil.
W. A. Gaines, Internal-Revenue Service, Kentucky.
Dr. J. O. Holmes, pension examiner, Kentucky.
J. R. Spurgeon, secretary legation, Liberia.
Henry Demas, naval officer, New Orleans, La.
James Lewis, surveyor-general, Louisiana.
Mrs. V. E. Bahn, postmistress, Madisonville, La.
E. L. Simon, postmaster, South Atlanta, Ga.

So Mr. McKinley reached the close of three years of his service firmly established in the confidence of the people and stronger than ever by reason of having so successfully piloted the grand old ship of state through the channel of political unrest, skillfully escaping the Scylla of domestic discord while steering away from the Charybdis of foreign complication.

In war or in peace, whether dealing with whites or blacks, foreigner or native, President McKinley's course has been dictated by a singleness of purpose—that of faithfully administering the trust placed in his hands. Uninfluenced by prejudice, unmoved by ill-advised clamor, and unruffled by captious criticism, he pursues the even tenor of his way, adhering steadfastly to the right as God gives him to see the right, vindicating day by day the judgment of his supporters, and presenting to the nations of the globe the perfect embodiment of the typical American.

RECORDER CHEATHAM ON THE SITUATION—WHAT ONE OF THE RACE'S MOST POWERFUL LEADERS SAYS OF PRESIDENT M'KINLEY'S ADMINISTRATION—NEGRO INTELLIGENCE UPON THE SIDE OF REPUBLICANISM.

At no time since the enfranchisement of the negro have so many conflicting problems confronted our people and called for keener discrimination or calmer judgment. It gives me infinite pleasure to note the intelligent interest taken by my race in all the questions now up for solution. It points to a brighter era and offers a remedy for many of the ills that now beset us. The more the negro reads and studies, the better he becomes acquainted with the history of the country and the attitude of parties on the issue of human rights, the stronger a Republican he becomes. The so-called "blind faith" of other days is giving away to the conviction that as a plain business proposition the Republican party can more safely be trusted to conduct the affairs of government, and that its continuance in power is the surest method of sustaining and increasing the wave of prosperity now sweeping over the land.

The Administration of President McKinley is a grand success. He has led us successfully through a trying foreign war; he has made the name of the United States respected and honored in every nook and cranny of the civilized world; his policy of judicious expansion, as exemplified in the acquisition of the Philippines and Porto Rico, and the protection of Cuba, is placing our beloved nation beyond the period of provincialism and is opening broader avenues for the investment of capital and the promotion of Christian principles; he has given the negro splendid recognition in the domestic and diplomatic service, and has afforded us an opportunity to prove anew our skill and valor upon the field of battle; he has just given us two regiments of picked men, and placed over them the gallant heroes who won fame at Santiago.

In accord with military usage, the colonel and regimental officers are tacticians of wide experience and happen to be white, but I am satisfied that when the troops take the field, and when the black soldier performs, as he will, some conspicuous act of bravery and demonstrates beyond question his capacity for epaulettes, President McKinley will not hesitate to award them to him. Every step we take in advance must be earned, and it can only be held by hard and continuous work and eternal vigilance. This may seem cruel, but it is the condition we are compelled to meet, and we might as well prepare ourselves for merciless competition. Our future greatness lies in industry, education, and the ability to do what is needed a little better than anyone else can do it, with equal promptness and fidelity. Our prosperity lies in making friends with the strongest forces of the body politic, and yielding cheerful obedience to the law.

There is hope for the negro, and the problem can be solved by natural processes, if he just keeps "hammering away," and permits no opportunity for advancement to escape him. We have good friends in the South, as well as in other sections of the country, and we should be careful when we discuss the situation not to abuse those who are kindly disposed toward us.

I have no fears of the result in Ohio. The President's wise and conservative administration will be sustained, and Judge Nash will be elected by a healthy majority. The negro voters are too sensible to be led away by appeals to prejudice and passion, and under the guidance of such eminent men of affairs as George A. Myers, W. R. Stewart, W. H. Parham, H. C. Smith, John P. Green, Charles Cottrell, Robert Harlan, and others, they will rally enthusiastically around the Republican standard. The issues are strongly and candidly stated in the platform, and the negro understands thoroughly that in the prosperity brought about by Republican success he will enjoy an equitable share.

There is nothing for the negro in Democratic success in Ohio. There is everything for him in the triumph of the party of freedom and human rights.

HENRY P. CHEATHAM.

COLORED MEN IN THE SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR—PRESIDENT WILLIAM M'KINLEY GIVES THEM PROMINENT ASSIGNMENTS.

When hostilities broke out between the United States and Spain in 1898, President McKinley did not hesitate to call upon valiant colored men to assist in maintaining national honor and defending the country's flag. Several volunteer regiments were organized at once and were officered by some of the brightest men of the race.

In Cuba the negro soldiers distinguished themselves by signal bravery and daring, the charge at San Juan Hill being a lasting monument to their valor and courage. As a result of this memorable battle many were promoted from the ranks to executive positions. Those who were not assigned to duty in Cuba served their country by discharging important guard and picket duty. At the close of the war with Spain the bulk of the regiments, white and black, were mustered out. The negro troopers of the Regular Army, comprising the Ninth and Tenth Cavalry and Twenty-fourth and Twenty-fifth Infantry, remained in the service.

Appreciating the superior services of the negro troops in the recent war with Spain, President McKinley decided to increase the number of negro regiments in the Regular or Standing Army, and on the 8th of September, 1899, issued an order for the organization of two new regiments of infantry, to be composed of colored men. The Democrats protested against this action, but to no avail. Two regiments were called for. The regiments have been designated as the Forty-eighth and Forty-ninth Volunteer Infantry, and are being organized, respectively, at Fort Thomas, Ky., and Jefferson Barracks, Mo.

The full complement of officers has been selected, and following are the field officers (white):

Forty-eighth Regiment—Colonel, William P. Duvall, captain, First Artillery; lieutenant-colonel, Thaddeus W. Jones, captain, Tenth Cavalry; majors, Sedgwick Rice, first lieutenant, Seventh Cavalry; Alexander L. Dade, first lieutenant, Third Cavalry; John Howard, first lieutenant, Nineteenth Infantry.

Forty-ninth Regiment—Colonel, William H. Beck, captain, Tenth Cavalry; lieutenant-colonel, Arthur C. Ducat, captain, Twenty-fourth Infantry; majors, Ernest Hinds, first lieutenant, Second Artillery; George W. Kirkman, captain, Twenty-third Infantry; James W. Brott, captain, Twenty-fourth Infantry.

Following are the company officers (colored) of the Forty-eighth Regiment:

Captains—John Buck, first sergeant Troop B, Tenth Cavalry; Thomas Campbell, late first lieutenant Company L, Seventh United States Volunteer Infantry; William H. Brown, sergeant-major, Ninth Cavalry; Carter P. Johnson, Tenth Cavalry; Thomas Grant, late first lieutenant Company F, Tenth United States Volunteer Infantry; Robert R. Rudd, late captain Company A, Ninth Battalion Ohio Volunteers; James E. Hamlin, late captain, Third North Carolina Volunteer Infantry; Pleasant Webb, late captain, Sixth Virginia Volunteers; William A. Hankins, late captain, Sixth Virginia Volunteers; Leon W. Denison, late captain Company K, Eighth Illinois Volunteers; Stephen Starr, late second lieutenant, Ninth United States Volunteer Infantry; Alexander Richardson, late first lieutenant, Ninth United States Volunteer Infantry.

First lieutenants—L. H. Smith, first sergeant Troop M, Tenth Cavalry; Peter McGown, first sergeant Troop E, Tenth Cavalry; William H. Allen, sergeant, Company A, Ninth Cavalry; John H. Anderson, squadron sergeant-major, Ninth Cavalry; Charles O. Thomas, late lieutenant, Eighth United States Volunteer Infantry; Jerry M. White, late first lieutenant, Twenty-third Kansas; James F. Powell, late second lieutenant, Indiana Volunteers; H. B. Brown, late first lieutenant, Third North Carolina Volunteer Infantry; H. J. Parker, late first sergeant, United States Volunteer Infantry; Jacob G. Smith, late second lieutenant, Ninth United States Volunteer Infantry; John W. Brown, late second lieutenant, Ninth United States Volunteer Infantry; Charles C. Caldwell, late first lieutenant Company B, Ninth Battalion Ohio Volunteers.

Second lieutenants—Walter Green, first sergeant Company K, Tenth Cavalry; G. B. Turner, commissary-sergeant, Tenth Cavalry; Joseph Moore, first lieutenant Company H, Eighth United States Volunteer Infantry; J. B. Coleman, late first lieutenant Company E, Seventh United States Volunteer Infantry; Lincoln Washington, sergeant-major, Ninth Cavalry; David B. Jeffers, late second lieutenant, Tenth United States Volunteer Infantry; Wilson Ballard, late second lieutenant, Ninth Battalion Ohio Volunteers; Joseph C. Andrews, private, Company L, Sixth Massachusetts Volunteers; Frank R. Chisholm, late private, Company L, Sixth Massachusetts Volunteers; John K. Rice, late first lieutenant, Sixth Virginia Volunteers; George W. Taylor, noncommissioned officer, Third North Carolina Volunteers; Green F. Marion, late sergeant, Third Alabama Volunteers.

Forty-ninth Regiment—Captains, William B. Edwards, sergeant, Company A, Tenth Cavalry; Charles W. Jefferson, first sergeant Company B, Ninth Cavalry; Floyd H. Crumbly, late first lieutenant Company A, Tenth United States Volunteer Infantry; Edward L. Baker, late first lieutenant Company B, Tenth United States Volunteer Infantry; John C. Proctor, late first lieutenant, Eighth United States Volunteer Infantry; Emanuel D. Bass, late first lieutenant Company D, Ninth Battalion Ohio Volunteers; William H. Hawkins, late captain, Twenty-third Kansas Volunteers; Benjamin Graves, late captain, Sixth Virginia

Volunteers; William R. Staff, sergeant-major, Twenty-fourth Infantry; Frank R. Steward, late second lieutenant, Eighth United States Volunteers; Robert G. Wood, late second lieutenant, Ninth United States Volunteer Infantry; Robert Gage, late captain, Third Alabama Volunteers.

First lieutenants—Charles Perry, first sergeant Troop L, Tenth Cavalry; L. H. Jordan, first lieutenant Company K, Seventh United States Volunteer Infantry; Charles Spurlock, sergeant, Company E, Ninth Cavalry; Ebert W. Maden, sergeant, Company E, Ninth Cavalry; Charles H. Robinson, first lieutenant, Sixth Virginia Volunteers; James H. Thomas, late first lieutenant, Indiana Volunteers; David J. Gilmer, late captain, Third North Carolina Volunteer Infantry; Robert Blakeman, late first sergeant Company H, Eighth Illinois Volunteers; Hamilton H. Blunt, late first lieutenant, Ninth United States Volunteer Infantry; Thomas C. Butler, late second lieutenant, Ninth United States Volunteer Infantry; Macon Russell, late second lieutenant, Eighth United States Volunteer Infantry; L. A. Tillman, late quartermaster-sergeant, Seventh United States Volunteer Infantry.

Second lieutenants—A. M. Ray, sergeant, Company F, Tenth Cavalry; Robert L. Gough, corporal, Company D, Twenty-fourth Infantry; Wyatt Huffman, late second lieutenant, Eighth United States Volunteer Infantry; Beverly Ferea, late first lieutenant, Seventh United States Volunteer Infantry; Henry F. Walla, commissary sergeant Ninth Cavalry; William Blaney, late second lieutenant, Tenth United States Volunteer Infantry; Horace F. Wheaton, private, Company L, Sixth Massachusetts Volunteers; George E. Payne, second lieutenant, Twenty-third Kansas Volunteers; Leander W. Hayes, late sergeant, Third North Carolina Volunteers; Gilford E. Campbell, late sergeant, Eighth Illinois Volunteers; Edward B. Johnson, Tenth Cavalry.

These two regiments will be composed of about 1,200 men each, all of whom will be colored, with company officers of their own race.

What has President McKinley done for the negro along military lines, you ask? Let us see.

He has appointed 24 negro captains at a salary of $1,800 per annum each, amounting to $43,200; 24 first lieutenants at a salary of $1,500 each, amounting to $36,000; 24 second lieutenants at a salary of $1,400 each, amounting to $33,600; 2 regiments of 2,400 privates at $156 each, amounting to $374,400. Grand total, $487,200 per annum.

HON. JOHN P. GREEN PRESENTS A FEW FACTS IN FAVOR OF MR. M'KINLEY'S ADMINISTRATION.

[From the Colored American.]

Permit me to say, here and now, that I am positively and unqualifiedly in favor of the renomination and reelection of President McKinley, for the following reasons, in part:

First. His Administration has given us an honest and conservative Government, has maintained our financial integrity, abolished soup houses, and given work to all who are able and willing to work, at increased wages.

Second. Under his wise and statesmanlike leadership, Cuba has been liberated at a minimum of cost in blood and treasure, and large and valuable tracts of territory added to our domain. The possession of these "colonies" will stimulate our manufacturing and commercial industries, and furnish valuable markets in the near future for the products of the farm, the mine, the loom, the factory, and mills, and furnaces. This is what we need and must have. Further, President McKinley has given more official patronage to the colored American than any other President before him; and would have done more for the colored Republicans of the South if the murderous assaults made on Federal appointees there had not discouraged it. I speak advisedly when I say that the colored American has drawn more dollars under McKinley's Administration than ever before.

Third. I favor President McKinley because I know him to be our friend.

Now, what are the charges preferred against the President by some of our people, by reason of which they advise colored men to abandon the Republican party and ally themselves with the Democratic party, dominated by the Southern wing, which has suppressed our vote, colonized us in "Jim Crow" cars, and are daily engaged in horribly mutilating and murdering us?

They censure the President because he has not sent Federal troops into the South to prevent lynching; and they point to the Administration of Grant, in contrast. The cases are not parallel. President Grant did not send any troops into the South to suppress Kuklux Klan outrages; they were there already, had not been recalled after the termination of the civil war, and he simply ordered them from place to place in the several States where they were located to protect voters at the polls, and to assist United States civil officials in serving process.

The case of ex-President Cleveland sending United States troops to protect the mails during the strike at Chicago is often referred to. This is not a similar case for several reasons.

First. There was no dispute on the part of President Cleveland's law advisers as to his legal right to send those troops to Chicago to protect the mails.

Second. The disorder at Chicago continued for a week or more, and Mr. Cleveland had time to send troops there. In the case at Lake City, S. C., no one save the bloody lynchers knew that Baker and his family were going to be assassinated; and after it was done it was too late to send troops. All that was left to be done was to detect the assassins and prosecute them according to law. This the President has done and is doing. He even has employed extra able counsel to assist the prosecuting attorney at Charleston.

Take the terrible affair at Wilmington, N. C. The governor of North Carolina is a Republican, and was authorized to call on the President for troops in an emergency. The governor did not call for troops; the election was ended; no one was killed. Then, like a clap of thunder out of a cloudless sky, the mob assailed and killed a lot of helpless colored people. Not even the colored people at Wilmington knew that this foul deed would be perpetrated. The President could not foresee what even they could not tell, even if he had possessed the legal power and the means had been appropriated by Congress to send troops there.

No one could know that those six men "lynched" at Newnan, Ga., would be lynched, or that Sam Hose would be mutilated and burned, before the deeds were done. After these acts were perpetrated the sending of troops to the several localities would have been only a shallow farce.

Of one thing we are certain: When President McKinley was Governor McKinley and there was no question as to his legal right to use troops to protect a menaced prisoner, he used them, and that in such a way that the law had its full and free course. But that was in a State where the law officers notified him in time of the danger, and he had the opportunity to send troops before the victim was lynched. Again, the President is complained of because he did not refer in his message to the lynchings in the South. While this was, from my point of view, a mistake, yet we must not lose sight of the fact that doing is more valuable than talking; and what Democratic platform ever contained anything advising for the welfare of the colored American or what Democratic President ever remembered him in his messages? At the very moment when the message was being read the vicinity of Lake City, S. C., was "bristling" with detectives who were gathering evidence for the prosecution of the assassins of Baker and his family, and at the prosecution of the same at Charleston the evidence collected was cumulative, and had the trial taken place anywhere except in the South they would have been convicted.

If the President himself had been assassinated nothing more could have been done than to arrest the guilty parties and prosecute them in a court of law. This has been done and is still in process in the case referred to. Others will follow, let us hope. We must not forget that in the President's first utterance as President he condemned lynching and lawlessness.

Again, the President is found fault with because he has not appointed more and higher commissioned officers in the Army. Well, as to this complaint we can say the end is not yet. More than this, we can say that he not only sent our four regular regiments of soldiers to the front and gave them places of honor (at the front) when white regiments were clamoring to go there, but he also appointed a large number of first and second lieutenants in the volunteer service; and what more has a Democratic President ever done?

It may be said that a Democratic President would have done more, but who can prove it to be fact? In that trying ordeal the President was not "a law unto himself." We must remember he had many influences that were hostile to us to reckon with, and let us give him credit for what he has done.

The foregoing, Mr. Editor, are my earnest, honest sentiments, and however much your readers may differ with me, I trust they will at least credit me with having the courage to express my convictions.

With respect,

JOHN P. GREEN.

T. THOMAS FORTUNE ON THE NEGRO IN 1897-1900.

[From the New York Sun.]

Through all the troublous three years of the past the rock of safety has been President McKinley. He remained unruffled and unexcited when many of the people of the Republic thought we were unprepared for war. He made the mandate of the people his own and responded to the Macedonian cry of the outraged people of the Pearl of the Antilles and drove the Spanish oppressor from this hemisphere. There is no one, in my opinion, so well prepared to grapple with all the grave questions growing out of the Spanish-American war as William McKinley; hence, have no doubt that next November the American people will say to him at the ballot box: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant." I believe, however, that the crowning feature of President McKinley's Administration is the prosperity which it has brought to the nation, and in which the Afro-American people have shared equally with others of their fellow-citizens, and the basis of this prosperity has been the sound financial policy the Administration has stood for and made a fixture, so that the credit of the Republic at home and abroad is as good as that of any nation.

No one who has traveled in the South within the last twelve months can deny the fact that the men who make our annual output of 10,000,000 bales of cotton are more prosperous, more cheerful, more contented, and better dressed, and take more pride generally in their country. This condition of affairs is not only true of the South and of the black man, but of all sections of our country and of all races of our people. I want also to refer here to the consummation of the dying wish of General Grant that the resentments and estrangements growing out of the civil war might be removed and that we should again become a united people. The generosity and fairness of President McKinley and the Spanish war have accomplished this, which I am sure is gratifying to every patriotic citizen.

It is not generally known how handsomely President McKinley has treated the Afro-American citizens in appointments to office. It is estimated that there are about 18,267 of these in the public service. In the District of Columbia there are 2,517; in the States, 7,500. In the Army and Navy there are 8,250, of whom 186 are officers. The President has made 237 nominations of Afro-Americans, among them 2 collectors of internal revenue, 9 consuls, 4 receivers of public money, 1 register of land office, 1 surveyor-general, 1 naval officer, 8 collectors of customs, 16 postmasters, 2 ministers to foreign countries, the recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia, 2 supervisors of the census, 1 secretary of legation, the Register of the Treasury, and a special agent to the Paris Exposition.

There have been made of original appointments more than 7,000, slightly more than one-third of the whole. In the classified civil service there has been an unprecedented number of promotions, and the average grade of colored clerks is higher than ever before. Under the President's civil-service order of 1899 quite a number who were removed under Mr. Cleveland's two Administrations for offensive partisanship have been reinstated. We draw in salaries from the Federal Treasury $5,536,612 per annum, nearly 60 cents for every man, woman, and child in the country.

In his inaugural address President McKinley strongly condemned mob and lynch law, and in his recent message to Congress he reiterated the condemnation. The whole power of the Administration was used to secure a conviction of the persons who murdered Postmaster Baker at Lake City, S. C. On all the counts, it seems to me that President McKinley has done the handsome thing by Afro-American citizens, and I believe they will support him as cordially next November as they did in 1896.

T. THOMAS FORTUNE.

Mr. Speaker, I desire in closing to express my admiration of the course of President McKinley in the trying duties of his position. In the conduct of the war with Spain Mr. McKinley has exhibited a quality of generalship the most potent encomium upon which is the speedy and satisfactory termination of the exasperating conflict. In this struggle the negro was given a man's chance, and a lion's share of the glory is his. The President's prudence, sagacity, and inflexible determination here stamped him as the peer of the greatest military commanders of any age.

The waving Stars and Stripes, unfurled over the ramparts of

Cuba, of Porto Rico, of Hawaii, and the Philippines are mute but eloquent witnesses to his wise and patriotic leadership. "McKinleyism" has come to be associated with protection to labor, the elevation of the citizen, sound finance, enduring prosperity, and, best of all, to be synonymous with a "Greater America," upon whose expanded soil the sun never ceases to shine. While Mr. McKinley has been deeply engrossed with the most intricate problems of statecraft, he has not been unmindful of the just claims of party workers. He has distributed the official rewards with rare tact and judgment, and no element which assisted in the masterful triumph of 1896 is without representation. The negro vote has fared handsomely at his hands.

Military Academy Bill.

SPEECH
OF
HON. THOMAS M. JETT,
OF ILLINOIS.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, May 15, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 11538) making appropriations for the Military Academy—

Mr. JETT said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will not address myself to the pending bill, but desire to make some observations on the question of trusts.

Mr. Chairman, that there exists within the United States a great many monopolies and trusts, formed for the purpose of private gain and which are exceedingly dangerous to the well-being of the people as well as the free institutions of our country, is well known. When these trusts are permitted to carry out their purposes, as they have been doing recently, they become oppressive and interfere with labor and legitimate enterprise and rob the people of the fruits of their toil. That the great aggregations of capital in many instances rob the people of the fruits of their toil no one can successfully deny.

I desire, Mr. Chairman, to submit the testimony of many who are informed thoroughly and can speak knowingly upon this subject.

I will first submit that of Mr. Henry C. Frick, a former business partner of Andrew Carnegie:

THE CARNEGIE EXPOSURE—RICH BEYOND THE DREAMS OF AVARICE—MR. CARNEGIE'S PROFITS GREATER THAN A KING'S REVENUES—ONE DAY'S INCOME PAYS THE PRESIDENT'S SALARY—CONFRONTED BY TRUSTS OF HALF A BILLION—THE MODERN YOUTH FACES A WALL OF MONOPOLY—ALL DOORS OF OPPORTUNITY CLOSED BY THE TRUSTS.

Is there a man in the country who can read the extraordinary statements made by Henry C. Frick in his suit against Andrew Carnegie without stopping to think of the swift change which the trust system, backed by Government favoritism, has wrought in economic, political, and social conditions in America?

Mr. Frick says that Mr. Carnegie's share of the profits of the Carnegie Steel Company last year was $12,285,000. He also says that Mr. Carnegie's share of the earnings this year will probably be $24,867,500.

CARNEGIE'S PROFITS GREATER THAN KING'S REVENUES.

Can you grasp the meaning of that? Twelve millions of dollars last year; $24,000,000 this year! This is the private income of one man. Let me give you a list of annual incomes that may help you to establish a rule of proportion:

Queen Victoria	$1,925,000
The German Emperor	3,852,770
The Emperor of Austria	3,875,000
The King of Italy	2,858,000
Andrew Carnegie	24,867,500

ONE DAY'S INCOME PAYS PRESIDENT'S SALARY.

Mr. Carnegie's income from his steel works is $68,130.13 a day. That is more than the salary of the President of the United States for a whole year. His annual income is equal to the wages of 12,000,000 of workingmen at $2 a day.

But is Mr. Carnegie the only man in the community who is able to pay the President's salary for a year out of one day's income?

Until Mr. Frick made his astounding revelation no one had any suspicion that the Carnegie Steel Company was earning $42,500,000 a year. May there not be other men in the country—many of them—whose incomes would startle the country if the real facts were to be made known? Who can tell? The trust system, the scheme of limited monopoly, is so well surrounded with safeguards of secrecy that it is only by the accident of a legal quarrel among the great financial captains that the truth may now and then be uncovered. Senator HANNA, the spokesman of the present Administration at Washington, laughs at the earnest men who have tried to probe this greatest problem of the present generation. The trusts should be "let alone." They pay millions of dollars into the Republican campaign fund. Why should they be disturbed or investigated?

RICH BEYOND THE DREAMS OF AVARICE.

I do not single out Mr. Carnegie for criticism. I make no complaint because he is rich beyond the dreams of avarice. He is simply the product of a system. He has brains and courage and industry. While others have dawdled or groped stupidly he has mastered hard questions. He has not spared himself. What he has he got by his own genius. He has been a benefactor of his race in more ways than one.

But when Mr. Carnegie began his struggle for wealth and power there were no trusts. That is true of practically every other man of power in the trusts. The door of opportunity was open for them. They have not left it open for others.

THE MODERN YOUTH FACES A WALL OF MONOPOLY.

Mr. Frick deserves the thanks of the nation for this contribution to the world's knowledge. He has no doubt started springs of thought in the public mind that will flow long after his suit against Mr. Carnegie has been won or lost. The thinking American citizen will ask himself how it is that one man can lawfully—and Mr. Carnegie's wealth is lawful—earn twenty-four millions a year. He will glance backward and forward. He will think of his father, of himself, of his son. And he will see that the founders of the great trusts entered upon their business careers when competition was possible, and that they have gradually destroyed the competitive system.

Could Andrew Carnegie start in the steel trade to-day and achieve power? Does anyone believe that this man, with all his intelligence and ability to apply himself to the work before him, could break through the wall of monopoly built around the steel trade?

CONFRONTED BY TRUSTS OF HALF A BILLION.

Imagine Mr. Carnegie young again and eager to become the independent proprietor of a successful steel plant. He would find himself face to face with such colossal combinations as these:

American Car and Foundry Company:	
Common	$29,000,000
Preferred, 7 per cent	29,000,000
Total	58,000,000
American Steel Hoop Company:	
Common	19,000,000
Preferred, 7 per cent	14,000,000
Total	33,000,000
American Steel and Wire Company:	
Common	50,000,000
Preferred, 7 per cent	40,000,000
Total	90,000,000
American Tin Plate Company:	
Common	28,000,000
Preferred, 7 per cent	18,000,000
Total	46,000,000
Federal Steel Company:	
Common	46,484,300
Preferred, 6 per cent	53,253,500
Total	*99,737,800
National Steel Company:	
Common	32,000,000
Preferred, 7 per cent	27,000,000
Total	†59,000,000
Pressed Steel Company:	
Common	12,500,000
Preferred, 7 per cent	12,500,000
Total	25,000,000
Republic Iron and Steel Company:	
Common	27,352,000
Preferred, 7 per cent	20,852,000
Total	48,204,000
*Bonded indebtedness in addition	29,959,000
†Bonded indebtedness in addition	13,042,000
Total	43,001,000
Grand total:	
Common stock	244,336,300
Preferred stock	214,605,500
Bonded indebtedness	43,001,000
Aggregate capital	501,942,800

THIS POWER DANGEROUS TO THE REPUBLIC.

Men like Mr. Carnegie, having established themselves in power, naturally seek to prevent competition. He is not alone in this. It is the foundation idea of the trust system.

But can a power like this exist in a republic without destroying the republic?

What is the remedy? Who knows? Is there a remedy at all? And how can there be any effective and reasonable remedy until the Government is in the hands of men who honestly want to find a remedy?—*James Creelman in New York Journal.*

CRUSHING POWER OF THE TRUSTS—DRIVES THOUSANDS TO THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY—SMALL MERCHANTS AND MANUFACTURERS CROWDED OUT—THEY CAN NO LONGER SUPPORT THE PARTY OF HANNA, AND THEY ARE BOLTING.

Thousands of small business men and manufacturers who supported Mr. McKinley in 1896 have decided to support the Democratic party this year. A more significant movement can hardly be imagined.

This means that the crushing power exerted by the trusts is driving the victims of this all-ingulfing, rapacious system of centralization out of the party dominated by Mr. McKinley and Senator HANNA, the open agents of trusts and syndicates, and for the first time the trust has become a factor—probably a controlling factor—in practical politics, not only in the West and South, but also in the East, and particularly in New York.

BUSINESS MEN BECOME SALARIED EMPLOYEES.

The cry which rings from State to State and increases in volume and intensity every week is a cry against a system of absolute monopoly, backed by

Government favoritism, which is crushing out small proprietors, shutting the gates of opportunity and converting a large and important body of hitherto independent business men into salaried employees. The change has been swift and almost noiseless. In every city and town are to be found scores of hired men who, only two years ago, were in business on their own account. These men were helpless to resist the overpowering weight of the trust system. Let any man in any part of the country investigate this statement in his own community. The great danger which threatens the country is that no man will be able to engage in any of the businesses controlled by trusts unless he does so as a hireling, and that, with competition destroyed, the prices of necessaries of life will be fixed arbitrarily by the trusts, without restraint. Go to any store in your neighborhood and ask whether the trusts have reduced prices. The rapid rise in the prices within the past year is startling, almost incredible.

HANNA SAYS "TRUSTS DO GOOD."

Senator HANNA says publicly that the trusts are doing good by lowering the cost of manufacture and distribution. That is true. The Journal has said the same thing. It is a part of the order of progress. Organization and systematic economy, whether by trusts or otherwise, must cheapen manufacture. I have failed to find any man whose opinions on any subject are worth hearing who is willing to say that it is not a good thing to lessen the cost of producing any necessary of life.

TRUSTS INCREASE PRICES.

But Senator HANNA has nothing to say about the fact that the trusts have become so powerful, so ruthless, that, while the cost of manufacture is growing less, the price to the consumer is increasing.

The startling rise in the prices of articles manufactured by trusts completely unmasks the gigantic industrial and commercial conspiracy which is bleeding the whole country. No man is safe now. No man dares to interfere with the pillage. Within one year the trusts have nearly doubled in power and in perfection of organization. Yet prices in retail stores everywhere are going up and up. If you are not already aware of this, ask your wife, your housekeeper, your butcher, your grocer. This is the most overwhelming thing on the whole social, political, or economic landscape. This it is that is driving tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands, of new recruits to the Democratic party. Monopoly stalks grimly on the ashes of competition.

The business community is losing its independence; the trusts, with a newly awakened realization of power, are raising the prices of everything they manufacture; in small towns and villages clerks are taking the place of proprietors.

ADMINISTRATION SYMPATHETICALLY INACTIVE.

President McKinley and Attorney-General Griggs are sympathetically inactive. They know that the Supreme Court of the United States has declared in the most positive and unmistakable language that the anti-trust law passed by Congress is constitutional, and that it is sufficient to reach the criminal nature of the trust conspiracy. The President and the Attorney-General know that at the present time there is being organized the most extensive and irresistible combination of railroad transportation, hand in hand with the other trusts, and that the nation is becoming weak and bloodless under the burden. But they also know that Mr. HANNA expects to get $25,000,000 from the trusts, to be used in keeping the Administration in power. The Attorney-General refuses the enforce the anti-trust law, and the President will not compel him to do it.

COUNTRY ROUSED TO ITS PERIL.

The result of my investigation in New York and the Middle West during the past few weeks is a firm conviction that for the first time the country is aroused to the real peril to a republican form of government arising from the trust system, which Mr. HANNA says is a good thing.

This is the supreme Democratic issue. No leader and no combination of leaders can decrease its power or importance. It is changing votes every hour. There may be a difference of opinion regarding legislation on the subject, but every man I have met seems to understand that with a President and Cabinet free from the control of the trusts the country has a better chance to strike at the giant crimes of the trusts than is possible when the President and the Cabinet place the whole power of the Government behind the criminal combinations.—James Creelman in New York Journal.

Mr. Chairman, I now desire to submit a full and clear statement from the pen of Hon. John DeWitt Warner, published recently in the publication known as the Middle West, of Grand Rapids, Mich., in which some very interesting questions concerning the steel and wire monopoly are discussed. It is here shown the effect of this great trust upon the prices of wire and steel; how it more than doubled the prices in 1899; how the people of the United States are made to pay 88 per cent more for fencing wire than foreigners have to pay for the same wire.

LESSON IN TRUSTS—STEEL AND WIRE MONOPOLY MORE THAN DOUBLED PRICES IN '99—EXPORTS AT HALF PRICE—WIRE NAILS NOW FOUR TIMES AS HIGH AS IN 1896—ENGLAND GETS HALF HER NAILS OF US—MILLS CLOSED TO RESTRICT PRODUCTION—RESULTS OF PROTECTION.

The steel and wire trust is a monopoly combination born of and maintained by the tariff, the sole purpose of which, in this case at least, is to enable this great corporation to fleece American consumers, while at the same time exporting vast quantities of their products, and, after paying freights, selling them in foreign markets at little more than half the price extorted from American consumers. Grand Rapids citizens, many of them at least, are familiar with John DeWitt Warner, lately a Congressman from New York City, whose address here on the tariff question in 1892 was one of the most effective indictments of the protection robbery system ever drawn. Well, Mr. Warner has been looking up the steel and wire trust and has given the result in an exhaustive special article, the chief features of which are here printed:

CONFESSION OF A TRUST.

The demoralizing effects of the tariff on trusts, and the manner in which it enables these trusts to fleece consumers, is well illustrated by the testimony of John W. Gates, managing director of the American Steel and Wire Company, before the Industrial Commission, November 14, 1899. Without a blush he stated that prices of wire nails, etc., had been doubled; that he deprecated the necessity for such high prices; that they were due to the high prices of raw materials; that his company exported 700 tons of wire a day; that it furnished England with 60 per cent of her supply; that goods were sold lower to foreigners; that such prices were necessary "to hold outside trade;" that not infrequently new plants were shut up and dismantled; that this was done for "various reasons;" that five plants had been closed; that his company had a monopoly of the barbed wire business; that, therefore, higher prices were charged for these products; that his company was making big profits; that his company did not recognize labor unions as such; that subsidies should be paid to steamship lines and to corporations with $5,000,000 or more capital; that the Government should supervise all such corporations; that he went to Europe to form a world trust; that he proposed to increase prices $10 a ton if such a trust were formed; that the Germans contemplated a $20 increase; that the Germans wanted too big a share of business; that Germany's bounty system was excellent; that if it were applied here we should soon be doing 90 per cent of the iron and steel business of the world; that the protective tariff had had much to do with building up the industry; that the continuance of the policy was necessary to the future prosperity of the industry.

Can any sensible, fair-minded, and patriotic man take the statements and admissions of Mr. Gates and reach his conclusions as to the necessity for tariff duties or bounties? Is it not clear that he has received so much from the Government that he now thinks it owes him and his kind a living? Will any honest man think it fair for these manufacturers to sell their products at the highest possible notch to those who pay the tariff bounties and to bestow upon the untaxed foreigners the blessings of low prices—even "to hold outside trade?" Why not tax the foreigner a while and give home consumers a chance to get some of their tariff taxes back? Consider to what use the tariff has been put in the wire and nail industry by the millionaires whom it has produced.

EARLIER WIRE COMBINATIONS.

Going no farther back than in 1895 we find the Consolidated Steel and Wire Company, an Illinois corporation of 1892, with $4,000,000 capital, as the barbed-wire trust, with John W. Gates as manager. Various pooling agreements were formed in 1894, 1895, and 1896 between all of the barbed-wire manufacturers, but they were only temporarily successful in producing higher prices. The Export Barbed-Wire Association, composed of four principal exporters, was in force several years previous to 1895 and was partially revived in 1896. In September, October, and November, 1895, "prices were fixed by agreement," and were $2.85 per hundred pounds for barbed wire. The previous April the price was $1.90. The average prices for previous years were: 1894, $2.18; 1893, $2.55; 1892, $2.29; 1891, $2.72; 1890, $2.97. In December, 1895, the combination broke and prices fell to $2.

NAILS PREVIOUS TO 1898.

Early in 1895 wire nails were selling at a "base" price of 75 to 80 cents a keg in Pittsburg. In May two associations, one for cut and one for wire nails, got together and put this price up to $1.20. These associations pooled and the wire-nail people "contributed financially to enable the Cut Nail Association to keep control of the market, especially in the payment of subsidies to keep idle the large number of nail machines," as the Iron Age of December 3, 1896, tells us. The associations regulated the amount of nails offered for sale each month and the price at which they should be sold. "Understandings were had with Canadian manufacturers. Nail-machine makers were subsidized not to sell to those outside the associations. Jobbers who did not cut prices were given rebates. Prices were advanced almost steadily for one year. By May, 1896, wire nails were selling at $2.70 in Chicago and $2.55 in Pittsburg. The pool held together until December, 1896, when prices broke more than 1 cent per pound, and in July, 1897, were down to $1.35 per keg.

HOME TWICE EXPORT PRICES.

On December 3, 1896, the Iron Age said high prices of cut and wire nails had reduced consumption from over 9,000,000 kegs in 1891 and 1892 to less than 8,000,000 in 1895 and in 1896 to probably "far less than in 1895, notwithstanding the fact that a large amount of nails had been exported into foreign countries at less than half the price that the American public paid for their nails." In November, 1896, the price to foreigners was $1.30, while the price to Americans was $2.70. At least one dealer bought a large quantity of nails at export prices and after shipping them to Amsterdam and back and paying freight and other charges both ways made a handsome profit while underselling the trust in its own market. He, however, was boycotted by the trust and was thereafter unable to buy nails at any price. The exports for the fiscal year 1896 were 28,762,187 pounds.

TRUST FORMED IN 1898.

Agreements were broken and patched up in 1897 and 1898. In April, 1898, the American Steel and Wire Company of Illinois was formed with $24,000,000 capital. It contained 14 mills, 7 of which constituted the Consolidated Steel and Wire Company, formed in 1892 with $4,000,000 capital. This trust was not large enough to fully regulate production and prices. It was swallowed up by the new American Steel and Wire Company, a New Jersey corporation formed January 13, 1899, with $90,000,000 capital, $40,000,000 of which is 7 per cent cumulative preferred stock. This trust includes practically all of the wire, wire-rod, and wire-nail mills of this country. The value of the 26 plants and other property absorbed is about $20,000,000, which, even admitting the $18,000,000 other capital claimed, would leave over $50,000,000 of water. It owns its own sources of supply. Its monopoly conditions and advantages were thus set forth in March, 1899, by its president, John Lambert:

"It will not be necessary to make any further purchases, for the reason that we have all the producing capacity that we need. It has been our policy to so fortify ourselves that we are practically independent, or, if you please, to put ourselves in a position to take the ore from our own mines, transport it in our own vessels, convert it into pig iron in our own furnaces, roll it into steel billets in our own steel mills, roll it into iron rods in our own rod mills, and finish it in our own mills into plain and barbed wire and all the different kinds of wire used, not only in the United States, but all other countries where wire is used. In this way we have succeeded, as we own one of the best ore mines in the Mesaba range. We have our own coke mines and coke furnaces; so that you will see that we start at the bottom and have all the profits that there are from ore to finished material. Our business is entirely satisfactory and the company is doing very well."

The trust has a monopoly of the drawn and barbed wire business, but has considerable competition in woven fence wire. It also does a large business in copper wire and copper electrical goods and in fencing, poultry netting, baling wire, and bale ties. The actual output in 1898 of all the plants now in the trust was:

Wire rods	tons	826,840
Drawn wire	do	1,130,124
Barbed wire	do	275,918
Wire nails	kegs	6,551,737
Woven-wire fencing	miles	10,050

EFFECT ON PRICES.

The effect of this trust upon prices has been almost marvelous. The following tables of average monthly New York and Chicago "base" prices are

from the Iron Age of January 4, 1900. The first gives the base prices of wire nails:

Month.	1899.	1898.	1896.	1895.
January	$1.59	$1.55	$2.49	$0.95
February	1.73	1.57	2.42	.95
March	2.00	1.55	2.57	1.00
April	2.25	1.47	2.55	.95
May	2.35	1.45	2.70	1.10
June	2.00	1.43	2.70	1.50
July	2.70	1.36	2.70	1.95
August	2.80	1.36	2.70	2.20
September	3.10	1.45	2.70	2.40
October	3.20	1.47	2.70	2.40
November	3.28	1.40	2.70	2.42
December	3.53	1.37	1.60	2.42
Average	2.60	1.45	2.54	1.68

(The column of 1897 prices is omitted for lack of space. But when the old nail pool broke in December, 1896, to $1.60 they kept falling till they reached $1.35 for July, the average for the year being $1.46. It is worth noting, too, that the base price—which is the rate for "spikes"—is now $3.75, instead of $3.53, as given by the foregoing table for December.) In the table following, giving the "base" prices of barbed wire, the 1897 column is omitted for the same reason. In this case the price kept falling until it averaged $1.65 for August, 1897, the average for the year being $1.80:

Month.	1899.	1898.	1896.	1895.
January	$2.05	$1.90	$2.02	$1.90
February	2.25	1.90	1.97	1.90
March	2.62	1.90	1.95	1.95
April	2.80	1.87	2.05	1.90
May	2.95	1.80	2.15	1.95
June	3.20	1.80	2.00	2.10
July	3.30	1.80	2.00	2.15
August	3.40	1.80	1.90	5.55
September	3.67	1.80	1.85	2.85
October	3.77	1.82	1.85	2.85
November	3.88	1.82	1.85	2.85
December	4.13	1.82	1.95	2.00
Average	3.17	1.85	1.96	2.25

It should be noticed that these are the base prices of wire nails in carload lots. Because of "extras," due to sizes, the average price per keg is fully 60 cents more than those quoted above. Of course the prices of small lots are still higher, and the retail prices, especially in remote districts, very much higher. The base price is fixed at Pittsburg, and freights are added to all points of delivery. The Pittsburg price is now 33 cents lower than Chicago and New York prices, which are 5 cents below St. Louis prices.

ENORMOUS TRUST PROFITS.

In April one of the directors estimated the yearly net earnings at $12,000,000. The statement of the earnings to June 30, 1899, showed a net profit of $4,802,000 for the first six months. Judging from the prices of wire and wire nails, the profits for the second six months should be at least $8,000,000, the increase in prices being nearly all profit, because the trust owns its own mines and furnaces, and the actual cost of making iron, steel, and wire is not much greater than when prices were less than half present prices. While it is unlikely that the present excessive profits will continue for many months, it is difficult to see how the profits from July, 1899, to July, 1900, can fall below $15,000,000.

It may be noted that when this trust was first formed we heard a great deal about the economic advantages and savings of great combinations. Thus Garrit H. Ten Broek, of St. Louis, counsel for the company, announced that "the only effect on the market that I can see will be a possible slight lowering of prices, because of the economy, and also a steadiness of prices for the future." There are still numerous pro-trust theorists prating about the blessings of trusts, as if nearly all of the trusts had not, in practice, actually demonstrated that they are, under present conditions, all-round curses.

If the wire trust lowers prices it will do so only because of the removal or threatened removal of tariff duties or because prices are too high to yield maximum profits. The Iron Age of November 30, 1899, contains six columns of interviews with hardware men in twenty-five States on "the effect of high prices on the demand for goods." Many dealers say they expect to sell 25 or 30 per cent less goods in 1900 because of advanced prices. Many farmers are refusing to build fences with wire at high prices. A Maryland farmer said: "The price of wire is prohibitive; I shall go home and put the hands to work and make rail fences." The farmers are deferring the building of houses because of the increased prices of lumber, nails, glass, etc.

LOW EXPORT PRICES.

Mr. Gates neglected to tell the Industrial Commission how much export prices were below home market prices. It will make these farmers feel happy to know that this same trust which charges them at a "basis" of $3.53 per keg for nails (about $4 to $4.50 at retail for spikes) exports these nails and sells them to Europeans at $2.14 "basis" per keg, and that it exported about 70,000,000 pounds in 1899 to all parts of the earth. The exports for the fiscal years 1893 to 1899 of wire and wire nails were as follows in pounds:

Year.	Nails.	Wire.
	Pounds.	*Pounds.*
1893	2,300,501	42,796,043
1894	3,233,776	44,778,268
1895	4,367,267	61,093,717
1896	8,031,927	70,928,706
1897	2,941,714	107,729,155
1898	22,894,099	137,054,094
1899	51,233,212	215,194,475

Exports are increasing rapidly and were 50 per cent greater than ever before during the last six months of 1899. The total exports of wire for the first eleven months of 1899 were 241,922,967 pounds; of wire nails, 62,996,401 pounds. These tremendous exports and the prices at which they are made indicate that there is no need of protection and subsidies at home, except for the officers of the trust, who are trying to capture "90 per cent of the world's trade." Will the farmers who are building rail fences because barbed wire is too expensive feel like voting to continue a tariff system which compels them to pay 88 per cent more for fencing wire than foreigners have to pay for the same wire? Large quantities of barbed wire were exported from New York in December, 1899, at $2.20 per hundred, although the home price at the end of the month was $4.10.

JOHN DE WITT WARNER.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I desire to submit for the benefit of this House and for the country some facts in relation to the great salt trust.

From this it will be seen that this trust has fattened and thrived because of the fact that it has the benefit of the high protection laws. This, also, Mr. Chairman, is evidence of the fact that the position of the Democratic party as to how to regulate the trusts is a correct one—that is, by putting on the free list goods and products of the kind and character manufactured by these trusts.

This article is prepared by Mr. Byron W. Holt, and you only have to read it to become convinced that he is familiar with his subject and that this trust is a great detriment to the American people.

STORY OF THE GREAT SALT TRUST—HAS RAISED PRICES 80 PER CENT SINCE 1897—HOW REPUBLICANS MANAGED THE BUSINESS FOR THIS PET.

Salt was on the free list of the Wilson bill, in force from August 28, 1894, to July 24, 1897. Under the McKinley and Dingley bills the duty on salt in bags or barrels was 12 cents and in bulk 8 cents per 100 pounds. These duties vary from 30 to 100 per cent and will average about 50 per cent.

Before salt was put on the free list the manufacturers appeared at Washington, declaring that such a proceeding would practically ruin the business. Thus, Mr. Thomas Molloy, secretary of the Onondaga Coarse Salt Association, told the Senate Committee on Finance that "when salt shall be admitted free * * * our even now struggling industry shall be paralyzed or destroyed in an unequal competition with the cheaper product of foreign cheaper labor. We will then soon be made to pay to the English Salt Union the price which it exacts elsewhere."

Contrary to predictions, we both produced and consumed more salt from 1895 than ever before, as is shown by the following table of production and imports:

Consumption of salt in United States (in barrels of 280 pounds each).

Year.	Domestic production.	Net imports.	Total consumption.
1890	8,876,991	1,820,427	10,697,418
1891	9,987,945	1,678,159	11,666,104
1892	11,698,890	1,614,816	13,313,706
1893	11,897,208	1,224,025	13,121,233
1894	12,968,417	1,511,792	14,480,209
1895	13,669,649	1,760,115	15,629,764
1896	13,850,726	1,795,223	15,645,949
1897	15,973,302	1,438,838	17,412,040
1898	17,612,634	1,307,972	18,920,606

PRICES AND TARIFF DUTIES.

The average net factory price for all kinds of salt (about one-half of which is common fine salt), according to the United States Geological Survey, was 36½ cents per barrel in 1894, 32 cents in 1895, 29.2 cents in 1896, 30.8 cents in 1897, and 35.3 cents in 1898. The "net" price means the price of the salt alone; the cost of the barrel adds about 20 cents—though much coarse salt is not sold in barrels.

The present price of "factory-filled" dairy salt at works in Michigan is 55 cents as against 35 cents, or less, in 1896. The Chicago price is now 75 cents. The New York City price of same grade salt from western New York is $1.40 as against $1 to $1.10 in 1896 and 1897. Prices of salt in many Middle and Western States are now nearly double those of 1896.

In 1897 many manufacturers asked to have the McKinley duty on salt replaced. Over 40 pages of the Tariff Hearings of 1897 are occupied by the statements of the manufacturers who wanted duties and of the importers, meat packers, etc., who wanted free salt. The manufacturers in 1894 stated that the repeal of the duty would not make salt cheaper, and in 1897 that the replacement of the McKinley duty would "not perceptibly" add to the cost of salt. Yet for some indefinite and unexplained reason they wanted the duty and could not continue to live much longer without it. They got the duty and immediately began to fix prices and to form a trust, which has quite "perceptibly" advanced prices.

SALT ASSOCIATIONS AND TRUSTS.

The salt manufacturers have always had an affinity for selling agencies and price agreements. In 1866 the Michigan manufacturers were uniting. The Michigan Salt Association began in 1876. It takes the product of all members and sells it, thus avoiding much competition. It has been renewed every five years since 1876, and has generally controlled about 90 per cent of Michigan's product, which is one-third of our total product. Since 1890 New York has produced more salt than Michigan, and the two States now produce 70 per cent of our product.

Other similar selling agencies were in operation in New York and Ohio, and each had alliances and agreements with the others. As, however, previous to 1898, but little was done to restrict production, the permanent effect upon prices was not great.

March 20, 1899, the National Salt Company, a New Jersey concern, was incorporated with $12,000,000 capital, $5,000,000 of which is 7 per cent preferred stock. It immediately acquired the dozen or more manufactories in New York for which its predecessor, the National Salt Company of West Virginia, was the distributing agent. Those plants were said to manufacture 90 per cent of New York's product and to have made net profits in 1898 of "not less than $450,000." By October this company had purchased many of the best plants in Ohio, West Virginia, Michigan, and Kansas, had leased other plants for five-year periods, and had contracted for the output of other plants. Thus, in the Pomeroy, Ohio, district, the trust appears to have bought and closed one plant, closed three other plants which it had "dead rented" for five years, and contracted for the output of three more plants. In Michigan it has contracted for the product of the members of the Michigan Salt Association.

The prosecuting attorney for Meigs County and the attorney-general of Ohio are proceeding against this trust to test its power to own and close furnaces which have been running for thirty years.

The United States Salt Company, an Ohio corporation of 1890, appears to have been the local trust which prepared the way for the national company. Both of these organizations are said to be officered by Standard Oil people and to be, practically, adjuncts of the Standard Oil trust. The headquarters at New York are in the building of the Standard Oil Company, and Standard Oil attorneys in Ohio are defending the National Salt Company.

The National Salt Company now has a natural monopoly in many of the inland States and an artificial tariff monopoly in many of the coast States. It has only recently begun to limit production and to put up prices in the Middle and Western States. It will undoubtedly soon put up prices to what it considers the maximum-profit point. It is said to have had an "understanding" with the Salt Union, which controls much of Great Britain's product. It is difficult to verify this statement, although New York salt importers admit that there are "friendly" relations of some kind between these organizations.

Our imported salt comes principally from Great Britain, West Indies, and Italy. The cost of transportation from Liverpool averages about $1.60 per ton, or 30 cents per barrel. This, added to the duty, gives our manufacturers an advantage in our markets of about 20 cents per 100 pounds, or 50 cents per barrel. This advantage is less on the coast and greater inland. If our trust, as now seems probable, gets what is virtually a complete monopoly, there is no reason why it can not, by charging higher prices inland, collect the whole tariff tax on all its product. This would amount to $4,000,000 or $5,000,000 a year. It is probably collecting half this amount at present.

The only classes who have thus far avoided the trust are our fish packers and our exporters of meats. These enjoy the special privilege of getting their salt free and cheap. Is there any sound reason why others should be compelled to pay tribute to this trust?

BYRON W. HOLT.

Mr. Chairman, here is a suggestion from the Buffalo Evening Times that is worthy of much consideration. It tells of the origin, the evil, and the remedy for trusts. I most heartily commend it to our Republican friends on the other side of this Chamber:

THE TRUSTS—ORIGIN OF THE EVIL AND THE REMEDY.

The old rhyme runs:

"For every evil under the sun
There's a remedy or there's none;
If there is one, try and find it;
If there isn't, never mind it."

It is almost universally conceded that modern monopolistic industrial combinations are a public evil and a menace to society. If they are an evil, How is the evil to be overcome? is the sensible and practical question. Some say there is no remedy, others propose remedies that would be worse than the evil. There are those who seem to become hysterical the moment they would discuss the trust problem. Questions in economics can be best studied by the application of approved economic teachings. Flippant writers and orators lacking in information scoff at the arguments of scholarship against the trusts as "theoretical," just as they did at the arguments against a protective tariff—the father, mother, and great grand parent of nearly every trust. Remove the high protective tariff and one of the sources of trust inspiration would thereby be removed.

If the evil is admitted, here is at least a partial remedy. There is no use indulging in academic disputation if practical ends are not to be sought. There are publicists and politicians who continually rant "Down with the trust," but who are persistent in their stubbornness to give no heed to the policies and practices which produce the trusts. They shout "Down with the trust" and then defend the policy of a Gage in placing the banking trust more firmly on the people's already overburdened shoulders. They cry "Down with the trust" and then contend that the Democratic party shall not declare as one of its cardinal principles a determination to regulate the meanest and most dangerous of all trusts, viz, the money trust. Here again is a cause and in this line may be found a remedy for the trust evil—a cause, an appreciating value—a remedy, a stable currency. The present money system leads inevitably to centralization—government and financial centralization and industrial combinations go hand in hand. The idea of it all is that the Republican policy of protection is a prolific breeder of trusts and the English policy of gold monometallism, adopted by modern Republicanism, is the stay of their youth and the sustenance of their years.

For more specific remedies Professor Hadley, president of Yale, proposes social ostracism of the beneficiaries and promoters of trusts. As incidental to some real solution of the problem, this will do very well; but it is only another of the very many propositions advanced by those who look at the results rather than at the causes of social ills. Trusts do not appear, like mushrooms, in a night. They are the outgrowth of long years of iniquitous economic teaching and of special privilege legislation. The time has passed to argue with those who deny that there is any evil and who assert that these colossal combinations are merely the result of the development of the laws of trade. The same was said of personal slavery that is now being said of this industrial serfdom; and it is just as idle for those who are convinced that the trusts are a menace to individual and civic life to seek to overcome this form of oppression without beginning with first causes as it was in slavery days to propose superficial, compromising policies.

Mr. Bryan and Mr. Cochran have agreed upon publicity. Mr. Bryan also suggests a national law confining the operation of every business combination to the State wherein it is incorporated, or State laws excluding corporations of one State from doing business in another State. This, with the application in legislation of old-fashioned Democratic principles—principles which are so old that they appear to be young—will go far to remedy the trust evil. This the Democratic party proposes to do. The Democratic party proposes to remedy the trust evil by the application of those principles of government which would make these ominous combinations impossible except when conducted by the State itself, the people being always the beneficiaries. It proposes to prevent all trusts, national and international, and to aid in this prevention to inaugurate the original and American policy of finance, the stability and equity of which was unquestioned for more than eighty years, and which has the indorsement and approval of the best statesmanship of the Republic from the days of Jefferson to the days of Blaine.

Mr. Chairman, I further submit some very important information concerning the prosperity of the trust business for the year 1899. This is a statement from the publication heretofore mentioned, of Grand Rapids, Mich. To every member of this House it will be quite evident that the writer knows a few Administration secrets.

Mr. Chairman, this shows also the great influence that the trusts are able to command and the power they exercise, and reads as follows:

NINE BILLIONS—AGGREGATE OF CAPITALIZATION OF AMERICAN TRUSTS—PROSPERITY CROP OF 1899—GREAT GROWTH IN NUMBERS, CAPITAL, AND INFLUENCE—POWERFUL ENOUGH TO DICTATE THE VERDICT IN THE EMBALMED-BEEF CASE AND SAVE EAGAN.

The trusts marched with giant strides in 1899. They recruited to their army hundreds of industries, great and small. They increased their capital by billions of dollars. They dictated the decisions of official bodies, as in the Army beef investigation. They faced the people at the polls, not of their choice, to be sure; yet, in spite of the raising of this political factor in the Ohio campaign, that State was carried by the Republicans. It is admitted that they were treated with deference in the report of the United States Industrial Commission which has been inquiring into their methods and tendencies.

Lastly, the leader of the trust movement, the Standard Oil "crowd," has appeared in the open as a money trust. By control of stupendous sums of its own and others' money the Rockefeller clique brought on a Wall street panic in the next to the last week of 1899, which demonstrated its power to lower or raise the prices of stocks and the ruling rate of interest in the exchanges and money markets of the world.

Two events of the year, on the other hand, have caused apprehension to the men most interested in the trusts. One, the most recent, was the decision by the Supreme Court of the United States on December 4, in the celebrated Addystone Pipe case, brought under the Sherman anti-trust law. That statute had been violated by the six corporations in the iron-pipe business, which had divided territory among themselves and had agreed upon prices.

The other warning is the twice-repeated fall in the prices of industrial securities on the stock exchange. In the July slump "industrials" shrank $101,255,618 in value; in December they fell $400,000,000.

New Jersey, the great breeding ground of the trusts, reported at the close of the fiscal year in November that it had chartered 2,000 corporations with an aggregate authorized capital of $4,403,400,000. No such figures as these had ever startled observers of the times.

Of these the greatest were the Federal Steel Company, with $200,000,000 of capital; the Distilling Company of America, $125,000,000; the newly formed Standard Oil Company, $110,000,000; the American Steel and Wire Company, $90,000,000; the American Bicycle Company and the National Tube Company, $80,000,000 each; the Continental Tobacco Company and the Amalgamated Copper Company, $75,000,000 each; the American Hide and Leather Company and the United States Worsted Company, $65,000,000 each; the American Ice Company, $60,000,000; Republic Iron and Steel Company, $55,000,000; American Foundry Company, $50,000,000; National Steel Company, $50,000,000; Rubber Goods Manufacturing Company and American Tin Plate Company, $50,000,000 each.

Below these figures there were 11 corporations with $30,000,000 or more; 13 with $25,000,000 or more; 11 at $20,000,000; 33 with $10,000,000 or more.

At the end of February, 1899, the total capitalization of 353 trusts was $5,832,882,842. An estimate of the additions in 1899 places the total capitalization of trusts now in existence at about $9,000,000,000.

Delaware has begun to see the advantage to a State in fostering these combinations. Under a new law offering superior advantages to companies with large capital, the Blue Hen State has hatched $416,850,000 of charters since March. New Jersey's revenue from a year's incorporations was $758,000.

A recent estimate shows that 3,547,000 men earn their living in the employ of trusts.

The year's most striking instance of a single trust's power with the Government was the whitewashing of the beef trust. General Miles charged against the Commissary Department that it had fed unfit beef to the soldiers in the Cuban and Porto Rico campaigns. The "fresh" beef was "embalmed," he declared, and the canned beef was nauseous and unwholesome. President McKinley appointed the Wade commission to investigate the charges. The Packers' Combination supplied the beef.

The commission brought in a verdict practically of "guilty, but no conviction." Its report found that improper food "enervated" the troops and unfitted them for the advance upon Siboney and Santiago; that their "food supply was insufficient and irregular;" that Commissary-General Eagan had bought 7,000,000 pounds of canned beef for the campaign, which act it describes as an "unwarranted and reckless" purchase of "food that was practically unknown and untried." This the report pronounced "a colossal error, for which there is no palliation."

This fault was placed wholly upon General Eagan, and although most of the commanding officers testified to the fact that the beef itself was bad, no word against the trust or against the Secretary of War, who practically dictated the purchases, was used in the report.

The commission further decided that "the interests of the service will be best subserved if further proceedings are not taken."

General Eagan, not for his "colossal error," but for violent language in reference to General Miles, was sentenced by court-martial to dismissal from the Army. The President modified this to suspension—with full pay.

The Industrial Commission, in an investigation undertaken because of a pressing demand for Government action, held leisurely sessions through the year. Important men in the leading trusts have made some startling admissions before it. Henry O. Havemeyer, of the sugar trust, said:

'It would be beneficial to the public to have under Government supervision all corporations dealing in things essential to the comfort of mankind. It is the Government through its tariff law—the mother of trusts—which plunders the public. The trusts are merely the machinery."

Daniel G. Reed, president of the American Tin Plate Company, said: "The tin plate trust has had to double the price of its product within the year. A fee of $10,000,000 was paid to Judge Moore, of Chicago, for organizing this company."

The commission discovered that the American Tin Plate Company, controlling the product in that industry; the National Steel Company, and the National Steel Hoop Company were practically one organization, with a capital of $150,000,000.

Railroad men said that the anti-trust law and the interstate-commerce act were violated by the railroads themselves, and that these laws should be amended to permit the railroads to form a pool.

P. E. Dowe, of the Commercial Travelers' League, showed that leading trusts had got rid, through destruction of competition, of 6,000 "drummers," while they had raised prices of standard articles of necessity by from 10 per cent for paper to 100 per cent for iron pipe.

This and other testimony was damaging, but the trusts had prepared for this. At a meeting at the Hoffman House early in the year leading spirits in the greatest corporations in the country were represented and a line of policy was agreed upon. What pressure this coalition was able to bring to bear at Washington is not discovered, but advance suggestions from the commission indicate that its findings will not be disagreeable to the combinations of capital under investigation.

Mr. Chairman, I will now submit some evidence from the North American, a publication of Philadelphia, and a Republican paper,

to show how the trusts work. It will be seen that this editor does not agree with Senator HANNA, the chairman of the Republican National Committee, in this, that the trusts are a good thing. Here is the testimony of the North American on this great question:

HOW THE TRUSTS WORK.

We are constantly being assured that trusts tend directly to help the whole people by lowering prices. The Standard Oil Company, which has lately been under investigation in Washington, pleads injured innocence and strives to show that the ugly things that have been testified against it are untrue. All the same, however, there was another rise in the price of coal oil a few days ago, and for no other apparent reason than that the Standard, having things all its own way, can raise its prices without hindrance. Inasmuch as this is the third or fourth increase in prices within a year, it is evident that the Standard managers understand that the proper office of a trust is to squeeze the people in order to pay 33 per cent dividends.

A year ago, after the window-glass trust got into working order, the price of glass went up 75 per cent. There was no pretense that the price of sand or other raw materials had advanced, or that the workmen had demanded a 75 per cent increase in their wages. The trust, without saying anything, simply put up the price, and that was all there was to it; but it so happened that there were a number of concerns making window glass that had not been taken into the trust, and as this opposition became considerably augmented by the formation of a large cooperative company of workingmen, there was difficulty in maintaining trust prices, and something had to be done. This something has just been announced, and it is a sweeping reduction in prices, amounting to something like 50 per cent. It is hoped by this move to crowd out the cooperative and individual concerns, and if a 50 per cent reduction will not do it, then doubtless a 75 or 100 per cent decline will. The trust, having the enormous gains of the last twelvemonth in its treasury, and being well capitalized, can afford to do business for nothing for a few months, or long enough to starve out and break up those who are opposing its monopoly of high prices.

These are two instances of how the trust works to help the people, and the plan is so simple that anybody can understand it. It is just to have a sliding scale of prices—a slide down till the opposition is pushed to the wall, and then a slide up to recoup by robbing the people. Yet there are many men in public as well as in private life who would assure us that the trust is all right, and that it is a good friend of the people, notwithstanding the fact that the the farmer has to pay three times as much for a shovel as he did a year ago, or that the man who needs a new roof on his house finds that the wire-nail trust has helped him to the extent of an advance of 150 per cent in the price of nails. Trust prices are always high prices when the trust can get a monopoly.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to be able to offer the evidence of the Sons of Husbandry in opposition to the great monopolies that are causing so much evil and distress throughout the country. Here is what the National Grange of the Patrons of Husbandry say, as given by the Gazette, of Terre Haute, Ind., on the all-absorbing subject of trusts:

[The Gazette, Terre Haute, Ind., Thursday, November 23.]

THE NATIONAL GRANGE ON TRUSTS—RESOLUTIONS PASSED AFTER A LONG DISCUSSION WEDNESDAY.

SPRINGFIELD, OHIO, *November 23, 1899.*

The National Grange, which has been in session in this city during the past week, will adjourn sine die to-day. Important in to-day's proceedings were the reports of the committee on "trusts," and the merchant marine committee's report was as follows:

"The National Grange express their approval of the address of our worthy master, Aaron Jones, regarding trusts, and demand the enactment by Congress of such laws as will protect the people against all combinations of men and capital inimical to public policy.

"We are not opposed to associations of interests which merely lessen the cost of production, but we are decidedly opposed to the misuse of the power which large combinations of capital give for the purpose of destroying competition, controlling production, and arbitrarily dictating prices of commodities. Associations opposed to legislation are one thing; combination as opposed to isolation is another. We are opposed to all corporations or trusts which control the source of supply and, like the Standard Oil Company, reach out their arms and embrace all competition. Special favors are granted them by railroads, thus enabling them to undersell and force to the wall the smaller dealers who might otherwise compete with them. We encourage the investment of capital in every branch of legitimate industry and demand fair play. The construction of the Erie Canal benefited the farmer. Competition has reduced the price of transportation in New York 80 per cent during the past twenty-five years. The expansion of our territory and commerce tends to increase the number of capitalized associations. The greed and selfishness which too often actuate men has become an element of danger and must be controlled. It must be made impossible for so-called trusts to accumulate millions by selling watered stock without adding to the wealth of the country.

Therefore we recommend:

1. Official inspection of all corporations, as in the case of national banks. No corporation should be tolerated whose books can not bear such inspection.
2. Prohibition of all rebates or discriminations by public carriers.
3. Taxation of all capital stock.
4. All capital stock should be paid up in full.
5. Severe penalties for violation of law (a) by forfeiture of charter, fine, and imprisonment; (b) by impeachment, fine, imprisonment, or all public officials whose duty it may be to enforce the law and who fail to perform that duty.

Suggestions: We would advise petitions to Congress to pass remedial legislation along the lines above suggested.

We ask the members of our body to secure State legislation not in conflict with national laws, but suited to the peculiar requirements of their respective States. One of the greatest evidences of trusts is their power to control elections and corrupt officials. This can be remedied by educating the people. Meanwhile, we must control by the strong arm of authority.

One principle worthy of consideration has been thus stated. Whenever monopolies are based upon the acquisition of nearly the entire supply of national treasures of any sort, or upon exclusive ownership of raw material of any kind, Government ownership of the source of supply is called for. The National Grange of the Patrons of Husbandry pledges its best efforts for the suppression of such dangerous associations, and we invite the earnest cooperation of every liberty-loving citizen of the Republic.

The merchant-marine resolution was taken up, but after considerable discussion it was referred to a committee, with instructions to draft a subresolution, which in substance was as follows:

"That we most heartily desire the upbuilding of our merchant marine, but we are emphatically opposed to the principle of subsidy and believe the desired results can and will be accomplished without resorting thereto."

Mr. Chairman, the commercial travelers are united in denouncing monopolies. Here is what Mr. P. E. Dowe, president of the Commercial Travelers' National League, says upon this question of trusts. It is worthy of thoughtful consideration:

[From the Philadelphia North American.]

ANTI-TRUST IS THEIR SLOGAN—COMMERCIAL TRAVELERS ARE UNITED IN DENOUNCING MONOPOLIES—NO GREEN GOODS AGAIN—PRESIDENT P. E. DOWE SAYS HIS COMRADES HAVE BEEN DECEIVED ONCE TOO OFTEN—THEY ARE A MIGHTY POWER, AND WILL TAKE CARE THAT THOSE TO WHOM THEY INTRUST THEIR VOTES ARE WORTHY OF THEM.

"Three hundred and fifty thousand traveling men in the United States are ready to talk anti-trust at the next Presidential election. Each of these men can easily talk to 20 voters every day. Anti-monopoly, in short, can be drummed into the ears of 4,500,000 voters during each twenty-four hours preceding the November day upon which the vote will be cast."

The above statement was made by P. E. Dowe, of New York, president of the Commercial Travelers' National League and an officer of the American Anti-Trust League.

Mr. Dowe is in this city on a brief business trip. He is one of the foremost anti-trust men in the country. Continuing, Mr. Dowe said:

"I am glad that the North American is willing to give the trust question a fair discussion, but would like to reply to 'Mr. Eclectic' in your paper this morning.

"Commercial travelers do not desire to be objects of charity. They are opposed to trusts from policy and principle. They consider them detrimental and demoralizing, un-American and unhealthy. Vast commercial conspiracies for purely speculative purposes, composed in the aggregate of over seven parts water, their purpose is to limit output, control products, advance prices, and subjugate the people by the degradation of labor.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR ALL.

"'Mr. Eclectic' has fallen into the fallacious argument which has been suggested by henchmen in the service of the trust, using the weapons of impractical and theoretical writers, advancing the proposition that commercial travelers should have no right to complain because of assumed improvement in business methods for economy's sake, and calling attention to improved machinery in the past having affected other classes. All writers advancing this fallacy do so either with the thorough knowledge that the proposition is an untenable one or shows an ignorance of the true situation.

"Commercial travelers represent the most intelligent labor in the country, and there is only one bar to their being the employing class—lack of capital. In all instances where machinery has saved labor it has been physical and not intellectual labor. The only machine that is applicable in the argument is the machine of wild-cat speculation, the machinations of stock-jobbing promoters, underwriters and speculators, the gamblers in watered stocks.

FALSE ECONOMY.

"These men who, under the misguise of scientific economy applied to business methods, attempt to foist on the people so-called industrial stock, composed of over seven parts water.

PRINTING PRESCRIBED.

"A machine which is specifically applicable to the case is the improved printing-press, which grinds out trust certificates that represent the combines that squeeze the people by advancing prices, by putting the screws to labor—intellectual and manual—and by filching the money of widows, orphans, and small speculators generally for stock which has an intrinsic value of only one-eighth.

"Leaders among the traveling fraternity have urged time and again the appointment of commercial travelers or men of business experience in the consular department of the Government as a means of increasing its efficiency. I read this morning that the President has under serious consideration the establishment of a department of industry and commerce, to be represented in the Cabinet.

"Commercial travelers' associations have urged this for years, and in Nashville two years ago was held a conference of presidents of various commercial travelers' associations to urge that steps be taken along those lines. No consideration has been given our request either for the appointment of consuls or the establishment of the department of commerce and industry. Yet the Administration favorably considered recommendations along that line from other sources.

HOW THEY WERE CHEATED.

"Prior to the last Presidential election nothing was too good for the commercial traveler, and he was lauded by Republican managers in the highest terms, but he had delivered the goods and payment was protested, and, although I was a Republican in all previous elections, I consider the commercial travelers can expect nothing from the Republican Administration.

"I have here a press report in which MARK HANNA says: 'The trusts are not by any means an objectionable combination.' As straws show from where the winds blow, I am of the opinion that any anti-trust plank in the Republican platform will be no better than a farce comedy. The willingness of trust officials and trust magnates to supply campaign funds is sufficient evidence of that, were not MARK HANNA'S statement already in print.

"The Republican Congress may attempt to take the matter from politics by passing some law for the purpose of pulling wool over the eyes of the public, which, in the hands of indifferent officials, would be found as inadequate as the Sherman anti-trust law and the Donnelly measure in New York.

"I have concluded, after efforts to secure action by public officials under the laws of different States, that absolutely nothing can be expected from the Republican officials to cope with the situation.

"The commercial travelers have been sold green goods once, but are not likely to be caught by the same game a second time."

Mr. Chairman, I desire in this connection to submit a list of commodities advanced in price, furnished by Mr. Percy E. Dowe, under oath, which fully explains itself. Here will be found the increases in price brought about by the operations of the monopolies to the great injury of the masses.

A PARTIAL LIST OF COMMODITIES ADVANCED IN PRICE.

During the last week of August the American Anti-Trust League had representatives call upon 500 manufacturers and dealers in New York City to obtain information as to advances in prices, both of trust goods and of the commodities higher in price owing to the increased cost of materials used in production (directly or indirectly affected by trusts).

The agents turned in reports made in writing at the time of each interview, and many of them signed by the party giving the information.

No commodity was discovered as having been decreased in price. The following is the list in alphabetical order:

Agate ware or enameled ware	50 p. ct.
Almonds	100 p. ct.
Angles, iron	45 p. ct.
Builders' hardware, since June	35 to 65 p. ct.
Beds, iron	50 to 65 p. ct.
Beds, brass	10 to 20 p. ct.
Buttons, bone and ivory	20 p. ct.
Buttons, metal	33⅓ p. ct.
Brass castings, within two months	87½ p. ct.
Barbed wire	87½ p. ct.
Beams, iron	30 p. ct.
Beef	25 p. ct.
Beef tongue, smoked	3 c. a lb.
Beef, corned and boiled	100 to 150 p. ct.
Bolts	15 p. ct.
Building papers, within two months	10 p. ct.
Bags and trunks, on account of advance of stock	40 to 50 c. a doz.
Brooms, within six months	30 p. ct.
Brushes, whitewash	50 p. ct.
Bright-wire goods	33⅓ p. ct.
Belting, rubber, within year	75 to 80 p. ct.
Brass wire	3 c. a lb.
Corned beef (delicatessen)	
Canned goods, general advance.	
Canned salmon	15 p. ct.
Canned lobster	15 p. ct.
Copper wire	100 p. ct.
Copper and brass hollow ware	About 40 p. ct.
Copper, since August 31, 1898	50 p. ct.
Crackers	1 to 1½ c.
Condensed milk, Magnolia brand	25 c. a case.
Cotton linings	12½ to 15 p. ct.
Cement, Rosendale	15 p. ct.
Carpets	16 to 20 p. ct.
Combs, rubber	About 25 p. ct.
Chains	2½c. a lb.
Chairs, ordinary	25 to 33⅓ p. ct.
Chairs, wood-seat	33⅓ p. ct.
Edge tools	5 to 15 p. ct.
Envelopes—Notice out for a further advance, previous prices canceled, new quotations not given, advance to date	40 p. ct.
Extension tables	Fully 30 p. ct.
Flannels	10 p. ct. or more.
Files	25 p. ct.
Felt roofing	30 to 33⅓ p. ct.
Gloves (gents')	15 to 20 p. ct.
Galvanized ware	About 40 p. ct.
Glassware	20 p. ct.
Glass, window, double, since May	50 p. ct.
Glass, window, single, since May	40 p. ct.
Glass, plate	35 p. ct.
Hats, felt	7½ to 10 p. ct.
Hats, wool	7½ to 12½ p. ct.
Ham (delicatessen)	3c. a lb.
Hardware, since June	45 p. ct.
Iron, wrought	100 p. ct.
Iron (for horseshoes)	About 40 p. ct.
Iron sash weights, within two weeks	33⅓ p. ct.
Iron pipe, wrought, nearly doubled, recent advances aggregate	62½ p. ct.
Iron, galvanized (last advance June 11), advance	62½ p. ct.
Iron, structural	87½ to 100 p. ct.
Iron beams	87½ p. ct.
Iron angles	100 p. ct.
Iron beds	35 to 65 p. ct.
Iron, pig, foundry, since August 31, 1898	100 p. ct.
Iron, pig, Bessemer, since August 31, 1898	125 p. ct.
Iron, pig, charcoal, since August 31, 1898. Chicago	100 p. ct.
Iron, old material	75 to 100 p. ct.
Iron bar, refined	80 p. ct.
Iron tank plates	125 to 130 p. ct.
Knit underwear	7 to 10 p. ct.
Knit wool	$1 to $1.50 a doz.
Linings, cotton	12½ to 15 p. ct.
Linseed oil, within three weeks	20 p. ct.
Lead	14 p. ct.
Lumber (except oak)	20 to 25 p. ct.
Lumber, oak	33⅓ p. ct.
Linoleum, domestic	12½ to 20 p. ct.
Lead pencils, cheap grades	10 to 15 p. ct.
Lanterns, June 1, advance	25 p. ct.
Muslins	About 5 p. ct.
Medicines, patent	5 p. ct.
Notions, advance is general throughout the line, averaging	5 p. ct.
Nails, cut, within twelve months	115 p. ct.
Furniture, July advance, average	25 p. ct.
Flour, within three weeks	30 c. a bbl.
Nails, wire, within twelve months	92 p. ct.
Pails, wood	50 p. ct.
Pulley blocks, wood	10 p. ct.
Photo paper (prepared) nearly	110 p. ct.
Plumbers' supplies	30 to 60 p. ct.
Piano supplies	10 to 33⅓ p. ct.
Pins	Over 25 p. ct.
Poultry netting	About 25 p. ct.
Paper, book and writing. Notice of further advance, compelling independent envelope makers to withdraw quotations. Advance to date	20 p. ct.
Rubber goods—everything in rubber greatly advanced.	
Rubber belting, within year	33⅓ p. ct.
Refrigerators (ordinary) advanced	$1 to $1.25 each.
Ribbons	5 to 10 p. ct.
Ranges	20 to 33⅓ p. ct.
Rope, since January	33 p. ct.
Spelter	20 p. ct.
Shoes, advances owing to the hide and leather trusts, in all grades	10 to 20 p. ct.
Shoes, Ray State, for workmen, advanced	15 c. a pair.
Shoes, cheap grades, advanced	20 to 50 c. a pair.
Soaps, common	25 c. a box.
Spool cotton	from 8 to 25 p. ct.
Spool cotton, Willington American Thread Company (And an agreement to forfeit a semiannual bonus of 10 per cent if prices are cut.)	1½ c. a doz., or 8 p. ct.
Silk, sewing	About 20 p. ct.
Steel (for horseshoes), within two years, over	100 p. ct.
Salt, coarse, for the grocery trade	10 to 15 p. ct.
Salt, fine, for the grocery trade	10 p. ct.
Price to outsiders, $1.10; old price, 80 cents barrel. Special prices for the salt clique.	
Spring beds	30 to 50 p. ct.
Steel billets, within one year over	130 p. ct.
Sash cord	About 10 p. ct.
Stoves	25 to 33⅓ p. ct.
Another advance expected.	
Shovels	100 p. ct.
Screws	About 50 p. ct.
Scoops	Over 50 p. ct.
Snow shovels	Nearly 145 p. ct.
Solder	50 p. ct.
Steel bars	110 p. ct.
Steel billets	130 p. ct.
Structional iron	90 to 100 p. ct.
Sheet iron	52½ to 62½ p. ct.
Turpentine, recent advance	62½ p. ct.
Type, recent advance	5 p. ct.
Trunks, on account of advance of stock	10 p. ct.
Tea, advance to consumer, 15 to 25 cents a pound, owing to war tax of 10 cents a pound; wholesale advance	10 to 15 c. a lb.
Tobacco—American Tobacco Company in competition will often furnish 6 pound packages of tobacco at the price of 5.	
Tin plate, within year 67½ per cent; total advance	About 75 p. ct.
Tinware	From 20 to 500 p. ct
Tubs, wood	50 p. ct.
Tin, nearly doubled within year	95 to 100 p. ct.
Tank plates	125 to 130 p. ct.
Varnish	15 p. ct.
Woodenware, average	33⅓ p. ct.
Woolens (tailors')	20 to 25 p. ct.
Wall paper, cheap grades	50 to 80 p. ct.
Wall paper, high grades	25 p. ct.
Whisky	10 to 25 c. a gallon.
Wine, California. It is claimed that Crocker interests have cornered grape crops for seven years.	
Wheels for baby carriages, rubber-tired	25 p. ct.
Wood handles	20 p. ct.
Wrought iron	Over 100 p. ct.
Wire rod	100 p. ct.
Wire goods (bright)	50 p. ct.

Personally appeared before me, Percy E. Dowe, who states, being duly sworn, that he is the chairman of the committee of statistics of the American Anti-Trust League, and that the foregoing list of articles and advances of the prices of the same is a correct compilation of written reports of duly authorized agents of the said American Anti-Trust League, of which fact he fully attests.

PERCY E. DOWE.

Sworn to before me this 7th day of September, 1899.

FREDERICK THEALL,
Notary Public, Orange County, State of New York.

Mr. Chairman, I now call the attention of the House to a discussion of commodity prices and wages, which is very ably presented by the Quincy Journal:

COMMODITY PRICES AND WAGES.

According to Bradstreet's latest record of average commodity prices, there was an average advance in about a hundred staple commodities of 17 per cent over a year ago; of 22 per cent over two years ago; of 30 per cent over three years ago.

These advances mean, of course, increased cost of living. How has it been in regard to salaries and wages? Have they correspondingly advanced? The United States Investor says:

"During 1899 the general level of commodity prices rose between 20 and 30 per cent, but as regards a large part of the community there was absolutely no increase in income, while in the case of some there was an increase which fell far short of the figure representing the advance in prices. These are facts which can not be controverted, and the conclusion is inevitable."

Iron and steel have increased over 200 per cent the past year; woolens at least from 20 to 30 per cent; the advance in cotton goods has been greater than that in woolens. The rise in wheat and flour and in one or two other products in Bradstreet's list has been less than the Investor states, but it probably represents with approximate correctness the average advance.

Has there been from 10 to 30 per cent advance in wages? In the iron and steel industries and in the woolen and cotton mills there have been advances of 10 per cent in wages, but in what industries has there been from 20 to 30 per cent advance? The average advance in wages does not probably exceed 3 or 4 per cent.

And, as the Investor says, the major part of the community has not been favored in this way at all. The professional classes, the official class, and the clerical classes in the wholesale and retail trades are in receipt of the same incomes substantially as when commodity prices were at the lowest. The great agricultural class, at least so far as engaged in cereal production, is in no better position now as consumers of manufactured commodities than prior to 1897; for the great advance in grain, which began three years ago on the basis of wholly exceptional and temporary conditions, has been nearly all lost. There has been increased employment of labor in many lines, but this gain to the factor of consumption is partly offset by the idleness among salesmen which the industrial combinations have brought about.

The vast majority of the people are evidently not prepared to meet the advanced prices. The increased cost of living has come when there has been much smaller advance in salaries and wages, when, indeed, there has been any advance at all.

Commenting on this situation, the Springfield (Mass.) Republican says:

"The great majority of the people, in a word, are not prepared to meet the increased prices and the higher cost of living. If it be said that they already have risen to the new demands upon them, since production at the high prices is already in progress, it may be replied that this is not so. The greatly increased cost of iron and steel and products therefrom has not yet reached the final consumer. The shipbuilder, the railroad, the building constructor, and so on, have encountered the higher costs and expect to be able to recoup themselves in higher transportation rates and house and store rents, but whether they will be able to or not is just the question.

"The recent marked increase in woolen quotations is for goods which will not be offered to the retail consumer until next summer, fall, and winter, and

there is some doubt in manufacturing circles whether the higher prices can be enforced, or whether consumption will not fall off enough to wipe out any gain from the higher prices.

"And this reduced consumption must certainly be the effect of the present demands of the producer unless salaries and wages and wheat farmers' profits are somehow increased materially above their existing level. No immediate possibility of this is observable. The recent collapse in speculation, foreshadowing some little reversal of recent tendencies in business and industry, makes any general marking up of salaries and wages above where they are at present out of the question.

"It would appear, therefore, that the present level of commodity prices can not be maintained, but must recede to meet the conditions of consumption."

Mr. Chairman, here is what a "trust maker" has to say about his offspring:

SUGAR.

HENRY O. HAVEMEYER. I would state freely that where a corporation dealing particularly in things that are essential to the benefit of mankind—clothing, fuel, oil, sugar, food, or anything which would become, as I describe it, of a quasi public character—it would be beneficial to the public to have them under Government supervision.

It is the Government, through its tariff laws, which plunders the people, and the trusts, etc., are merely the machinery for doing it.

The true "communion of pelf" is the customs tariff bill. It says to the people, "Here is a law we have enacted for your robbery. Do not complain of it."

Steel rails were exported at the time the steel schedule was under discussion, and about being voted for, to England, where they can be produced at $15 a ton. Here they are worth $24. That is in evidence now. The rails are sold for $24 a ton, and that is because the people, under the tariff, are mulcted the difference.

I have got Carnegie, and can quote him, that he can export steel rails to any part of the world. What does he want a tariff for? I am not talking about things that are ancient history. I am talking about the infamy of the tariff of to-day, which is the mother of these trusts; there is not a line of it free from it.

Hundreds of thousands of workmen and middlemen have been eliminated by the formation of industrial combinations. The stockholders must receive dividends on their enormous capitalization, and this can only be done by curtailing the expense to the lowest possible limit, and by putting the price of commodities up to the highest notch the public will stand. This is the basic principle of all trusts.

Mr. Chairman, is there any wonder why the McKinley Administration is so severely criticised for its relations with the trusts? This criticism has been brought about by the Administration itself, and it had no right to complain for being criticised.

Take the action of the Secretary of the Treasury with the National City Bank of New York:

GAGE PAYING THE DEMANDS FOR FAVORS BY THE 1896 CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTORS.

Here are the facts from Secretary Gage's report to Congress:

"Under my administration of the Treasury Department no discrimination in favor of one bank against another has been made."—*Secretary Gage to Congress in answer to the Post-Dispatch charges.*

A. B. Hepburn, vice-president of the National City Bank, wrote, under date of June 5, 1897, to Secretary Gage:

"The National City Bank, of which I recently became vice-president, through the consolidation of the business of the Third National Bank with it, is one of the banks designated as a United States depository, and I write to request that in any changes which may be made under the Administration we may not be disturbed in this respect. We should like to remain a United States depository at present.

"Of course the bank is very strong, and if you will take pains to look at our list of directors you will see that we also have very great political claims, in view of what was done during the canvass last year.

"Yours, very truly,

A. B. HEPBURN."

Here are some of "our list of directors who have very great political claims in view of what was done during the canvass last year" (1896):

H. O. Havemeyer, president sugar trust.

William Rockefeller, president Standard Oil Company.

W. D. Sloan, banker and Vanderbilt representative.

James H. Post, broker of sugar trust, and director of National Sugar Refining Company.

Robert Bacon, member of J. Pierpont Morgan bond syndicate; also director in copper trust.

Jacob H. Schiff, chairman Union Pacific refunding syndicate.

Stephen S. Palmer, national zinc trust.

Samuel Sloan, director in number of railroads.

Cleveland H. Dodge, of copper trust and director in Copper Queen Consolidated Company.

H. Walter Webb, then vice-president of the New York Central.

(The Vanderbilt railroad directors were the largest individual subscribers to the McKinley campaign fund.)

Figures from Gage's report to Congress: May 14, 1897, before Secretary Gage received the Hepburn letter, the Government deposits in the Standard Oil National City Bank were $300,000.

After date of above letter in 1897 the National City Bank received, of the $58,000,000 in settlement of the Union Pacific debt, $24,000,000.

On July 14, 1898, the balance of Government money deposited without interest in National City Bank was $19,579,000.

On September 20, 1899, the balance was $29,000,000.

In the floating war loan of $200,000,000 in June, 1898, in which 313 banks participated, the National City Bank received $14,000,000.

On January 7, 1899, the Government balance in the National City Bank was $20,555,000.

On July 8, 1898, the balance was $10,500,000, showing that the bank had the free use of over $10,000,000 for six months.

AGREED TO SAVE THE BANK CITY TAXES.

NEW YORK, *January 11, 1900.*

Among the letters sent to Congress by Secretary Gage was the following from President Stillman, of the National City Bank, under date of August 8 last, referring to taxes on the New York custom-house:

"We shall make the above payment of $3,215,000 upon the understanding, of course, that we are not to be liable for any taxes or water upon the property so long as you remain in possession and the balance of $50,000 remains unpaid and the deed is undelivered."

Not one dollar of this purchase price was paid into the Treasury, as directed by the special act of Congress authorizing the sale of the property. The custom-house was not sold under the general act of 1864, quoted by Mr. Gage in justification.

Although Mr. Stillman asks the Secretary to protect him from the payment of city taxes, the Government was under agreement to pay the bank 4 per cent annually on the money paid for rental. This while the bank had full use of the money to loan out at market rates.

Does any general act of 1864 or the special act of Congress authorize any such jugglery?

This is the position in which the Administration finds itself, as shown in the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, and as set forth in an Indiana paper upon the said report.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to append the following article of Col. William Jennings Bryan and make it a part of my remarks. This is an able discussion of the cost of an imperial policy sought to be thrust upon the American people:

WILL IT PAY?

On former occasions I have quoted authority against the policy of imperialism and have insisted that the adoption of an European colonial policy would endanger the perpetuity of the Republic. While every lover of his country should be willing to surrender a pecuniary advantage, however alluring, if that advantage would in the least jeopardize our national existence, still the opponents of imperialism are fortunate in having upon their side the dollar argument as well as the arguments based upon fundamental principles.

The forcible annexation of the Philippine Islands (and, in my judgment, even annexation by the consent of the people) would prove a source of pecuniary loss rather than gain. Heretofore our acquisitions have been confined to the North American Continent, the nation having in view either security from attack or land suitable for settlement. Generally both objects have been realized. Florida and the territory between the Mississippi and the Pacific were necessary for purposes of defense, and, in addition thereto, furnished homes and occupation for an increasing population.

The Hawaiian Islands are nearer to the Western than to the Eastern Hemisphere, and their annexation was urged largely upon the ground that their possession by another nation would be a menace to the United States. When objection was made to the heterogeneous character of the people of the islands, it was met by the assertion that they were few in number. In the opinion of those who favored the annexation of Hawaii the advantages to be gained from a strategical standpoint outweighed the objection raised to the population. No argument made in favor of the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands can be used in support of the imperialistic policy. The purchase of Alaska removed one more monarchy from American territory and gave to the United States a maximum of land with a minimum of inhabitants.

In the forcible annexation of the Philippines our nation neither adds to its strength nor secures broader opportunities for the American people.

Even if the principle of conquest were permissible under American public law, the conquest of territory so remote from our shores, inhabited by people who have no sympathy with our history or our customs, and who resent our attempt to overthrow their declaration of independence, would be a tax upon our military and naval strength the magnitude of which can not now be determined.

Who can estimate in money and men the cost of subduing and keeping in subjection 8,000,000 people, 6,000 miles away, scattered over 1,300 islands, and living under a tropical sun?

How many soldiers did Spain sacrifice in her effort to put down almost continuous insurrection in Cuba? How many perished from wounds and disease in the vain attempt to keep the Pearl of the Antilles under Spanish dominion? Yet Cuba has only about a million and a half of inhabitants, and Habana is only half as far from Cadiz as Manila is from San Francisco.

If this question is to be settled upon the basis of dollars and cents, who will insure the nation that the receipts will equal the expenditures? Who will guarantee that the income from the Philippines, be it great or small, will find its way back to the pockets of the people who, through taxation, will furnish the money?

And even if the amount invested in ships, armament, and in the equipment of soldiers is returned dollar for dollar, who will place a price upon the blood that will be shed? If war is to be waged for trade, how much trade ought to be demanded in exchange for a human life? And will the man who expects to secure the trade risk his own life or the life of some one else?

The demand for a standing army of 100,000 men is the beginning of a policy which will increase the hours of toil and fill the homes of the land with vacant chairs.

In his essay on the West Indies, Lord Macaulay denies that colonies are a source of profit, even to European countries. He says:

"There are some who assert that, in a military and political point of view, the West Indies are of great importance to this country. This is a common but a monstrous misrepresentation. We venture to say that colonial empire has been one of the greatest curses of modern Europe. What nation has it ever strengthened? What nation has it ever enriched? What have been its fruits? Wars of frequent occurrence and immense cost, fettered trade, lavish expenditure, clashing jurisdiction, corruption in governments, and indigence among the people. What have Mexico and Peru done for Spain, the Brazils for Portugal, Batavia for Holland? Or, if the experience of others is lost upon us, shall we not profit by our own? What have we not sacrificed to our infatuated passion for trans-Atlantic dominion?

"This it is that has so often led us to risk our own smiling gardens and dear firesides for some snowy desert or infectious morass on the other side of the globe; this induced us to resign all the advantages of our insular situation—to embroil ourselves in the intrigues, and fight the battles of half the continent—to form coalitions which were instantly broken—and to give subsidies which were never earned; this gave birth to the fratricidal war against American liberty, with all its disgraceful defeats, and all its barren victories, and all the massacres of the Indian hatchet, and all the bloody contracts of the Hessian slaughterhouse; this it was which, in the war against the French Republic, induced us to send thousands and tens of thousands of our bravest troops to die in West Indian hospitals, while the armies of our enemies were pouring over the Rhine and the Alps.

"When a colonial acquisition has been in prospect, we have thought no expenditure extravagant; no interference perilous. Gold has been to us as dust, and blood as water. Shall we never learn wisdom? Shall we never cease to prosecute a pursuit wilder than the wildest dream of alchemy, with all the credulity and all the profusion of Sir Epicure Mammon?

"Those who maintain that settlements so remote conduce to the military or maritime power of nations fly in the face of history."

Thus wrote England's orator, statesman, and historian.

Shall we refuse to profit by the experience of others? Has the victory of 70,000,000 people over 17,000,000 so infatuated us with our own prowess that gold is to become to us also as dust and blood as water?

Let us consider for a moment the indirect cost of annexation. Grave domestic problems press for solution; can we afford to neglect them in order to engage unnecessarily in controversies abroad.

Must the people at large busy themselves with the contemplation of "destiny" while the special interests hedge themselves about with legal bulwarks and exact an increasing toll from the productive industry?

While the American people are endeavoring to extend an unsolicited sovereignty over remote peoples, foreign financiers will be able to complete the conquest of our own country.

Labor's protest against the black list and government by injunction, and its plea for arbitration, shorter hours, and a fair share of the wealth which it creates, will be drowned in noisy disputes over new boundary lines and in the clash of conflicting authority.

Monopoly can thrive in security so long as the inquiry, "Who will haul down the flag" on distant islands turns public attention away from the question, Who will uproot the trusts at home?

What will it cost the people to substitute contests over treaties for economic issues? What will it cost the people to postpone consideration of remedial legislation while the ship of state tosses about in the whirlpool of international politics?

In considering the question of imperialism we have a right to weigh possibilities as well as certainties; and among the possibilities may be mentioned an offensive and defensive union between the United States and one or more European nations. Already one may hear an Anglo-American alliance suggested—a suggestion which would have been discarded as a dream a year ago. When this nation abandons its traditions and enters upon a colonial policy, a long step will have been taken toward those entanglements against which Washington and Jefferson with equal emphasis warned their countrymen.

What a change the imperialistic idea has already wrought in the minds of its advocates! During the nation's infancy and development the American people spurned the thought of foreign alliance and its attendant obligations; they refused to yoke the young Republic with a monarchy. The wisest among us are not able to measure the cost of a policy which would surrender the nation's independence of action and drag it into the broils of Europe and Asia.

The Monroe doctrine, too—what will become of it? How can we expect European nations to respect our supremacy in the Western Hemisphere if we insist upon entering Asia? So long as we confine ourselves to our own continent we are strong enough to repel the world; but are we prepared (or is it worth while to prepare) to wage an offensive warfare in other parts of the globe?

On the other hand, what advantages are suggested by imperialists to offset the cost and dangers mentioned.

They tell us that trade follows the flag and that wider markets will be the result of annexation. Without admitting that any argument based upon trade advantages can justify an attempt to adopt a double standard in government—a government by consent in America and a government by force in Asia—it may be answered that commerce is a matter of cost and not a matter of bunting. The protectionist understands this and demands, not a flag barrier, but a price barrier between the home manufacturer and the foreign competitor.

Public attention has already been called to the fact that while Spain was sending soldiers to the Philippines England was sending merchandise. While the home government was sending money to the islands Great Britain was drawing money from them.

The cost of transportation is an important factor and has more influence than sovereignty in directing the course of trade.

Canada does not refuse to deal with us merely because she flies the British jack; in fact, I have been told that she sometimes buys even her British jacks in the United States. Our foreign trade is increasing, and that increase is not due to an expanding sovereignty.

The insignificance of the trade argument will be manifest to anyone who will compare the consuming capacity of the Filipinos with that of a like number of Americans. The inhabitants of the Torrid Zones can never equal or even approach the inhabitants of the Temperate Zones as customers. England's commerce with the United States is greater than her commerce with India, and yet India has a population of nearly 300,000,000, and the English flag floats over them.

It is yet to be decided whether the open-door policy will be adopted in the Orient or a tariff wall built around our subjects there, but neither plan will be found satisfactory.

Our people, however, should not expect a colonial policy to prove acceptable, either to the governed or to the governing. If we attempt to run our country upon the European plan we must prepare ourselves for continual complaint. History has thus far failed to furnish a single example of a nation selfish enough to desire a colony and yet unselfish enough to govern it wisely at long range.

It has been argued that annexation would furnish a new field for the investment of American capital. If there is surplus money seeking investment, why is it not employed in the purchase of farm lands, in developing domestic enterprises, or in replacing foreign capital? In 1896 we were told that we were dependent upon foreign capital and must so legislate as to keep what we had and invite more. Strange that it should be necessary to have an English financial system in order to bring European capital into the States and also an English colonial policy for the purpose of taking American capital out. Every dollar sent to the Philippines must be withdrawn from present investments, and we must either suffer to the extent of the amount withdrawn or borrow abroad and increase our bondage to foreign money lenders.

It is sometimes suggested that the Philippines would furnish homes for those who are crowded out of this country. This argument, too, is without foundation. The population of the United States amounts to only 21 persons to the square mile, while the Philippine Islands already contain about 60 to the square mile. It will be several generations before the population of the United States will be as dense as it is now in the Philippines.

Our people will not flock to Manila; climatic conditions will be as great an obstacle as overpopulation. English supremacy in India has continued for nearly a hundred and fifty years, and yet in 1891 the British-born population of India was only 100,551—less than the total number of prisoners confined in the jails of India at the end of 1895.

Jamaica has had all the advantages which could be derived from an English colonial policy, and yet the white population in 1891 numbered less than 15,000 out of a total of 639,000.

Java has been under the dominion of the Netherlands for nearly three hundred years, and yet in 1894 the Europeans upon the island numbered less than 60,000 out of a total population of more than 25,000,000.

Spain has been able to induce but a small number of her people to settle in the Philippines, and, if we can judge from the reports sent back by our volunteers, we shall not succeed any better.

But while the Philippines will not prove inviting to Americans, we shall probably draw a considerable number from the islands to the United States. The emigration will be eastward rather than westward. During the six years from 1889 to 1894 more than 90,000 coolies left India, and we may expect an influx of Malays.

It is not strange that the laboring men should look with undisguised alarm upon the prospect of oriental competition upon the farms and in the factories of the United States. Our people have legislated against Chinese emigration, but to exclude a few Chinese and admit many Filipinos is like straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel.

The farmers and laboring men constitute a large majority of the American people; what is there in annexation for them? Heavier taxes, Asiatic emigration, and an opportunity to furnish more sons for the Army. Will it pay?

Death of Hon. Lorenzo Danford.

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. LENTZ,
OF OHIO,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, January 20, 1900.

The House having under consideration the following resolutions:

"*Resolved*, That the business of the House be now suspended, that opportunity may be given for paying tributes to the memory of Hon. LORENZO DANFORD, late a member of the House of Representatives from the State of Ohio.

"*Resolved*, That, as a particular mark of respect to the memory of the deceased and in recognition of his eminent abilities as a distinguished public servant, the House at the conclusion of these memorial proceedings shall stand adjourned.

"*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the family of the deceased.

"*Ordered*, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate."—

Mr. LENTZ said:

Mr. SPEAKER: To me a peculiar interest attaches to the life and service of LORENZO DANFORD. He was really the first prominent public man whom I knew personally in my boyhood. In his greatest days I was a student in the high school under that matchless and faithful teacher, Prof. James J. Burns, at St. Clairsville, where Mr. DANFORD was almost constantly in court. His ability and success have been so well portrayed here in the eulogy of my colleague (Mr. KERR) that it seems almost unnecessary to undertake to say anything, because what could be said would seem like repetition. But I feel that I ought to say something of how he appeared to us in that community in our boyhood days.

LORENZO DANFORD was on one side or the other of every important case that came before the court, and it was usually considered in advance that the side that was fortunate enough to secure his services would be victorious in the cause, particularly if it was a jury case. Not only was he considered a great lawyer, but I can appreciate what my colleague (Mr. GROSVENOR) has said about the tears at his grave. He was appreciated as a friend, as a councillor, as a neighbor, as a good citizen, and as a soldier with a magnificent record. No one spoke of DANFORD except to praise him. To the boys in that community he was the model before the court, and he was the model not only through the seventies, but even later, as an orator. It was painful to see his uncomfortable condition during the last few months of his life, particularly after his visit to the deathbed of his father, and my colleague is quite right in his statement that Mr. DANFORD'S death really began at that bedside of his father. He was not, in those last few months, the DANFORD of whom we, at least in Ohio, are proud. The DANFORD of the last few months was not even the DANFORD of 1896 or 1897.

I know of no better description of him in the campaign of 1897 than that given in some newspaper account of a speech made by him at Marietta. He and Senator HANNA were there, and the account of the meeting was simple and brief. I do not know who the reporter was who described it, but in substance, and I think in exact language, these were the words:

Senator HANNA took the platform and made a speech to a large and enthusiastic audience. After him the Hon. LORENZO DANFORD, of St. Clairsville, took the platform and showed Senator HANNA how to make a speech.

That was a sufficient description of that meeting to all who had heard DANFORD in the court room or on the rostrum. This is no discredit to the ability of Senator HANNA to make a speech, nor to the ability of any other man; because I think it is fair to say, with due regard to all that may have been said of the Shannons and and the Kennons of St. Clairsville, and others who were giants in the forties and the fifties, that Belmont County, yes, and the eastern part of Ohio, never produced any man of whom it might not be said that LORENZO DANFORD could show him how to make a speech.

I am pleased to know that LORENZO DANFORD was born in Belmont County, and who is there that is not proud of old Belmont! No one of us born in that beautiful county has ever had to apologize for the morality or hospitality of its people. Nature and nature's god were generous to old Belmont, giving her pure air, rich minerals, fertile soil, and crystal waters. The world's greatest masters in music, sculpture, and painting would have been greater masters could they have spent their youth in the dreamland

beauty and inspiration of the song of the birds, the sculpture of the hills, and the paintings of the sunrise and sunset of old Belmont.

LORENZO DANFORD was born in a county that was greater relatively at the time of his boyhood and young manhood than it is now among the counties of the State. The great highway known as the National Road runs through that county and in his younger days it was the greatest thoroughfare of the Republic. It was as important in Mr. DANFORD'S young manhood as the Union Pacific Railroad was in a later day.

The bar at St. Clairsville has gained distinction probably not equaled by any other bar in the State except that of Lancaster, which was the home of the Ewings, the Shermans, the Hunters, and others of that school. LORENZO DANFORD has left a name that will live with other generations; it will be a sweet memory; it will be a pleasant dream; the recollections of him will go down in the traditions of Belmont County as a part of the honor and fame of one of the best counties in the State, and LORENZO DANFORD'S memory will be repeated to the youngest of the children of old Belmont with a fond and affectionate regard by all who knew him, for none knew him except to love him. As we here to-day in the American Congress pay the last tribute of affectionate words to the memory of a faithful friend, whose life added to the dignity and the beauty of the hills of old Belmont, I recall the philosophy of Tom Moore's sad poem:

This world is all a fleeting show,
For man's illusion given;
The smiles of joy, the tears of woe,
Deceitful shine, deceitful flow:
There's nothing true but Heaven.

Poor wanderers of a stormy day,
From wave to wave we're driven;
And fancy's flash and reason's ray
Serve but to light the troubled way:
There's nothing calm but Heaven!

Porto Rico.

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES L. BARTLETT,

OF GEORGIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, February 26, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 8245) entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues for the relief of the island of Porto Rico, and for other purposes," and the Senate amendments thereto—

Mr. BARTLETT said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The remarkable spectacle is presented to the House and the country by the Ways and Means Committee, and by a majority of the Republicans on this floor, of endeavoring to stretch the Constitution so that we can acquire and govern distant colonies and then at the same time to contract it so that when such territory is once acquired it shall not be governed by the Constitution. Against such a theory of government and such a construction of the Constitution, of which this bill is a product, I most earnestly protest. It degrades our science of government and the principles of the Constitution from the high plane on which the fathers and the founders placed them to the low level of an imperialistic "three card monte" game for empire—"now you see it and now you don't." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this measure with all the earnestness of my nature. I believe it is the first avowed step in a policy which will embark this country and its people upon imperialism, and will bring destruction to this Government, founded though it be on the theories of government formulated and established by the framers and fathers of it, that the Republic might be perpetuated for all time to come.

I fear that it is but the entering wedge which will eventually rend asunder the great principle that this Government rests for its powers upon the grant to it in the written Constitution, the product of the minds of the wisest, most patriotic, and ablest men that ever assembled to consider and promulgate the principles of free government under the sun. It is the result of their experience, after considering the efforts and failures of all other peoples before their time, and which has lived and survived through many trials and conflicts, and I trust and hope it will live and survive long after those who now seek to destroy it are forgotten.

This theory of government, the grant of power in the Constitution to it, and the restraint of authority that forbids its exceeding the grant is the sheet anchor of our people, and it has enabled them to resist safely the waves of every conflict and of every political and domestic storm, and it will carry them into safety now. For there is one consolation to those who believe that this bill is unconstitutional, and it is this: Whatever this Congress may do, however they may trim down, shade, or override the sections of the Constitution, there is a court which is the greatest that ever sat upon a bench, and it will, if it is guided, as we believe it will be, by the prior decisions of that grand tribunal, hold to the indestructible principles of the Constitution, which, for them and the people and our posterity, are our only safety and hope for the preservation and perpetuation of this Republic.

For, above partisan politics and party aims and desires, when the cold, calm judgment of the law and the Constitution are alone permitted to guide and govern the judges, as doubtless they will be, whose duty it is to ascertain and declare the law and to restrain illegal and void unconstitutional acts of legislation, this court will save this people from the wrong and injustice sought now to be inflicted by them upon the innocent and unfortunate people of Porto Rico and the greater injury to our own institutions.

But aside from the question whether this bill violates the Constitution, the Congress of the United States, and that people whose ancestors established by their struggles, by the forfeit of their lives and the shedding of their blood, this free Republic, the grandest and best that ever rose to bless mankind, should be slow to forget that we are a people whose Government had its origin in the effort of the mother country, in the exercise of despotic power, to impose upon our forefathers a system of unjust taxation. They freed themselves from the yoke of England on the issue of unjust taxation, and the great war of independence was fought and carried to a successful end and the Republic began, and has prospered and lived over a century mainly because of the effort to impose a much less onerous but still as odious a tax as the one sought now to be enacted.

What a commentary for those who do not believe that republics can survive, that the descendants of the American Revolution, who fought because unjustly taxed, now propose to tax unjustly and unequally the small island of Porto Rico, which has come to us by the fortunes of war, and whose people have welcomed the rule of this Republic. What has Porto Rico done to merit at our hands the passage of such a bill as this? And to do this we must not only stab the Constitution in its most vital, living principles, but declare that the rights we now propose to assert are above and beyond the limitations of that instrument framed by the fathers of the country to restrain both national and State governments.

The people of Porto Rico protest; its business men protest against it; and the business men of New York and other places in this country have protested; the President of the United States undertakes to stay the hand of his party; the commissioner and other officials who have investigated affairs in Porto Rico unite in recommending that it be treated as a part of the United States and be permitted to have its products sent in free; and every man who believes that this Government should be fair and just and not play the part of a hypocrite toward Porto Rico will protest.

They were powerless under Spain; they had suffered under her misrule for years; they welcomed our arms and accepted our Government, not only without protest, but with joy. And now we propose by this bill to deny the Declaration of Independence, the theories of our Government, and stand before the world, as we justly should, as self-convicted hypocrites. Why? The two great monopolies of the sugar and tobacco trusts demand that we sacrifice not only the Porto Ricans, but the provisions of the Constitution. How subservient we must be to lend our aid to these interests when justice, humanity, good faith, good conscience, the theory and genius of our Government, and the plain grant of its powers forbid us to do it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to call attention briefly to a few questions of law upon this subject. And first I desire to say that the principle of the law of nations as promulgated by those writers who have written on this subject declares that when any country, by conquest, purchase, treaty, or otherwise, extends its domain and territory, the instant that is done the acquired territory becomes a part of the territory of the empire, of the republic, or of the kingdom, and that that part of it so acquired by conquest or law is to be ruled by the laws of the country which so acquires it.

I go back to the foundation, to the elementary law writers. I go back to the books which we as students at the law school studied, books which every man who enters upon the study of the law first reads when he undertakes to find out what is the law of nations. And we find it laid down in Vattel's Law of Nations that—

> When a nation takes possession of a distant country and settles a colony there, that country, though separated from the principal establishment or mother country, naturally becomes a part of the state equally with its ancient possessions. Whenever, therefore, the political laws or treaties make no distinction between them, everything said of the territory of the nation must also extend to its colonies. (Vattel's Law of Nations, chapter 18, section 210.)

Also, book 2, chapter 7, section 80, Vattel, declares that the—

domain of a nation extends to everything she possesses by a just title; it comprehends her ancient and original possessions, and all her acquisitions made by means which are just in themselves, or admitted as such among nations—concessions, purchases, conquests made in the regular way, etc. And by her possessions we ought not only to understand her territories, but all the rights she enjoys.

And that is the rule all over the world, even among people who are not ruled by written constitutions, as we are. But, Mr. Chairman, this Republic of ours, founded as it is upon a written constitution that has provisions restraining the powers of the congress and of its people, until they shall change it—this principle of government extends to us and makes us govern these people according to the provisions of the Constitution.

I have here all the provisions to which I shall refer, and which I shall print in my remarks.

I desire to say that the Supreme Court has settled this question in the matter of taxation. They have settled it in the case of Loughborough *vs.* Blake, which I shall not now quote, and in the oft-quoted case of Cross *vs.* Harrison. They have settled it in later cases which I shall undertake to read or to incorporate in my remarks. But without making any other criticism upon Cross *vs.* Harrison, I desire to say that in my judgment the principles which it enunciated and decided are misconstrued by some gentlemen who have read it here. This is the language which it appears to me has escaped them:

No one can doubt—

This is on page 190 of that decision, in 16 Howard—

No one can doubt that these orders of the President, and the action of our Army and Navy commanders in California in conformity with them, were according to the law of arms and the right of conquest, and that they were operative.

When and how long, say the court?

Until the ratification and exchange of a treaty of peace.

These orders of the President thus given to the military authorities are fully set forth in the instructions of Mr. Buchanan, who was then Secretary of State under President Polk. After directing the collection of taxes under the de facto government as a military necessity, the Secretary proceeds:

"This de facto government will, of course, exercise no power inconsistent with the provisions of the Constitution of the United States, which is the supreme law of the land. For this reason no import duties can be levied in California on articles the growth, produce, or manufacture of the United States."

Mark it. That was while California was living under the de facto military government. That was while the military governor was collecting the taxes on goods imported from foreign countries and was not obedient to the tariff law of 1790 and the act of 1846. But the Secretary of State, the mouthpiece of President Polk, who carried on the war, declared:

But no such duties can be imposed in any other part of our nation on the productions of California.

Why? Because the Constitution of the United States was the supreme law of the land, and the supreme law of the land declared that we should make these taxes uniform.

I read the following from the case of Cross *vs.* Hamson:

This de facto government will, of course, exercise no power inconsistent with the provisions of the Constitution of the United States, which is the supreme law of the land. For this reason no import duties can be levied in California on articles the growth, produce, or manufacture of the United States, as no such duties can be imposed in any other part of our Union on the productions of California. Nor can new duties be charged in California upon such foreign productions as have already paid duties in any of our ports of entry, for the obvious reason that California is within the territory of the United States.

Then the war tariff was, immediately on receiving news of ratification of the treaty, made to conform to the existing tariff law.

That war tariff, however, was abandoned as soon as the military governor had received from Washington information of the exchange and ratification of the treaty with Mexico, and duties were afterwards levied in conformity with such as Congress had imposed upon foreign merchandise imported into the other ports of the United States, Upper California having been ceded by the treaty to the United States. This last was done with the assent of the Executive of the United States, or without any interference to prevent it. Indeed, from the letter of the then Secretary of State and from that of the Secretary of the Treasury we can not doubt that the action of the military governor of California was recognized as allowable and lawful by Mr. Polk and his Cabinet. We think it was a rightful and correct recognition under all the circumstances, and when we say rightful we mean that it was constitutional, although Congress had not passed an act to extend the collection of tonnage and import duties to the ports of California.

The court say:

That war tariff was immediately made—

Immediately on receiving news of the ratification of the treaty made what?——

by the Governor-General, under the direction of the Secretary of State, to conform with the tariff laws of the United States in existence in this country.

Again, the court go on to say:

The war tariff, however, was abandoned as soon as the military governor had received from Washington information of the exchange and ratification of the treaty with Mexico, and duties were afterwards levied in conformity with such acts as Congress had imposed upon foreign merchandise imported into the other ports of the United States, Upper California having been ceded by the treaty to the United States.

This last was done with the assent of the Executive of the United States, or without any interference to prevent it. Indeed, from the letter of the then Secretary of State and from that of the Secretary of the Treasury, we can not doubt that the action of the military governor of California was recognized as allowable and lawful by Mr. Polk and his Cabinet. We think it was a rightful and correct recognition under all circumstances; and when we say rightful, we mean that it was constitutional, although Congress had not passed an act to extend the collection of tonnage and import duties to the ports of California.

So, Mr. Chairman, with all that has been said about the Cross and Harrison case being authority which will sustain this bill, here is the permission by which these taxes were levied; here are the facts and the history, and here the decision of the court, which undertakes to declare that the Constitution of the United States extended there, and those duties can not be collected because they were not uniform.

I desire especially to call attention to the case of Geofroy *vs.* Riggs (133 U. S. R., page 158).

The opinion in this case is by Justice Fields, and it is a discussion of our treaty with France in 1800, and determines the question whether or not the territory ceded the United States was a State within the contemplation of that treaty and of the Constitution of the United States.

In discussing this case, and referring to the eighth section of the first article of the Constitution, the justice says:

The power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises is given for the purpose thereinafter mentioned. This grant is general, without limitation as to place. It consequently extends to all places over which the Government extends. If this could be doubted, the doubt is removed by the subsequent words, which modify the grant. The words are: "But all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States." It will not be contended that the modification of the power extends to places to which the power itself does not extend. The power, then, to lay and collect duties, imposts, and excises may be exercised and must be exercised throughout the United States.

The grant of this power and the exercise of it, according to this statement, must be exercised subject to the rule of uniformity, and on this question this case seems to take it as being undoubted.

In speaking of the general grant to lay and collect taxes, and declaring that it comprehends the District and Territories as well as the States, he declares:

The subsequent clauses are intended to regulate the exercise of this power, not to withdraw from it any portion of the community.

In discussing what is meant by the State, he quotes the seventh article of the treaty of 1800 with France, as follows:

"In all the States of the Union whose existing laws permit it, so long and to the same extent as said laws shall remain in force, Frenchmen shall enjoy the right of possessing personal and real property by the same title and in the same manner as the citizens of the United States."

* * * This article is not happily drawn. It leaves in doubt what is meant by "States of the Union." Ordinarily these terms would be held to apply to those political communities exercising the various attributes of sovereignty which compose the United States, as distinguished from the organized municipalities known as Territories and the District of Columbia; and yet sovereign communities with an independent local government are often described as States, though the extent of their political sovereignty be limited by relations to the more general government or to other countries. (Halleck on International Law, chapters 5, 6, and 7.)

The term is used in general jurisprudence and by writers on public law as denoting organized political societies with an established government. Within this definition, the District of Columbia, under the Government of the United States, is as much a State as any of those political communities which compose the United States. Were there no other territory under the Government of the United States, it would not be questioned that the District of Columbia would be a State within the meaning of international law, and it is not perceived that it is any less a State within that meaning because other States and other territory are also under the same Government.

In Hepburn *vs.* Ellzey (2 Cranch, 445–452) the question arose whether a resident and a citizen of the District of Columbia could sue a citizen of Virginia in the circuit court of the United States. The court, by Chief Justice Marshall, in deciding the question, conceded that the District of Columbia was a distinct political society, and therefore a State, according to the definition of writers on general law, but held that the act of Congress in providing for controversies between citizens of different States in the circuit courts referred to that term as used in the Constitution, and therefore to one of the States composing the United States. A similar concession, that the District of Columbia being a separate political community is in a certain sense a State, is made by this court in the recent case of the Metropolitan Railroad Company *vs.* District of Columbia (132 United States, 1, 9), decided at the present term.

In the same opinion the court further declare:

The treaty power as expressed in the Constitution is in terms unlimited, except by those restraints which are found in that instrument against the action of the Government or of its departments, and those arising from the nature of the Government itself and of that of the States. It would not be contended that it extends so far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids, or a change in the character of the Government, or in that of any of the States, or the cession of any portion of the territory of the latter without its consent. (Fort Leavenworth Railroad Company et al. *vs.* Lowe, 114 U. S., 525–541.)

But, with these exceptions, it is not perceived that there is any limit to the questions which can be adjusted touching any matter which is properly the subject of negotiations with a foreign country. (Ware *vs.* Hylton, 3 Dall.,

199; Chirac vs. Chirac, 2 Wheat., 259; Hannestein vs. Lynham, 100 U. S., 483; 8 Op. Attys. Gen., 417; The People vs. Guke, 6 Cal., 381.)

If the Constitution prescribe one rule and the law another and different rule, it is the duty of courts to declare that the Constitution and not the law governs the case before them for judgment. If the law include no case save those for which the Constitution has furnished a different rule, or no case which the legislature has the power to govern, then the law can have no operation.

If it includes cases which the legislature has power to govern, and concerning which the Constitution does not prescribe a different rule, the law governs those cases, though it may, in its terms, attempt to include others, on which it can not operate. In other words, this court can not declare void an act of Congress which constitutionally embraces some cases, though other cases, within its terms, are beyond the control of Congress, or beyond the reach of that particular law. If, therefore, Congress had power to make a law excluding slavery from this territory while under the exclusive power of the United States, the use of the word "forever" does not invalidate the law, so long as Congress has the exclusive legislative power in the territory.

But it is further insisted that the treaty of 1803 between the United States and France, by which this territory was acquired, has so restrained the constitutional powers of Congress that it can not by law prohibit the introduction of slavery into that part of this territory north and west of the Missouri and north of 36° 30' north latitude.

By a treaty with a foreign nation the United States may rightfully stipulate that the Congress will or will not exercise its legislative power in some particular manner on some particular subject. Such promises, when made, should be voluntarily kept with the most scrupulous good faith. But that a treaty with a foreign nation can deprive the Congress of any part of the legislative power conferred by the people, so that it no longer can legislate as it was empowered by the Constitution to do, I more than doubt.

I desire to refer to the noted case of Scott vs. Sanford in 19 Howard, which has been criticised upon the floor of this House as being "an infamous decision," and has been referred to as the only case sustaining the doctrine laid down by Chief Justice Taney that this country had no constitutional right to hold territory as colonies. Upon an investigation of that case it will appear to any unprejudiced mind that the entire court was united upon that proposition.

The opinion of the court is pronounced by Chief Justice Taney, in which two of the justices—Justice McLean and Justice Curtis—dissent, and the third justice—Nelson—gives a separate opinion upon a single point in the case, expressing no opinion upon the unconstitutionality of the act of 1820, known as the "Missouri compromise law," and the rest of the justices declaring it unconstitutional. It is declared, Chief Justice Taney speaking for the whole court:

There is no power given by the Constitution to the Federal Government to establish and maintain colonies bordering on the United States or at a distance, to be ruled and governed at its own pleasure, nor to enlarge its territorial limits in any way, except by the admission of new States. That power is plainly given; and if a new State is admitted, it needs no further legislation by Congress, because the Constitution itself defines the relative rights and powers and duties of the State, and the citizens of the State and the Federal Government. But no power is given to acquire a territory to be held and governed permanently in that character.

He further adds:

We do not mean, however, to question the power of Congress in this respect. The power to expand the territory of the United States by the admission of new States is plainly given; and in the construction of this power by all the departments of the Government, it has been held to authorize the acquisition of territory, not fit for admission at the time, but to be admitted as soon as its population and situation would entitle it to admission. It is acquired to become a State, and not to be held as a colony and governed by Congress with absolute authority; and as the propriety of admitting a new State is committed to the sound discretion of Congress, the power to acquire territory for that purpose, to be held by the United States until it is in a suitable condition to become a State upon an equal footing with the other States, must rest upon the same discretion. It is a question for the political department of the Government, and not the judicial.

He further adds that it is the duty of Congress to maintain in the territory the authority and rights of the Government, and also the personal rights and rights of property of individual citizens, secured by the Constitution. (See pages 52 and 53, Dred Scott case.)

He further declares that the power in the General Government to obtain and hold colonies and dependent territories over which they might legislate without restriction would be inconsistent with its own existence in its present form. Whatever it acquires it acquires for the benefit of the people of the several States who created it. It is their trustee acting for them and charged with the duty of promoting the interests of the whole people of the Union in the exercise of the powers specifically granted.

Further on it is declared by him:

The power of Congress over the person or property of a citizen can never be a mere discretionary power under our Constitution and form of government. The powers of the Government and the rights and privileges of the citizen are regulated and plainly defined by the Constitution itself. And when the territory becomes a part of the United States the Federal Government enters into possession in the character impressed upon it by those who created it. * * *

The territory being a part of the United States, the Government and the citizen both enter it under the authority of the Constitution, with their respective rights defined and marked out; and the Federal Government can exercise no power over his person or property beyond what that instrument confers, nor lawfully deny any right which it has reserved.

Justice Wayne concurred entirely in the opinion of the Chief Justice, and Justice Nelson concurred in the opinion of affirmance, and did not discuss the question nor deny the propositions stated.

Justice Grier concurred fully; Justice Daniel concurred at length, and so did Justice Campbell, distinctly denying the supreme sovereignty of Congress over territory then belonging to the United States, or that they might thereafter acquire.

Justice Catron also concurred, upholding the propositions of the Chief Justice.

Justice McLean and Justice Curtis dissented, on page 148, Justice McLean said:

In organizing the government of a Territory Congress is limited to means appropriate to the attainment of the constitutional object. No powers can be exercised which are prohibited by the Constitution or which are contrary to its spirit; so that, whether the object may be the protection of the persons or property of purchasers of public lands, or of communities who have been annexed to the Union by conquest or purchase, they are initiatory to the establishment of State governments, and no more power can be claimed or exercised than is necessary to the attainment of the end. This is the limitation of all the Federal powers.

He further says:

The Constitution was formed for our whole country, and the expansion or contraction of her territory require no change in the fundamental law.

Justice Curtis, dissenting, said:

Before I proceed further to notice some other grounds of supposed objection to this power of Congress, I desire to say that if it were not for my anxiety to insist upon what I deem a correct exposition of the Constitution, if I looked only to the purposes of the argument, the source of the power of Congress, asserted in the opinion of the majority of the court, would answer those purposes equally well. For they admit that Congress has power to organize and govern the Territories until they arrive at a suitable condition for admission to the Union; they admit, also, that the kind of government which shall thus exist should be regulated by the condition and wants of each Territory, and that it is necessarily committed to the discretion of Congress to enact such laws for that purpose as that discretion may dictate; and no limit to that discretion has been shown, or even suggested, save those positive prohibitions to legislate which are found in the Constitution.

I confess myself unable to perceive any difference whatever between my own opinion of the general extent of the power of Congress and the opinion of the majority of the court, save that I consider it derivable from the express language of the Constitution, while they hold it to be silently implied from the power to acquire territory. (Opinion of Mr. Justice Curtis, Scott vs. Sanford, pages 229, 230.)

This case of Scott vs. Sanford has been referred to, and the principle just quoted approved in the following cases: 16 Wallace, page 73; 112 U. S. R., page 101; 114 U. S. R., page 45; 143 U. S. R., page 159; 152 U. S. R., page 49; 169 U. S. R., page 705.

In these cases above cited opinions have been rendered by Justice Miller, Chief Justice Waite, Justice Gray, Justice Matthews, and Chief Justice Fuller.

In 16 Howard, in what is known as the Slaughterhouse Cases, page 73, Justice Miller, referring to the Dred Scott decision, says that this decision in the Dred Scott case, while it has been attacked by some of the ablest constitutional lawyers and statesmen in the country, has never been overruled. The decision in the Slaughterhouse Cases was made in 1872.

In this case, also, in discussing what privileges and immunities the citizens of the United States and of the States are entitled to, the Justice quotes with approval the decision of Justice Washington (4 Washington, Circuit Court Reports, 471), which declares:

Protection by the Government; the enjoyment of life and liberty, with the right to acquire property of every kind and to pursue and obtain happiness and safety; subject, nevertheless, to such restraints as the Government may justly prescribe for the general good of the whole; the right of a citizen of one State to pass through or to reside in any other State for purposes of trade, agriculture, professional pursuits, or otherwise; to claim the benefit of the writ of habeas corpus; to institute and maintain actions of any kind in the courts; to take, hold, and dispose of property, either real or personal, and an exemption from higher taxes or impositions than are paid by other citizens; to which may be added the elective franchise as regulated and established by the laws or constitution of the State in which it is to be exercised.

And on page 75 of 16 Wallace, Justice Miller says:

Fortunately we are not without judicial determination of the meaning of section 2 of the fourth article of the Constitution.

In the case of Murphy vs. Ramsey (114 U. S. R., page 44) Justice Washington decided as follows:

The personal and civil rights of the inhabitants of the Territories are secured to them, as to other citizens, by the principles of constitutional liberty, which restrain all the agencies of government, State and national. Their political rights are pledges which they hold as privileges in the legislative discretion of the Congress of the United States.

Already the statutes of the United States, as embraced in the Revised Statutes, section 1978, provide what shall be the rights and what are the rights of the inhabitants of any territory that may be possessed or acquired.

Section 1977 declares:

All persons within the jurisdiction of the United States shall have the same right in every State and Territory to make and enforce contracts, to sue, be parties, give evidence, and to the full and equal benefit of all laws and proceedings for the security of persons and property as is enjoyed by white citizens, and shall be subject to like punishment, pains, penalties, taxes, licenses, and exactions of every kind, and to no other.

In the case of Ward *vs.* State of Maryland (12 Wallace, page 430) the court declares:

These privileges include those not named, but which are of the same general character, and embrace nearly every civil right for the establishment and protection of which organized government is instituted.

In the case of Crandall *vs.* Nevada (6 Wallace) the court declare:

The citizen of this great country has the right to be protected by the implied guaranties of its Constitution.

Amongst which he distinctly lays down the right of free access to the ports of the country, through which all the operations of foreign commerce are conducted, etc., and quoted from the language of Chief Justice Taney:

We are one people with one common country; we are all citizens of the United States.

See especially the further opinion in this case (Candrell *vs.* Nevada), on bottom of page 79 and page 80.

It is true that this decision arose under a discussion of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution, which declares:

All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside.

Another case sustaining the proposition that the principles of the Constitution extend to all the territory of this Government is that of the United States *vs.* Moore (3 Cranch, page 159).

In the court below the opinions of the judges were delivered to the following effect:

Cranch, J.: The question to be decided upon this demurrer is whether the act of Congress for abolishing the fees of justices of the peace in the District of Columbia can affect those justices who were in commission before and at the time when that act passed, and who accepted their commissions while those fees were legally annexed to the office. The points made in the argument of this case are important, and some of them not altogether clear of doubt. It has been contended that Congress, in legislating for the District of Columbia, are not bound by any of the prohibitions of the Constitution. But this is a doctrine to which I can never assent. Can it be said that Congress may pass a bill of attainder for the District of Columbia?

That Congress may pass laws ex post facto in the District of Columbia, or order soldiers to be quartered upon us in time of peace, or make our ports free ports of entry, or lay duties upon our exports, or take away the right of trial by jury in criminal prosecutions. Yet all this they may do if, in legislating for the District of Columbia, they are not restricted by the express prohibitions of the Constitution. The words must be positive and strong indeed to justify such a construction. The only clause from which such an inference can possibly seem to flow is that which says: "Congress shall have the power to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over such District."

The court, in deciding this case, say:

But the whole instrument is to be taken together and every part is to be made consistent with the residue, if possible. That Congress may legislate "in all cases whatsoever over such District," etc., is the general proposition, and the prohibitions are the exceptions. The true construction is that Congress may legislate for us in all cases where they are now prohibited by other parts of the Constitution. The express commands of the Constitution operate as prohibitions of everything repugnant to such commands. In every case, therefore, where Congress are not bound, either by the commands or prohibitions of the Constitution, they have a discretionary power to legislate over the District.

The Constitution was made for the benefit of every citizen of the United States, and there is no such citizen, whatever may be his condition or wherever he may be situated within the limits of the territory of the United States, who has not a right to the protection it affords.

Marshall, J., concurred. Present: Marshall, C. J., Cushing, Patterson, Chase, Washington, and Johnson.

Hon. Thomas M. Cooley, a former president of the American Bar Association, and during his life the leading constitutional jurist of the United States, in an article contributed to the Forum in 1893, in which he discussed the question of Hawaiian annexation, said:

Now outlying colonies are not within the contemplation of the Constitution of the United States at all. The structure of government created under it never had in view such colonies, and the people of the United States would never have consented to provide for our holding them. Our Government is not suited to that purpose. The proposal that we should vie with England and France and Germany in establishing colonies in distant quarters of the globe would now be scouted at once by the people and by the Congress as being altogether foreign to our institutions.

He went on to say:

There is no indication in the Constitution itself or in any of the actions or discussions which led up to its formation that the people of the day contemplated any other condition of things than a Union composed of contiguous States made up of people mainly of one race, with territory held in common by them, to be governed under Congressional authority while on its way through increasing population to the formation of other such States and to admission to the Union on an equal footing with the original States when the proper maturity had been reached.

This was the general plan of the Union; and all the terms of the Constitution, when applied to it, are fully satisfied. Anything proposed under the treaty-making power that, if carried into effect, would change this condition of things, and especially anything that would make of the nation the ruler of outlying states or colonies or territories not acquired with any expectation of being brought into the Union, or not capable of becoming harmonious members of a family of contiguous States, constituting together one common country, would seem to be as much by implication forbidden as would be anything that directly antagonized provisions of the Constitution itself. (Forum, Volume XV, pages 389, 393, 398.)

In Loughborough *vs.* Blake (5 Wheaton, 377) the question of the right of Congress to tax property in the District of Columbia by direct tax, according to population, was discussed and the tax upheld upon the ground that the District of Columbia was territory of the United States and subject to the Constitution of the United States, just as the States were subject.

Chief Justice Marshall, for the entire court, defined the term "United States" as follows:

Does this term designate the whole or any particular portion of the American empire? Certainly this question can admit of but one answer. It is the name given to our great Republic, which is composed of States and Territories. The District of Columbia or the territory west of the Missouri is not less within the United States than Maryland or Pennsylvania.

Judge Cooley, whose commentaries are universally accepted as conclusive interpretations of our constitutional law, summarizes the doctrine as follows:

And when territory is acquired the right to suffer States to be formed therefrom and to receive them into the Union must follow of course, not only because the Constitution confers the power to admit new States without restriction, but also because it would be inconsistent with institutions founded on the fundamental idea of self-government that the Federal Government should retain territory under its own imperial rule and deny the people the customary local institutions. (Cooley's Principles of Constitutional Law, 170.)

Prof. Henry Wade Rogers, president of the Northwestern University, in a paper read before the American Social Science Association, in September last, concludes as follows:

The truth of the matter would seem to be that Congress, in the exercise of the power to lay and collect duties, imposts, and excises, must so frame the law that all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States; that the term "United States" includes all annexed territory; that where an act of Congress is necessary to include newly annexed territory within a collection district it is plainly the duty of Congress to enact such legislation, and its failure to do so would result in a condition of things contradictory to the intent of the Constitution. After a treaty of cession has been ratified duties can be fixed by action of the President as the head of a military government established by him; but such action is only a temporary expedient, and can not be of permanent nature. That Congress, when it comes to legislate upon the subject, can not establish one tariff law for Hawaii or for Porto Rico and a different one for the remainder of the United States, but the law which it enacts must be uniform throughout all our possessions.

So much has been said in denunciation of the opinion of Chief Justice Taney in the celebrated Dred Scott case that it will not be out of place to call attention to the fact that, while this country was engaged in civil war, on the 15th of October, 1864, in the city of Boston, honor was paid to the memory of this distinguished Chief Justice by the bar of that city, on learning of his death; and his former associate upon the bench, Justice Curtis, was the chairman of the committee to report resolutions upon his life and character.

The proceedings of that meeting were as follows:

At a meeting of the members of the bar of the first circuit, at Boston, on Saturday, the 15th day of October, A. D. 1864, to take measures for giving expression to the feelings of the bar on occasion of the death of Chief Justice Taney, the meeting having been called to order by Richard H. Dana, jr., attorney of the United States; Sidney Bartlett was appointed chairman.

On motion of Mr. Dana, a committee consisting of Benjamin R. Curtis, Caleb Cushing, Richard H. Dana, jr., and Sidney Bartlett was appointed to prepare and report resolutions for the consideration of the bar.

At an adjourned meeting, held Monday, the 17th day of October, A. D. 1864, the following resolutions, reported by Benjamin R. Curtis, in behalf of the committee, were unanimously adopted, namely:

"*Resolved*, That the members of this bar render the tribute of their admiration and reverence for the preeminent abilities, profound learning, incorruptible integrity, and signal private virtues exhibited in the long and illustrious judicial career of the late lamented Chief Justice Taney.

"*Resolved*, That the attorney of the United States be requested to communicate these proceedings to the court and ask to have them entered on the records of the court."

Mr. B. R. Curtis then addressed the Court:

May it please the Court: I have been requested to second the resolutions which Mr. Attorney has presented. I suppose the reason for this request is that for six years I was in such official connection with the late Chief Justice as enabled me to know him better than the other members of the bar.

Among other things, he said:

Perhaps I may be permitted to say that, though on the only important occasions on which I had the misfortune to differ with the Chief Justice on such points I thought he and they who agreed with him carried the powers of the court too far, yet, speaking for myself, I am quite sure he fell into neither of these extremes. The great powers intrusted to the court by the Constitution and laws of his country he steadily and firmly upheld and administered; and, so far as I know, he showed no disposition to exceed them.

Are the principles of the Declaration of Independence and the provisions of the Constitution of the United States to be denied to these people who voluntarily submitted to our armies and rejoiced at becoming citizens of the United States and being released from the oppression of Spain? Our forefathers, who signed the immortal Declaration and severed themselves from the mother country and ceased to be colonies, fought for their independence because, amongst other things, it was declared that we had the right to be free and independent, and amongst other complaints were

"the cutting off of our trade with all the ports of the world, imposing taxes upon us without our consent, and depriving us, in many cases, of trial by jury."

Surely the descendants of these patriots, who set upon this continent the first beacon light for liberty and the establishment of a republican government, can not afford to deprive even so small a portion of the people of the United States of the rights guaranteed by the Constitution.

The President himself has recognized the right of these people to share in the privileges and rights of American citizens, for in his message to Congress he said:

> It must be borne in mind that since the cession Porto Rico has been denied the principal markets she had long enjoyed, and our tariffs have been continued against her products as when she was under Spanish sovereignty. The markets of Spain are closed to her products except upon terms to which the commerce of all nations is subjected. The island of Cuba, which used to buy her cattle and tobacco without custom duties, now imposes the same duties upon these products as from any other country entering her ports. She has therefore lost her free intercourse with Spain and Cuba without any compensating benefits in this market. Her coffee was little known and not in use by our people, and therefore there was no demand here for this one of her chief products.
>
> Our plain duty is to abolish all customs tariffs between the United States and Porto Rico and give her products free access to our markets.

The Secretary of War joined in that recommendation as follows:

> The question of the economic treatment of the island underlies all the others. If the people are prosperous and have an abundance of the necessities of life, they will with justice be easily governed, and will with patience be easily educated. If they are left in hunger and hopeless poverty, they will be discontented, intractable, and mutinous. The principal difficulty now in the island of Porto Rico is that the transfer of the island from Spain to the United States has not resulted in an increase of prosperity, but in the reverse. The industry of the island is almost entirely agricultural. The people live upon the products of their own soil and upon the articles for which they exchange their surplus products abroad. Their production is in the main coffee, sugar, and tobacco. The prosperity of the island depends upon their success in selling these products. * * * And I wish most strongly to urge that the customs duties between Porto Rico and the United States be removed.

If the President and Congress shall now by this bill withdraw from these people the protection of the Constitution, the right of equal and uniform taxation, and the other guaranties of the Constitution, then the profession of the President in his message is to be accepted as not having been made in good faith.

When this bill is passed and becomes a law, it can be said of the Republican majority—

> Thou hast unmasked a nation falsely clad
> In altruistic garb; revealed a land
> Blind to distinctions between good and bad,
> And smiting liberty with ruthless hand.

The action of the President in first recommending free trade for Porto Rico, and then at the behest of his party bosses in changing his recommendation to Congress by secret admonitions to his political associates in the House, must and will be passed on by the people at the polls.

> Whether as tool or tyrant History's pen,
> Upon the nation's scroll of lasting shame,
> Shall pillory in letters black his name,
> Time alone can adjudge.

So much has been said upon the floor of this House and elsewhere with reference to the duty of the South in looking after her own interests in the matter of cotton raising and cotton manufactures, and the advantage to her in colonial expansion, in order to acquire trade and commerce and a market for our products and manufactures, I desire to call attention to certain facts with reference to cotton manufacture and the cost thereof in China and Japan, which are as follows:

COTTON INDUSTRY IN CHINA.

In January, 1899, there were reported:

Number of cotton spinning mills	15
Number of spindles in operation	378,052
Annual output (when all the existing mills are in full operation), 390,000 bales of 400 pounds (approximate); value of annual output	$18,720,000

Manufacturer's cost of a bale of yarn, 400 pounds of 20 hanks:

Raw cotton, including import duty	$36.50
Cost of production	5.00
Commission for purchasing cotton	.10
Interest on money invested in purchasing cotton, storage, etc.	1.00
Insurance on import of cotton	.20
Interest on money invested in machinery	1.50
Insurance on the plant and incidental expenses	1.00
Total	45.30

The average price for Chinese spun yarn is about $47 per bale of 400 pounds; therefore the manufacturer's profit is about 5 per cent. (Taken from the current price list published by the Celestial Empire, of Shanghai, January 10, 1900.)

The value of raw cotton imported into China during three calendar years ending December 31, 1898, was as follows:

1896	$954,822
1897	1,649,939
1898	2,073,003

The value of cotton yarn (foreign spun) imported into China during the same period was—

1896	$15,939,556
1897	25,019,260
1898	28,495,396

Wages in the cotton mills of Shanghai, Hankow, and Soochow vary according to the skill of the operatives, the average being about 25 cents (silver) per day (12½ cents in United States currency). This low rate is largely caused by the scarcity of skilled labor which compels the employment of several unskilled hands to compass the work of one trained operative; thus three or four women are required to do the work at a frame which could be attended to by one experienced person. The aggregate pay of the four unskilled operatives amounts to 50 cents in United States currency.

A considerable quantity of cotton is annually raised in central and southern China, but there are no data as to its exact quantity. The native cotton brings a much higher price than the Indian or American product.

In 1898 China imported from the United States 156,314,155 yards of cotton cloth, valued at $6,944,520, and in 1899 227,868,196 yards, valued at $10,273,487. The total value of imports of all kinds of cotton goods into China in 1898 was $56,631,741.

COTTON INDUSTRY IN JAPAN.

Reports of May, 1899, represent the cotton industry in Japan as follows:

Number of cotton-spinning mills	47
Number of spindles in operation	1,106,404
Annual output, bales of 400 pounds	650,000
Value of annual output	$29,250,000

Cost of manufacture per bale of cotton yarn of 400 pounds, 20 hanks:

Raw cotton (cost at mill)	$34.50
Labor	8.00
Commission on purchasing cotton	.10
Interest on money invested in purchasing cotton, storage, insurance, etc	1.00
Interest on money invested in machinery	.50
Total	44.10

The average price for Japanese spun yarn is about $45.50 per bale.

The value of raw cotton imported into Japan during the three calendar years ending December 31, 1898, was as follows:

Year.	Ginned.	In the seed.	Total.
1896	$16,053,136	$233,538	$16,286,674
1897	21,561,131	248,476	21,809,607
1898	22,705,220	166,957	22,872,186

The value of the total imports of raw cotton imported into Japan in the calendar years 1897 and 1898, respectively, was $21,674,000 and $22,872,000, of which $3,636,000 in 1897 and $7,376,000 in 1898 came from the United States. The Japanese cotton manufacturers will this year begin to import cotton direct from Galveston, Mobile, New Orleans, etc., by their own regular steamers, in which event it is expected that much larger quantities will be annually imported than ever before.

The wages of Japanese labor have increased nearly 100 per cent within the last five years, the average pay of operatives in cotton factories being about 25 cents per day in United States currency.

Although the cotton industry has made great progress in Japan, her imports of cotton goods have been $27,894,177 in 1896, to $32,582,209 in 1897, and to $32,812,293 in 1898.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal said with reference to the immense amount of trade that we are to secure in the South and elsewhere by the acquisition of these new territories. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] was bold enough to declare the other day after they squeezed them all they could be, that then the Government and the Republican party proposed to hold these islands—for what? For the purpose of allowing others to make as much money out of them as possible, and after they had made all the money they could, then, perhaps, after you had got all that you could by squeezing them, you proposed to extend to the Philippines, perhaps, the Constitution and ingraft the principles of the Declaration of Independence.

For myself—I am speaking now with reference to my own people—I say that the statistics and facts and the history of the trade of these colonies has demonstrated that it is not profitable. Take the colonies of England, France, and Germany, and history will demonstrate in every instance that the trade with tropical colonies has not been sufficient to stand alone and that it led to a tax upon the people. France pays $14,000,000 to-day, Germany $5,000,000, and England something over $1,900,000 a year in order to sustain her colonies. This is shown by an article by Mr. Ireland in the February number of McClure's Magazine.

This article that I have permission to print will show that in the consumption of English products, of manufactured goods, the nontropical countries consume the products of England averaging $26.16 per head, while the tropical colonies consume of the mother country's product only 72 cents per head; and as $26.16 is to 72 cents so is the difference between the benefits paid by England, this great mother of colonies, that Empire which is to-day straining the force of the Empire in an effort to extend her colonies and to throttle liberty in South Africa. Great Britain, who has the most powerful navy in the world and can guard and protect her colonies, receives from her tropical colonies no benefit, but a great loss.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a great deal about the immense trade that we were to get by extending our power and our commerce. If we were to follow the example of Rome and the other

countries that extended their power and their commerce over other countries, they did so until the people were corrupt. Their legislation became corrupt, and they fell. I shall be very glad to do all things proper to extend our trade and commerce, but so far as my people are concerned, trade and commerce are not above the love of liberty and not above the Constitution. And after we have gotten it all, Mr. Chairman, what will be the result? The English poet, Thompson, has truly said:

> Whenever puff'd with power and gorged with wealth,
> Nations like ours let trade enormous rise,
> And East and South their mingled treasures pour;
> Then swelled, impetuous, the corrupting flood
> Burst o'er city, and devours the land.

And I repeat here the question propounded to the poet by his friend Mr. Hill, who, in writing to him after he had read the poem from which these lines are taken, said:

> Think seriously upon this observation, and try if in all your acquaintance with past ages you can find a people long at once retaining public virtue and extended commerce.

[Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

APPENDIX.

A Few Facts About the Colonies of the Great Powers.

[By Alleyne Ireland, author of Tropical Colonization.]

VALUE PER ANNUM OF THE IMPORTS OF ENGLAND, FRANCE, AND GERMANY FROM THEIR RESPECTIVE COLONIES.

Although the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland—referred to throughout this article as England, for the sake of brevity—is not the oldest of the colonial powers, being outclassed in that respect by Spain, France, Holland, and Portugal, her colonies are to-day by far the most important, both in regard to their extent and population, whilst the commerce of the British colonies is greater in volume than that of all the colonies of all other powers put together.

If we include India, the colonies of England cover an area of 9,000,000 square miles; and if to this we add the area of British protectorates and spheres of influence, the total area subject to British rule is 11,000,000 square miles. The smaller area, that of the colonies and India alone, supports a population of 367,000,000; the larger area about 420,000,000, or, roughly speaking, six times the population of the United States. As a colonial power France comes next to England, but at a great distance behind. The French colonies, including Algeria, Tunis, and all protectorates and spheres of influence, have an area of 3,500,000 square miles, and a population of 53,000,000.

Next comes Germany, whose colonies and protectorates have an area of 1,000,000 square miles and a population of 11,000,000. The Dutch colonies have an area of 800,000 square miles and a population of 33,000,000. As compared with these, the colonies of the United States cover an area of 125,000 square miles and have a population of 9,000,000. The details are:

Country.	Area.	Population.
	Sq. miles.	
Hawaii	6,640	117,000
Porto Rico	3,668	813,000
Philippines	115,000	8,000,000

But to return to colonies. Colonies may be divided into two great classes, tropical and nontropical. The difference between tropical and nontropical colonies from the commercial standpoint is most striking. During the five-year period 1893-1897, England imported from her nontropical colonies annually goods to the value of $230,000,000, and from her tropical colonies goods to the value of $230,000,000. What this means will be seen when it is remembered that the population of the nontropical colonies during the five years was about 9,500,000, whilst that of the tropical colonies was 346,500,000. To put it in another way, each man, woman, and child in England's nontropical colonies sends annually to England about $23.18 worth of goods, whilst each man, woman, and child in the tropical colonies sends only 66 cents' worth. Similarly in regard to exports of British goods. Each person in the nontropical colonies consumes $12.32 worth of British goods, whilst each person in the tropical colonies consumes only 71 cents' worth. In other words, taking imports and exports together, it pays England better that one child should be born in Canada than that 25 children should be born in Ceylon.

Let me put this in yet another way. Taking Victoria in Australia as a typical nontropical colony, and comparing it with the average of twelve tropical colonies—British Guiana, Mauritius, Trinidad, Jamaica, Barbados, St. Kitts-Nevis, Antigua, Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Montserrat, and Dominica—we get the following results, the figures being based on the average returns of ten years: Victoria, the nontropical colony, exports yearly per head of her population goods to the value of $70, whilst the tropical colonies export only $25.80 worth per head of their population.

But the tropical colonies themselves vary very greatly in their productive efficiency, as measured by their exports, some exporting as much as $45 per head, whilst others export only $13 per head annually. This wide difference is easily explained. The value of exports from these colonies is regulated by the efficiency of their labor supply—a good labor supply means big exports, a poor labor supply small exports. In regard to their labor supply, we can divide tropical colonies into three classes: 1. Those in which imported contract labor is used. 2. Those in which there is such a dense population that the natives must either work or starve. 3. Those in which there is no pressure of population and in which imported contract labor is not used.

In order to compare the productive efficiency of these three classes of colonies I select three of each class: Mauritius, British Guiana, and Trinidad, which employ imported contract labor; Barbados, Antigua, and Grenada, in which there is a pressure of population, and St. Vincent, Montserrat, and Dominica, in which there is no pressure of population and in which there is no imported contract labor. If I take the average value of the annual exports of these colonies during the ten-year period 1882-1891, I get the following results: The colonies of the first class export yearly $45.51 worth of goods per head of their population; the colonies of the second class, $36.40 worth, and the colonies of the third class only $11.66 worth.

It is not difficult to understand why this should be so. In the colonies where there is no pressure of population there is no need for the natives to work, for they can supply all their wants from the bounty of nature. The forest furnishes them with excellent material for a house and food in abundance, whilst a little desultory labor will soon establish a small garden, which will grow a few bananas or plantains to be sold in the nearest town, thus supplying what little money is necessary for clothing. Under these circumstances the ordinary dweller in the Tropics is content to live. His wants are few and simple, and he can gratify them without the wages which the white man offers him. So he does not work. Where there is a pressure of population, things are different. Take Barbados as an example. There every inch of soil is occupied. There are no forests in which the negro can build his hut, and no spare lands on which he can cultivate his patch of corn or plantains. And there are about 1,200 souls to the square mile. Under these circumstances it is easy to understand that there is a moderately good labor supply. Lastly, there are the colonies employing imported contract labor. Their high productive efficiency is due to the presence of a large body of laborers who are under contract to work five days a week and seven hours a day for five years.

I may close this article with a very brief description of the manner in which the system of imported contract labor is worked in the British colonies. I select British Guiana as an example. The laborers are recruited in India by voluntary enlistment. The agent of British Guiana resides in Calcutta, and sends out recruiting agents who make known to the people the terms offered by the British Guiana planters.

Those men and women who express their willingness to go to the colony are called before a magistrate, and the terms of the contract are read over to them in their own language. If any wish to withdraw at the last moment, they are allowed to do so, and are then sent back to their homes at the expense of the British Guiana government. Those who sign the contract are then put on board a sailing vessel for the voyage. Each vessel carrying laborers is provided with a medical man, who has to see that all the regulations

A most interesting point in connection with the colonies of the European powers is whether they are a source of profit or of loss to the sovereign state. This may be looked at in two ways: First, whether they are directly a source of profit or loss, or, in other words, whether they pay revenue into the treasury of the sovereign state or are a cause of actual expense to the mother country; second, whether the home country succeeds in securing such a proportion of trade from her colonies as to amount to a real national advantage.

In regard to this point, we may compare the colonies of England, France, and Germany. The British colonies receive nothing from the imperial treasury and contribute nothing to it. This does not, of course, imply that under special circumstances, such as those created by the disastrous hurricane in the West Indies last year, no financial aid is given by England to her colonies, but merely that each colony raises its own revenue without depending on England in any way. Both Germany and France, however, pay out annually large sums of money for the administrative expenses of their colonies, scarcely any of which are self-supporting.

VALUE PER ANNUM OF THE EXPORTS OF ENGLAND, FRANCE, AND GERMANY TO THEIR RESPECTIVE COLONIES.

France pays yearly about $14,000,000, and Germany about $5,000,000. It has been stated that, although England's colonies are not a source of direct expense to the mother country, they are so indirectly, for it is the possession of colonies which necessitates such enormous expenditures for the British navy. This is a mistaken idea. Even if England owned no colonies she would still have to keep her navy at its present strength, for two reasons—because it is her first line of defense, and because her carrying trade, which forms about 60 per cent of the carrying trade of the world, must be protected.

It is seen, then, that so far from colonies being a source of direct revenue to the sovereign states, they are in the case of both France and Germany a source of great expense.

But what of trade? Does not the possession of colonies imply a very important commercial development in which the mother country reaps great profit? Here again we will compare France, Germany, and England. First, in regard to imports from colonies. In 1897 England imported from her colonies goods to the value of $470,000,000, her total imports from all countries, including her colonies, being valued at $2,250,000,000. In other words, she received more than one-fifth of her imports from her own colonies. In 1896 France imported from her colonies goods to the value of $70,000,000, her total imports being valued at about $750,000,000. That is to say, she received less than one-tenth of her imports from her colonies. Germany received in 1896 imports from her colonies to the value of $2,000,000, her total imports being worth $1,000,000,000. That is, she received about one five-hundredth part of her imports from her colonies.

Turning now to exports, we find that in 1897 England exported British and Irish produce to the total value of $1,170,000,000, of which $400,000,000 worth went to the British colonies—roughly, one-third of her total exports. In 1895 the value of exports of French merchandise amounted to $680,000,000, of which $68,000,000, or one-tenth, went to the French colonies. Germany exported in 1896 home merchandise to the value of $700,000,000, of which $2,000,000 worth, or one three hundred and fiftieth part went to the German colonies.

If we consider these figures for a moment, we shall perceive several curious facts. England exported to the British colonies goods to a value six times as great as that of the exports from France and Germany to their respective colonies; and she also imported from her colonies six times more goods than France and Germany put together imported from their colonies.

Now, both France and Germany strive to secure a monopoly of the trade of their own colonies by erecting formidable tariffs against the goods of other nations. England, on the other hand, throws open the trade of her colonies to the whole world, and anyone can thus compete with her for the trade of her own possessions; yet it is seen that England secures an immense trade with her colonies. This is not because the colonies are under the British flag (since there is no preferential treatment of British goods in the British colonies), but because she is highly efficient commercially. England's commercial efficiency is well shown by the following table:

Country.	Population.	Exports.
England	40,000,000	$1,170,000,000
United States	70,000,000	1,210,000,000
France	39,000,000	680,000,000
Germany	53,000,000	700,000,000

Roughly speaking, England produces for export a little less than twice as much per head of her population as the United States, France, or Germany. in regard to sanitation and food are observed during the passage. The laborers get the passage free of cost, as also food and clothing. Those who wish to carry young children with them are allowed to do so.

On arrival in British Guiana, the laborers are allotted to the different estates. The terms of the contract are as follows: The laborer contracts to reside on the estate and to work five days a week for seven hours a day for five years, at the end of which time he becomes absolutely free to go where he pleases. The planter contracts to supply each laborer with a well-built,

well-ventilated house, with a good water supply. He must also provide on his estate a hospital for the use of sick laborers, and must employ a medical man to visit the estate at least once every forty-eight hours and examine and prescribe for all laborers presenting themselves. He must also build a school on his estate for the education of the children of the laborers. All the above are provided free of cost to the laborers. In addition to this, he must pay each man not less than 24 cents a day and each woman not less than 16 cents a day. When it is remembered that the ordinary laborer can buy all the food he can eat for 8 cents a day, the wages seem very fair. As a matter of fact, the laborers save considerable sums of money, and frequently after their term of indenture is over they set up small shops on the estates, and eventually in many cases become prosperous citizens. It should be noted that the planters are not allowed to sell goods of any kind to their laborers, under a very heavy penalty. In 1897 there were 4,444 East Indian depositors in the British Guiana Government Savings Bank, with a total sum of $413,351 to their credit. At the end of the five years' contract the laborer becomes free, and can not be engaged under contract again, a provision intended to protect the immigrant from any influence which might be brought to bear on him to forego his rights to entire freedom after his contract is out. If an immigrant remains five years in the colony after his indenture expires, even though he does no work during that time, he becomes entitled to a free grant of land from the government. Until quite recently he was entitled to a passage back to India on paying one-half of the actual cost of transport. Under this latter provision, 38,000 immigrants returned to India during the past twenty-five years, carrying with them money and jewelry to the value of about $2,800,000.

The interests of the contract laborers are under the care of a special department of the government—the immigration department. All employees of this department must pass examinations in the native dialects of the immigrants. Inspectors from this department visit the estates frequently and examine the pay lists in order to see if the laborers are getting their fair wages. These officers also hear and investigate any complaints that may be made to them, and if it is necessary, they may issue all process of law free to the laborers.

The immigration department can always enforce any demands it may make, for if a planter refuses to remedy any defect in his arrangements, or declines to perform any act suggested by the immigration agent-general, that official has the power to refuse further supplies of laborers, and may also take away from the estate what laborers it has. As this would mean ruin to the planter, he can not disregard the orders he gets from the immigration department. Should any planter be convicted of an offense against a laborer, the immigration department demands his dismissal from the estate, and warns all other estates that if they employ him they will not be furnished with any more laborers. As no punishment of any kind can be inflicted on a laborer except by the legal authorities of the colony, it will be readily perceived that the lot of the indentured laborer in British Guiana is not a hard one.

Of course there are systems of indentured labor which, when not under proper government supervision, give rise to great abuses, but this need not necessarily be so, and if the United States finds it expedient to sanction the employment of imported contract labor in its new possessions, it will undoubtedly establish the system on lines similar to those adopted in the British colonies, which insure strict Government control and high protection for the interests of the laborers.

Grant Memorial Services.

REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES H. GROSVENOR,
OF OHIO,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Saturday, May 19, 1900.

The House having under consideration the following resolutions:

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the thanks of Congress be given to the Grand Army of the Republic for the statue of Gen. Ulysses S. Grant.

"*Resolved*, That the statue be accepted and placed in the Capitol, and that a copy of these resolutions, signed by the presiding officers of the House of Representatives and the Senate, be forwarded to the chairman of the committee of the Grand Army of the Republic on the Grant Memorial"—

Mr. GROSVENOR said:

Mr. SPEAKER: Time as it rolls along fills up and makes permanent reputations; breaks down and destroys reputations. In no walk of life, I presume, does time effect greater changes than in the career and history of the soldier.

I shall speak but a very few minutes, and, of course, shall not go over the historical data pertaining to the history and career of this magnificent American. But I want to speak along a line of thought incident, first, to the period of the activity of Grant, and then to the period in which we are now living, and see how much of the present we owe to what he did in the past.

He was born in an humble cabin, in an humble district of Ohio, in the Congressional district now represented by my friend from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and was sent by the kindness of a member of Congress to the Military Academy. He did not go there under a competitive examination. He went there at the suggestion and upon the selection of a member of Congress—a politician. There has not been a man who has arrived at greatness in either the Army or the Navy of the United States who did not get his start in just that way. He did not develop greatness, as I have read the record, either at the Military Academy or during his service as a soldier prior to the war of the rebellion, and he made a very slow start in the beginning of the war. Going out as colonel of an Illinois regiment, he very shortly became a brigadier-general.

But the stars of that period of the civil war were not very hard to obtain, provided always the applicant or the recipient was capable of drilling a regiment or even a company. So little was known of military tactics among the volunteer troops of the North that he who could come possessed of ability enough to set a regiment in its proper position in the field was almost sure of early promotion; and it was that sort of promotion that Grant got. His earliest and warmest champions would not say that, beyond his practical knowledge which he had learned in the Army and at West Point, he had shown any qualities that would have singled him out from any of the other colonels of the splendid body of men who commanded the Illinois troops in the volunteer service.

He had the good fortune to be pointed at early by the envy and jealousy of others. He had the good fortune to be condemned bitterly at the very outset of his great career. The criticisms that were heaped upon him in his campaign along the Tennessee and Cumberland rivers were significant of the jealousies and heart-burnings and ambitions of that period of time. But out of it there came the first indications of his greatness of character as a soldier.

I do not know that I should at this time undertake to describe with accuracy what it was in particular that indicated itself then unless it was his determination to keep out of quarrels and controversies and to go steadily and straightforwardly upon the persistent pathway that he had selected in those campaigns. It is perfectly fair in making history to say that he was surrounded and environed by hostile criticism from the Headquarters of the Army that turned out to be not only unjust at the time and for the conditions then existing, but which became contemptible and insignificant in the light of that which followed.

The campaign up those rivers was a campaign of wonderful import. Those who remember the effect that the campaign of Grant at Fort Henry and Fort Donelson had upon the great army of the Confederacy that had wintered at Bowling Green and Nashville and through that interior section of the South will remember very well the effect that Shiloh had upon the entire movement of that great army.

His ideas of strategy, that were scarcely put in writing, but were worked out with the same tenacity of purpose that was afterwards exhibited in the Wilderness, were manifest at that time and have stood the fire of criticism ever since.

I shall not follow him through his career. I speak only of his growth and development at the beginning. I shall not discuss his strategy at Chattanooga, when he came to take command of the armies of the West after the undecisive battle of Chickamauga. He found the United States troops at Chattanooga practically cut off from supplies—almost in a condition of starvation. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that he found more suffering in the Union Army at Chattanooga for want of medical, hospital, quartermaster, and commissary stores than all the 250,000 men who served in the Spanish war had to endure from the firing of the first gun down to the surrender of Spain and the treaty of Paris. [Applause.]

He found more men sick and dying than were sick and dying in the whole Army of the United States that conquered Spain. He took hold of that army. This is not the time to discuss the men who were his assistants. Grant never had an assistant in the popular acceptation of that term. The plans of that army were his plans. The troops west of the mountains and southwest were moved and brought together and concentrated upon his own plan and by his own orders. He had just achieved disenthralment from the War Department. He had just gotten rid of the baneful influence of some of the inheritances that the old army had cast upon the new army.

I do not desire, as I said, to follow the details of this campaign. I wish to point out this fact: Thirty-five years have passed over our heads since Grant achieved the culmination of his great fame as a soldier. During that time there have been wars in the world. During that time there have been great changes in military tactics, in military organization, in military supplies and munitions, and all that appertains to the military arm of governments; but I venture to say that among those who have come and gone, among those who have led armies in Egypt, in Germany, in France, and in Africa there has been no man who has any pretense of competition with Grant as a soldier to-day. The men who led those armies may have inherited greater armies, better armament, and better material. They may have fallen commanders to greater armies. They may have had greater accumulations of munitions of war. They may have had many an auxiliary of success better than Grant had. But there is not one of them who stands to-day upon the record of war, or who will stand upon the record of the historian of the future, with anything like the character of Grant as a great soldier.

He has been criticised somewhat by one of the great generals of Europe, great in the amount of pay that he draws, great in the high rank that he holds, great in the splendid decorations that he has; but I ask my countrymen here to-day, when we are considering something of Grant in the light of thirty-five years, whether we may not with a pride that is enjoyable contrast the career of Grant, all his mistakes, if he ever made any; study his tactics,

study all that he ever did as a soldier—and he was the great soldier and center of our operations—compare them, with the most critical eye, with the best thing that has been done by the British army in its great campaign against the Boers, and tell me whether Grant does not shine like a meteor.

General Grant never sent an unequipped and unprepared army into a strange country, strange in its topography, strange in its water courses, strange in all that relates to the physical conditions of the country, and divided his army up into three columns and sent them off into different directions to unsupporting distances and allowed them to be whipped in detail. It is an easy thing to overpower an enemy when you have five to one and are fighting with every advantage in your favor, and strategy counts but little where brute force is in such discrepancy.

I think the strategy of Grant that centered in the Wilderness and in front of Richmond the magnificent organization of the Army of the Potomac, will live as an exemplar of military strategy and perfection long after Wolseley, his critic, long after Wolseley, the man who had depreciated him, long after Wolseley, the hero of Tel el Keber, in Egypt, and the planner of the strategy of South Africa, will have been relegated to his proper position among the great generals of the world. [Applause.]

So much for Grant as a soldier. He was a great soldier. He was great in detail and great in aggregation. He was great in his knowledge of the position of a soldier and great in his knowledge of the position of armies.

Grant had the advantage of the Southern Confederacy in point of numbers and in point of the ability of his Government to furnish him munitions of war. The time is coming when we will more frankly discuss this question than has been proper in the days that have gone by. The time is coming when we shall feel less inclined to take offense or to fear friction and criticism when we discuss more frankly the real relative positions of the two great armies that confronted each other. Briefly, the Northern army had more men, more money, a seacoast, a better navy. Other suggestions might be made. So much for the Northern army. The Southern army had an advantage which, in my judgment, was as great or greater than all these aggregated.

The Southern army fought upon interior lines. They fought upon their chosen ground. They fought upon the ground of which they had full knowledge, and without that in their favor the disparity of numbers would have made it impossible that even the Americans of the South, the splendid soldiers of those armies, imbued by patriotism as they understood it, by false patriotism as we understood it, with all their glorious chivalry and devotion to their cause, could ever have maintained themselves for four bloody years as they did.

So much for the fighting part of it.

Grant was a good politician, a good statesman, and I am going to point out very briefly a point in his career that I think it is well for us to consider now. Grant was in favor of giving everybody a fair chance. There was a great deal of argument in his conduct about the horses. And is it not wonderful now that some members of this House who can go back and remember the bitterness with which we closed that war and came out of it have lived to vote to ratify Grant's generosity to the Southern soldier by passing in the House of Representatives a bill to pay some of those straggling soldiers for some of those straggling horses that Grant advised them to take home—the soldiers so straggling that I am afraid they are all dead, and the horses so straggling that we may never get an estimate of their value; and yet, lest we should not do our duty by the great commander's beneficent suggestion, we are willing to send our Departments out and hunt up the widows and children and next of kin and legal representatives of these men and pay them for horses when we do not know exactly what their original title was.

Grant proposed that the Southern people should start out without any load upon them. They were to start even; they were to start undisfranchised. They were to vote, they were to become members of a great body politic, and they were to work out their salvation not as enemies of this country but as friends. And no man did more to lay the foundation upon which equal rights have been extended to the South than did that grim soldier, Grant.

Now, the thought that comes to me is this: In a free government all must participate. In a government where all are taxed, all are compelled to obey the law, everybody must stand upon an equality of political rights or there will be destruction and overthrow of the body politic. The activity of enemies is far more potential to injure a republic than the activity of friends to uphold and support it. So it is inconsistent with the very idea of a free government that there shall be within that government a body of men who by reason of some distinction shall be in an inferior political relation to the government than the other class of the people.

You can have all friends of a government and it will live; but you can not maintain a free government half friends and half enemies. And so if General Grant were alive to-day and could speak from his magnificent resting place in New York, in my judgment—and I say it in all kindness and only as a suggestion, reviewing in the mind's eye only the things which he did and said to the people of the South, and the potentiality of his plans in that direction—he would say to the people of the South, "Be careful how you enter upon a condition to be made by you that shall place in the census returns of the eleven Southern States a registered body of disfranchised and forever organized enemy."

It is hard to work out the other plan, and there are many drawbacks to it, and the people of this country ought to be exceedingly patient while the great problem is being solved; but the other plan that makes an organized body of aliens is a worse plan, and will unsettle, ultimately, the very foundation upon which free government stands.

Mr. Speaker, I will not extend my remarks further. I had a little personal knowledge of General Grant by mere contact. I met him first in the Sequatchie Valley as he came to take command of the army down there. He demonstrated to us one of his wonderful characteristics—his judgment of men—when he took away from the army under Thomas and Rosecrans some of our very best generals, who afterwards became magnificent soldiers in the Army of the Potomac. I met him afterwards several times in the reunions of the soldiers, and met him finally when he was President of the United States.

We look upon General Grant not only as the greatest soldier that this country has ever produced, but a soldier far greater than has been produced elsewhere in all the world, judged by a critical study of what he accomplished, the manner of its accomplishment, and all the surrounding incidents of his great career.

Grant was produced in this country. He was an American through and through, a man of great proportions. He has been dead fifteen years, and during the whole of that period of time no successful rival of Grant has appeared anywhere upon the stage of the world's activity; and to-day we do ourselves honor when we come here, speaking in our representative capacity, speaking for the comrades of the dead chieftain, speaking for the loved ones who followed his career while their loved ones were exposed to war and evil—and we come in all these capacities to testify our love for Grant, our pride in memory of him, our affection and love for that which he accomplished, and to renew upon this same shrine our fidelity and fealty to the country which he saved from ruin, and come to point the eyes of all the world to this truest and best type of an American citizen. [Loud applause.]

Appropriations.

SPEECH
OF
HON. LEONIDAS F. LIVINGSTON,
OF GEORGIA,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, June 2, 1900,

On appropriations, fiscal years 1897, 1898, 1899, 1900, and 1901, made by the Fifty-fourth and Fifty-fifth Congresses and at the first session of the Fifty-sixth Congress.

Mr. LIVINGSTON said:

Mr. SPEAKER: In submitting a statement of the appropriations made at this session of the Fifty-sixth Congress, I beg to call to the attention of the House and the country the fact that, notwithstanding the enormous appropriations for 1900 on account of the Spanish-Cuban war, the Army and Navy appropriations for this session are $50,770,888.58 in excess of those of the last session.

The statement I submit shows also that in every Department of the Government, beginning with the agricultural and ending with the permanent appropriations, we have increased at this session the amounts authorized at the last session. And when to the aggregate we add the amounts that should have been appropriated at this session, but which have been deferred, for no good reason, or at least for reasons that need explanation on the part of those in control—amounts which must be appropriated at the second session of this Congress, such as that necessary to complete the Nicaragua Canal (the bill having passed the House, carrying authorization of an expenditure of $141,000,000); and also that usually appropriated for rivers and harbors, $16,000,000; and for public buildings and grounds, $3,000,000; and for outstanding claims, estimated at $10,000,000—if, I say, we add $170,000,000 to the sum stated in the table, $709,729,476.89, we would have a grand total of $879,729,476.89 for this session alone. And thus the total shown in the exhibit is not quite complete or fair, considering that such large amounts that must be met are withheld for the next session.

I submit that, to be fair, we should let each fiscal year take care of all necessary appropriations and not unload this year on the

fiscal year 1902 things that should be provided for and included in the fiscal year 1901.

And I call attention also to the constant and gradual increase in the appropriations for pensions, and likewise to the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriations. These items could not have been affected to any great extent by the Spanish-Cuban war. It shows indeed an increase, as before stated, all along the line, despite the fact that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds have held back all matters before them, and the Committee on Rivers and Harbors all matters before them, with two or three exceptions, and all accounts and claims have been practically barred from consideration at this session.

The exhibit, when carefully studied, will show the exact situation. Here it is:

Appropriations, fiscal years 1897, 1898, 1899, 1900, and 1901, made by the Fifty-fourth and Fifty-fifth Congresses and at the first session of the Fifty-sixth Congress.

Title.	Fifty-sixth Congress, first session, fiscal year 1901.	Fifty-fifth Congress.		Fifty-fourth Congress.	
		Fiscal year 1900.	Fiscal year 1899.	Fiscal year 1898.	Fiscal year 1897.
Agriculture	$4,023,509.00	$3,726,022.00	$3,509,202.00	$3,182,902.00	$3,255,532.00
Army	114,220,095.55	80,430,204.06	23,193,302.00	23,129,344.30	23,278,402.73
Diplomatic and consular	1,771,168.70	1,714,583.76	1,732,208.76	1,695,208.76	1,642,558.76
District of Columbia	7,576,869.31	6,834,535.77	6,426,880.07	6,186,991.06	5,900,319.48
Fortification	7,385,628.00	4,909,902.00	9,377,494.00	9,517,141.00	7,377,888.00
Indian	8,198,069.24	7,504,775.81	7,673,854.90	7,674,120.89	7,390,496.79
Legislative, executive, and judicial	24,176,532.53	23,410,840.79	21,635,846.65	21,690,766.90	21,519,324.71
Military Academy	653,589.67	575,774.47	458,689.23	479,572.83	449,525.61
Navy	65,080,916.67	48,099,909.58	56,098,783.68	33,006,234.19	30,562,660.95
Pension	145,245,236.00	145,233,830.00	141,233,830.00	141,263,880.00	141,328,580.00
Post-Office	113,648,230.75	105,634,138.75	90,222,300.75	95,665,338.75	92,571,564.22
River and harbor	561,000.00	16,091,841.94			12,659,550.00
Sundry civil	65,298,885.95	48,385,930.86	48,490,212.26	53,611,783.38	35,096,710.19
Deficiencies	15,679,512.46	25,005,912.26	349,772,389.96	10,557,417.34	15,341,911.07
Total regular appropriations	573,517,256.89	517,558,212.05	766,835,084.26	407,657,801.40	306,375,024.51
Miscellaneous	3,500,000.00	28,744,590.24	6,560,311.29	999,057.90	416,010.06
Permanent annual appropriations	132,712,220.00	128,678,220.00	117,836,220.00	120,078,220.00	119,054,160.00
Grand total	709,729,476.89	674,981,022.29	893,231,615.55	528,735,079.30	515,845,194.57

It should be borne in mind that in the case of the above-noted appropriations for the Navy the authorization of the 8 new war ships—2 battle ships, 3 armored cruisers, and 3 protected cruisers—involves an ultimate expenditure for construction, armor, and armament of something like $56,000,000, not one dollar of which is now appropriated for and does not figure in the Navy item, but must be met in future years.

The dominant party attempted to commit this Congress at this session, and will doubtless renew their efforts at the coming session, to commit the Government to what is known as the ship-subsidy scheme, which involves the sum of $120,000,000, to be expended throughout a term of years.

The Porto Rico Tariff.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN F. FITZGERALD,

OF MASSACHUSETTS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, February 28, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 8245) to regulate the trade of Porto Rico, and for other purposes—

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: While I do not wish to answer for my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL] the statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAFF] that those Republicans who are opposing this measure will meet with the just wrath of their constituents next fall, I think I can safely say that in the position that my colleague has taken upon this matter he is in harmony with the sentiment of the majority of the people of the State of Massachusetts on this important question. The history of that State is more closely interwoven with the early history of this country than almost any State in this Union. The blood of her sons, shed upon the fields of Concord, Lexington, and Bunker Hill, emphasizes the devotion of that people to the principles that underlie this Government to-day, and these same principles lie at the root of the question we are discussing to-day. [Applause.]

"Taxation without representation" of the thirteen colonies received it death blow when the tea was thrown into Boston Harbor. And the people of that grand old Commonwealth have not forgotten those early struggles and what they meant. Massachusetts will never refuse to strengthen the arm of any of her sons who prefer principle to party and who are unwilling to see the flag of the country stand for oppression and injustice in place of freedom and humanity. [Applause.]

The gentleman from New York a few moments ago submitted an amendment calling for a reduction of the duties from 25 to 15 per cent. If it is a crime to tax those people for a large amount, the reduction of the tax is a mere descent from grand to petty larceny. In other words, these people are to become American citizens, 15 per cent removed. No man who has argued this question denies the fact that we have the power to admit the products of Porto Rico free. The greatest lawyers in this body seem to have an honest difference of opinion as to whether the Constitution requires the admission free of the products of Porto Rico. It certainly does not prohibit this being done.

In support of the former theory, I wish to submit to the House utterances on this question set forth by the greatest minds of this country.

In the first place, it has been decided by the Supreme Court of the United States, through Chief Justice Marshall, in Loughborough *vs.* Blake (5 Wheat., 317), that the term "United States" in the Constitution includes the Territories of the Union as well as the States. The court said:

The power, then, to lay and collect duties, imposts, and excises may be exercised and must be exercised throughout the United States. Does this term designate the whole or any particular portion of the American empire? Certainly this question can admit of but one answer. It is the name given to our great Republic, which is composed of States and Territories. The District of Columbia or the territory west of the Missouri is not less within the United States than Maryland or Pennsylvania, and it is not less necessary, on the principles of our Constitution, that uniformity in the imposition of imposts, duties, and excises should be observed in the one than the other. Since, then, the power to lay and collect taxes, which includes direct taxes, is obviously coextensive with the power to lay and collect duties, imposts, and excises, and since the latter extends throughout the United States, it follows that the power to impose direct taxes also extends throughout the United States.

Chief Justice Marshall, in Martin *vs.* Hunter's Lessee (1 Wheat., 304–326), said:

The Government of the United States can claim no powers which are not granted to it by the Constitution, and the powers actually granted must be such as are expressly given or given by necessary implication.

And the same great jurist, in Givens *vs.* Ogden (9 Wheat., 1), in speaking of the Constitution, also said:

This instrument contains an enumeration of the powers expressly granted by the people to the Government.

Chancellor Kent, in his Commentaries, declares:

Such a state of absolute sovereignty on the one hand and of absolute dependence on the other is not congenial with the free and independent spirit of our institutions; and the establishment of distant territorial governments ruled according to our will and pleasure would have a very natural tendency, as all pro-consular governments have, to abuse and oppression.

Mr. Webster, in a passage that has been well quoted by my distinguished colleague [Mr. MCCALL], declares that—

An arbitrary government may have territorial governments in distant possessions, because an arbitrary government may rule its distant territories by different laws and different systems. Russia may govern the Ukraine and the Caucasus and Kamchatka by different codes or ukases. We can do no such thing. They must be of us, part of us, or else estranged. I think I see, then, in progress what is to disfigure and deform the Constitution. * * * I think I see a course adopted that is likely to turn the Constitution under which we live into a deformed monster, into a curse rather than a blessing, into a great frame of unequal government, not founded on popular representation, but founded in the grossest inequalities; and I think if it go on—for there is a great danger that it will go on—that this Government will be broken up.

Webster declared the same doctrine in his "Reply to Hayne," made January 26, 1830. He said:

The National Government possesses those powers which it can be shown the people conferred upon it and no more. The people erected this Government. They gave it a Constitution, and in that Constitution they have enumerated the powers which they bestow on it. They have made it a limited

Government. They have defined its authority. They have restrained it to the exercise of such powers as are granted.

It is a Government of strictly limited powers; of enumerated, specified, and particularized powers; and whatever is not granted is withheld.

In a letter to the Barings, dated October 16, 1839, this great statesman wrote:

This General Government is a limited Government. Its powers are specified and enumerated. The State legislatures, on the other hand, possess all usual and extraordinary powers of government, subject to any limitations which may be imposed by their own constitutions, and with the exception of the operation on these powers of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. Webster, in his "Reply to Calhoun," made February 16, 1833, said:

The sovereignty of government is an idea belonging to the other side of the Atlantic. No such thing is known in North America. Our governments are all limited. In Europe sovereignty is of feudal origin, and imports no more than the state of the sovereign. It comprises his rights, duties, exemptions, prerogatives, and powers. But with us all power is with the people. They alone are sovereign; and they erect what governments they please and confer on them such powers as they please. None of these powers is sovereign in the European sense of the word, all being restrained by written constitutions.

Alexander Hamilton said, in response to the objection of Mr. Randolph, Attorney-General, that the power to incorporate a bank could not be implied from the "nature of the Federal Constitution:"

This proposition is not precisely or even substantially that which has been relied upon. The proposition relied upon is that the specified powers of Congress are in their nature sovereign; that it is incident to sovereign power to erect corporations; and that therefore Congress have a right, within the sphere and in relation to the objects of their power, to erect corporations. It shall, however, be supposed that the Attorney-General would consider the two propositions in the same light, and that the objection made to the one would be made to the other. To this objection an answer has already been given. It is this: That the doctrine is stated with this express qualification, that the right to erect corporations does only extend to cases and objects within the sphere of the specified powers of the Government. * * * A particular legislative power implies authority to erect corporations in relation to cases arising under that power only.

Chief Justice Taney, in the famous Dred Scott decision, said:

The power of Congress over the person and property of a citizen can never be a mere discretionary power under our Constitution and form of government. The power of the Government and the rights and privileges of the citizen are regulated and plainly defined by the Constitution itself. And when territory becomes a part of the United States the Federal Government enters into possession in the character impressed upon it by those who created it. It enters upon it with its powers over the citizen strictly defined and limited by the Constitution, from which it derives its own existence, and by virtue of which alone it continues to exist and act as a government and sovereignty. It has no power of any kind beyond it, and it can not when it enters a Territory of the United States put off its character and assume discretionary or despotic powers which the Constitution has denied to it. It can not create for itself a new character separated from the citizens of the United States and the duties it owes them under the provisions of the Constitution. The territory being part of the United States, the Government and the citizen both enter it under the authority of the Constitution, with their respective rights defined and marked out, and the Federal Government can exercise no power beyond what that instrument confers, nor lawfully deny any right which it has reserved. * * *

The powers over person and property of which we speak are not only not granted to Congress but are in express terms denied, and they are forbidden to exercise them. And this prohibition is not confined to the States, but the words are general, and extends to the whole territory over which the Constitution gives it power to legislate, including those portions of it remaining under Territorial government as well as that covered by the States.

In Cooley on Constitutional Law it is said:

The Government created by the Constitution is one with limited and enumerated powers, and the Constitution is the measure and the test of the powers conferred. * * *

It is manifest that there must be a difference in the presumption that attends an exercise of national and one of State powers. The difference is this: To ascertain whether any power assumed by the Government of the United States is rightfully assumed the Constitution is to be examined in order to see whether expressly or by fair implication the power has been granted, and if the grant does not appear the assumption must be held unwarranted. To ascertain whether a State rightfully exercises a power, we have only to see by the Constitution of the United States it is conceded to the Union, or by that Constitution or by that of the State prohibited to be exercised at all. (Pages 29-31.)

I give the above opinions for what they are worth, but I suggest to my Republican brethren, who are intent on passing this bill, in the light of the decision that I have just quoted, as the part of wisdom on their part, to avoid any legal problem in connection with our government of this province by adhering to the original recommendation of the President.

Let us consider for a moment the condition of this island. I quote the report of Brigadier-General Davis, whose language must appeal with telling effect to the justice and humanity of the American people:

The coffee lands suffered worst. These trees are planted on the hill and mountain slopes, and in many places the declivities are very abrupt. The gale tore up the trees, loosened the soil, and the deluge of water converted the earth into a semifluid.

Then followed landslides, and thousands of acres of coffee plantations slid down into the valleys; trees, soil, rocks, and every vestige of culture are piled up in the bottom of the valleys. In such cases there is no restoration possible, for where there were smiling groves are now only bald rocks which were uncovered by the avalanches.

It will take five years to reestablish these coffee vegas, and there will be necessarily years of want and industrial paralysis.

The sugar industry has suffered much less than the others. Some cane has been uprooted and some has been buried, and many mills have been damaged or destroyed. The margin of profit at present prices to the sugar grower is small, but there is a margin of probably a half cent per pound to the manufacturer who has modern machinery; but the old "Jamaica train" mills, which are badly damaged, will probably never be reconstructed, and the growing cane for next year can not be ground on such estates unless their owners can negotiate large loans. Many will be unable to do this, so the prediction seems justified that much growing cane will next year be left to rot in the fields.

The municipal governments are many of them prostrate; the police can not be paid, the prisoners can not be fed, and the schools must be closed if not wholly supported from the insular treasury.

From every town and village I am appealed to for financial help, donations; loans are asked, implored even, and the alternative of chaos is predicted as the result of refusal. Proprietors beg for financial help and the homeless for rehabilitation of their dwellings. * * *

I can think of but two measures of relief. Neither alone will fully realize that result, and with a combination of the two the recovery will not be immediate. Unless something is done by the invocation of powers beyond my control, I fear that the conditions prevailing will go from what is now extremely bad to a still worse condition, even to the assumption in certain localities of military government, pure and simple, with hordes of people dependent for their existence on the bounty of the Government of the United States and its people.

I have abstained from any expression of opinion upon this matter until I could have time to investigate the real state of affairs in which the island was left by the calamity, the like of which the people of the United States fortunately have and can have no conception.

It is with hesitancy that I propose measures of relief that have been hitherto unknown, but our country has by assumption of sovereignty over foreign lands and people incurred responsibilities which can not be evaded. By the treaty of Paris nearly 1,000,000 inhabitants of Porto Rico have been *brought under the laws of the Union.* They are unused to American laws and customs, and have had in the past no power of initiation. They were taught and forced to rely upon the Government in any and every important undertaking or proposition. They have been thoroughly taught to obey, but know little of self-reliance. Is it surprising that the obliteration of one-third of the wealth of the island, other than the soil itself, has been followed with industrial paralysis? So I have to hear the appeals—most piteous appeals—for help from almost every hamlet. They see no way to turn but to the way they have always turned—i. e., to the Government, and as its representative here I must hear and dispose of those appeals.

Many millions of money, as loans, have been asked by municipalities and individuals. *I can only give food for the hungry. Should the supply fail, there would be a famine such as in the past has swept over and depopulated large districts in India and China.*

What is our duty under these circumstances? Let me here quote the proclamation of Gen. Nelson A. Miles when he took possession of this island:

HEADQUARTERS OF THE ARMY,
Ponce, Porto Rico, July 28, 1898.

To the Inhabitants of Porto Rico:

In the prosecution of the war against the Kingdom of Spain by the people of the United States in the cause of liberty, justice, and humanity, its military forces have come to occupy the island of Porto Rico.

They come bearing the banner of freedom, inspired by a noble purpose to seek the enemies of our country and yours and to destroy or capture all who are in armed resistance. They bring you the fostering arm of a nation of free people, whose greatest power is in its justice and humanity to all those living within its fold. Hence the first effect of this occupation will be the immediate release from your former political relations and, it is hoped, a cheerful acceptance of the government of the United States. The chief object of the American military forces will be to overthrow the armed authority of Spain and to give to the people of your beautiful island the largest measure of liberty consistent with this military occupation.

We have not come to make war upon the people of a country that for centuries have been oppressed, but, on the contrary, to bring you protection, not only to yourselves, but, to your property, to promote your prosperity, and bestow upon you the immunities and blessings of the liberal institutions of our Government. It is not our purpose to interfere with any existing laws and customs that are wholesome and beneficial to your people so long as they conform to the rules of military administration of order and justice. This is not a war of devastation, but one to give to all within the control of its military and naval forces the advantages and blessings of enlightened civilization.

NELSON A. MILES,
Major-General Commanding United States Army.

The President of the United States, in his message to the Congress, in giving information as to the state of the Union, spoke these remarkable words:

It had been denied the principal markets she had long enjoyed, and our tariffs have been continued against her products as when she was under Spanish sovereignty; that the markets of Spain are closed to her products except upon terms to which the commerce of all nations is subjected. The island of Cuba, which used to buy her cattle and tobacco without customs duties, now imposes the same duties upon these products as from any other country entering her ports. She has therefore lost her free intercourse with Spain and Cuba, without any compensating benefits in this market. The markets of the United States should be opened up to her products. Our plain duty is to abolish all customs tariffs between the United States and Porto Rico and give her products free access to our markets.

The Secretary of War, in his annual report, says:

The highest considerations of justice and good faith demand that we should not disappoint the confident expectation of sharing in our prosperity with which the people of Porto Rico so gladly transferred their allegiance to the United States, and that we should treat the interest of this people as our own; and I wish most strongly to urge that the customs duties between Porto Rico and the United States be removed.

What has occurred since December to bring about the changed condition of affairs and to disclose to the country a situation unique in the history of Congress, a Republican President deserted by his own party and sustained by practically the entire Democratic minority of this House.

The sugar trust and the tobacco trust have come to the front and have indicated to the Republican campaign manager that not a dollar in contribution need be expected from these interests this coming fall if sugar and tobacco are admitted free. It would be amusing, if it were possible under such distressing circumstance,

to listen to the Republican leaders of this House tell of the philanthropic way in which the Government is going to alleviate the poverty and wretchedness of the Porto Ricans by levying taxes on their own products which, if even feasible, must take months before it amounts to a sum that will anywhere near meet the necessities of the case. [Applause.]

Is it not a humiliating confession for the American people to make that after two years of American control the people of the island are in a worse condition than when under the domination of Spain? Do we not know that since this province became part of the United States a hurricane has swept over it, destroying the coffee crop in storehouse and in field, as well as ruining the fields for coffee cultivation for some time to come? If we are to blame for the utter glutting of the warehouses of Porto Rico with thousands of tons of tobacco and sugar, by reason of the taking away of the Cuban and Spanish markets from this people because of the tariff barriers raised by those countries against Porto Rican products after its acquirement by this country, and the coffee crop absolutely destroyed by the hurricane, why are we not bound to grant immediate relief to the people by appropriating money from the Treasury?

I noticed in the report received from the Treasury Department this morning, notwithstanding our enormous war expenses, there is a surplus of nearly $40,000,000 in the eight months of this fiscal year. The Secretary is now engaged, and has been for months, in loaning our money without interest to national banks (which receive exorbitant rates in most instances) for the sake of keeping the money in circulation. Why not appropriate $1,000,000 at once to relieve the immediate wants of those people? Let them understand that this great nation of ours, which has stood before the world for the past century as the exemplar of humanity and liberty, will not allow a territory captured by her own soldiers, and over which the American flag flies, to suffer from starvation and want. [Applause.]

I read an order in last evening's paper from Secretary Root calling for the creation of another regiment of Porto Rican soldiers. In that order he said that the first battalion of native Porto Rican soldiers was such a success that others must follow, and further on in this order the United States cavalry which was on duty there was ordered home. What nation do these soldiers belong to? What flag are they sworn to protect? What constitutional rights do they possess? Can the right of trial by jury be denied them? Can they be denied the right to practice religious worship in any manner they please? Are they to be denied the right to assemble peaceably and petition the Government for a redress of grievances?

Can they be deprived of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness without due process of law? Just consider, Mr. Chairman, the inconsistencies of a government which calls on men to defend the flag, yet denies them the protection of the Constitution. What reason will the Republicans of this House give to the people of the country next year for their change of front on this question? Why are the men who have heretofore been so active in defense of liberty now so prone to slavery? It is in obedience to the call of the protected interests of the country, the trusts and monopolies which have thrived and fattened under the Administration and which hold the Republican party by the throat.

No government can exist upon a policy directly at variance with its time-honored principles. Success may follow for a while; but time betrays its weakness, and it falls to ruin. When one considers the care with which our great charter of liberties was framed, and the safeguards with which it was surrounded to protect human rights, does it seem possible that its framers intended that at any time or in any way Congress, by its mere dictum, could confer the power of life or death, vassalage or servitude, on the inhabitants of territory of the United States?

I am surprised at the use of the words "import" and "export" in this bill. Import and export imply dealings with a foreign country, and yet everybody knows that the American flag is the emblem to which the Porto Ricans have sworn allegiance.

If a foreign foe attacks Porto Rico to-morrow, what forces would be called upon to defend it?

Somebody has made the statement that it is necessary to tax Porto Rican sugar to protect the farmer who raises beet sugar. If this is so, why did we admit Hawaii on equal terms, with its population of Chinese, Japanese, and savages, with but 8,000 Caucasians and producing 240,000 tons of sugar, and refuse to admit Porto Rico, which is right at our shores and contains more than 800,000 Caucasians and produces but 60,000 tons of sugar?

In dealing with this island we should not forget Lincoln's words that—

> Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty.

In doubtful constitutional questions I think it is the part of wisdom to battle for rather than against human rights. [Loud applause.]

I am a firm believer in the policy of expansion, but am unalterably opposed to imperialism. I think it is well that the present legislation has been proposed at this time, as it will clear the atmosphere in regard to the respective attitudes of the two parties in the next campaign. I believe the time will come when the United States will include what is now known as North America. I think it will be done under the protection of the American flag as well as the benign influence of the American Constitution.

I rejoice that it was under Democratic Administration that practically the entire country west of the Mississippi was added to the territory of the United States; and I am proud of the fact that during any of these accessions no attempt was made to saddle any of the new Territories with taxation that was not uniform throughout the country. I have been in favor of sustaining the Government in the present struggle in the Philippines, and I rejoice that the Democratic party has voted every dollar asked for by the Government in the present conflict.

The Philippine Islands should never be annexed as part and parcel of our Government; but they should be retained by this Government until law and order are restored and our obligations to every interest satisfied. Then, when this is done, it is the bounden duty of the United States to help the people of that island to organize a republic which will be free and untrammeled and a living example of the beneficence of this great country. Our trade will then expand by friendship and gratitude, and not by tyranny and subjection. [Loud applause.]

I will close my remarks upon this question with a few quotations from history which bear with remarkable precision upon the present situation of our Government.

The first is from the pen of Mr. Froude, England's valiant champion in her atrocities on the Irish people. I am reminded by this reference of Ireland's sad picture, brought about by unjust taxation and oppression in the same form that we are about to saddle on Porto Rico. Do our Republican friends wish another Ireland saddled to our door? Have they not seen sufficiently the prostitution of the liberties and rights of the Irish people by the English Government to be unwilling to allow this country to occupy the same rôle with Porto Rico? Mr. Froude used these words:

> To the student of political history, and to the English student above all others, the conversion of the Roman republic into a military empire commands a peculiar interest. Notwithstanding many differences, the English and the Romans essentially resemble one another. The early Romans possessed the faculty of self-government beyond any people of whom we have historical knowledge with the one exception of ourselves. In virtue of their temporal freedom, they became the most powerful nation in the known world; and their liberties perished only when Rome became the mistress of conquered races, to whom she was unable or unwilling to extend her privileges. If England was similarly supreme, if all rival powers were eclipsed by her or laid under her feet, the imperial tendencies, which are as strongly marked in us as our love of liberty, might lead us over the same course to the same end. If there be one lesson which history clearly teaches it is this, that free nations can not govern subject provinces. If they are unable or unwilling to admit their dependencies to share their own constitution, the constitution itself will fall in pieces from mere incompetence for its duties.

Gibbon, in his Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, uses this significant language:

> The tender respect of Augustus for a free constitution which he had destroyed can only be explained by an attentive consideration of the character of that subtle tyrant.
>
> When he framed the artful system of imperial authority, his moderation was inspired by his fears. He wished to deceive the people by an image of civil liberty, and the armies by an image of civil government. The names and forms of the ancient administration were preserved by him with anxious care. The usual number of consuls, prætors, and tribunes were annually invested with their respective signs of office and continued to discharge some of their least important functions. Cæsar—

Continues Gibbon—

> had provoked his fate by ostentatiously taking the title of king, while he might have reigned as such under the title of consul or tribune. Augustus was sensible that mankind is governed by names; nor was he deceived in his expectation that the senate and people would submit to slavery, provided that they were respectfully assured that they enjoyed their ancient freedom. To explain, in a few words, the system of the imperial government, as it was instituted by Augustus and maintained by those princes who understood their own interest and that of the people, it may be defined as an absolute monarchy disguised by the forms of a commonwealth. The masters of the Roman world environed their throne with darkness, and humbly professed themselves the accountable ministers of the senate, whose supreme decrees they dictated and obeyed. The face of the court corresponded with the forms.

Have we not a fitting parallel in this country to-day? Do not our friends on the other side declaim against imperialism and yet do their actions not belie their words? When we govern the people of our territories as vassals, we cease to be a republic and join in the inevitable march of empire. [Loud applause.]

In the government of Porto Rico we are bound by those principles of justice and equity which are the heritage of this nation.

We have existed as a Government for more than one hundred years. During all this period of time wherever our flag has floated there has reigned with it humanity, progress, and equal rights.

No man has ever ventured at any period of our history to suggest that we should legislate against the products of one State in favor of those of another.

Why take this action against poor down-trodden Porto Rico, with all the trials and tribulations that now surround her?

Action of this kind is indefensible, both in morals and politics, and will never be indorsed by the American people.

If we can not govern Porto Rico so as to give better results than Spain, then we should leave her alone. The personality, so to speak, of the whole nation ought to prevail in this matter, and if it does this island will be governed in furtherance of its own interests and not with any view to its exploitation in the interest of this country.

The extension of this kind of government is in the line of the expansion policy which has characterized the Democratic party's history since the foundation of the Government.

The conquering of foreign territory and its subsequent exploitation for the benefit of this Government, regardless of the interests and rights of the subject province, is the policy of empire which the Republican party now seeks to fasten upon the people of this country. The issue will be fought this coming November. Who can doubt the result? Who dares to say that the American people will ever declare that the Stars and Stripes can float over a subject province and dependent people? [Loud and long continued applause.]

Government by Injunction or Martial Law—Which? We Have Tried Both. Let Us Have No More of Either.

Government by injunction dwindles into a mere misdemeanor when compared with the bull pen and mediæval despotism of martial law in Idaho.

The slaves are no longer below us, but they are among us. We have abolished slavery without having solved the question of labor. In law there are no more slaves—in fact, there are many.

The industrial slaves of 1900 are more in need of William Lloyd Garrison, Wendell Phillips, Lovejoy, John Brown, Whittier, Lowell, and Lincoln than were the negro slaves of our own country or the vassals and serfs of Europe in the mediæval ages.

Agitation and education by organized labor is the best process and the only hope of maintaining free speech, free press, free schools, and a free ballot.

Unorganized labor is the timid, crouching, servile instrument of capital, yielding its head and extending its neck to the yoke of the master. Unorganized labor stands before the American people as a pitiable example of that old saying that "Necessity knows no law." They have become so hungry and so naked that to satisfy their immediate physical wants they are perfectly willing to sacrifice every mental and moral want, not only of themselves, but of their posterity, even to the fourth generation and all the other generations. Unorganized labor promises to the people of the United States nothing except in the final analysis a condition of labor not unlike that in China and India.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN J. LENTZ,

OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, May 28, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (S. 3419) making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes—

Mr. LENTZ said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I certainly fail to understand the application of the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LINNEY] to the question under discussion. I think he, as well as the rest of us, understands that these two proposed amendments are here largely to prevent the repetition of the injustice done in the Debs case, in Chicago. That case, above all others, attracted the attention of the people to the subject of government by injunction or the possible arrogance and despotism of a Federal judge, who does not go back to his people for reelection or approval once in five or six years, but who goes upon the bench by social pull or political favor for life, and, having gotten that place, commits acts of despotism under the power to punish for contempt or what is now better known as government by injunction.

For instance, the court has stated to a man, "You shall not go to your fellow-workers in reference to seeking employment or working in this mine or for that railroad," and then, some one having accused his fellow-man of violating this order, he is brought into court upon one affidavit, as against a dozen affidavits on the other side, and yet the judge may take the testimony of the one against the testimony of a dozen and imprison a man for six weeks or six months; and why not six years or sixty years? It is only a question of time when the terms of imprisonment will be lengthened; and what is to prevent the judge from exercising that power in that arbitrary way?

Now, I contend that it is just the same as if the judge were to send out a decree that no man in this District shall be a horse thief, no man in this District shall be a housebreaker, no man in this District shall commit murder, and if afterwards the judge thinks that a man is guilty of such an offense the judge may send out and have him arrested on an affidavit or two; and because he has issued such an order the man accused can be imprisoned, at the discretion of the judge, without the time-honored right of a trial by jury.

Mr. LINNEY. Will the gentleman allow me a question there?

Mr. LENTZ. Certainly.

Mr. LINNEY. In all these cases of contempt, is there not a right of appeal, where the party charged with the alleged contempt can have his case reviewed?

Mr. LENTZ. The gentleman certainly knows there is no such thing as the right of appeal. The gentleman certainly knows that the court refused Debs that right, because they held that they had no power to review the discretion of the court imposing the punishment. They dismissed the appeal on the ground that the judge whose order was treated with contempt was the one to determine that matter.

Mr. LINNEY. And held that the court had properly disposed of it.

Mr. LENTZ. What I am opposed to is imprisonment at the discretion of the court in connection with contempts committed beyond the presence and possible knowledge of the judge. I am opposed to clothing a Federal judge, whom we send into Alaska or elsewhere, with power to punish as for contempt disobedience to his order, which may have taken place 10 miles or 100 miles away from the presence of the court. What I insist upon is that we shall not invest a court with the right to send a man to prison for months or years, depending on the resentment of the judge or the persecution of the party complaining; but that there shall be a jury of the man's peers called in, and that there shall be a finding on the evidence whether this man has committed a contempt or not; and, having committed a contempt, I would be in favor of going still further and allowing that jury to impose the penalty.

There are States in this Union where the jury is allowed to determine the penalty to be imposed for the crime committed. This government by injunction is aimed at labor organizations, and there is no reason why a disinterested jury should not fix the penalty just as in other cases.

Mr. LINNEY. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question there? The question is, as most of these contempt cases are of a summary character, if it were to be modified now as you are suggesting with reference to a jury, will not that deprive that branch of the law of its summary character altogether?

Mr. LENTZ. I want to deprive it of that summary character. That is precisely what I would do. I want to strike out entirely the discretion, and would rather have twelve good and disinterested men than a judge, who might be influenced by personal prejudice or resentment, have the power of sending a man to jail. I would rather have twelve such men as are found in a jury box than any judge sent out by the President of the United States, I do not care whether that President is Mr. Bryan or Mr. McKinley. It is not a question of who it is. I think it would be safer to leave it to the community than to a judge who was appointed for life, and who at best is but human, and it is human to err.

But why dwell on the tyranny of government by injunction, which dwindles into a mere misdemeanor when compared with the bull pen and mediæval despotism inaugurated by Governor Steunenberg and perpetuated by President McKinley, Commander in Chief, using the military forces in the Cœur d'Alene district of Idaho under the name of "martial law?" Let us talk no more of Armenian outrages or atrocities of the unspeakable Turk. Let us make our apologies to Russia, and let us beg the pardon of degenerate Spain for the harsh things we said about her treatment of the Cubans and the Filipinos.

It was De Tocqueville who inquired—

Can it be believed that democracy, which has overthrown the feudal system and vanquished kings, will retreat before tradesmen and capitalists?

Had he lived forty years longer and witnessed the use of the United States troops by President McKinley in Idaho, at the demand of mine-owning capitalists, imprisoning more than a thousand men in the Idaho bull pen, without so much as an affidavit, or an indictment, or a warrant, or a trial, or a conviction against any one of them, he would not have asked the question, but would probably have repeated the famous remark of the historian Grote, who said:

I have lived long enough to outlive my faith in government by the majority. I have lived long enough to learn that there is no such tyranny as the tyranny of a majority.

The problem which confronts us is not merely an inquiry into the arbitrary and despotic use of the military branch of the National Government, but in connection with this we are also confronted with sociological and economic questions which strike their roots deeper in American soil than the bottom of the deepest mine in the Cœur d'Alene district.

In the language of Mr. Dole, in his introduction to Tolstoi's work entitled What To Do, I repeat:

Great social questions face us. They are rising like ominous storm clouds above the horizon, not only in what are sometimes called the "effete monarchies" of the Old World, but here in this New World, in this favored land. Thoughtful men and women are everywhere busying themselves with their solution.

Side by side with the portentous increase of wealth is the more portentous increase of destitution and crime. On the one side, unheard-of luxury; on the other, desperate poverty. On the one side, pride and idleness; on the

other, beggary and anarchy. There are warnings in history—two mighty warnings—the fall of Rome, the French Revolution. Rome sowed the wind and reaped the whirlwind. The French aristocracy cried, "Après nous le deluge;" but the deluge came while, not after; it was a deluge of blood.

Modern civilization is sowing the whirlwind. What shall we or our children reap? There are enormous wrongs. Can they be righted while yet there is time? How?

And in solving this problem let us not forget the words of the Teacher who told us that—

No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye can not serve God and Mammon.

This is as true of nations as it is of individuals. It is as true of national policy as it is of individual character.

The immortal Henry George, in the ninth chapter of his Social Problems, has spoken in a language peculiarly suggestive and helpful to anyone desiring to make an intelligent and comprehensive analysis of the troubles in the Cœur d'Alene district of Idaho. I refer to these words:

Whoever considers the political and social problems that confront us must see that they center in the problem of the distribution of wealth, and he must also see that, though their solution may be simple, it must be radical.

For every social wrong there must be a remedy. But the remedy can be nothing less than the abolition of the wrong. Halfway measures, mere ameliorations and secondary reforms, can at any time accomplish little, and in the long run avail nothing. Our charities, our penal laws, our restrictions and prohibitions, by which, with so little avail, we endeavor to assuage poverty and check crime—what are they, at the very best, but the device of the clown, who, having put the whole burden of his ass into one pannier, sought to enable the poor animal to walk straight by loading up the other pannier with stones?

Let high moral and philosophic considerations of justice and equity inspire the American citizen to hear both sides of the question of the Idaho bull-pen before he determines which is the cause and which is the effect. And while inquiring let him not forget the thought of Amiel, who said:

If the measure of a civilization is to be the number of perfected men that it produces, we are still far from this model people. The slaves are no longer below us but they are among us. Barbarism is no longer at our frontiers; it lives side by side with us. The world grows more majestic but man diminishes. Why is this? Is it because we have abolished slavery without having solved the question of labor? In law there are no more slaves—in fact there are many.

And the wage slave whom Amiel recognized throughout Europe has brothers and sisters who are wage slaves not only in New York and Chicago, but also in the Cœur d'Alene district of Idaho.

A subsidized and syndicated press has, by suppression of many of the facts and by distortion of many others, led many of our people to believe that the Cœur d'Alene labor trouble is summed up in the statement that certain men belonging to labor unions blew up a mill, and that the governor of Idaho and the President of the United States imprisoned these men and punished them for that crime. If that were the case, if that were the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, I should have nothing further to say on the subject, except to withdraw my resolution for investigation and confess that I had been misled when I filed it.

But I propose to submit herewith, in as brief a compass as possible, an abstract of the facts and the history of the Cœur d'Alene labor troubles, which I believe ought to convince any fair-minded American citizen that the smallest crime committed in the Cœur d'Alene district was the blowing up of the mill, and that greater crimes were committed by those who violated the statutes of the State of Idaho and the constitutions of the State of Idaho and of the United States under the arrogance and despotism of martial law.

In addition to my own statement, I appeal to the conscientious citizen to read the testimony in its entirety as taken before the Military Committee, and if that be asking too much time, I then appeal to the fair-minded to be honest enough with themselves and their neighbors to read the extracts from the testimony and the comments thereon made by Prof. James A. Collins, ex-editor of the National Economist and statistician in the Eleventh Census, who has carefully read again and again the entire testimony, and who was frequently in attendance during the progress of the hearing, and whose age, learning, and experience peculiarly fit him for the analysis and abstract which I shall attach hereto and incorporate with my remarks.

To present the Cœur d'Alene case in a nut shell, suffice it to say it began with a strike of union and nonunion employees in the mine of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan Mining Company, at Wardner, for wages equal to the wages paid at Burke, at Gem, at Mullen, and all the other mines in the Cœur d'Alene district, the Bunker Hill and Sullivan Mining Company having paid lower wages for several years than was paid by any other mine in that country, although it is one of the richest lead mines in the world. The managers of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan yielded and agreed to pay the same wages as was paid in the other mines, but in connection with this announcement they also announced that all union men must quit their employ. This was a violation on the part of the mining company of a statute of Idaho which prohibits employers from discriminating against union laborers among their employees, and accordingly the men continued the strike.

The management of the mining company appealed to the governor for protection. The governor suggested to the mining company that they arbitrate the differences in accordance with another statute of the State requiring arbitration. Again the Bunker Hill and Sullivan violated this statute of the State, wiring the governor their refusal to arbitrate. In other words, in the arrogance and insolence of a corporation without a soul, the Bunker Hill and Sullivan Mining Company defiantly committed the two crimes of violating two statutes of Idaho, the one preventing discrimination against union labor and the other requiring arbitration in cases of difference.

Following these two violations of the law a large number of unknown men met at Wardner on the 29th of April and blew up the concentrating mill of the Bunker Hill & Sullivan Company, a mill which the management by their sworn statement had placed on the tax duplicate of the county at a valuation of $51,000, but after it was destroyed, it was heralded to the world as a mill worth $250,000. If it be true that the mill was worth $250,000, then the management by perjury avoided paying taxes on $200,000 worth of their property, and compelled their poor neighbors who owned the small homes in that county to pay that much additional tax for the benefit of this gigantic and greedy corporation.

In other words, the corporation, in addition to being guilty of the two violations of law already mentioned, was guilty of a third, that of perjury, and fourth, that of theft, in thus compelling their poorer neighbors to take out of their pockets a sum sufficient to pay into the county treasury to make good that which was withheld from the county by the management of the mining company in their perjured statement that the mill was worth only $51,000.

Following the destruction of the mill, the governor, on the night of the 29th of April, wired to President McKinley for troops, claiming that Shoshone County was in a state of insurrection. On the following day, the 30th of April, D. C. Mills wired the Secretary of War; also James L. Houghteling, of Winnetka, Ill., wired the Secretary of War and the President for troops, and also the following telegram was sent direct to the President:

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., *April 30, 1899.*

WILLIAM MCKINLEY, *President United States:*

As representative and treasurer of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan Mining Company, I earnestly indorse the request of the governor of Idaho to the effect that Federal troops be ordered to protect our property, now in the course of destruction.

Very respectfully, WILLIAM S. CROCKER,
Banker, San Francisco.

It will be observed that to the signature of William S. Crocker was added the word "banker," it being evidently the theory and the purpose of Mr. Crocker to appeal to the President's well-known subserviency to the capitalists. And in this connection I submit another telegram, as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 30, 1899.*

J. ADDISON PORTER, *Secretary to the President:*

An armed mob has destroyed valuable property in Wardner, Idaho, in which Jack Hammond, James Houghteling, and others of your friends are interested. The governor has asked for Federal troops. Please lend your interest to this appeal with the President.

HERMAN B. BUTLER.

Consider carefully the language of Mr. Butler. It is not a telegram to Mr. Porter, but a telegram to Porter as secretary to the President. In other words and in substance, a telegram to the President. And again, note how pregnant are the three lines of this telegram. The property destroyed at Wardner, Mr. Butler says, is property in which Jack Hammond and James Houghteling, and others of your friends are interested—Jack Hammond, one of the Jamieson raiders of South Africa, who was condemned to death for treason, and spared and pardoned only by the leniency of Oom Paul Kruger. And as to the expression "others of your friends are interested," we shall probably never have much light or information. Suffice it to say that Mr. Butler's telegram and Banker Crocker's telegram are couched in such terms and so full of suggestion that one can not help thinking of the letter sent by Mr. Hepburn from the Standard Oil Bank to the Treasury Department reminding Secretary Gage of the valuable services rendered by the directors of the bank in the campaign of 1896. Was it the request of the governor or the sight draft drawn by the bankers and capitalists on the President which secured the use of the Army for the benefit of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan Mining Company in the Cœur d'Alene district?

After the United States troops arrived the evidence shows that the officers and attorneys of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan Mining Company were daily and almost constantly in close communion with General Merriam and his subordinate officers, and that many hundreds of men were arrested and imprisoned and subjected—many for several days, many for several weeks, many for several months—to all the indignities, humiliations, hardships, and losses of their time and their business without even so much as an accusation, or an indictment, or a warrant, or other process of law against them.

In less than a week after the troops had arrived the "ironclad"

and "blacklisting" system, called the "permit" system, was devised and formulated by and with the assistance of Mr. Lindley, the attorney of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan. In fact, the evidence is quite sufficient that Mr. Lindley, the able attorney of San Francisco, was really the controlling spirit, and that General Merriam and Bartlett Sinclair carried into effect, by way of military orders under martial law, the designs and schemes of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan Company, as formulated and presented by their San Francisco lawyer, Mr. Lindley.

I shall not dwell at length on the outrages and the infamous treatment of the men in the bull pen, because I feel confident that every sane man will put himself for a moment, in his imagination, in prison without warrant, and without process, say for a night, or a week, or a month, or six months, without any privilege of writ of habeas corpus, or any other privilege or right except that conceded at the point of bayonets held by men who were really under the control directly of the United States Army, who in turn were under the control of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan Mining Company, by reason of the subserviency of Governor Steunenberg and the indifference or collusion of the President of the United States.

The details of these outrages will appear sufficiently in the summary of Professor Collins. By use of this blacklisting permit system Dr. France, a young physician in the employ of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan Mining Company, practically drove out from Shoshone County, Idaho, as tramps and outcasts, 1,500 union laborers, together with their wives and children, compelling them to seek a livelihood somewhere, anywhere, everywhere on the face of the earth by depriving them of that God-given right to labor in the community where they had established themselves and their homes.

Quoting one of my friends, I desire to say: The right to labor is the highest and most sacred of all human rights. Deprive man of that right and you at once deprive him of the right to life. All other rights are dependent upon and subordinate to this right. Everything in the physical and social world testifies that the supreme purpose of this life is labor. The science of human anatomy and human physiology alike proclaim it. It is manifest in the provision for varied and complex movement in the jointed skeleton, the contractile muscles, and the power-supplying apparatus of digestion and circulation.

The function of every organ testifies that the purpose of this life is labor. Moreover, God has created man with certain physical wants, upon the satisfaction of which depend not only the maintenance of his physical life, but also the development of his higher and nobler nature. He has made the satisfaction of these wants dependent on man's labor, giving him the power and laying on him the obligation to labor—a power that distinguishes him from all other animals and enables him to become as it were a helper in the creative work.

With what other power is man by his Creator clothed save the power of exercising his own faculties? Nature acknowledges no demand save the demand of labor. In no other way can her treasures be drawn forth or her powers utilized and controlled. She is an absolutely impartial mistress and makes no discriminations among men. All men to her stand on the same level and have equal rights. She acknowledges no claim but that of labor, and acknowledges that without regard to the claimant. The laws of nature are the decrees of God, and it behooves nations as well as individuals to respect them.

There is written in them broadly and distinctly the right of all men to labor and to enjoy the results. At the call of labor the ore is raised from the vein, the forest tree transformed to finished lumber, and cotton and wool converted to cloth. It was because these autocratic and despotic mine bosses would deprive American citizens of the God-given and inalienable right to labor that caused the destruction of the concentrator at the Bunker Hill and Sullivan mine. These petty tyrants would contravene the laws of nature and nature's God, as well as the laws of Idaho.

And who is this Dr. France, who was placed in control of the liberty of all the union and nonunion men of Shoshone County? According to his own testimony, he is a young physician who made himself agreeable and acceptable to the managers of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan, and they placed him and still keep him in a position where they levy a tax of a dollar a month upon each one of their 500 employees for his benefit, and in addition to this he secures additional pay from the 200 miners of the Last Chance mine, and in case he has occasion to treat the wives or children he receives still more pay.

Thus it will be seen that through his catering to the management of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan, he is enabled to pocket an income somewhere between $8,000 and $10,000 a year, although he struck that community a stranger and a wanderer, without friends or acquaintances seven years ago. Is this such an impartial and fair-minded representative of the law of the land that he is fitted even in the least to determine the rights of men to earn their living in Shoshone County?

At the beginning of the strike the Bunker Hill and Sullivan Company caused all the difficulty by making war on union labor. Is it fair or equitable on the part of Governor Steunenberg or President McKinley to permit, even for a single day, this henchman of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan to pass judicially upon the rights of men and women and children to live in the Cœur d'Alene district? Is this man capable of an impartial and just discrimination as to the rights of the men and women and children in that community, when he is receiving three or four times as much of a salary annually, through the agency of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan Company, as he would be able to earn in any other community on earth?

Is this the way the chief executives of a State and a nation are to administer justice? Let honest men stop and consider. Let true Americans ask themselves whether Weyler had any more power, or exercised his arbitrary will with any more malice against Cubans when he starved them to death, than did this Dr. France when he starved the 1,500 men and their wives and children out of a home in the State of Idaho and drove them to the four quarters of the globe.

To bring the infamous despotism established by the use of the United States Army in the Cœur d'Alene district more plainly before the mind's eye I invite attention for a moment to the present street-railway strike in the city of St. Louis. Suppose the governor of that State should wire the President for troops, declaring the city of St. Louis to be in a state of insurrection. Suppose a few capitalists, owners of the street railway, should wire the President that they and others of his friends are interested. Suppose the President should send the troops to St. Louis. Suppose the governor should declare martial law and place the city of St. Louis under the control of the Army.

Suppose the officers of the street railway company should send for Lawyer Lindley, of San Francisco, and he should advise the blacklisting permit system recently found so effective in Idaho, and suppose the street railway company has some subservient tool named Dr. France, who was receiving by and through the power of the street railway company three or four times as much salary as he could earn anywhere else on earth, and suppose this Dr. France, of St. Louis, should be authorized and empowered to sign permits, and suppose this Dr. France, in collusion with the managers of the street railway, should decide that it was for the best interests of the street railway company to drive all union labor out of the city of St. Louis, and to drive all men of whatsoever organization out of the city if they showed any sympathy for the striking street railway employees.

This would be martial law in St. Louis. This would be more effective than any ironclad or blacklisting system ever dreamed of by railway or manufacturing corporations. This would destroy the carpenters' unions, the horseshoers' unions, the bakers' unions, the typographical unions, and all the other unions of the city of St. Louis, and the same system extended will eventually destroy all the labor unions of the United States; and when you destroy the labor unions of the United States, you have destroyed the men who keep the small lamps of liberty lighted and burning. Unorganized labor, whether in the factory or on the farm, is losing ground year by year and day by day, and the hope of the American Republic remains in the debates and discussions kept alive in the lodges of the brotherhoods of organized labor. I repeat that government by injunction dwindles into a mere misdemeanor when compared with the bull pen and mediæval despotism of martial law in Idaho.

Recently I was honored by an invitation from New York City extended by the Workingmen's Committee of One Hundred to address them on the subject, "Abraham Lincoln." A part of what I then said I repeat here, as reported in the Journal of the Knights of Labor, as follows:

LINCOLN AND LIBERTY.

Immediately after Edward Markham had read his famous poem on Lincoln, Congressman LENTZ was introduced by the chairman and spoke, in part, as follows:

When I accepted the invitation of the Workingmen's Committee of One Hundred, I was advised that I was to answer to the toast, "Abraham Lincoln," and with no other thought than that I reached the Lexington Opera House, took my seat among the distinguished gentlemen here at this table, to be surprised when I opened the menu card to find opposite my name the subject: "Militarism—The Idaho bull pen."

However wide may appear to be the gap between the subject "Lincoln" and the words "bull pen," yet, my friends, I hope before I finish what I have to say that you will be convinced that there is in fact a very close connection between these two subjects.

The potency and inspiration of the name of Lincoln is due almost entirely to the fact that his life was devoted to the cause of liberty. It is a peculiarly happy coincidence that there is an alliteration in the name of Lincoln and the word "liberty." [Applause.]

Before Lincoln had gone far in his work as President of the

United States—in fact, in his very first annual message to Congress—he gave the key and synopsis of his life work in this sentence concerning the relations of labor and capital:

Labor is prior to and independent of capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor and could never have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital and deserves much the higher consideration.

[Applause.]

Such was the solemn judgment and the holy conviction of the greatest man in the President's chair since the day of Thomas Jefferson. It was this same Lincoln who said "This nation can not exist half slave and half free." It was this same Lincoln who at Gettysburg said:

The world will little note nor long remember what we say here; but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us; that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

[Applause.]

Can anyone review this philosophy of Lincoln and tolerate for a moment the thought of his being found to-day in company with those who, in their greed, are making war on the Filipinos or making war on labor unions? [Great applause.]

It is Scriptural, I believe, that "he who neglects his own family is worse than the heathen." In other words, I question the purposes of the man who prates about civilizing and reforming the other side of the earth while millions of homes in our own land are denied the ordinary comforts and privileges of decent and ennobling opportunities for bettering and improving the condition of the children living and yet unborn. [Applause.]

Until two years ago our National Government was spending about $23,000,000 annually through the War Department.

To-day we are appropriating about $125,000,000 for the Army, and enough more for the Navy to make the round figures about $200,000,000 a year.

The American citizen who is unable to see in these mammoth figures the plain demonstration that we have already begun our mad career of militarism and imperialism, and are rushing headlong toward despotism, is incapable of logical reasoning and unworthy of citizenship in this Republic.

Many of our conscientious people are confessing from day to day that they are alarmed at the rapid growth of militarism in this country and the many manifestations that the present policy of our Government is purely an imitation policy, patterned and fashioned absolutely after the example set by the monarchies of Europe. Notwithstanding the fact that the light is dawning upon many who have apparently been asleep, yet there are many others who seem to need further evidences that the policy of our Government is departing at right angles from the lines projected by all the patriots and statesmen from Washington to Lincoln; and to those who are still in doubt as to the real meaning of the signs of the times I appeal for an earnest and careful consideration of the facts involved in a study of what took place on both sides in connection with the labor troubles in the Cœur d'Alene district of Idaho.

To begin with, there is a statute in the State of Idaho providing for fine and imprisonment of any employer who discriminates against labor organizations, and there is another statute which requires arbitration of differences between employer and employees. [Applause.]

The people of the State of Idaho, by their legislation, clearly indicate that they recognize what you and I recognize to be a fact; that unless labor is organized the last hope of free institutions will be wiped from the face of the earth. I regret exceedingly that throughout this country the lyceum, the debating society, the town meetings, and all other institutions calculated to stimulate free thought and free speech are rapidly disappearing. Organized labor is to-day substantially the only institution which offers an opportunity for discussing public policies, economic questions, and the rights of man. As James B. Smiley says:

No one can ignore the unrest of the times, and many a voice cries out against the existence of tramps and paupers and hollow-eyed hunger in the midst of unparalleled wealth. In all our cities the squalor of the slums mocks the luxury of the palace. Many workers suffer want—many idlers live in luxury.

These are the shameful and monstrous conditions of industrial slavery in 1900, and they are much worse than were the conditions of negro slavery in 1860. The industrial slaves of 1900 are more in need of William Lloyd Garrison, Wendell Phillips, Lovejoy, John Brown, Whittier, Lowell, and Lincoln than were the negro slaves of our own country or the vassals and serfs of Europe in the mediæval ages.

Agitation and education by organized labor is the best process and the only hope of maintaining free speech, free press, free schools, and a free ballot.

Unorganized labor is the timid, crouching, servile instrument of capital, yielding its head and extending its neck to the yoke of the master. Unorganized labor stands before the American people as a pitiable example of that old saying that "Necessity knows no law." They have become so hungry and so naked that to satisfy their immediate physical wants they are perfectly willing to sacrifice every mental and moral want, not only of themselves, but of their posterity, even to the fourth generation and all the other generations. Unorganized labor promises to the people of the United States nothing except in the final analysis a condition of labor not unlike that in China and India.

Year by year, generation by generation, unorganized labor will continue to carry the masses of humanity downward and downward in their subserviency, not to feudal lords this time, but to the trust barons, until the millions and hundreds of millions who are to people the American Republic will be mere herds of dumb, driven cattle. In organized labor alone I see the salvation of unorganized labor. [Applause.]

The use of the military in Idaho is not in punishment of the men who destroyed a few dollars' worth of property; but, on the contrary, the governor of that State and William McKinley, acting in concert, and, as I believe, in collusion with the owners of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan mine, have maintained martial law in Shoshone County, in the State of Idaho, and during the maintenance of martial law they have kept in prison many hundreds of men, and by their blacklisting permit system have prevented many more hundreds from the right to labor, and it is estimated that in the aggregate the losses inflicted upon the union workmen of that district by depriving them of the right to labor aggregated at least a million dollars.

Was not the martial law which destroyed a million dollars' worth of property of poor men a matter of concern to the President of the United States? Was he not more riotous in this despotism and violation of the Constitution than were the men who blew up the mill?

In addition to this loss there must be added to it the enormous loss to the other labor organizations of the United States, who by their charity supported the wives and children of these men throughout that long period, and all this was done by the President of the United States, by and with the use of the United States Army, for the ultimate and sole purpose of destroying the labor unions of that community.

Is any one of you aware of anything in American history on a par with this? In the hundred and odd years of the history of the forty-five States of the Union the law of the tyrant and the despot has never been thought of for any such period as that just witnessed in Idaho. [Applause.] Many men overlook the difference between martial law and military police.

Martial law is the law of war, the law of a conqueror invading a foreign country, invading the land of an enemy. A Roman general or a Mohammedan chief, with sword and fire, invades the country of a people whom he proposes to subjugate. He has neither time nor opportunity nor inclination to establish civil law, and for the time being his will, the arbitrary and unlimited caprice or whim of the military despot, is the only law of the land. This is martial law.

In America it is specifically provided in the Constitution of the United States that martial law should never be resorted to by the Chief Executive of the nation or any governor of any State except in two cases specifically mentioned in the Constitution: One, invasion; the other, rebellion—the one meaning in case of military necessity, when our own country has been invaded by a foreign enemy; the other, when the people of our own country rise up and undertake to overthrow the Government.

And for martial law, in case of a riot, there is absolutely no provision either in the Constitution of the United States or the constitution of Idaho. Both specifically limit the application of martial law to "invasion" and "rebellion," and in neither of these constitutions is the word "riot" or "insurrection" or "malicious destruction of private property" mentioned as a cause for the exercise of the law of a tyrant and a despot on the part of either the governor of the State or the President of the United States. [Great applause.]

Suppose one man murders another. There is no constitutional warrant for martial law. Suppose ten men or a hundred men kill one man. There is no warrant nor legal authority for martial law. Injury either to the property or the liberty of an individual is specifically an offense under the Constitution of the nation and States, to be punished by courts and juries, and in such cases the military power can be called into force only to assist the sheriff in making the arrest, to bring the accused before the civil court sitting to give the man indicted by due process of law a fair trial by a jury of his peers.

We had the riots in Chicago, but no one has forgotten that even there we did not resort to martial law, but merely made use of the military as a police, notwithstanding the destruction of millions of dollars' worth of property.

We had a riot in Ohio which burned down the court-house in

Cincinnati, and the riot continued for several days; but we did not establish martial law. We merely used the military arm as a police, notwithstanding the destruction of public property and public records and the halls of justice.

At Homestead there was no resort to martial law, but rather to military police.

At Hazleton, where innocent miners were shot in the back, the governor did not exercise the right of martial law.

In the great strike at Pittsburg in 1877, where millions of dollars' worth of property was destroyed, it was not considered necessary to resort to martial law; but in Idaho, where nothing was done except that the mill of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan Company was blown up, because of the prejudice and the ill will that the Bunker Hill had created against itself through years of gross conduct, the governor of the State and the President of the Union established martial law and denied the writ of habeas corpus; and these men, thus imprisoned from four to six months, not permitted to give bail or bond for their liberty, and all the while that they were kept in this prison their wives and their children were absolutely ignored, no one of whom was ever furnished, either by the President of the United States or the governor of the State, with even so much as a loaf of bread; and had it not been for organized labor throughout the Republic women and children would have been left naked and hungry, even to starvation.

Men were imprisoned who were not miners—for instance, shoe dealers, butchers, merchants, druggists, clerks, teachers, traveling men, and all classes—and were imprisoned merely because they were believed to be in sympathy with organized labor.

One man was kept imprisoned for four months who is the owner of probably fifty to one hundred thousand dollars' worth of property, and when he was finally released he was told that they had found that the charges against him were not true, and upon his inquiry as to what the charges were, he was told that he was suspected of being too friendly to one of the men who was accused of crime.

Now, I submit to you to think for a moment of yourselves being under indictment for some crime. Suppose under martial law your relatives and your friends upon whom you might depend for assistance in making your defense and in bringing into court witnesses who are in possession of information of your innocence; suppose that these friends and witnesses were arrested and imprisoned until after your trial, and then released, after you had been convicted, would you consider that you had been living in a free country? Would you believe that you had a fair and impartial trial by a jury of your peers? Such are some of the outrages perpetrated in Idaho under martial law.

Under martial law men were compelled to testify before an inquisition, without the privilege or presence of an attorney.

This despotic power of martial law is being used this very day in Shoshone County to drive union men away from a county wherein they have lived for the last fifteen years; where they have constructed and equipped a hospital at a cost of $50,000; where they have owned and maintained their own cemetery; where their children have been born and were being educated in the public schools, which the union men themselves had organized and established. This despotic power exercised by the use of the military of the United States is being used to break up an institution that keeps alive in its union halls the discussion and consideration of many social and public questions; to break up an institution which furnishes the halls in that community in which all public lectures and theatricals are given; to break up an institution which provides by monthly assessment a fund to maintain this magnificent hospital and to provide for the many misfortunes, injuries, accidents, and diseases which are common in that particular district; and all this because one mining company persistently insulted and outraged organized labor by discharging every member the very instant it found that a union man was in its employ!

All these outrages in the name of martial law have been and are being perpetrated because one mining company, although declaring dividends from thirty thousand to sixty thousand dollars a month, is determined to destroy union labor and reduce the wages of its employees! Such is the prostitution of the American eagle by the governmental forces in this day of militarism and imperialism! [Loud applause.]

This Abraham Lincoln, whose birth you commemorate and celebrate, ought to be here now fighting and bleeding that the industrial slave might be free. Militarism is abroad in the land. Martial law and despotism is rampant in Idaho. How long, if this is tolerated there, will it be in reaching the labor unions of New York and Ohio?

All that has been perpetrated in Idaho has been perpetrated in the name of law, but actually done in anarchy. The President of the United States and the governor of Idaho have been partners and tools under the direction and control of capitalists, who are determined to reduce the wages of labor until no hope for books, or musical instruments, or pictures shall ever again light up the minds of the boys and girls in the homes of the wage-earners. Is it a crime to belong to labor unions? If so, William McKinley and Governor Steunenberg are right in their perpetuation of martial law in Idaho. If it is not a crime to belong to labor unions, then William McKinley and Governor Steunenberg are worse than despots, and worse than anarchists, because they have intelligence enough to know the plain language of the constitutions of the United States and Idaho.

But the members of the social four hundred are too torpid and too sleepy to care. They belong to the same class of high priests and chief people who crucified Christ. History repeats itself, and in this day it is necessary that history should quickly repeat itself and produce for us another Lincoln, who will say from the high executive place of the President of the United States that "Labor is prior to and independent of capital; capital is only the fruit of labor. Labor is the superior of capital, and deserves much the higher consideration." Unless such a President is elected by the people of this Republic the time is not very far distant when every laborer will have a soldier to carry on his back as he goes to his work. [Great applause.]

Now, my friends, I think I have demonstrated what I said to you at the beginning:

> The time is ripe, and rotten ripe, for change.
> There is more force in names * * *
> Than most of men dream of; and a lie will keep
> Its throne a whole age longer if it skulk
> Behind the sound of some fair seeming name.
> Let us call tyrants, tyrants; * * *
> For men in earnest have no time to waste
> In patching fig leaves for the naked truth.

And I hope when you go away from this meeting to-night, and when you awake in the morning, that your first thought will be on the subject of the "rights of man," and I hope you will be permeated and inspired by the same spirit that moved and controlled James Russell Lowell, in the days of the black slave, when he said:

> Is true freedom but to break
> Fetters for our own dear sake,
> And with leathern hearts forget
> That we owe mankind a debt?
> No! true freedom is to share
> All the chains our brothers wear;
> And with heart and hand to be
> Earnest to make others free.
>
> They are slaves who fear to speak
> For the fallen and the weak.
> They are slaves who will not choose
> Hatred, scoffing, and abuse,
> Rather than in silence shrink
> From the truth they needs must think!
> They are slaves who dare not be
> In the right with two or three.

[Round after round of applause, participated in by all present.]

But since I made the foregoing remarks before the workingmen's banquet I have heard it urged as against the miners of the Cœur d'Alene district that they had a strike there in 1892 which resulted in the death of several men on each side in a contest between the miners and certain Pinkerton employees. In short, it was a repetition in the West of substantially the same thing which took place at Homestead in 1892, in the East, and if there is reason now for maintaining martial law in Idaho, why not establish the despotism of martial law in Pennsylvania?

The Republican majority of the Military Committee, arguing further in support of their condemnation of the miners' unions and their complete indorsement of all the barbarity, brutality, militarism, and repudiation of statutes and constitutions by the president of the union and the governor of Idaho, offer as an excuse for this mediæval despotism a recital of a few gross crimes committed in a mining country in a period of fifteen years in a country which, as one of the witnesses testified, has been entirely developed since 1885—in fact, so much developed that Wallace, the county seat of Shoshone County, a small city of 2,800 people, did not even have so much as a name nor the beginning of an existence in the year 1885.

Of the thousands of men who rushed into that country, some to remain for a few weeks and others for a few months, and others for years, constantly coming and going as men do in newly discovered mining communities, there were as a matter of course many gamblers and adventurers who put in their appearance during the first few years, but the evidence shows that since 1892 proportionately no more crimes have been committed in that community than in the city of Spokane, Wash., or any other city.

It is also urged by the Republican majority that because certain men blew up this mill of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan and then dispersed, many of them leaving the country and many of them returning to their work, that therefore constitutional guaranties could be ignored and the rights of man held for naught. Let the honest man inquire and ask himself why it was that these men on their way down to Wardner did not stop to do so much injury as scratching with a pin or the finger nail any one of the other dozen or score of mining properties in that community.

These men did not destroy property merely because they were wicked or insane. The destruction of this mill, unreasonable as

it may have been, was simply the outcry and protest of men who saw a greedy corporation bent upon depriving them and their children of any hope in life except that of being mere beasts of burden. These men who destroyed this mill in their helplessness to secure their rights under the statute for arbitration or their rights under the statute against discrimination, like a child in misery or in pain, made this explosion their outcry, that fair-minded men might hear them and inquire into the matter, since the governor of the State had shown no disposition to compel the mining corporation to perform its obligations, specifically provided for in the statute of the State.

The Republican majority of the committee compliments the governor in his courage. The Democratic minority of the committee would compliment him much more in his courage had he shown that kind of courage as an executive which would stand up and compel the capitalists owning the mines to obey the laws of the State, even though it should make the mining corporation such an enemy of the governor that the governor might not secure a seat in the United States Senate a little later on.

There is much more that could be said and should be said in this connection, but I prefer at this point to submit to you the report of the Democratic minority of the Committee on Military Affairs, in which you will observe every Democrat on the committee concurs and subscribes his name. It is as follows:

VIEWS OF THE MINORITY.

On the 29th day of April, 1899, from 800 to 1,000 men went to the Bunker Hill and Sullivan mine, situate near Wardner, in Shoshone County, Idaho, and blew up the concentrator of that mine.

During the progress of the commission of this crime two men were murdered by those engaged in perpetrating this outrage; the citizens of Wardner were terrorized, and the officers of the law were powerless to prevent the crimes and outrages which took place on that day. This crime can not be too severely condemned. Nothing can extenuate it, and its authors deserve the severest punishment which the law can mete out to them.

After the crime had been committed the perpetrators of it dispersed. According to the evidence before the committee, three or four hundred of those engaged in it fled from the county of Shoshone into the State of Montana and into British Columbia. This evidence is reenforced by a telegram of General Merriam sent to the Adjutant General of the Army on May 4, 1899:

WARDNER, IDAHO, *May 4, 1899.*

ADJUTANT-GENERAL ARMY, *Washington, D. C.:*

Inquest still in progress with closed doors. One hundred and twenty-eight arrests made by State officials under military support. No signs of resistance, but indications are most leaders of mob have escaped, going east or west into Montana and Washington; others hidden in the mountains. Sheriff at Thompsons Falls, Mont., reports many arriving on foot over mountain trails. Governors Idaho and Montana corresponding for arrests in Montana. Troops in position to do all that is possible. There is now no sign of organized resistance.

MERRIAM, *Brigadier-General.*

These men escaped before May 4, 1899, and after the 29th of April, 1899, there was absolutely no resistance by anyone to the civil authorities of the State of Idaho. It appears from the evidence that the civil authorities of Shoshone County at once began to arrest those who were suspected of being engaged in the commission of the crime of April 29, 1899, and were so engaged when their authority was suspended by the action of the governor of Idaho, and by the sending of troops of the United States into Shoshone County.

The governor of Idaho, acting upon telegrams and advices sent him from the scene of the trouble, called upon the President of the United States for troops to aid him in suppressing what he called an insurrection. The President responded to this call, and General Merriam, of the Army, was placed in command of the troops and directed to proceed to Shoshone County. Your committee believes that the governor of Idaho had the right to call upon the President for troops, and that the President was authorized to respond to said call by virtue of Article IV, section 4, of the Constitution of the United States; but your committee is of opinion that the troops so sent to the State of Idaho continued to be under the control of the President of the United States, and that the military commander in command of said troops could only use them in aid of the civil authorities of the State to preserve peace and order, and to prevent resistance being made by lawless persons to the process of the courts and the proper civil authorities of the State.

The telegram of the Secretary of War dated May 31 clearly defines the duty of the commander of the troops, and shows beyond controversy that the soldiers of the United States should not be used unless it was necessary "to aid the State authorities to suppress rioting and to maintain peace and order."

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 31.*

Brigadier-General MERRIAM,
Commanding Department of Colorado, Denver, Colo.:

You will instruct Major Smith, commanding at Wallace, that he is to use the United States troops to aid the State authorities simply to suppress rioting and to maintain peace and order. These were your original instructions. The Army must have nothing whatever to do with enforcing rules for the government of miners or miners' unions. That is a matter for the local authorities to deal with.

R. A. ALGER, *Secretary of War.*

As a matter of fact there never was any rioting in Shoshone County after the 29th of April, 1899; peace and order prevailed there when the troops arrived. No resistance whatever was made to the serving of process or to any action taken or sought to be taken by the State authorities. The courts were open, a coroner's inquest was being held, a grand jury was very soon empaneled, no justice of the peace was interfered with, no sheriff or constable was resisted by anybody. The State authorities were exercising their functions, and have so continued to exercise them from April 30, 1899, down to the present time. Such being the facts, it is most extraordinary that United States soldiers should have been kept for over a year in Shoshone County, Idaho, overawing the civil authorities, used with the consent of the President of the United States in upholding a most tyrannical course of conduct pursued by the governor of Idaho to prevent men, charged with no crime, from earning their daily bread.

The evidence clearly shows that General Merriam totally misunderstood his duties, and was ignorant of the first principles of the laws of the land. It may be, and probably is, true that he intended to do what he thought was right, but his conduct displayed gross ignorance of law and an utter indifference to the rights and liberties of the citizens. General Merriam arrived at Wardner on May 3, after some of his troops, which troops had already arrested a large number of men without semblance of warrant, and at the suggestion of one Bartlett Sinclair, the civil representative of the governor of Idaho.

After General Merriam's arrival at Wardner, upon the suggestion of Mr. Sinclair, he sent about 150 soldiers to the town of Burke, in Shoshone County (May 3); these soldiers were accompanied by four so-called deputies appointed by Sinclair verbally; these deputies and soldiers, upon their arrival at Burke, found no disturbance there, no rioting, no breach of the peace; the population of the town was pursuing its usual avocations; there was not a suspicion of resistance to the State authorities, and yet these soldiers and deputies proceeded to arrest, and did arrest and put under guard without warrant, the entire male population of that town, consisting of about 300 persons; among them were clergymen, school-teachers, druggists, merchants, etc.; they were given no hearing; it is true that some of them were released in an hour or two, but that release did not and could not excuse the outrage thus put upon innocent men and American citizens.

But the mass of these people were placed upon cars and taken to Wardner, and there imprisoned. Not one of them, so far as the evidence discloses, was ever tried for any offense, although many of them were held in prison for months. Such conduct can not be too severely condemned. It was an outrage upon the liberty of the citizen which has no parallel in the annals of this country. It is no excuse to say that General Merriam was requested to do this thing by the representative of the governor. It was his duty, as the commander of the troops, to know the law, and the law was and is that when a military commander is sent into a State to aid the civil authorities thereof he can not act unless those authorities are being resisted, and even if they are being resisted the civil authorities must be armed with proper and legal warrants before the military can aid them in the execution of their duties.

The general commanding the troops exceeded his authority, and was guilty of a gross violation of law when he sent a detachment of troops into the State of Montana for the purpose of arresting supposed fugitives from justice from Idaho. It can not be contended for a moment that General Merriam had any authority for this action. It is true four so-called deputies accompanied the detachment of soldiers, but the most ignorant citizen of the Republic knows that a deputy of one State has no authority to arrest citizens in another State unless clothed with authority given him by the proper authorities of the State into which he goes. The result of this invasion by General Merriam into the State of Montana was the arrest of a citizen of Montana by Lieutenant Lyon at St. Regis, Mont.

This man, without warrant of law, without even a hearing before a military court, was taken from his own State into the State of Idaho and thrown into prison. It is true that he was only held for a few days and then released, but that does not excuse the outrageous treatment to which he was subjected. It only serves to emphasize the inexcusable conduct of Lieutenant Lyon, acting under the orders of General Merriam, in arresting and imprisoning an entirely innocent man, taking him from his home and giving him no opportunity to show his innocence. The conduct of General Merriam in this matter is sought to be excused by him on the ground that the governor of Montana authorized the arrest of suspects in Montana without formal extradition papers; but this contention can not be sustained. The governor of Montana had no such power, and General Merriam should have known it.

Another instance of flagrant violation of law was the conduct of Lieutenant Lyon, acting under orders from his superior, in forcing men to work in the Tiger-Poorman mine by threats of violence. This conduct was inexcusable. These men were freemen. Their labor was their own, and no conditions justified Lieutenant Lyon in forcing them to work against their will. The excuse that the mine would have been destroyed is not tenable. If Lieutenant Lyon had seen fit he might have used his soldiers for the purpose of pumping the water out of the mine, but he exceeded his authority and violated the liberty of the citizen when he forced citizens to work against their will.

The suppression by Major Smith, of the Army, of the Mullan Mirror, a newspaper published at Mullan, in Shoshone County, can not be defended. It was a gross violation of law, wholly unjustified by any evidence which was given before this committee. The editor of the paper was put in jail without a warrant, kept there a long time without a trial and with no charges ever preferred against him, and his property destroyed and never returned to him.

The "permit system," approved by General Merriam and kept in operation to this day by the presence of the military forces of the United States, is an outrageous violation of the laws of Idaho and of the laws of the United States. Under this system no man is permitted to work in the mines of Shoshone County unless he obtains a permit from Dr. France, a representative of the governor of Idaho. The evidence before the committee is that this system could not be maintained without the aid and presence of the military forces of the United States. Under this system the miners of the Cœur d'Alene are absolutely under the control of one man, and their daily bread can only be earned at the will of an irresponsible officer, whose duties are defined in no statute and from whose acts and edicts there is no appeal. Such a condition of affairs has never before existed in any community in the United States, and that the Army of this country should be used for such a purpose is a disgrace to our civilization and a grave reflection upon those who permit such abuses to exist.

To sum up, the undersigned are satisfied from the evidence adduced before the committee that General Merriam was wholly mistaken as to his powers and duties; that he was ignorant of the laws of his country; that he failed to distinguish the difference between military law and martial law, and that his conduct has resulted in the gravest injuries to the liberty of the citizen and the rights of individuals. Innocent men have been kept in prison for months without a trial, and have been finally discharged without any charges being preferred against them.

The undersigned, to sustain the propositions of law above insisted upon, cite the following authorities: Ex parte Milligan (4 Wallace, 15; Federal Cases, case No. 8073; Cooley's Constitutional Law passim); Luther vs. Borden (1 Howard, Federal Cases, No. 9005).

We are aware that General Merriam defends his conduct in Shoshone County on the ground that he was carrying out the wishes and requests of Mr. Bartlett Sinclair, the civil representative of the governor of Idaho. It therefore becomes necessary to inquire into the legality of the appointment of Bartlett Sinclair, and to determine whether he was such State authority as General Merriam should have aided. It will not be denied that it was the duty of the commanding general to ascertain for himself and determine rightly who were the State authorities of Idaho whom it was his duty to aid. The State authorities of Idaho, those meant by the Secretary of War, were undoubtedly the legal State authorities, those constituted by the laws of the State.

If, therefore, the governor of Idaho exceeded his powers in appointing what he called his representatives, it was the duty of the commanding general to ignore the requests and wishes of any illegal representative of the governor. It was equally his duty to refuse to grant any requests of the governor himself unless they were valid and legal requests. Thus any request

to arrest any citizen of the State without a warrant should have been ignored, because the military could only properly aid the State authorities when they themselves were acting in pursuance of law.

Now, as to the appointment of Bartlett Sinclair, it was plainly illegal and not justified by any law or statute of Idaho. There are statutes of Idaho (sections 7405-7407) which authorize the governor to appoint a civil officer to command State troops when called out to suppress an insurrection; but in this case there were no State troops; and it will not be contended for a moment that the governor of Idaho could appoint a civil officer to command United States troops or to act in conjunction with them. There is no law of Idaho which authorizes the governor to appoint any civil officer and to confer upon him the powers of a dictator, with the right to arrest men indiscriminately without a warrant, to appoint deputies, and to discharge all the functions of government.

The governor has not this absolute power himself, and surely he can not confer it upon another. The contention that this can be done under martial law will not hold in this case, because, while martial law was proclaimed, it, as a matter of fact, did not exist. It could not exist, because the courts were open and every State officer was discharging his functions without let or hindrance. A coroner's inquest, a grand jury, and all the machinery necessary to bringing criminals to justice had full sway. There was no disturbance of the peace, no destruction of property, no resistance to State authority.

At one time or another there were over 1,100 men in the prison at Wardner, known as the "bull pen." They were not tried, they were not charged with any crime, and they were held and guarded by the United States troops. It was the duty of the military commander on the ground and of the Commander in Chief of the Army to inquire into the causes and reasons for the detention of these men. No such inquiry was ever made, and this large number of American citizens was imprisoned without trial, and it is vain for the commanding general and his superior officer, the President of the United States, to justify this outrage on liberty by asserting that these citizens of the United States were held by the State authorities of Idaho.

It may be proper to state that the evidence discloses a conspiracy on the part of the officers of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan mine, and of those who sympathize with them, o drive from Shoshone County all union miners by the device of the "permtt system," which system, it is admitted, can only be maintained by the use of United States soldiers.

There is a specific statute in the State of Idaho against employers of labor discriminating against employees by reason of their membership in or affiliation with any labor union, and when the Bunker Hill and Sullivan Company gave notice in April that no union miner should remain in their employ, they violated the law of the land just as much as the men did who blew up the concentrator.

There is another statute in the State of Idaho providing specifically for arbitration in case of difficulty between employer and employee, and when the managers of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan refused to arbitrate, they were just as much guilty of breaking the law of the land as were the men who blew up the concentrator. In other words, the Bunker Hill and Sullivan Mining Company stood alone as lawbreakers in two specific instances before their employees and other employees of that community were guilty of the destruction of property.

Again, it is but fair to suggest that had the mine owners been law-abiding citizens themselves, and complied with the request of the governor for arbitration, or complied with the statute which prohibited discrimination against men belonging to labor unions, there would have been no violations on the part of the employees. A fair hearing of both parties to the difficulties in the Cœur d'Alene district forces the conclusion that those who provoked the crime of the 29th of April, 1899, were no less responsible for it, inasmuch as they were lawbreakers in two instances prior thereto, than were the men who actually committed the malicious destruction of property.

There is another phase of this serious and important manifestation of the social and military conditions of the country which must not be overlooked. Under the constitution and statutes of the State of Idaho the governor is authorized in cases of emergency to call the legislature in session on twenty days' notice. In this age of civilization, when a man is supposed to be free from arrest without due process of law, and free from imprisonment until he has been found guilty by a jury of his peers, neither the governor of the State of Idaho nor the President of the United States was justified in brushing away the constitution and statutes of the State of Idaho and the Constitution of the United States and establishing the arbitrary, despotic, and tyrannical imprisonment of men merely at the whim or caprice of an alleged representative or agent stationed in the Cœur d'Alene district. Common sense and common decency would have suggested to the governor of the State, as well as the President of the United States, that the legislature of Idaho should have been called at once in session, and their deliberations and decisions should have controlled the rights and the liberties of these thousands of men, women, and children in the Cœur d'Alene district.

It appears from the evidence taken that at no time from and after the morning of the 30th of April, 1899, has there been even the slightest resistance offered to any civil officer, nor has there at any time been wanting the services of county commissioners, a sheriff, a prosecuting attorney, a jury, and a judge, all selected substantially at the suggestion of the governor after conference and close communion with the managers of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan Mining Company. Fairness and impartiality on the part of the governor would have suggested to him the calling of the legislature, that they might, in their collective wisdom, decide what was necessary and for the best interests of the State of Idaho; and prudence and a respectful concern on the part of the President of the United States for the rights of the labor unions of that district ought to have suggested to him that he demand of the governor that rather than resort to his arbitrary and despotic will he should call the legislature in session and let them determine what course should be pursued; and the President should have notified the governor that unless the ironclad and blacklisting system against the members of labor unions was abolished the United States troops would be immediately withdrawn. There appears in the evidence nowhere any necessity or justification for tolerating the use of the troops to enforce the permit system.

Section 4, Article IV, of the Constitution of the United States, under which we think the President was authorized to send the troops at the call of the governor of Idaho, not only provides that the President shall protect each State against domestic violence on the application of the legislature, or the executive when the legislature can not be convened; but it also provides that the United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion; and we hold that the arbitrary and tyrannical power exercised in establishing the blacklisting system of union labor was not a republican form of government, nor even a civilized form of government, and we hold, as we believe all self-respecting citizens of America will hold, that the President of the United States is not and was not justified in sending the troops into the State of Idaho and leaving them indefinitely, or forever, in that jurisdiction without exercising any discretion or control over them.

We contend that the President of the United States can not relieve himself of responsibility nor for a day divorce himself from the deepest concern as to what the troops, of which he is Commander in Chief, are doing and are being used for. Neither law nor order, nor justice, nor equity, nor decency, nor humanity would tolerate the despotic system which perpetrated upon thousands of men, women, and children the brutality of the bull pen and the blacklisting system which has driven some 1,500 member of the miners' unions, together with their wives and children, from Shoshone County and denied them the privilege of earning a livelihood among their neighbors and their friends and has throw them upon the world as outcasts and tramps without even having so much as an affidavit or an indictment against them, much less a conviction for any offense, even of the petty degree of a misdemeanor. Let it be confessed with shame and humiliation that our Chief Executive and our Army officials have become so callous to the rights and liberties of labor that these things could have been perpetrated in this year of our Lord 1899 and 1900.

The undersigned recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives*, That the conduct of the President and of the military forces of the United States in Shoshone County, Idaho, has been reprehensible, violative of the liberty of the citizen, and totally unwarranted by the laws and Constitution of the United States."

WM. SULZER.
JOHN J. LENTZ.
N. N. COX.
JAMES HAY.
THOS. M. JETT.
JAS. L. SLAYDEN.
ROBT. F. BROUSSARD.

Recently my attention was called to a paragraph which appeared on the same day in all parts of the Union in scores of Administration newspapers, or, more properly speaking, libel sheets, venal and subsidized, and prostituting themselves to any use required by the political machine here at Washington. The paragraph is as follows:

Representative LENTZ has lost no time in entering upon the work of misrepresenting the testimony adduced in the Idaho investigation. But that sort of thing is decidedly Lentzesque.

It appeared in many papers on the same day—the 16th of May last—for instance, I find it in an Administration sheet, the Youngstown (Ohio) Telegram, as follows:

Representative LENTZ has lost no time in entering upon the work of misrepresenting the testimony adduced in the Idaho investigation. But that sort of thing is decidedly Lentzesque.

Also in another Administration sheet in Bowling Green, Ohio; also in the Logansport (Ind.) Journal, as follows:

Representative LENTZ has lost no time in entering upon the work of misrepresenting the testimony adduced in the Idaho investigation. But that sort of thing is decidedly Lentzesque.

Also in another Administration sheet in Morris, Ill.; also in the Guthrie (Okla.) State Capital, as follows:

Representative LENTZ has lost no time in entering upon the work of misrepresenting the testimony adduced in the Idaho investigation. But that sort of thing is decidedly Lentzesque.

Is this the advance agent of a campaign of libel and slander? Is it possible that the commandment "Thou shalt not lie" was not written for Republican editors?

Can a man in public life not expose a beef-trust administration or a Republican post-office robbing trust in Cuba without finding machine-made paragraphs of unmitigated falsehoods prepared in Washington and distributed throughout the entire Republic on the same day to vilify him?

Fie upon an Administration which prates about "national honor" and "duty and destiny," all the while carrying on a campaign of falsehood, libel, slander, and vilification against those who are merely trying to turn the light on the rats in the barn!

Will the editors of these libelous sheets dare to invite the public to read the complete record of the testimony in the Cœur d'Alene case, or will they conceal from their readers the fact that the Republican majority in Congress refused to permit the testimony to be printed and distributed to the people, as requested by the Democrats?

As in the past, so in the future, I shall present proof of my statements and challenge contradiction by the Administration cuckoos. And in addition to the views of the minority, I present the following extracts from the testimony of the witnesses who appeared on both sides of the controversy during the examination, and it will be noted by every fair-minded reader that the Republican members of the Military Committee prefer to presume in favor of the negro soldiers, no one of whom testified in the case, to contradict the testimony of Levi R. Miller, an old soldier and a member of the G. A. R.

In other words, the Republican party, as represented on the Military Committee, is willing to go on record that it will treat the testimony of Mr. Miller as that of a perjurer, rather than believe that the negro soldiers perpetrated the outrages to which Mr. Miller and others testified, concerning the treatment of himself and another G. A. R. man who was imprisoned in the same bull pen without any charge ever being preferred against them.

The Republican majority of the Military Committee have certified that the charges filed by me were not sustained, and had they been willing to publish the testimony in its entirety, as the Democratic membership of the committee requested, there might be some reason to believe that they had full confidence in their

report; but their willingness to bury or burn the testimony justifies the suggestion that they are probably unwilling to have the public know the truth and the whole truth about the President's use of the Army in the Cœur d'Alene district of Idaho.

I incorporate the analysis and condensation of the testimony made by Professor Collins, which substantiates and proves every charge made, and I must confess that I was greatly surprised to find so much evidence in support of so many charges, because I had a right to assume that the charges as made in the newspapers might be exaggerated, whereas, in fact, an examination of the testimony here submitted will satisfy every liberty-loving citizen and every fair-minded juror that the truth has not been half told in any newspaper account of this first experiment of a Russian Siberia in the Republic of America.

MILITARISM IN IDAHO—WEYLER'S METHODS USED AGAINST UNION LABOR—IMPERIALISM ILLUSTRATED IN THE CŒUR D'ALENES.

[Abstract and comments by J. A. Collins.]

Upon a careful review of the testimony of record before the Committee on Military Affairs in this investigation, any thoughtful and patriotic man must be shocked by the realization of the imminent danger to our free institutions, and the innate rights of our people, so clearly demonstrated by this great object lesson. That the constitutional rights of the citizen can be trampled upon, that the established laws can be overridden, that the Constitution can be defied, that despotic power can be usurped and exercised, that innocent citizens can be seized without warrant and imprisoned without process of law, that such acts can be supported by the armed forces of this Republic, under the authority of the President, would be bad enough, indeed, in time of war or serious revolutionary emergencies; but that such a thing is even possible at all, in a time of profound peace, is startling in the extreme; yet we have here before us the indisputable proof that such is unfortunately the case. That such a thing is not only possible, but actually transpires to-day, in the very heart of our country, is too clearly demonstrated to allow us to overlook or ignore it.

This investigation has exposed and brought to our attention a condition of affairs so infamous, so despotic, so defiant of our Constitution and the spirit of our free institutions, that it seems a crime of the very highest magnitude, against the very life of the Republic. That such a crime is possible at all is an impeachment against the entire party to whom has been intrusted the guardianship of our institutions and our liberties; but that such an infamy should not only have been allowed, but been supported and made possible by the bayonets which were only forged to protect those institutions and those liberties, makes it mandatory that the power so perverted and debauched should be brought to strict account before the high tribunal of a free but outraged people.

In the very heart of this Republic, amid a peaceful, industrious, and prosperous citizenship, there has been established the methods of the military autocrat, the midnight arrest, the forcible entry and search of homes, the tramp of the soldier, the clank of arms, the shackle, and the Bastile. There the methods of Weyler, who shocked the civilized world by his inhuman atrocities perpetrated upon the suffering people of Cuba, have been put in operation by "the Weyler of the Cœur d'Alenes" (Captain Edwards), who persecuted innocent American citizens by confining them "incomunicado" in emulation of his Spanish prototype of the Moro at Habana, and inflicted brutal and degrading punishments upon innocent men, unconvicted of crime; treated as felons American citizens against whom not even a charge of any kind had or could be preferred. There another petty despot, Bartlett Sinclair, a political chameleon and adventurer, in emulation of the methods of the same illustrious "butcher," revived his infamous "reconcentrado" system in the bull pen.

In this mass of evidence are facts related that call up recollections of the prisons of Siberia, of the military arrests of Russia, of the inquisition of the dark ages. One imagines he can hear the echoes of the French Revolution, the moans from the Bastile, the rattle of the death carts, the prayers of the condemned, the thud of the guillotine, or the despairing wails from the dungeons of the Moro and the foodless huts of the starving reconcentrados.

All these grewsome sounds would be but a fit accompaniment to the saturnalia of persecution carried on in that devoted section of our land, and under the approval of the President, who asks now, at the hands of the people, to longer be intrusted with the direction of our destiny. But one is led to ask, How can these things be? How can it be possible that such conditions can exist, that such deeds can be enacted under the American flag? Ah! how? That is a question which it behooves every man to ask, and not only ask, but study earnestly, or the time may come to him when he himself will be the victim and live the very experiences which seem to him impossible. These deeds are not only possible but here is the unimpeachable proof, the evidence of credible witnesses who have themselves not only witnessed but suffered these outrages. But how was it possible that the people did not rise in righteous indignation and visit their just vengeance upon the guilty? Let us see.

This whole deplorable series of infamies originated in a conspiracy conceived by a trust combine, the Bunker Hill and Sullivan Mining Company, to drive out of the Cœur d'Alene district all union labor; it was a conspiracy against a particular class of citizens. They realized that the only defense possible to labor, in its struggle with combined capital, is in organization and united action. This they determined to prevent, in order that they might dictate their own terms and at the same time take what they pleased from the output of labor for their own share, while the laborer remained absolutely the slave of their dictation.

A controversy as to wages was inaugurated, violence was resorted to, and the governor was appealed to for assistance, but when the time came for him to perform his part in this diabolical plot he was either too sick or too cowardly to go in person among the outraged people he had betrayed into the power of this conscienceless combination, and he chose, illegally, from among his sycophantic dependents a fitting tool for such filthy service; a nobody from nowhere; a conscienceless adventurer, a typical sycophant, who, regardless of right, of justice, of common humanity, of the Constitution or the laws, would serve the ends of his master and perpetrate any infamy to further the purposes of his employers.

His first act was to consult with the instigators of the plot, the officials of the Bunker Hill Company. Having done this, he went direct to Wardner, chose from among the employees of this company his entire force of assistants of every description, his deputies, who were to serve as a technical cover for the United States soldiers used in illegally arresting citizens without warrant or charge, and in breaking into and searching the homes of the people. He made the company physician chief inquisitor of his star-chamber investigation. He made the company's attorney chief prosecutor, and another attorney of the company chief advisor and assistant to himself. The greater portion of his jury of inquest he chose among the dependents and employees of the company, and the rest from traders who depended on the patronage of the company for their support. He arrested and deposed, illegally and without cause, the duly elected and qualified civil officers of the county, and installed in their places the creatures and tools of the company. Even the warden and cook of his prison were taken from the rolls of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan Company. The entire community was put under surveillance of this coterie, and the will of this petty despot was the only law. The troops of the United States obeyed his slightest wish and enforced his every command. A reign of terror was inaugurated. The entire county was dragnetted, and whole communities thrown into prison without warrant or knowing of any charge against them—the sacred writ of habeas corpus suspended and denied.

There was no appeal from the decree of the dictator. United States soldiers stood watch and ward about the prison; the most trivial act on the part of the unfortunate prisoners brought swift and brutal punishment. The petty tyrant in the uniform of the United States Army acting as jailer vented his petty spite against the unfortunates who excited his resentment in punishments only dealt out to felons and the victims of an irresponsible autocracy or slaves. Free-born American citizens were humiliated and persecuted in the most inhuman manner, although no charge had ever been preferred against them; the law did not exist for them; the Constitution of their country could bring no defense; to them the flag of freedom was made a mockery and a lie. For them liberty and equality were but a dream, and the free institutions of their country a deception and a fraud; the dignity of their citizenship a burlesque and a farce. The will of the petty despot was stronger than the protecting arm of the country. The ægis of the Constitution could not protect them from the bayonets of its own soldiery. The President, to whom was intrusted the guardianship of their liberties, looked on their misery and wrongs the helpless creature of a corrupt oligarchy, which had compelled his aid in their infamous designs.

This illustration of imperialism is too realistic, too vivid, to allow it to be passed without calling to it the attention of the people whose liberties are so seriously menaced by it. This application of the methods of militarism is too startling, too tragic, to allow it to go unrebuked. The perpetration of these outrages on the liberty of the people and the spirit of our free institutions is too flagrant, too high handed and defiant, to be allowed to go unwhipped of justice. If such infamies are possible under existing conditions, what might be expected under a fully developed and thoroughly organized system of imperialism, backed and supported by a strong standing army, and directed and controlled by a cold-blooded, selfish, and mercenary power in the hands of the trusts and combines and various money influences, centralized to further their own vicious ends and pecuniary advantages?

If such tyranny and oppression can be perpetrated at this time, under existing institutions, what might we not anticipate with further power and extended opportunity and incentive? If it can happen now in Idaho, it is possible in another locality; if it can be perpetrated against one class of citizens, it can be against any other; if it could happen yesterday to those citizens, it can happen to-morrow against these.

All these infamies, all this defiance of the Constitution and ignoring of the civil law, these outrages upon the rights and dignity of citizenship, the establishment of this reign of terror and reckless exercise of despotic power was only possible through the aid and support of the United States troops, and for this illegal and despotic employment of the forces of the United States the President, as commander in chief, is unquestionably responsible.

This investigation has developed so many startling facts, revealed so many dangerous possibilities, is such a startling index to existing conditions and points so unerringly to the danger which threatens, that I would not feel that my duty had been performed if I should fail to set out fully the facts as developed. Therefore the charges in the resolution are set out separately and in consecutive order, with the facts testified to showing beyond question that every charge is well founded and fully sustained by competent evidence. I therefore set out a full review of the case as it developed, setting out each charge in its consecutive order, together with the proofs substantiating it.

The resolution charges as follows:

First. Troops have been sent into the State of Idaho in defiance of and contrary to the provisions of Article IV, section 4, of the Constitution of the United States, in that it was done at the individual request of the governor of Idaho, without the authority of the legislature, and at a time when there was no condition of insurrection or riot, and when the legislature could have been called together without danger or delay from any source whatever; and further, without even consultation with the sheriff of Shoshone County, where it was desired that the troops should be sent.

Article IV, section 4, of the Constitution of the United States, herein referred to, is in the following words:

The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion, and on application of the legislature, or of the executive (when the legislature can not be convened), against domestic violence.

It is clearly shown by the evidence that the occurrence upon which the governor of Idaho based his demand for Federal troops was merely a momentary outbreak arising from a difference between one mining corporation and certain individual miners. It was in no manner a rebellion against the civil authorities of the State or county, nor has there been an instance proven of resistance to any civil process or defiance of the constituted authorities of the State. The occurrence seems to have been merely an ebullition of temper upon the part of a portion of the population in the locality, excited against a certain financial or industrial corporation, and in no manner arose to the dignity of an insurrection. At the worst it was merely a local riot, and the evidence shows clearly that the civil power of the State was amply sufficient to discipline and punish those guilty.

Even had the civil authorities been unable to cope with the situation the militia would have been amply sufficient, as there was no disturbance in any portion of the State outside of this extremely limited zone and the sparse population there located. There is no evidence to show that civil process was in any case resisted or the officers of the law defied. The evidence clearly shows that the riot was of momentary existence, and immediately upon its cessation the people returned peaceably to their homes and civil process could have been served without resistance or the least danger to the representatives of the constituted authorities. There is not a single case of resistance against any officer of the law shown. It has not been proven that any condition of insurrection against the constituted authorities existed in any part of the State which rendered the assembling of the legislature impossible or even dangerous. Indeed, it is clearly shown that the conditions throughout the State were normal, and that profound peace reigned everywhere after April 29, 1899.

It is clearly shown that in issuing his proclamation declaring a state of insurrection in Shoshone County that the governor acted arbitrarily and outside of any authority vested in him by the statutes of the State of Idaho, which statutes are a part of the record in this investigation (sections 7400–7408, Laws of Idaho), and will be found in the quoted evidence of Mr. F. C. Robertson.

In the issuing of his proclamation the governor failed to comply with any of the requirements of the statute. Section 7402 of the statutes was ignored and no call made upon the militia. There is no evidence that the requirements of section 7403 or 7404 were complied with by any civil officer. Indeed, not one of the statutes relating to this duty of the governor was in any way regarded. The entire statute is based upon the fact of resistance to the service of civil process, issued by the properly constituted authorities, and in no single instance has it been shown that such resistance had been made or that any rebellion against the civil authorities existed.

Even had a state of insurrection existed and an open defiance of the constituted authorities been developed, the only authority vested in the governor was to call out the militia of the State to aid and uphold the civil authorities. This he flagrantly failed to do, and without even an attempt to assemble the legislature, rushed to the President, appealing for Federal troops. It is shown by the evidence of Mr. Robertson, the governor himself, and many others that the largest number of men claimed to have been participants in the riot was 1,200, and yet the number of men in the State within the age limit for military service was at least 45,000, and still there was no call for their services.

The governor makes the lame excuse that the militia force was greatly depleted by the sending of men to the Philippines, and yet it is shown that only one company from the State militia was absent on such service, and he only asked for 500 United States soldiers. The application of the governor of Idaho by telegraph to the President, dated April 29, 1899, 11 p. m., asking for Federal troops, and setting out his reasons for such request (set out in the report of the Major-General Commanding the Army, and made a part of this record), is shown by the evidence to be misleading and untrue. The immediate compliance of the President, without inquiry or hesitation, as shown by his reply next morning, evidences a readiness which, to say the least, is surprising; and yet the flood of telegrams from corporation magnates throughout the United States, and made a part of this report, are indices that point to the influence behind the whole procedure.

These telegrams and letters from bankers, trust manipulators, and corporation magnates came from various money centers of the United States, far removed from the scene of trouble, and none of them from mine owners in the vicinity, except those from the management of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan mine, showing clearly the character of influence brought to bear upon the President. The evidence shows that the dispatch of Governor Steunenberg was sent immediately after the disturbance had ended, and before any attempt could be made by the civil authorities to arrest any of the participants, and before he had any ground to charge a defiance of the civil authorities.

On May 4 General Merriam telegraphed to the adjutant-general:

One hundred and twenty-eight arrests made by State officials under military support. No signs of resistance.

All witnesses examined testified to a perfetcly peaceful condition as existing at all times after April 29, and not one instance of defiance of or resistance to the constituted authorities, even at Wardner, and no intimation is had of any reason why the legislature could not have been convened, or the military forces of the State used. No mines were threatened or interfered with other than the Bunker Hill and Sullivan, nor has any complaint been lodged by any other operators, and the whole deplorable affair is clearly shown to have grown out of the unjust and tyrannical action of this one corporation toward its own employees. The charged resistance against the State authorities has not only not been proven, but it seems from the evidence that the power and authority of the State was used to support this single corporation in its measures of oppression and injustice toward a certain class of citizens, although they themselves were the first lawbreakers.

The governor himself, in his statement, shows that he was appealed to by the managers of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan mine to lend his aid to that corporation as early as April 26, when they telegraphed to him asking protection and falsely stating that the civil authorities were unable to cope with the mob. At the same time it is stated by all the witnesses examined that there was no riot prior to April 29. The governor stated that he replied to the corporation manager, advising reference to the board of arbitration, as required by law, but the manager refused. The governor states that he telegraphed to the sheriff of Shoshone County asking information as to the situation, and in reply the sheriff sent the following telegram:

WARDNER, IDAHO, *April 26, 1899.*

FRANK STEUNENBERG, *Governor, Boise, Idaho:*

Your telegram received. Am on the ground. All is quiet. No armed mob. Matters are orderly. Will do all in my power to preserve order. The county authorities were not applied to until 10 a. m. this morning.

JAMES D. YOUNG, *Sheriff.*

On April 27 the governor received the following telegram:

WARDNER, IDAHO, *April 27, 1899.*

FRANK STEUNENBERG, *Boise:*

Trouble with Last Chance settled. Union men satisfied. No disturbance.

JAMES D. YOUNG, *Sheriff.*

This is all of the information received by the governor prior to April 29, and it was surely sufficient to satisfy him that there was no necessity for his interference in any way, and that the sheriff of the county considered that there was no necessity for any uneasiness as to his ability to control the situation. It is certainly evident from all the testimony introduced, including the statement of the governor himself, that the civil authorities were fully competent to control the situation, and that no riot, much less insurrection, existed. On April 29 the first information which came to the governor was not from any civil officer asking for soldiers, but

from Mr. Burbidge, manager of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan mine, who again appealed for protection. A. L. Mohler, president of the Oregon Railroad and Navigation Company, also telegraphed the governor as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., *April 29, 1899.*

FRANK STEUNENBERG, *Boise, Idaho:*

The armed force at Cœur d'Alene mines took possession of Northern Pacific engine and are using our tracks. Will you protect us against use and damage of our property?

A. L. MOHLER,
President, O. R. and N. Company.

The governor thereupon sent the following dispatch to the sheriff:

BOISE, IDAHO, *April 29, 1899.*

JAMES D. YOUNG, *Sheriff Shoshone County, Wardner, Idaho:*

Representations are made that you are not able to cope with those who threaten disturbance, and that railroad property has been forcibly taken possession of. Up to this time I have relied upon your power and ability to protect property and preserve order. Wire me the situation and any contemplated or actual violence, as reports seem to call for prompt and vigorous action by the State.

FRANK STEUNENBERG, *Governor.*

At 4 p. m. on the same day, the governor received the following dispatch from President Mohler, after the riot was over. Observe that this dispatch is sent from Portland, Oreg., a point farther removed from the scene of disturbance than the governor himself was.

PORTLAND, OREG., *April 29, 1899.*

FRANK STEUNENBERG, *Boise, Idaho:*

Message received. Conditions at Wardner could not be worse. Rioters have set fire to Bunker Hill Mill, which is now burning. As they previously loaded it with dynamite, presume its destruction is only a matter of a few minutes. Rioters have cut wires, have appropriated Northern Pacific trains, and have interrupted all business. It is reported there are 800 of these rioters who are masked and armed and propose driving out miners at Bunker Hill mine. I can not urge too strongly that you exhaust every means in your power to bring this matter to successful termination, and that not one moment be lost. Rioters have also taken possession of the lines of this company.

A. L. MOHLER.

Upon the strength of this sensational telegram, from a citizen of Oregon, hundreds of miles from the scene of disturbance, and without waiting for a reply or call from the sheriff of the county, who was on the scene, and without knowing what was being done by the civil authorities, or even giving a passing thought to the State military forces, the governor rushed to the telegraph office and wired the following dispatch to the President. This dispatch was sent at 6.30 p. m., April 29, after the disturbance had ceased and the men had dispersed:

BOISE, IDAHO, *April 29, 1899.*

The PRESIDENT, *Washington, D. C.:*

In pursuance of the statute in such case made and provided, I, Frank Steunenberg, governor of Idaho, the legislature not being in session, and it not being possible to convene it, do hereby apply to the President of the United States, to call forth the military forces of the United States to suppress insurrection in Shoshone County, State of Idaho. This is sustained in the fact that all of the available Idaho National Guard volunteered for service in the Philippines, and said county is in a state of insurrection. I am of the opinion that at least 500 troops in the aggregate will be necessary, but smaller detachments should be ordered in as rapidly as possible.

FRANK STEUNENBERG, *Governor.*

After having sent this appeal to the President, on the same evening the governor received the following dispatch from the sheriff:

WARDNER, IDAHO, *April 29, 1899.*

FRANK STEUNENBERG, *Governor, Boise, Idaho:*

About 800 armed men took possession of train at Wallace and arrived at Wardner Junction about noon. They immediately marched to the Bunker Hill and Sullivan concentrator and destroyed it, together with the adjoining buildings, after which they returned on the same train to Wallace. A few cars were badly damaged by the explosion of the mill. One man was shot and killed, and two wounded. No one expects further trouble, so far as I can learn. I was on the scene during the trouble, but was unable to disperse armed miners. Have deputized several men, and think I can handle the situation.

JAMES D. YOUNG, *Sheriff.*

Now, this is the situation which existed on April 29, when the governor made his appeal for Federal troops, as the governor himself explained it. The riot had occurred and was over, the excitement had subsided and the people had returned to their homes. The sheriff declared himself able to control the situation, and it only remained to arrest and punish the perpetrators of the crimes committed. There was no report of any resistance to civil process or civil officers and none seemed to have been anticipated, and yet the governor reports to the President a state of insurrection which he himself shows did not exist. That no resistance was made to civil processes served by the properly authorized civil authorities is proven by the testimony of Edward J. Flannagan, a justice of the peace, who had issued warrants on April 29, which were served without resistance, and by William Powers, a constable, who on that day arrested alone eight men upon warrants and met no resistance.

Andrew J. Devlin testified that he was in Wardner on May 2, and there was no disorder of any description, or any instance of resistance to the civil authorities, but that men were that day arrested on warrants, charging them with complicity in the riot of April 29, and that the county attorney was proceeding with his duties of finding out and arresting suspected parties, with as much energy as possible, and in no case was he resisted or his process defied. Wilber H. Stewart, Thomas Heney, Moses S. Simmons, James R. Sovereign, F. O. Martin, L. J. Simpkins, George Cornell, Allen F. Gill, and many others, testified that there was no disorder in Shoshone County before or after the riot of April 29, nor was there ever any defiance of the State civil authorities or resistance of any civil process; consequently there was no state of insurrection or rebellion, and no reason why participants in the riot could not have been arrested and punished by the regular processes of the civil courts.

The only persons who claim that such a condition existed are the governor, who was 500 miles away, and the operators and owners of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan mine, in whose interest this persecution was undertaken.

The county commissioners, it is shown by the evidence of Mr. Stimson and the governor himself, were not inquired of as to the situation, and the sheriff, as has already been shown, when asked by the governor, declared that all was quiet, and that he had the situation in hand and could control it; that is to say, that he feared no resistance to his measures for bringing the guilty to justice. The only element of disturbance appears to have been the soldiery, when they began the indiscriminate arresting of innocent and peaceable citizens, many of whom were miles away from the scene of disturbance and many had no connection whatever with the mining interests.

Second charge. The resolution charges in the second place that—

In defiance of section 9, Article I, of the Constitution, martial law was declared and the writ of habeas corpus suspended in Shoshone County in time of profound peace, when there was no condition of rebellion or invasion or any menace to the public safety.

Section 9, article 1, of the Constitution of the United States is in the following words:

The privilege of the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended unless when, in cases of rebellion or invasion, the public safety may require it.

The constitution of the State of Idaho contains a clause identical with this, except with the added clause, "and then only in such manner as shall be prescribed by law."

This charge in the resolution is sustained by an overwhelming weight of testimony. On May 4, 1899, Governor Steunenberg issued a proclamation declaring the county of Shoshone to be in a state of insurrection and rebellion, which established martial law in said county, or was so interpreted by General Merriam, as is shown by his telegram to the officer commanding at Wardner, ordering arrests and notifying him of the declaration of martial law in Shoshone County. This telegram is dated May 3, and is embodied in the report of the major-general commanding the army, of record in the case.

The legislature of Idaho has never passed any law authorizing the governor to suspend the writ of habeas corpus, and the Supreme Court of the United States has construed the provision of the Federal Constitution to mean that the right to suspend the writ is vested in Congress, and not in the President of the United States, so that the right to suspend the writ of habeas corpus is a legislative rather than an Executive function. Decisions are in evidence to this effect.

The evidence shows that the effect of this proclamation was to suspend the writ of habeas corpus in the county of Shoshone and that General Merriam so understood it, and that with this understanding wholesale arrests began without warrant or any civil process. Even before the issuance of this proclamation the military began its espionage and the exercise of its arbitrary power, as is evidenced by a dispatch dated May 2 from General Merriam to the Adjutant-General of the Army. Report of Major-General commanding Army, to wit:

Troops concentrating at Wardner and Mullan will control outlets from mining camps. If not disapproved, I will scrutinize travel outward and detain suspected passengers. This is martial law, but no other course likely to secure rioters.

To this dispatch the Adjutant-General replied on the next day, May 3, in the following words:

Your cipher message received. Submitted by the Acting Secretary of War to the President, and I am instructed to say your action is approved.

H. C. CORBIN, *Adjutant-General.*

Here it is evident that martial law was declared by the general commanding the United States forces in Shoshone County two days before the proclamation of the governor was issued, and this action was approved by the President. On May 3, the day before the governor's proclamation was dated, the following dispatch was sent by Captain Batchelor, in command at Wardner, to General Merriam, at Walla Walla:

I arrived here yesterday at 2 p. m. and encamped. Situation quiet at present. Much apprehension apparent. Search for arms now in progress, which I am protecting. Arrests contemplated, which Sinclair thinks may lead to resistance. Walla Walla troops not in yet.

BATCHELOR, *Commanding.*

From this it is evident that quiet reigned on May 2, and the only apprehension which seemed to exist was of danger to the citizens from the troops and in the mind of Mr. Sinclair, and yet

the next day the governer proclaimed a state of insurrection and rebellion, when not a single case of resistance to civil process had been reported, although many warrants had been issued and served.

From these facts it seems clear that martial law was first declared and initiated by the general commanding the United States forces in Shoshone County with the approval of the President two days before the date of the governor's proclamation. Immediately wholesale arrests began, and on May 4 General Merriam telegraphed the Adjutant-General:

One hundred and twenty-eight arrests. No signs of resistance.

On May 5, the day after the governor's proclamation was issued, 350 arrests were reported and not a single case of resistance, or disturbance of any kind (and this in the midst of a state of insurrection and rebellion so dangerous and aggravated that (in the opinion of the governor) the 45,000 able-bodied men composing the militia levy of the State, were unable to cope with it, and he was compelled to call upon the President for the irresistible force of 500 negro soldiers to hold the wild tumult in check and preserve the peace and dignity of the State.)

General Merriam himself states that—

The arrests of men suspected of complicity in the crime of April 29 began on the arrival of Captain Batchelor, May 2, and were continued in the different mining camps.

This evidence shows conclusively that the establishment of martial law was virtually the action of the general commanding the United States forces and was done under the approval of the President. That it was done in defiance of the Constitution, both of the State of Idaho and of the United States, there seems to be no lack of evidence to prove. General Merriam goes on to state in regard to the number and condition of prisoners:

As they were brought in, they were placed in a large building two stories high, used as a warehouse for the storage of hay and grain; it had no provision for fires and was without furniture, so that the prisoners were compelled to sleep on the floor. The prisoners were fed at the expense of the State, by a former boarding-house boss. Many of the prisoners were brought in without blankets, and they were not supplied until bedding was brought to them by their families or friends. It is probable that in this way some of the prisoners were exposed to the cold of the nights, and that some of the sickness was due to this exposure.

This was the mild statement of the general commanding, but he goes on with his statement and says:

After about May 5 the number of prisoners exceeded the capacity of the building (this in three days) and it became necessary to hold perhaps 200 of them quartered in box cars, side tracked near the Wardner Station.

In the meantime the State authorities had begun the construction of a prison, but the general says:

However, I became dissatisfied with the apparently slow progress made for their comfort, and on May 11 I sent the following telegram:

Governor STEUNENBERG, *Boise, Idaho:*

I am still holding nearly 500 prisoners in a barn and box cars. All are very uncomfortable, and with unsanitary conditions which will soon become intolerable. Something must be done to hurry preliminary examination and release of those not prima facie guilty. It is impracticable to make this large number of prisoners reasonably comfortable without time and expense. Can you not personally inspect the situation at once and bring help?

MERRIAM, *Brigadier-General.*

An anomalous condition is shown to have existed during the maintenance of martial law in the county of Shoshone. By the evidence of Mr. Alfred Frazier and a transcript of the records of the court presented by him and admitted to the record of this examination, it is shown that the civil courts were open, that the grand jury was in session, indictments were found and convictions had, sentence was passed, and Paul Corcoran was sent to the penitentiary, and no instance of resistance to the civil authorities is shown; and although the civil court was open and in session, yet no case of habeas corpus would be heard and no writ issued, under the plea of martial law.

This is proven by the testimony of Mr. Frederick C. Robertson, a practicing attorney of Spokane, Wash., and the attorney of certain of the prisoners held by the military and who presented the first application for a writ of habeas corpus on behalf of the county commissioners who were arrested there—William Boyle and William Stimson. Mr. Robertson says:

I subsequently, in connection with other counsel not appealing from the order of the lower court refusing the writ, made an original application to the supreme court of the State of Idaho, putting in that application matter that we thought raised a Federal question and argued that case before the supreme court of the State of Idaho. Our application was there denied.

And yet during this time Paul Corcoran was indicted, convicted, and sentenced in the district court and no one offered any hindrance to the process of the court.

Mr. Robertson states that he presented the application for a writ of habeas corpus in the district court on the ground that his client was not incarcerated in pursuance of the Constitution of the United States; that he was not arrested upon any warrant charging him with any offense; that he had been denied the opportunity of giving bail, and that, in other words, his arrest was illegal. (This arrest was made about four days after martial law had been put in force.)

The judge said in his decision that the governor had acted in the matter and that he would not inquire into the legality of any of these arrests. He informed me that the application had been opposed by the attorney-general, who was there representing the governor and did represent the governor and subsequently, the lower court having denied the writ to us, we went to the supreme court of the State of Idaho and there renewed our application for a writ of habeas corpus in the Boyle case. The supreme court took practically the same ground that the lower court did, and did not discuss the legal right of these men to be released.

There is no statute of the State of Idaho in evidence which gives to the governor the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus, but under his proclamation of May 4 the court of the State refused to consider applications for such writ and declared it suspended. The attorney-general claimed that the declaration that the county was in a state of insurrection suspended the writ of habeas corpus and all laws, and so instructed the district court having jurisdiction in Shoshone County.

The Constitution specially declares that—

The privilege of the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended unless * * * the public safety may require it.

There is nothing in evidence to show that the public safety was in any way threatened or in danger; nothing in evidence shows that there was any animosity against any portion of the public other than one single corporation, which was involved in a dispute with its employees, and the public had nothing whatever to do with the matter; nor was any threat or menace made against any other corporation or individual. Indeed, had the Bunker Hill and Sullivan management complied with the requirements of the laws of Idaho, as in evidence before this committee, there would have been an arbitration instead of a disturbance, and it is clearly demonstrated that the illegal action and defiance of the State laws on the part of this corporation was the prime cause of all the evils and injustice which followed as the result.

The whole matter was one for police survilleance, and in any properly organized municipality would have been controlled without serious results. The facts as stated by Mr. Robertson go to prove this to have been the case. On the 29th day of April, 1899, there were employed by the Bunker Hill and Sullivan mine about 400 men. The Last Chance mine, which was an adjoining property, employed on that day about 200 men, and the other mines in the Cœur d'Alene employed 1,220 to 2,000 men. All of the mines in the Cœur d'Alene employed union miners (there were six other mines in operation at this locality beside the Bunker Hill and Sullivan, which was one corporation).

The labor disturbances between the Bunker Hill and Sullivan and its employees commenced on the 13th day of April, according to the findings of General Merriam and others. All of the mines in the Cœur d'Alene on the 13th day of April, 1899, paid $3.50 per day for miners, with the exception of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan, which was nonunion and paid its employees $2.50 and $3, and so were paying to their men about $72,000 less a year than was paid by other mines in that district, and yet the Bunker Hill and Sullivan is considered to be the richest producer of lead and silver in the world.

The testimony of Mr. Burbridge, superintendent of the mine, and Mr. Birch, the foreman, as witnesses for the State in the Paul Corcoran case and of record in this investigation, shows that on the 13th day of April, there was a strike among the employees of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan; union and nonunion men all quit the mine and went out on a strike. There was no labor difficulty in any other mine in the district, because they were all satisfied. On April 13 the men having struck, a committee of union and nonunion miners (some of the nonunion men having joined the union) waited upon the superintendent of the Bunker Hill and asked for an increase in wages, to an equal amount paid by the other mines in the district, for the same services.

After taking the matter under consideration for several days, and the men becoming threatening and stopping the tramways, the management conceded the raise to $3.50 a day. Mr. Birch, in his speech from the office of the company, said that they would accede to the demand of the miners and pay them $3.50 per day, but that all union miners should apply to the office and get their time. This was in defiance of a statute of the State of Idaho, passed at the second session of the legislature. Approved March 6, 1893:

SEC. 1. It shall be unlawful for any person, firm, or corporation to make or enter into any agreement, either oral or in writing, by the terms of which any employee of such person or firm or corporation or any person about to enter the employ of such person, firm, or corporation, as a condition for continuing or obtaining such employment, shall promise or agree not to become or continue a member of a labor organization.

SEC. 2. Any person or persons or corporation violating the provisions of this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in a sum not less than $50 nor more than $300, or be imprisoned in the jail for not more than six months, or both such fine and imprisonment.

Thus the management of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan, by their illegal act and defiance of the laws of the State of Idaho, were the first law breakers, and by their arrogant assumption of power and

tyrannical and unlawful oppression of their employees, excited the resentment which led ultimately to the disorders and crimes which later disgraced the State, and which it is sought to lay at the door of the people who had been wronged, and whose rights had been overridden and disregarded.

Nor is the management of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan alone responsible for this outrage upon constituted rights and the dignity of citizenship. The executive branch of the State government must bear its share of the onus in this outrage, for the reason that it not only neglected to enforce the law against this defiant and dictatorial corporation by proceeding against it under the law, but it allied itself with the corporation and conspired with it to further persecute and oppress the laborers it was its duty to protect and defend. The natural result of this arbitrary and dictatorial action of the management of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan was to incense the miners, and they naturally became more turbulent and defiant.

About April 25 the superintendent of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan telegraphed to the governor stating that the property was being threatened, and asked for protection. There is a statute in the State of Idaho, passed in 1897, which provides that where there is a difference between labor organizations and their employers, the difference shall be submitted to a board of arbitration. This statute is as follows:

EMPLOYER AND EMPLOYEES.

Be it enacted by the legislature of the State of Idaho: SECTION 1. It shall be unlawful for any person, firm, or corporation to make or enter into any agreement, either oral or in writing, by the terms of which any employee of such person, firm, or corporation, or any person about to enter the employ of such person, firm, or corporation, as a condition for continuing or obtaining such employment, shall promise or agree not to become or continue a member of a labor organization.

SEC. 2. Any person or persons or corporation violating the provisions of section 1 of this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in a sum not less than fifty or more than three hundred dollars, or be imprisoned in the county jail for not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect and be in force from and after its passage and approval.

Approved March 6, 1899.

The governor, to save himself from the appearance of openly espousing the cause of those in open contempt of the laws of the State, telegraphed to the managers of the mine to submit the question to the board of arbitration. This Mr. Burbridge refused to do, and thus again openly defied a second law of the State.

These differences grew in virulence as they naturally would, until they culminated in the outbreak of April 29, four days after the refusal to arbitrate. This is the simple disagreement between employer and employees, which any intelligent and just manager or governor might and should have settled amicably in a few hours, had he shown a due regard for the law and the rights of his fellow-citizens; and yet, through arrogance and disregard of justice and the rights of others, greed and unreasonable resentment, this small disagreement has been allowed to develop into the magnitude of a national question, and developed a condition of oppression, injustice, persecution, tyranny, and arrogant and infamous defiance of the Constitution and the rights and dignity of American citizenship that is a burning disgrace to the nation and the civilization and liberty of which we boast.

As to the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus the decision of Chief Justice Taney is cited in the celebrated Merriman case, in which the Chief Justice declared—

The President, under the Constitution of the United States, can not suspend the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus, nor authorize a military officer to do so.

In stating the case the Chief Justice says:

A copy of the warrant or order under which the prisoner was arrested was demanded by his counsel, and refused; and it is not alleged in the return that any specific act constituting any offense against the laws of the United States has been charged against him upon oath, but he appears to have been arrested upon general charges of treason and rebellion without proof and without giving the names of the witnesses or specifying the acts which, in the judgment of the military officer, constituted these crimes.

Having the prisoner thus in custody upon the vague and unsupported accusations, he refuses to obey the writ of habeas corpus upon the ground that he is duly authorized by the President to suspend it.

This is exactly a parallel case with those in Idaho. The Chief Justice continues:

As the case comes before me therefore, I understand that the President not only claims the right to suspend the writ of habeas corpus himself at his discretion, but to delegate that discretionary power to a military officer. * * *

I certainly listened to it with some surprise, for I had supposed it to be one of those points of constitutional law upon which there was no difference of opinion, and that it was admitted on all hands that the privilege of the writ could not be suspended except by act of Congress. * * * The great importance which the framers of the Constitution attached to the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus to protect the liberty of the citizen is proved by the fact that its suspension, except in cases of invasion and rebellion, is first in the list of prohibited powers, and even in these cases the power is denied and its exercise prohibited unless the public safety should require it. * * *

Congress is of necessity the judge of whether the public safety does or does not require it, and their judgment is conclusive. But the introduction of these words is a standing admonition to the legislative body of the danger of suspending it and of the extreme caution they should exercise before they give the Government of the United States such power over the liberty of a citizen. It is the second article of the Constitution that provides for the organization of the executive department, enumerates the powers conferred on it, and prescribes its duties; and if the high power over the liberty of the citizen now claimed was intended to be conferred on the President it would undoubtedly be found in plain words in this article; but there is not a word in it that can furnish the slightest ground to justify the exercise of the power. * * *

With such provision in the Constitution, expressed in language too clear to be misunderstood by anyone, I can see no ground whatever for supposing that the President, in any emergency or in any state of things, can authorize the suspension of the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus or the arrest of a citizen, except in aid of the judicial power. * * *

The Constitution provides that "no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law." It declares that "the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated; and no warrant shall issue but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation," etc.

It provides that the party accused shall be entitled to a speedy trial in a court of justice. These great and fundamental laws which Congress itself could not suspend have been disregarded and suspended, like the writ of habeas corpus, by a military order supported by force of arms. Such is the case now before me, and I can only say that if the authority which the Constitution has confided to the judiciary department and judicial officers may thus, upon any pretext or under any circumstances, be usurped by the military power at its discretion, the people of the United States are no longer living under a government of laws, but every citizen holds life, liberty, and property at the will and pleasure of the army officer in whose military district he may happen to be found.

This is the opinion of one of the ablest jurists of the world and one of the highest rank in the annals of American judiciary. The constitutional provision is the same in the Idaho constitution as in the Federal, and yet the governor, by his mere proclamation, by the assumption of purely arbitrary authority, assumes to exercise a power which is denied to the President, and only granted to Congress under the most carefully guarded conditions. It is a most arrogant and insolent usurpation of arbitrary power without warrant, and in defiance of free institutions, and is an insult to the dignity of American citizenship, and if such insolent usurpation is tolerated the end of free government is arrived at.

A. J. Forney, the representative of the attorney-general in charge of the so-called coroner's jury (but actually a star-chamber inquisition), on his examination before the committee gave an illustration of the weak defense of the arrogant assumption of authority and arbitrary procedures on the part of the State and military representatives. In reply to a question by the chairman as to the authority under which the arrests of citizens confined in the bull pen were made, Mr. Forney said:

These arrests were not made by virtue of any process issued from our courts, or by any accusations filed against these men in our courts. These men were held by the authority of the governor, who had issued a proclamation declaring that county in a state of insurrection; these men were held by his orders, but were not held by virtue of any process of our court or by virtue of any accusation made against them in our courts.

The special attorney for the State thus virtually asserted and confessed the usurpation of dictatorial powers by the governor.

Mr. Forney further said:

The governor had appointed an agent to go there in his absence and take charge.

Thus the governor had delegated his power to another, an act which he had no authority to perform. Mr. Forney also quotes sections 7405 and 7406 of the statutes of Idaho as authority for the use of the military, but these statutes only authorize the governor to call out and use the military of the State to support the civil authorities.

Mr. Forney admitted:

Counsel did demand very strenuously to know not only who I had indicted, but also the evidence before the coroner's jury, but I asked the court to decline to make an order granting that information. * * *

That the appointment of Mr. Forney as special prosecutor for Shoshone County was illegal and in defiance of law was proven by the fact that Mr. Forney is a resident of Latah County.

Section 1810 of the statutes of Idaho says:

No person is eligible to a county office who at the time of his election or appointment is not of the age of twenty-one years, a citizen of the Territory, and for six months prior to the day of his appointment or election an elector of the county in which the duties of his office are to be exercised.

Here is an anomalous condition of affairs. A prosecuting officer commanding the arrest without warrant and imprisonment of citizens, denying them a knowledge of the charges on which they are held, denying them the benefit of counsel, denying the privilege of the sacred writ of habeas corpus, and at the same time himself criminally guilty of holding his assumed position in defiance of the laws which he pretends to uphold. Again, in the course of the examination Mr. Sulzer asked:

You testify there was martial law in Shoshone County *to some extent.* What do you mean by "to some extent"?

A. I said this, that a declaration of insurrection by the governor and troops going in there would put into effect martial law to some extent.

Mr. SULZER. Then there was martial law as against the members of the miners' union, but not martial law against the men in control of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan mine?

Answer. Martial law was declared. You might say it was in force to this extent against all who were aiders and abettors in this insurrection, and agitators.

Mr. SULZER. And those suspected?

Answer. I presume you might say suspected, or against whom there was some evidence.

Mr. SULZER. These men who were incarcerated in the bull pen were not permitted to give bail, were they?

Answer. No, they were not permitted.

Mr. SULZER. Some of these men you had no evidence against at all, and yet they were confined, and refused bail?

Mr. SULZER. You have been employed by the Bunker Hill and Sullivan mine, have you not, as a lawyer?

Answer. Yes; I am at this time.

As to the illegal declaration of martial law and suspension of the writ of habeas corpus, the following passage in the examination of Mr. Forney is illustrative. Mr. Hay said:

I wish, Mr. Forney, to call your attention to sections 7405 and 7406. Section 7405 is in these words: "When an armed force is called out for the purpose of suppressing an unlawful or riotous assembly, or arresting the offenders, and is placed under the temporary discretion of any civil officer, it must obey the orders thereto of such civil officer." That section applies only to the case of unlawful or riotous assembly, does it not?

Answer. Yes; or, I think, it would cover conditions of insurrection.

Mr. HAY. It does not say anything about insurrection, does it?

Answer. No.

Mr. HAY. Now, section 7406 speaks of insurrection, and is in these words: "When the governor is satisfied that the execution of civil or criminal process has been forcibly resisted in any county by bodies of men, or that combinations to resist the execution of process by force exists in any county, and that the power of the county as exerted has not been sufficient to enable the officers having the process to execute it, he may, on the application of the officer, or the district attorney, or the probate judge of the county, by proclamation to be published in such papers as he shall direct, declare the county to be in a state of insurrection, and may order into the service of the Territory such number and description of volunteer of uniformed companies, or other militia of the Territory, as he shall deem necessary, to serve for such term and under the command of such officer or officers as he shall direct."

Question. Now, I will ask you if that is not the only law of the State of Idaho which applies to a county being in a state of insurrection?

Answer. I think so.

Mr. HAY. And does not that apply entirely to such number and description of volunteer or uniformed companies or other militia of the Territory as he shall deem necessary to serve?

Answer. I think, in addition, it will cover Federal troops sent into the State.

Mr. HAY. Will you state what part of that section will cover Federal troops sent by the President, who is the Commander in Chief of the Armies of the United States?

Answer. That section does not cover in terms my position; but I think the implication would cover that.

Mr. HAY. You think, then, that the President can abrogate or delegate his powers as Commander in Chief in favor of the governor of the State?

Answer. Oh, he might do that temporarily. I think when he sends soldiers into a State they are subject to the orders of the officer in charge, appointed by the governor.

Mr. HAY. That is the very point I want to get at, because I will be perfectly frank in saying that after a very careful examination of the law I am satisfied that the President of the United States can not delegate his power over the troops of which he is Commander in Chief to any State officer. What I want is to have you or anybody else show me some law which would authorize the President to do that. You claim that this law of the State of Idaho does it by implication. Now, is there anything in the Revised Statutes of the United States that authorizes that?

Mr. FORNEY. I will read you the only section which I have been able to find bearing on the subject. It is in these words:

"In case of an insurrection in any State against the government thereof, it shall be lawful for the President, on application, if the legislature can not be convened, to call forth such number of the militia of any other State or States, which may be applied for, as he deems sufficient to suppress such insurrection; or, on like application, to employ for the same purpose such part of the land or naval forces of the United States as he deems necessary."

Mr. HAY. Is there anything in that statute which would imply that the President could send troops there and place them under the civil officer of the State of Idaho, over whom he would have no possible control?

Answer. Oh, I do not think in sending troops into a State the President loses absolutely his control.

Mr. HAY. What I want to get at, though, is, who was really the responsible commander of those troops, General Merriam or Mr. Bartlett Sinclair?

Answer. General Merriam was the commander of the troops, but Mr. Sinclair was the commander, so far as the State was concerned.

Mr. HAY. Is there any law of the United States which would have given to Mr. Sinclair, or any other agent of the governor, or the governor himself, the authority to command United States troops sent by the President of the United States?

Answer. I do not think he could command them in the absolute sense, in that regard.

Mr. HAY. Do you mean to say that General Merriam, acting under the command of the President of the United States, was bound to take cognizance of the statutes of Idaho?

Answer. Well, I do not know, you might put it that way.

Mr. HAY. Was not martial law declared in that region?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Mr. HAY. Is not martial law no law at all, except the regulations promulgated by the commander, who has charge of the territory, which is under martial law.

Answer. Practically so.

Mr. HAY. You agree with me then, in my interpretation of the law, or rather of the condition of affairs there—General Merriam was really the responsible commander, and was responsible for what took place as the commander put in charge in that region, which was then declared to be under martial law?

Answer. No; I do not think General Merriam was responsible.

Mr. HAY. Who was responsible?

Answer. The governor and his officials.

Mr. HAY. Then you mean that the governor and Mr. Sinclair, who, I suppose you mean by "officials," had control, and were in control of the United States forces?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Mr. HAY. And you can not point me to any law of the United States which authorizes the President of the United States to abrogate or delegate his powers as Commander in Chief of the Army to any State officer. Would the general in command report to the governor of Idaho or to the President of the United States as to what he was doing and what he contemplated doing?

Answer. I presume he would report to his superior officers.

Mr. HAY. The Secretary of War and the President of the United States?

Answer. Yes.

Mr. HAY. Now, Mr. Forney, you are not able to cite any law which provides that the President, when he calls out troops of the United States at the request of the governor of the State, abrogates his power over those troops, can you?

Answer. Oh, no; I know of no such law.

Mr. HAY. If the State officers were in command of those troops, what was the use of having those troops there? Could not the State authorities have called out a posse comitatus, or have enrolled a large number of deputy sheriffs, who could have controlled that situation as well as troops?

Answer. The State of Idaho had no militia at that time—they were in the Philippines. I presume that the governor thought that if he called out a posse, they would not be able to cope with the uprising.

Mr. HAY. Did he not have a large number of people there? A great many witnesses testified that they went along with the soldiers when the people were arrested?

Answer. Yes; they were deputies.

Mr. HAY. Do I understand that General Merriam put the soldiers under his command under the control of the State deputies, and permitted them to use those soldiers to arrest anyone they themselves might point out?

Answer. Practically, yes.

After continuing this line of questions for some time, Mr. Hay said:

It has been evident from the beginning of this investigation that the State authorities were responsible for everything that was done in Idaho. The point I want to bring out, and which seems to me is extremely pertinent, is this: That when the President of the United States sends troops to any State in response either to the request of the governor or of the legislature of the State, he does not, and can not, delegate his power to any officer of the State, nor can he abrogate his power in favor of any State officer. If in this case these troops were sent there by the President, whatever they did was done upon their own responsibility, and they can not hide behind the skirts of the governor of the State or of his representatives. What I wanted to bring out was, whether or not these troops commanded by General Merriam (who doubtless was instructed by his superior officers as to what his duties were) permitted men who could have no legal authority over them to direct their movements. I want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that it was the duty of the commander to ascertain what the law was and what his duties were and act accordingly.

Mr. LENTZ asked: Mr. Forney, who was in supreme control of the power or force which was put in operation in Shoshone County?

Answer. I think Mr. Sinclair, as the representative of the governor, and General Merriam.

Mr. LENTZ. Do you mean that Sinclair was the supreme force over General Merriam, or that General Merriam was part of the supreme force?

Answer. I think, Mr. Sinclair had absolute control, and General Merriam rendered him assistance.

Mr. LENTZ. Which one obeyed the orders of the other?

Answer. I presume General Merriam obeyed Mr. Sinclair's orders.

Mr. LENTZ. Then Sinclair was in supreme command of General Merriam and his armed force?

Answer. You may say that; I do not know.

Mr. LENTZ. I want to know who was the final authority—the man highest in power in Shoshone County—during this period.

Answer. I think Mr. Sinclair, as the representative of the governor, was the absolute authority.

Mr. LENTZ. Was he there as a military officer or a civil officer?

Answer. You might say he was both a civil and a military officer.

Mr. LENTZ. Mr. Forney, do you know of any statute in Idaho, or any decision of any court, which confers upon a man both civil and military authority at the same time?

Answer. Well, not in so many terms.

Mr. LENTZ. Do not the law and the constitution plainly and specifically separate the civil from the military power?

Answer. I think the civil and the military are separated. Our statute-section 7405, uses the words, "appoint a civil officer."

Mr. LENTZ. Now, then, if he appointed a civil officer, did Sinclair, by virtue of that statute, become a civil officer or a military officer?

Answer. The statute designates him as a civil officer. You might say, in one sense, that he was a military officer.

Mr. LENTZ. You say the statute says he is to be a civil officer?

Answer. Well, it does.

Mr. LENTZ. In one sense does the word "civil" mean "military"? Is that what you mean?

Answer. No, it does not mean "military."

Mr. LENTZ. Then, in what sense could the word "civil" become juggled into "military"?

Answer. In this way: Mr. Sinclair represented the governor and exercised considerable arbitrary power.

Mr. LENTZ. Does the law of Idaho give a civil officer "considerable arbitrary power;" is there any statute as to that?

Answer. Where there is an insurrection you might say that there was more or less arbitrary power; you might say in one sense that he was a military officer, because he was in command of the district which was declared to be in a state of insurrection.

Mr. LENTZ. The word "civil" also means "military" does it, in your judgment?

Answer. Well, in construing that statute——

Mr. LENTZ (interrupting). You construe the word "civil" to mean something else than civil; is that it?

Answer. The fact that he was there in charge of all the forces might make him, in one sense, a military officer.

Mr. LENTZ. In other words, is it not a fact that, having exercised military power, it is now necessary to distort the word "civil" so that it will have the additional meaning of "military?"

Answer. No; I do not think so. I think that that is a power which would follow the other.

Mr. LENTZ. In other words, in your judgment, the legislature did not know the meaning of the word "civil" when it used it. Is it not a fact, Mr. Forney, that only by interpretation, then, you can account for the military power exercised by Mr. Sinclair?

Answer. I would say that that power being given by the statute everything follows necessary under it in order to accomplish the object of the statute.

Mr. LENTZ. In other words the word "civil," in your judgment, by interpretation, is made to mean both "civil" and "military" in the statute?

Mr. LENTZ. Now, Mr. Forney, I shall read to you section 13, of article 4, of the constitution of the State of Idaho, and ask you whether this part of the constitution is still in force in Idaho and was in force at the time under consideration: "In case of the absence or disqualification of the lieutenant-governor, from any cause which applies to the governor, or when he shall hold the office of governor, then the president pro tempore of the senate shall perform the duties of the lieutenant-governor until the vacancy is filled or the disability removed." Is that section 13 of the constitution still in force, as you understand it?

Answer. I think so.

Mr. LENTZ. I will ask you to state whether section 9 of article 4 of the con-

stitution of Idaho is still in force. It is as follows: "The governor may, on extraordinary occasions, convene the legislature by proclamation, stating the purpose for which he has convened it. But when so convened it shall have no power to legislate on any subjects other than those specified in the proclamation, but may provide for the expenses of the session and other matters incidental thereto. He may also by proclamation convene the Senate in extraordinary session for the transaction of executive business." Is that section still in force?

Answer. I think so; yes, sir.

Mr. LENTZ. You may state whether, under that section, it would have been possible for the governor to have convened the legislature at any time since April 29, 1899.

Answer. He could not have convened it at once; it requires twenty days' notice.

Mr. LENTZ. I did not say at once. I asked whether it would be possible for him to convene it.

Answer. It would have been possible for him if the conditions had arisen to call it.

Mr. LENTZ. An occasion upon which Sinclair and others were given absolute and supreme power for eight or ten months in succession would be an occasion which would have justified the governor in calling the legislature, if he so desired, would it not?

Answer. Oh, he might, but I think it was an optional matter with the governor, whether he called it or not.

Mr. LENTZ. Now, I will ask you to listen to section 4, article 4, and state whether this is in force, as a part of the constitution of the State of Idaho, and was in force throughout the time concerning which we are inquiring: "The governor shall be the commander in chief of the military forces of the State, except when they shall be called into actual service of the United States. He shall have power to call out the militia to execute the laws, to suppress insurrection, or to repel invasion." Is that still the law?

Answer. That is still the law.

Mr. LENTZ. Will you state where in the constitution or in the statutes of Idaho there is any power given to the governor to delegate his military power?

Answer. I think it would be perfectly competent for him to appoint a civil officer under the statute.

Mr. LENTZ. That is what the statute says, does it not? a civil officer——

Answer. Yes, sir.

Mr. LENTZ. Now, is there any statute, to your knowledge, where it says that the governor may delegate his military authority to any individual?

Answer. No: there is no such statute.

Mr. LENTZ. Do you know of any part of the constitution of Idaho which gives the governor power to delegate his military authority conferred on him in section 4, article 4, of the Constitution?

Answer. I think section 7405 does.

Mr. LENTZ. And if that does not, then there is no power in the governor. Is that right?

Answer. That is the only statute I know of.

Mr. LENTZ. Section 7405 of the Statutes of Idaho contains all and the only authority of which you are aware?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Mr. LENTZ. Now, Mr. Forney, is it not a fact that in section 7405 the statute, in using the word "civil," must have meant that the civil officer would continuously be under the control of the civil courts?

Answer. No; I do not think so.

Mr. LENTZ. So long as he was a civil officer, and acted in the capacity of a civil officer, then, in your judgment, he had a right to violate or ignore or repudiate the order or decree of a civil court, had he?

Answer. I think that under that decision of the supreme court of Idaho that it was optional with him whether he would obey them or not.

Mr. LENTZ. Let me understand you. The statute could create him a civil officer, and then, by interpretation, he could eliminate himself from the boundaries or limitations of a civil officer, and repudiate an order of the civil court, could he?

Answer. Being in charge of that district, which was in a state of insurrection, he would be at liberty to ignore a civil process.

Mr. LENTZ. As a civil officer he would be at liberty to ignore it, would he?

Answer. No; in his military capacity.

Mr. LENTZ. In other words, he could put on the civil suit or the military uniform at will, could he?

Answer. Oh, I think the statute clothed him with both.

Mr. LENTZ. Does not the sheriff have power to control armed men under the statutes and the constitution of Idaho?

Answer. Yes.

Mr. LENTZ. Is he a civil officer or a military officer?

Answer. He is a civil officer, but he has not the power of a civil officer, appointed by the governor in an insurrectionary district.

Mr. LENTZ. Now, Mr. Forney, is it not a fact that, under the constitution of Idaho, sections 4 and 12 which I have read to you, the only possible individual to whom this dictatorial or military power could go was the lieutenant-governor of the State, and then only in the absence or disqualification of the governor?

Answer. I do not think so.

Mr. LENTZ. You think, then, that in spite of the constitution, which specifically reposes this power in the governor and specifically provides when it may pass to some other individual, and in the absence of any section of the code or any section of the constitution providing for the delegation of that power by the governor, the governor could, notwithstanding that, arbitrarily delegate it to any man he might select?

Answer. I do not think those articles apply to a case like the one in Shoshone County.

Mr. LENTZ. Then there are in Idaho a great many questions concerning a man's liberty, for which there is no constitutional provision, and yet, the constitution of Idaho is almost identical with that of the United States. In other words, there was a condition in Shoshone County, in your judgment, which was not covered by constitutional provision, as to invasion and rebellion, nor by code provision, as to riot and insurrection?

Answer. I think the governor was justified in acting under section 7405 of the statutes.

Mr. LENTZ. There is a provision in the constitution of Idaho, for the case of rebellion and the case of invasion, is there not?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Mr. LENTZ. And in your opinion, unless the word "civil" in section 7405 of the code can be interpreted as to justify the exercise of military power, by Sinclair, then there is no code section, nor constitutional section, which specifically provides for that case?

Answer. That is the only provision.

Mr. LENTZ. And that is the only section you claim in either the constitution or the code?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Mr. LENTZ. Mr. Forney, is it not a fact that the grand jury was in session about a month in the months of May and June?

Answer. Only about a week.

Mr. LENTZ. Is it not a fact that you could have kept the grand jury in session substantially as long as you saw fit to bring charges before it against different individuals in that county?

Answer. Oh, as a rule the district attorney is not required to dismiss the grand jury before he gets through with the cases which he has to present to it.

Mr. LENTZ. Is it not a fact that the grand jury was convened about the middle of June and was in session about ten days, or, say, substantially the grand jury was dismissed about June 22. Is that right?

Answer. Approximately so.

Mr. LENTZ. Was Paul Corcoran indicted at the session of the grand jury?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Mr. LENTZ. When did you begin his trial?

Answer. About the 5th of July.

Mr. LENTZ. How long did his trial continue?

Answer. Until about July 27.

Mr. LENTZ. Then did the court adjourn?

Answer. After the trial of Corcoran the court adjourned.

Mr. LENTZ. What did you do then?

Answer. I went home.

Mr. LENTZ. When did you return to Shoshone County?

Answer. About September 24.

Mr. LENTZ. When you returned did you try anybody?

Answer. No, sir; no demand was made upon me.

Mr. LENTZ. Were you not requested in open court by Mr. Robinson to produce and publish such indictments as you had against men in the bull pen?

Answer. Yes, sir; that is true.

Mr. LENTZ. Is it not a fact that you refused to make known any of the indictments to Mr. Robertson or anybody else?

Answer. Yes, sir; but I was not ready with the cases.

Mr. LENTZ. Did you serve notice upon any of the men in the bull pen that they were indicted?

Answer. No, sir.

Mr. LENTZ. Have any of those indictments been published?

Answer. No, sir.

Mr. LENTZ. What were the indictments against Mr. Heney, Mr. Cornell, Mr. Flannagan, and Mr. Stewart?

Answer. None of those were indicted.

Mr. LENTZ. But they were all held in the bull pen for months, were they not?

Answer. They were held there by virtue of the State authorities, and not by virtue of being indicted.

Mr. LENTZ. In other words, they were punished by several months' imprisonment and interference with their ordinary liberty and their business, and prevented from the control and management of their property interests and from the use of their time and labor without an indictment. Is that the case?

Answer. Yes; they were held there by the State authorities, without indictment.

Mr. LENTZ. So far as you know, no indictment was ever formulated against either of these gentlemen?

Answer. I do not think there was.

Mr. LENTZ. Is it not a fact all three of the county commissioners, Boyle, Stimson, and Simmins, went through the trial for their removal under your management without either one of them having been shown to have been within many miles of the scene of the riot of April 29, 1899?

Answer. I do not remember the testimony in the case; I did not conduct it personally.

Mr. LENTZ. Is it not your recollection that neither of them were at Wardner on the day of the trouble?

Answer. I can not say.

Mr. LENTZ. Did you ever hear anything against the reputation of either of these men or his standing as a reputable citizen of the county?

Answer. I did not know that these men were in existence till I went up there.

Mr. LENTZ. Now, Mr. Forney, is it not a fact that Mr. Reddy, at the September term of the court, demanded of the court and of you that the indictments against these men, if you had any, be presented, or published or made known, and that trial be had; and if no trial was to be had, they be released from the bull pen?

Answer. I do not remember of his making such a demand.

Mr. LENTZ. What did Mr. Reddy, as attorney for these men, say; what did he demand?

Answer. He demanded I should publish the indictments in my possession.

Mr. LENTZ. Yes; and what did you or the court do?

Answer. I asked the court not to publish the indictments.

Mr. LENTZ. When were these indictments made?

Answer. They were found in June.

Mr. LENTZ. And you refused, even in September, notwithstanding the presence of the attorneys of the men in the bull pen, to proceed with the trial of those men?

Answer. Nobody demanded a trial.

Mr. LENTZ. Was not your refusal to make known whom you had indicted a practical refusal to proceed with the trial of any of the men whom you held under those same indictments?

Answer. No; I was not ready for trial.

Mr. LENTZ. Then it was of your own motion that these men in the bull pen were denied the right to give bail or bond, under the constitution of the State; or was that by reason of an order made upon you by General Merriam or Sinclair, or some other person who assumed authority?

Answer. Neither General Merriam nor Sinclair ever spoke to me about those cases.

Mr. LENTZ. Who, then, was responsible for denying these men the constitutional right of having their indictments preferred, and being given the privilege of giving bond or bail for their liberty?

Answer. There were none in the bull pen I was ready to try.

Mr. LENTZ. Suppose you were not ready. Is it not frequently the case that prosecutors and lawyers are not ready for trial, and that the men under indictment are given the privilege of bail and bond, as provided in the constitution, not only of Idaho, but of other States?

Answer. Oh, yes; if these men had not been held by virtue of the State authorities, I should have had them all up and required them to give bond.

Mr. LENTZ. You mean the military authorities, do you not?

Answer. Well, the State authorities.

Mr. LENTZ. Your interpretation, then, was that the military law, which was being exercised there, had absolutely deprived these men of the right to have their indictments made known to them and to give bail?

Answer. No; I was not ready for trial; they were held by the State authorities, and I did not propose to interfere with them.

Mr. LENTZ. Mr. Forney, is it not a fact that the only reason you had for refusing to make known the indictments against these men in the bull pen was that you knew they would step up with their attorneys and give bail, and secure their release until such time as you were ready for trial?

Answer. Oh, no; I might have demanded those men of the State authorities.

Mr. LENTZ. Would the State authorities have listened to you?

Answer. I do not know whether they would or not.

Mr. LENTZ. Would you have advised them not to?

Answer. If I had wanted a man there, I think they would have delivered him up when I demanded him; but I think if any of those men had been tried and acquitted, they might have been taken back to the bull pen on judgment of the military commander there.

Mr. LENTZ. That is, the military power that was being exercised there was such that even if they had been tried in the civil court and acquitted, the military officers could have them taken up and put them back in the bull pen anyway?

Answer. Yes; I think the military authorities were authorized to take up any man against whom they thought they had evidence of insurrection.

Mr. LENTZ. Were you a civil officer or a military officer?

Answer. A civil officer.

Mr. LENTZ. Were you under oath?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Mr. LENTZ. Was it not your sworn duty to see that these men in the bull pen recovered their liberty without an hour's loss?

Answer. No; I did not so consider it.

Mr. LENTZ. And yet you say that as a civil officer, had you preferred your indictments against these men, you have no doubt that you could have secured their release from the bull pen?

Answer. I could have secured their release so far as the trial of the party was concerned.

Mr. LENTZ. Suppose you had taken Mr. Hendy out on an indictment for blowing up a mill and he had given bail or bond, could the military authorities have rearrested him and put him back in the bull pen?

Answer. They might have done so; they were dealing with a different class of offenses from what I was prosecuting in the civil court.

Mr. LENTZ. With what class of offenses were they dealing?

Answer. With cases of insurrection.

Mr. LENTZ. Then for the offense of insurrection you imprison every one that Sinclair and a few spotters see fit to have arrested, and keep them in jail for many months, and then dismiss them without any warrant, without any charge, without any affidavit, and without any accusation. Is that your idea of even martial law as against an insurrection?

Answer. Yes; whenever they believe that they were engaged in acts of insurrection, they can arrest them in that way.

Mr. LENTZ. And that their mere temporary or prejudiced belief against certain individuals would justify them in locking up a man for six months and placing him beyond the reach of the privilege of having a charge preferred against him in writing, and having the right to appear in open court with his attorney and give such bail as the court might fix?

Answer. I think, under martial law, whenever the parties in charge of a district are reasonably satisfied (whether it is a fact or not) that a man is guilty of committing an act of insurrection, they have the right to imprison him.

Mr. LENTZ. Is insurrection an offense against the laws of Idaho?

Answer. Oh, it might be, if taken in one sense; not for the acts, I presume, for which they held them.

Mr. LENTZ. Is riotous conduct indictable under the laws of Idaho?

Answer. Oh, riotous conduct is a misdemeanor there.

Mr. LENTZ. Is riotous conduct indictable under the laws of Idaho?

Answer. Oh, it is a misdemeanor, and a man might be indicted for it.

Mr. LENTZ. Is insurrection a higher or lower offense than riotous conduct?

Answer. It might be, in one sense, termed riotous conduct. It is not an offense specified in our statutes.

Mr. LENTZ. Then if a man were indicted for riot he could be bound over by the court for trial, could he not?

Answer. Oh, he might be.

Mr. LENTZ. But if the grand jury sent down an indictment charging a man with insurrection, upon demurrer in your court the court would allow such a man to go free without trial. Is that right?

Answer. I do not think that being guilty of insurrection is designated as an offense in our statutes.

Mr. LENTZ. Insurrection is so small an offense that it is not even worthy of indictment by a grand jury, and yet so large an offense, on the other hand, that a governor, or a man by the name of Sinclair, can lock a man up for six months or six years, if he sees fit, without even allowing him to give bail or bond, or have a trial, or have the privilege of habeas corpus?

Answer. Yes; I think under declaration of martial law the authorities might hold him if they believed him guilty of insurrection.

Mr. LENTZ. But a man could be guilty of almost any crime in the State of Idaho, and find a penalty provided in the statute and a process for his arrest and trial, but by oversight the legislature of the State and the constitution of the State have made no provision whatever for the conviction and punishment of a man guilty of insurrection?

Answer. I do not think, technically, there is any such offense laid down in our statutes.

Mr. LENTZ. I will call your attention to section 7407 of the statutes of Idaho, which is in these words: "Any person, who after the publication of such proclamation, resists or aids in resisting the execution of process in any county so declared to be in a state of insurrection, or who aids or attempts the rescue or escape of any person from lawful custody or confinement, or who resists or aids in resisting any force ordered out by the governor to quell or suppress an insurrection, shall be punished by imprisonment in the present Territorial prison for a term of not less than two years." I will ask you whether that section of the code does not exclude any other punishment for riot or insurrection except that herein specifically provided?

Answer. Yes, sir; so far as the State courts are concerned.

Mr. LENTZ. Even assuming now that the governor legally and properly declared Shoshone County in a state of insurrection, and that he had put the county under martial law, and that he had made this charge against certain individuals, could he have done anything else in the way of punishment except to have the men accused subjected to the ordinary trial by civil court and jury, and then subject them to this imprisonment, provided after a conviction, on a proper trial?

Answer. None of the prisoners in the bull pen were indicted for riotous conduct; they were indicted for murder, arson, and conspiracy. The offenses the governor imprisoned for may have been a different class of offenses.

Mr. LENTZ. Murder, arson, and conspiracy are all statutory offenses, are they not?

Answer. Yes, sir; they are.

Mr. LENTZ. And persons could be indicted for them and give bail, could they not?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Mr. LENTZ. Had you any higher grade of offenses against those men who never were indicted, who were in the bull pen, than the crimes of murder and arson and conspiracy?

Answer. No, sir; those are the highest crimes under our statutes.

Mr. LENTZ. Can you conceive of any punishment that would be authorized or warranted, or legal, in the State of Idaho, outside of those which are provided in the statute?

Answer. Those prescribed in the statutes are the only crimes I know of cognizable by the court, but I understand that offenses which obtain when a county is in a state of insurrection are different under proclamation; that they are such offenses as the governor or his subordinates may conclude are against the peace and order of the community and not cognizable by the courts.

Mr. LENTZ. I wish you would name one of those offenses of which the court could not take notice.

Answer. I do not know for what offenses they were arrested. Generally, I was informed, they were arrested for offenses of insurrection, and against the peace and good order of the community.

Mr. LENTZ. That is the point I would like you to make clear to this committee. Some offense which was against the peace and good order of the community, which was not within the specific language of the statutes of the State. But Mr. Forney never did designate any such offense.

Mr. LENTZ. Now, Mr. Forney, I ask you whether, in your opinion, the mere declaration of the governor, in his opinion, the county of Shoshone was in a state of insurrection relieved the governor and civil and military authorities present in Shoshone County of the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which is as follows: "No person shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land and naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject, for the same offense, to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb, nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor shall property be taken for public use, without just compensation."

This was objected to and, on appeal from the Chair, the objection was sustained by a strict party vote.

Mr. LENTZ. I now read to you, Mr. Forney, the sixth amendment of the Constitution of the United States, and ask you to state whether, in your opinion, the governor's proclamation placed him beyond the reach of this amendment and beyond the control of it? The article is as follows: "In all criminal prosecutions the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense."

This was objected to and sustained by a strict party vote.

Mr. LENTZ. Mr. Forney, is it not a fact that that community was in such a condition that any day after you got there any constable or sheriff could have taken into custody any of those men from their homes and brought them before the court or justice of the peace?

Answer. I don't know about that.

Mr. LENTZ. Do you know anything that would have prevented an officer taking these men by such a warrant from their homes or from their mines or from the streets, wherever they might have been found?

Answer. I don't know. The conditions were very strained for a long time between the union and nonunion men. That camp was not big enough for both of these people.

Mr. LENTZ. Do you know of any resistance to an officer from civil courts during the time you were in Shoshone County?

Answer. No; I know of no resistance.

Mr. LENTZ. What do you mean when you say that that place is not big enough for union and nonunion men; what place do you refer to?

Answer. The Cœur d'Alenes.

Mr. LENTZ. In other words, one or the other has to get out of the Cœur d'Alenes district; is that it?

Answer. That is about it.

Mr. LENTZ. It is your opinion that place is not big enough for union and nonunion men to live there at the same time?

Answer. No, sir; I do not believe it can be accomplished.

Mr. LENTZ. And it is because of this opinion in the minds of others that this system has been resorted to, to break up the unions in the Cœur d'Alenes district?

Answer. I do not know that that is the object.

Mr. LENTZ. What is the object?

Answer. To restore peace and order.

Mr. LENTZ. Had there been any disorderly conduct there the first week in May, 1899?

Answer. I do not remember.

Mr. LENTZ. Is it not a fact, Mr. Forney, that men who were not in the bull pen were called up by telephone and sent for by ordinary subpœna, and came before Dr. France and his court from different parts of the county and testified in that hearing that was carried on for weeks?

Answer. Yes; that is true.

Mr. LENTZ. And do you know of any person who was sent for, either by telephone, or by subpœna, or by an officer or deputy, who refused to come?

Answer. I do not remember of any instance.

Mr. LENTZ. You never heard of such a thing, did you?

Answer. No, sir.

Mr. HAY. Does martial law still exist in Shoshone County?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Mr. HAY. Is there any reason why the governor could not have called an extra session of the legislature during the last six months?

Answer. No; that is a matter optional with him.

Mr. LENTZ. Is it not a fact that in the Paul Corcoran trial, when a man named Johnson refused to testify, that Judge Stewart said, "Take this man out and put him on bread and water?"

Answer. I think that was the order.

Mr. LENTZ. Was not this man taken back and put in the bull pen?

Answer. Possibly he was.

Third. It is charged that Brig. Gen. H. C. Merriam, commanding the troops in Shoshone County, arbitrarily and without warrant of law, without informing the accused of the charges upon which they were arrested, and in defiance of the sixth amendment to the Constitution, arrested and imprisoned hundreds of citizens of the United States and of the State of Idaho, and held them prisoners under the most brutal and tyrannical conditions, denying to them their constitutional right to a speedy trial by an impartial jury of the State, which right the Constitution clearly guarantees. (Article III, section 2; amendments, article VI.)

The evidence in support of this charge is overwhelming, and

the abuses and outrages shown are most disgraceful and infamous, sufficient to excite the indignation and resentment of any people not already reduced to the condition of serfs and brutalized by slavery. That the arrests of citizens without warrant was begun or at least authorized by General Merriam even before the issuing of the governor's proclamation is proven by the dispatch of General Merriam to the Adjutant-General, dated May 2, and the reply of the Adjutant-General assuring the general in command that his action was approved by the President. Also by the dispatch of Captain Batchelor of May 3 addressed to General Merriam and already set out in this report. The dispatch of General Merriam to the Adjutant-General, dated May 4, and already referred to, reports 128 arrests the first day.

The fact that he asserts the arrests were made by State deputies, supported by United States troops, is a mere subterfuge and attempt to shift responsibility too apparent to be given any consideration. It was the military power exercised which accomplished the wrong, the so-called State deputies merely serving the purpose of scapegoats for the military. It was through the military that the existing conditions were made possible. Dispatches of General Merriam, already quoted, make it clear that wholesale and arbitrary arrests were made day after day and that soldiers were constantly used in this service. General Merriam states in his testimony:

> The arrests of men suspected of complicity in the crimes of April 29, which began at once on the arrival of Captain Batchelor, May 2,
>
> (before the issuing of the governor's proclamation)
>
> were continued daily in the different mining camps, by deputies under escort of troops.

There need be nothing further than the statement of General Merriam himself to prove the truth of this charge, but there is no lack of proof from innumerable witnesses. A reign of terror prevailed among the citizens; no man was secure from arrest, and no man's home was safe from the invasion of the soldiers at any hour night or day. No man had any assurance when he retired to his bed that he would not be dragged forth by armed soldiers before the dawn and thrown into the prison pen among the hundreds of others who knew not what crime had been charged against them, and for whom there existed no source of relief or tribunal of appeal, all was at the mercy of the soldiery. But let us hear what reliable eyewitnesses have stated on this point. The evidence of one honorable citizen, a trusted and honored official of the county, a man against whom no kind of dishonor or wrong has ever been charged, is enough to make the American blood boil in the veins of any self-respecting man at the infamous tyranny and arrogant brutality with which he was treated, and that by men who wore the uniform of this free Government and acted under the approval of the President.

The statement reads as though it came from a victim of Weyler's diabolism in Cuba, from an incomunicado prisoner in the Moro at Habana, or from a Siberian pen of a former Russian autocrat, and yet it is the sworn statement of an honorable American citizen and a trusted official of his State, against whom no shadow of crime has ever been cast. The individual referred to is Mr. William R. Stimson, one of the county commissioners of Shoshone County, and his statement was made under oath before the committee making this investigation. The fact that such a thing can be possible in this enlightened land, and under our boasted free institutions, is so astounding that it is thought well to give the statement in full. It is as follows:

> On the 29th of April, 1899, I resided at Gem, Idaho, which is about 15 miles from the Bunker Hill and Sullivan mines. My occupation is that of a plumber, and on the 29th day of April referred to I was in Gem, and at no time during that day nearer to the scene of disturbance. I was a county commissioner and a member of the school board of district No. 16. On May 6 I was working at my bench in my shop and was arrested by a negro soldier and another man whom I did not know; I afterwards learned that the white man's name was Booth. When I was arrested I told Booth that I had procured an affidavit, for the reason that I had heard that an affidavit would keep a man from going to the bull pen, and I had no desire to go there. I showed him the affidavit and he said it was all right, but said, "Take care of it, because it may be of some value to you sometime, but I have special instructions to arrest you." He said, "You will have to go along." I told him, "All right." He then searched me, took everything out of my pockets—my pocketknife, rule, plumber's pliers, and everything I had in my pockets. He then left me with the soldier and went out about town. The soldier kept me in charge there all of the afternoon. About dark Booth came back and told the soldier to bring me where they were lining up the balance of the men who had been arrested. I was placed on the cowcatcher of an engine, along with this soldier and Booth, and we were taken to Kellogg. We arrived there about 10 o'clock at night. We got off the engine, and I understood Booth to speak to someone. I am under the impression it was General Merriam. I understood him to say, "General, there is a mistake somewhere. There is a man here whom I think should not be thrown in." That was all I could hear. Then I heard someone give orders to take me to Captain Batchelor's headquarters, and on arriving there the captain asked me if my name was Stimson, and if I was one of the commissioners. I told him I was. He ordered his orderly to search me. The orderly searched me very thoroughly, and then the captain took me to the guardhouse; he went there with me. He said to the sergeant of the guard, "Put this man in the corner and make him stay there; don't let him speak to anybody; don't let him smoke; don't give him any privileges of any kind." Then he went away, and the guard ordered me to lie down in my corner, and I did so. One of the guards asked me if I had any blankets, and I told him I did not; he gave me one of his blankets. As I laid down, I noticed someone lying there in the corner with his hat over his face. I could not tell who it was. There was also another man lying in another corner whom I could not recognize. This last person spoke to me, saying, "Hello, Bill." I said "I don't know who you are." "Why," he said, "Jim Young." "Oh," I said, "it is you, Jim?" Just then a big colored soldier came plunging in with his Krag-Jorgensen and said, "Here, by God, you fellows shut up; you have got to obey orders here or it will be damned hard with you." After that I kept still; I had nothing to say. The next morning we got up and stood around there. We had no right to speak to each other. Finally, Mr. Boyle, one of the county commissioners, the person who was lying in the corner opposite to me, said that he was getting very hungry. The guard stuck his head in at the door and said, "Here, none of your rag chewing goes in there; you have got to keep quiet; no talking goes at all." About noon they took us to a closet and then took us to breakfast at the bull pen, which at that time was a big barn. I was very hungry, but the provisions they had for our breakfast were a lot of hash—stinking, rotten hash—that had been hauled from the Bunker Hill and Sullivan mine in a swill barrel. I was so very hungry that I undertook to eat some of it, but it made me sick. I could not eat it, so I went without my breakfast. I had had no supper the night before. After that all I undertook to eat was crackers and coffee; I lived on that for several days. Finally, a letter came to me, which was sent up by the sergeant to the captain's tent. The captain sent it down to the sergeant again by a deputy. The deputy gave me my letter and told me he would be obliged to read it. He said, "I have to read all these letters." He told me to open it, and said, "after you read it I will have to read it." I opened and read the letter and then gave it to the deputy. I think it was about four or five days after I had been down there that I saw Governor Steunenberg around the grounds one day. I asked the sergeant of the guard to let me go to the closet. He sent a guard with me, and on the way I got near enough to speak to Governor Steunenberg. I said to him, "Governor, this is rather a strange proceeding; I have been here now several days; I have tried to get a hearing and can not get anyone to pay any attention to my case, and I do not understand it." General Merriam spoke up and asked me who I had asked for a hearing. I told him I had asked Lieutenant Murphy; I had asked the sergeant of the guard several times to try and get me a hearing, and I had an affidavit in my pocket showing that I was not connected in any way with the riot, and that I was at home all day in Gem. The governor wanted to see the affidavit and I showed it to him. The affidavit was perfectly formal. He asked me about the different witnesses, and said he would take it to Sinclair and perhaps he would release me on it. I told him I believed that he was the governor of the State, and that I thought he had in many things more power than Sinclair, and if he could not release me on the strength of that affidavit I did not see how Sinclair could, and I did not care to lose my affidavit. I told him that I preferred to keep it in my possession because I thought it might be valuable to me some time. So he handed it back to me and turned and left me. A few days after that Mr. Boyle, myself, and Mr. Paul Corcoran, while eating our breakfast, were hurried off to the coroner's inquest. Some deputies came in and hurried us off. I was examined by Hugh France, the coroner, Attorney-General Hayes, and Mr. Lindley, the attorney for the Bunker Hill and Sullivan mine. They examined me quite at length, and after they got through Attorney-General Hayes followed me to the door, and said: "Stimson, I believe there is a mistake somewhere; I do not think you ought to be in the bull pen." I told him I thought there was a mistake, too. I said, "I don't think I ought to be there." I then showed him my affidavit. He said, "I heard the governor speaking about it; I will speak to Sinclair to-night, and I think you will be released." But that was the last I ever heard about it. Before I was taken into the room where the inquest was held, Mr. Robertson, my attorney, attempted to speak to me, but the soldiers blocked the way and refused him permission. My wife had been on a visit with her mother in Butte, Mont., for a month or six weeks, and she, of course, learned of my incarceration through the papers and came home. The day she arrived at home she came down on the stage with the two babies to see me. On the way down the stage was upset, and my wife was quite severely injured, so badly that she could scarcely walk. She managed to get down to where my quarters were, and it was some time before she could get a hearing and permission to speak to me. We were not allowed to talk to anyone, unless a deputy was there to overhear our conversation. So a deputy (Edmonston) brought my wife up to where I was, and said, "You have got just five minutes to talk in here," and he insisted on hearing every word we said to each other. My wife was feeling very badly and could scarcely talk, but she told me that she was in a very delicate condition. She said: "I am in a very delicate condition and am afraid this injury is going to go very hard with me." That is about all she told me. I then asked the sergeant to take me to the captain's tent. He took me there, and I told the captain the condition my wife was in. I told him that she had been injured, and could not take care of the children, and that I wanted a chance to go home. The oldest boy is 2 years and 3 months old and the youngest 7 or 8 months old. The captain said he could do nothing for me. I asked him, then, if I could assist my wife in taking the children down to the train. He said no, but that he would send the orderly and that he could carry the children. This was done. I then called to one of the deputies—I don't know who he was—and asked him to take a telegram down for me, and send it to a doctor at Wallace. I wanted the doctor to meet my wife at the train and take care of her. The deputy did as I requested, and on his return stated that my wife was almost in hysterics. I asked him to see some official and try and get permission for me to go home. He said that the governor and Sinclair both had gone, but, said he, "I am going to see France, but I don't think he will do much for you. He is pretty cold-blooded," he said. "I don't think he will pay much attention to your case." The next day Dr. France passed by the guardhouse, and I called him over and said, "Doctor, my wife was severely injured yesterday in the accident to the stage; she is in a delicate condition, and you, being a doctor, understand the situation. I want to go home with my wife." "Well, I can't do anything for you," he said. "Sinclair and the governor are both away, and I have not the power to release you, but as soon as Sinclair comes back I will intercede for you." That was the last I heard of that.

Mr. Stimson remained in prison under these horrible conditions for over two months, and yet there was no charge against him. In answer to questions as to the conditions existing in the prison, Mr. Stimson made the following statements:

> At that time it was severely cold, and we had rain and snow the entire time. The guardhouse was built of rough boards, with a flat shed roof; whenever it rained the rain poured through and got us soaking wet; there was no fire. There was very little straw on the ground when we first went in, and eventually that straw was all tramped into the ground (there was no floor in the house). They used this same guardhouse for soldier prisoners, and whenever the negro soldiers got drunk and disobeyed orders they were thrown into the guardhouse with us. At times there would be ten or twelve drunken negro soldiers thrown in there with us as prisoners and it was so crowded that I became so stiff in my joints that I could scarcely walk. I got rheumatism from being exposed to the wet which came through the roof and lying on the bare ground, which gave me such misery that I could not

straighten up or walk for several days. When they built the new bull pen, there were several bales of hay sent up there to make beds for the men in the bull pen. I told the sergeant of the guard that we wanted some of the hay to sleep on. He told me to go and get one of those bales. I went down and got it. Captain Leavell happened to see me, and calling to me said, "Drop that hay." I kept going and paid no attention to him. One of the guards stepped up and halted me, and the captain told the guard to make me drop the hay. Captain Leavell came up and said, "What are you doing with that hay?" I told him that we wanted it to sleep on. I said, "We are sleeping on the bare ground, and we want some hay." "Well," he said, "I have charge of that hay, and whenever I want you to have hay I will give it to you." But he did not give us any hay. When Captain Bachelor was there they had given strict orders not to allow us to smoke. Some of our friends had induced the sergeant to bring us in several boxes of cigars which they had bought us. They also sent us a lot of turkey and chicken, pie, cake, and such things, but, having no exercise, we did not care for them, and, having orders not to smoke, we did not need the cigars, so we set them out and told the guards to help themselves. One of the sergeants asked us why we did not smoke. We told him we had orders not to do so, and that we did not wish to disobey orders. "Well, now," he said, "boys, you go ahead and smoke, but don't let the officers see you." I was very anxious to smoke, and I smoked; but Captain Batchelor was walking by one day and he happened to see me standing in the guardhouse with a cigar in my mouth. He came over to me and said, "Corporal, take that cigar away from that man." So the corporal came up and I took the cigar from my mouth and offered it to him. He said, "Throw it down," and I threw it down. The captain said, "Corporal, I told you to take that cigar; now, I meant for you to grab it out of his hand and destroy it." He said, "Corporal, I will reduce you to the ranks if you make another break like that. I want you to be very severe with these men. I want you to treat them severely. I don't want you to be easy with them at all."

In reply to a question by Mr. JETT, as to whether he was arrested on a warrant, the witness replied, "No, sir; I never saw a warrant of any kind." Mr. JETT asked, "What charge was preferred against you?" The witness replied, "There was no charge of any kind; I never heard of any." Representative SULZER asked, "Who gave the order forbidding you to speak to your fellow-prisoners?" The witness replied, "Captain Batchelor gave the first order; after that, Captain Leavell. We heard them give the orders to the guard every night, when the new guard came on." The witness then made a detailed statement as to the filthy and unsanitary condition of the prison, but it is omitted here, as sufficient has been noted to show the animus and brutality of the officers in charge, and the infamous outrage upon the rights and liberties of innocent citizens, arrested without warrant, without charges of any kind being made, and the denial of a hearing by arbitrary decree of a dictator. Even the negro guards evidenced more humanity, more regard for justice and the rights of citizenship, than the officers who commanded them, who exhibited all the traits of petty tyrants and the arrogance and brutality that mark the tools of despots. The claim that the troops were only supporting the State authorities is a weak subterfuge; virtually they were the power in control and the deputies merely a technical cover for the atrocities perpetrated. This statement is a fair example of the volume of testimony, and is set out in order that a fair conception may be had of the actual conditions. Other witnesses, in large numbers, have verified and substantiated this one, and many have given details still more startling and alarming, when we consider the possibilities they indicate under existing conditions.

TESTIMONY OF GEORGE CORNELL.

George Cornell, a boot and shoe maker, residing at Burke, in Shoshone County, Idaho, testified as follows:

Throughout the 29th of April, 1899, I was in Burke, 19 miles from Wardner. There was no riot or disturbance either that day or any subsequent day up to this time. I have no knowledge of any secret session held by any organization of any kind for the purpose of organizing a movement to blow up the Bunker Hill and Sullivan Mill or any other property. I was arrested on May 4, without a warrant or being informed as to any charge against me. I was sitting at the table at the Tiger and Poorman boarding house, in company with John Frank, the superintendent of the Mercantile Company, and the fireman and engineer of the Northern Pacific Railroad. Some soldiers came in and said: "You men will have to get up and come on." John Frank said to them: "You don't want us, we are not miners. I am the superintendent of the Mercantile Company and these are two railroad men; none of us are the men you want." A soldier said "All right," and they left us. We stayed there probably two or three minutes longer and had about finished our dinner, when an officer with stripes on—I think he was a sergeant—came in and said: "You men will have to come on; my orders are to take everybody." We were driven out of the house and put in front of the soldiers. John Frank said: "I will go down to the store and square my proposition. You had better see the officers and get out of this." I started down to my place of business, and when I arrived there, there was a soldier just coming out of the door. I said to him, "Am I the man you are looking for?" He said, "Are you the proprietor?" I said, "Yes." He replied, "You are the man I want." I asked, "What are you going to do with us; where are you going to take us?" He said, "If there is anything in the house you want you had better go in and get it." I went in and put on my overcoat. When I came out I went over to where the other men were and was talking with them, trying to find out what was to be done with us. We then walked down the railroad track, near to a bridge that crossed a creek. A soldier, who seemed to be in charge, sat there in a chair taking down names, and I thought I would speak to him and see if I could not get released. I went up to him and he said, "Stand back." I said, "At least you will take my name." He replied, "I tell you to get back out of the way." I got back and we were held there until we were put on the train and taken to Wardner, where we arrived about 11 o'clock. Soldiers arrested us without any warrant, put us on the train and guarded us during the trip. At Wardner we were marched to an old barn and incarcerated about midnight on May 4. When the men came out of the mines, they were arrested in their mining clothes, which are very light, as it is very hot in the mines and they wear very little clothing, but, as it is cold at the surface in that high latitude at that season, they put on heavy clothing on coming out; but these men were not allowed to change their clothing when arrested, and many were almost naked except for their rubber and light underclothing. We had no blankets, no bedding, and no provision of that kind was made for us; no fire was lighted for us and it was very cold there at that season. We were compelled to sit around on bales of hay or on the floor or lie down on the floor to try to get a little rest. The next morning about 8 o'clock the doors were opened; but we were not allowed out of the building until 3 o'clock that afternoon. Then we were taken out in squads of 25 or 30 to eat, or try to eat. There was a big pan there, which was filled with stuff. The first man out was handed this pan, and the balance of the squad were told to follow him. They all had to get around, and take with their hands, out of that pan, what they could get to eat, and what they did eat. After we had eaten what we could of such food we were put back in the old barn. We were kept there the balance of that day and the next night under the same conditions as before. There had been no provision made for the men to wash even their faces and hands, and there was a large number who were just in the condition in which they had come out of the mines, their faces covered with the slime of the mines, and their hands and clothing the same, and it had dried upon them. They were calling for some means of washing themselves the next morning, but they got none. One of them who was fortunate enough to have a handkerchief would pass it from one to the other; and I saw men, for want of water, even spit upon that handkerchief, in order to wipe the grime out of their eyes. The next morning we were called out about 9 o'clock and fed in the same way as before. That was Friday. By that afternoon there were some blankets sent in by our friends. These were put in my charge and I distributed them, as nearly as I could, so as to allow one blanket to four men. The next morning (Saturday) we got some wash pans and towels—they came from our friends in Burke—and we got for the first time water to wash our hands and faces. That night about 10 o'clock I was one of the first to be attacked by cholera morbus or dysentery. We had all crawled into places for the night, to keep as quiet as possible, owing to the fact that we did not have room more than sufficient to allow the men to lie side by side. The floor was completely covered. The men could not get out. There was no possible way for a man at the back end of the barn to get out at the front without crawling on his hands and knees over these men, crawling right over their faces or any place he might happen to strike them, because it was pitch dark and one could see nothing. I crawled over these men in that way and went to the rear as they called it and returned. In a little while it was necessary for me to go again, which I did. The first time I went out it was about 9 o'clock and the next time it was about 10 o'clock. At this time the negro soldier on guard said to me, "Hurry up and get in there." I got back and the doors were closed. Rather than crawl over the men again and disturb them I sat down on a box near the door. I had been in that position nearly half an hour when some men came up to go out. They went to the door and rapped. No attention was paid to them. They rapped and kicked on the door again and the soldier told them to "Get away from there and quit that noise." The men replied, "We want to get out of here." The soldier replied, "Oh, well, you can't get out." Still the men kept coming until I should judge there were six or eight there at the time. Two of them especially seemed to be in a very bad condition. They had violent gripings, and were begging to get out. I went to the door and called to the soldier outside to send the sergeant to me. The guard paid no attention to me at the time, and I kicked on the door. The guard said: "You God damned son-of-a-bitch, if you don't get away from that door I will shoot through it." I was pretty well worked up by that time, and said: "I don't give a damn if you do shoot; we might as well die one way as another. I want to see the sergeant of the guard." The sergeant came out and opened the door, with a soldier on each side of him, and said: "God damn you, what do you want here, making so much noise?" I said: "Sergeant, I want you to look at that man there on the floor, rolling in agony because he is unable to attend to the call of nature." "I don't give a God damn if he is rolling in hell, he can't get out of here," was the reply. The man on the floor looked at me and said: "What will we do?" "Well," I said, "I'll tell you what I am going to do, and the rest of you can do the same. We can't dirty our clothing, and we've got to comply with the requirements of nature. Take your clothes down and do your work right here on the floor." They did so. I stayed there the balance of the night, and I am willing to say that there were not less than 25 men who relieved their bowels on the floor of that barn that night—possibly more than that—some of them two or more times. Toward morning the stench got to be something awful, and I got away from it as far as I could. The next morning I said to the corporal who was at the door, "Where is the sergeant of the guard?" He called him up, and I said to him, "Sergeant, I want to see General Merriam." "Oh," said he, "you don't want much, do you?" "No," said I, "I don't want much, but I want to see General Merriam." "Well," he he said, "I will see." In a short time he came back and said, "You can see lieutenant so and so," I don't remember his name. I said, "I don't want to see the lieutenant, I want the general." "Well," he said, "You can see the captain." Then he would go away, and the first time I would see him again I would make the same demand, until at last I said to him, "I have a right, I believe, to see the commanding officer here. I believe I have that right, and I demand to see him." This was early in the morning, and about noon an officer came to me and said, "There is General Merriam, standing right there now, if you are the man who wanted to see him." I stepped up to the officer indicated, and said, "Are you General Merriam?" He said, "Yes, sir." "Then," I said, "I have some things that I want to complain to you about." I want to make complaint against the treatment the men in that barn are receiving. There may be criminals among them, but I know there are dozens, probably hundreds, of men there who are just as innocent of any crime as you are. There are men there who are in the habit of conducting themselves just as well at home and live just as genteelly as you are in the habit of living when you are at home, and we at least have the right to demand fair and decent treatment, at least to be treated like human beings, instead of like animals and brutes." I then went on to relate how these men were refused permission to go out when they were sick, and the condition of filth upon the floor of the building, where they were compelled to sleep, which was the result, and that men coming to the door near morning, had walked into this filth with their stocking feet, and tracked it over the bedding and clothing, and even into the faces of those lying upon the floor. I said, "There is another thing I want to speak to you of while I am saying this, and that is the fact that these men have no place to eat. They have to sit on the dirty ground, which is getting filthy already. If they want to lay their bread or anything else down, they have no place to lay it; unless they take off what little clothing they have to lay it on they must lay it on the ground. There is a lumber yard not over a hundred feet from here; would it be asking too much that a few boards be brought to make some sort of arrangements for the men to have something, at least, to put their food on, instead of the filthy ground?" The general said to me, "Do you know the officer who was in command there last night?" "No, sir," I said; "he was a nigger, and all niggers look alike to me." He spoke to one of the officers near by and called him up. "Is this the man?" he said. I replied, "I think it is; at least he is the sergeant who was on guard last night." The general asked him what he had to say about this thing. He replied, "General, you know my orders were to close my doors at 10 o'clock." The general said something to him I did not understand, but he waived his hand and the sergeant went away. General Merriam then deliberately turned his back on me without giving me any reply, and I was put back into the bull pen. About 5 o'clock that afternoon I was lined up with several other men, and marched between soldiers to the gate, where we were told to go and not come back again. On going to the depot to get a ticket for home the agent refused to sell me a ticket without a pass from the military officials. I was told to go to Major Morton, which I did, and he gave me a written permit, which he signed, and on that I bought a ticket and went home at my own expense.

Mr. LENTZ. Now, Mr. Cornell, tell us of the incident concerning an old soldier whom you saw brutally treated by negro soldiers.

Mr. CORNELL. He was an old man, probably 65 years of age or more. He was coming back from the closet; they would only allow one man to go at a time. He was coming back rather slow. They always had a negro soldier following each man to and from this place. The soldier ordered the old man to hurry up; as he did not seem to walk fast enough to suit him, he jabbed him with his gun. He did that twice, possibly more; but twice that I am certain of. I know that he did that. The old man said, "That is right; stab the old man with the bayonet who fought four years to free you." The soldier said, "Oh, go on there, you old son of a bitch. I don't believe you ever fought to free anybody." This old man had a Grand Army button in the lapel of his coat, and just before he got back to the door he took the button from his coat and threw it on the ground, and came back, sat down in the barn and cried like a child. I went to the old man and tried to console him. I presume I felt as bad as he did. I thought it might have been so had it been my father, who still wears a Grand Army button. He gave me his name, which I put down in a memorandum book. The next day I was released. I never succeeded in finding out what became of him, and I can not remember his name without the book. This book was taken from me by Mr. Sinclair when I was arrested the second time, and I have never been able to secure its return.

(Mr. LENTZ made a demand upon Mr. Sinclair for the book.)

Mr. LENTZ. Mr. Cornell, tell us of your second arrest.

Mr. CORNELL. On June 23, about 10 o'clock in the morning, I was sitting in my place of business with some friends when a man named Murphy (a so-called deputy) came in and asked me if I was busy. I said, "No, not particularly; why?" "Well," he said, "I would like to have you come and take a walk with me."

Mr. LENTZ. Is he the same Murphy who served a term in the penitentiary?

Mr. CORNELL. Yes; for cattle stealing. There were two of these men, Murphy, who did the talking, and a man named Marshall. We went out together and I asked him what he wanted. He said, "It don't make any difference what I want; you just walk right along. Walk ahead there; walk right up there." So I was pretty sure what was going on. He took me up and turned me over to the soldiers and told them to keep me. They kept me that night, and the next morning Murphy and one of the soldiers searched me, and took the book of which I have just spoken. In that book lay a circular letter that had been issued by Ed. Boyce, the president of the Western Federation of Miners, which had been given to me when I was in Butte City previous to this, to take over and give to the ladies of that town, and Gem and Mullan, which contained instructions as to how they should run the commissaries, which had been established to furnish necessaries for the families (who were destitute) of the men imprisoned in the bull pen. That typewritten circular was in that book. Murphy took this book and handed it to the sergeant and said, "You keep this until I call for it." The next morning I saw him take the book back from the sergeant, and that was the last I saw of it until I saw it in the hands of Sinclair, at Wallace. I had an interview at Wallace with Sinclair, and asked him what I was arrested for. About all that he said was that I was doing too much talking. He had given orders that no one was to talk to anyone of a carload of men who had been brought from Joplin, Mo., to take the places of the miners who were in the bull pen. Two of these men had come to my place of business one night after their arrival to see me on a matter of business concerning their membership of the fraternal order of Red Men, of which order I am the chief officer in the State of Idaho, and it was my duty to attend to this business. Some of Sinclair's spies had seen these men in my place of business and reported it, and for this reason I was arrested, as I have described. Sinclair charged that I was trying to persuade the men not to go to work. I explained the facts of the case to him, but he refused to listen and had me put in the bull pen. This was on July 24, and I remained in the bull pen until August 14. I was sick and kept in the hospital most of the time. Just before I was released I was called into the warden's office before Dr. France. He asked me, "Who were you arrested by?" I replied, "By Murphy." "What were you arrested for?" he asked. "For talking to two Missourians, I understand." "How long have you been confined?" "About fifty days longer than I ought to have been," I replied. He said, "I will look into your case and recommend your release to Captain Edwards"—not that he would release me himself. That afternoon the warden said to me, "Captain Edwards has ordered your release. You may go at any time."

Mr. LENTZ. Is it not a fact that no papers were allowed sold, or to be sent to you, except one (The Spokane Review)?

Answer. That is the only paper I ever saw allowed in the bull pen.

Mr. LENTZ. Were the prisoners compelled to do manual labor?

Answer. Yes, sir; we were compelled to work or else were punished for refusing.

Mr. LENTZ. At the town of Burke, were not certain men compelled by force of arms to work by a military officer?

Answer. Yes, sir; by Lieutenant Lyons. A meeting was called by the military authorities at the Miners' Union Hall. I went to it. F. R. Culbertson, the superintendent of the Tiger-Poorman mine, Lieutenant Lyon, and a man named Clary, were at the head of the hall. Lieutenant Lyon was in uniform, and as I went in this man Clary rose and said, "Lieutenant Lyon wants to talk to the men." Lieutenant Lyon then rose and said: "I am no orator, but I want to talk plain to you. I understand that there has been a committee who waited upon the men of the Tiger-Poorman mine ordering them to quit work. Now, I don't know whether this is a fact or not, and I don't know whether that was a committee order, whether it was a committee of Miners' Union men or not; but it is to be hoped for the good of you men that it was not. Now, I was sent here for the purpose of saving this mine from dynamite, from fire, or from water, and, by God, I will do it, if it takes myself and every man I have got; and now I will give you men five minutes to get back to work, and if you do not get back to work I will put you back at the point of the bayonet." Then somebody said, "That is too short a time for us to talk the matter over; we want more time than that." He said, "I will give you ten minutes." Someone asked for more time, but he refused. "Now," he said, "there dare not a man leave this hall; the soldiers are guarding the door, and I will give you ten minutes to decide this question, whether you will go back by force or without." Then Mr. Culbertson talked to the men, asking them to go back without any trouble. Then they (Culbertson and Lyon) went out. After the men were left alone, it was asked what these men quit work for, and it was stated that they quit the pumps and hoist machinery because they were informed that men had been secured to take their places, and quit of their own accord, rather than be discharged; but they decided there was no alternative for them; but they were compelled to go back to work. I went out myself and notified Mr. Culbertson that the men would go back to work under compulsion. Shortly after that those men were all discharged and not one of them is allowed to work to-day. They were used by force until other men were brought to take their places, and then they were discharged. Those men were working under military guard the whole time they were there.

Mr. LENTZ. Could not the civil authorities have made arrests at any time after April 29?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Mr. LENTZ. Were the citizens arrested by the military only miners, or of what class were they?

Answer. They were of all classes—hotel keepers, cooks, waiters, barbers, saloon men, clerks in stores, butchers, bartenders—all classes—everybody.

Mr. LENTZ. You may state what you know as to the condition of the families of the imprisoned men, and whether the State or the United States made any provision for supplying them with the necessaries of life while their providers were held in the bull pen.

Answer. There was no such provision whatever made by either authority. About 1,200 men were held in prison, and a large number of them had families dependent on their daily labor for their support. These families were scattered through the county. There was a very large number of women and children left entirely destitute, and there would have been terrible suffering from exposure, cold, and hunger had not the labor organizations throughout the county and humane citizens come to their relief. After I got out of the bull pen it was reported to me that there were many families destitute. One in particular, which I went to see, was a Mrs. Garrett. I found that she had a little piece of bacon and some crackers. That was all she had. I gave her some money to last her till I could make some arrangements. She was nursing a little baby, and needed nourishment. I went and talked with some of the men in Burke, and then two others and myself started to Butte City. We went to confer with the labor leaders there in regard to some means of raising provisions for these destitute women and children. In Butte, within five days, we raised several hundred dollars in money and a guarantee of a carload of provisions, donated by the merchants of Butte City, who agreed to turn them over to the officers of the Western Labor Union and the Western Federation of Miners, to be shipped to Wallace, and from there distributed in little stores called commissaries at the different mines. After I came back I was given instructions by the president of the Western Federation of Miners, in the form of a circular letter, telling how these stores were to be run. They were to be under the management of ladies, as they were less likely to be arrested than the men. If men had been put in charge they would have been arrested immediately. For that reason they were put in charge of women. The circular letter I spoke of as being in the book was the one given to me to distribute to these women who were to run the stores, instructing them as to what to do in regard to the distribution of supplies. I visited a great many labor unions, and not one subscribed less than $50 to $150. With this money provisions, clothing, and fuel were bought. These supplies were distributed by the women to the families of prisoners, and this was their only reliance for support. Neither the State or the United States did anything to prevent their suffering or starvation.

TESTIMONY OF ALLEN F. GILL.

Allen F. Gill testified:

I am 42 years of age on April 29. I was master mechanic of the Tiger-Poorman Mining Company, at Burke, Idaho, and had held that position for three years previous to that time. Prior to that I had been president of the board of public works at Spokane, and before that master mechanic of the Oregon Railway and Navigation Company, which extends through Oregon, Washington, and Idaho. As master mechanic of the Tiger-Poorman Mining Company, I had charge of all machinery and power connected with the mine, and the employment and the discharging of all men in that department. On April 29, 1899, I was at work at the mine with all the men, with the exception of one. I was in and at the mine till 10 o'clock at night; the men were at work all the time; no disturbance occurred either in town or at the mine. On April 30 I was at the mine as usual, as were all the men except four. Everything was quiet as usual. The men continued to work as usual until May 3 or 4, at which time a number of the men and myself were arrested. In the evening of that day, United States troops came to Burke, and passed through the upper end of the town, leaving guards across the street. It was nearly 6 o'clock—time for my men to change shift—and I observed that a number of the pump men and mechanics who were going to work were stopped by these sentries. I secured permission from a sentry, who had charge of the line, to go to where Major Morton, the officer of the day, was in charge, thinking I could probably get a pass for myself and men, that we might go back and forth and continue work. I met Major Morton and told him the position I occupied, and informed him that the manager of the mine was absent at the time, and that the responsibility rested on me, that I had numbers of men there, with a great amount of machinery, and it was necessary that the men should continue their work, and go back and forth, in order to keep the machinery in the mines working. Major Morton told me that he knew nothing about me, and that he would have to put me under arrest. I told him in that case it would be necessary for me, the manager being absent, to wire the manager or the president, and to inform him as to the most effective way of securing my release. The major informed me that this was martial law, and that the troops were in charge. I asked permission to wire Mr. Glidden to telegraph Major Morton to secure my release. He said he thought this was unnecessary, that I might go down to Wardner, and if I was all right I might be released the next day. "But," he said, "however, I think General Merriam will be in Wardner to-morrow." I remained in line, arrested about three hours. I was very close to Major Morton all the time. I was among the first arrested. I observed his actions and those of the soldiers. The place where I was arrested was opposite my own house, or very nearly so. The soldiers were arresting men and searching houses. I heard Major Morton direct a soldier to break into my house in these words, "Break into those houses and search them." The soldier went to my house (my wife was out at the time, and the door was locked). She was with some other ladies who were congregated together at the time. I watched the soldier turn the knob of the door; it was locked. He jammed it in (broke the glass) and went in and searched the dwelling. I observed a number of similar occurrences, and the arrest of men on the way down to the mill. I went down to the mill with the rest of the prisoners. The night foreman came out and the major arrested him. The foreman told him that the mill was running, and he had a number of men in the mill, and he would have to go in and make arrangements to shut down before he could go in line, as he did not like to have the machinery running without control. The major said, "Go in and get your men; I want to count them." The night foreman shut down the mill and brought out the men, 10 or 12 of them. The major said, "Get in line here, get in line." We went on a little farther, near the company's boarding house; here we met 30 or 40 miners, who had just come off shift, in their wet clothes, and they were placed in line. They were not allowed to change their wet clothes, although they requested to do so, but were put on the cars in that condition, although the night was cold. We continued farther down the railroad track, when the fire whistle sounded (it appears that one man had been left behind to take charge of the boilers). The system of waterworks at Burke is such that the water for the city is supplied by the mining company, and during the time that the company is using the water there is no fire pressure on the city mains, and there is no one in Burke except myself who understands the working of these valves; that is, who knew how to shut off the water from the company's works and turn it on the city mains. On inquiry, they learned this, and I was directed by the officer in charge of us to go with some soldiers and protect the property. I did this. I found that, instead of there being a fire, the water, in consequence of the shutting off of the machinery, had been allowed to back up in the large flume that supplied the power; and it had overflowed, and started a big landslide immediately back of the boiler house, which was already nearly filled up, and it was probable that the next slide would carry the house away. The firemen knew no other way to attract attention, and so blew the fire whistle. After setting things right I went back and took my place in line, and was immediately sent for by Major Morton. I went to him and he told me I might go back and take charge of the property. I told him I could not do so, as the works were practically shut down, all my men being under arrest. He gave me men, barely sufficient to keep the pumps going (about eight men). My name was entered in a book and I returned to the mine. I will state here a few observations I heard made by the soldiers while I was at the mine. I heard someone say they expected when they came there that they had a lot of desperadoes

to contend with, and all of them said, "These men look all right, I believe two soldiers, one in the lead and one behind, could take all these men and put them in the box cars." That was my impression; there was no disorder nor had there ever been at that place. My opinion is that the military authorities, in coming there, defeated the ends of justice for this reason: That the miners who were guilty, or undesirable characters, had left Burke, and gone into Montana two days before the military came. Those who were innocent remained. If the civil process had been carried out, I have no doubt that these men would have been arrested and brought to justice, as I have no doubt they would have returned to work. The day after the arrests were made I went to Wardner. I had in my possession 27 affidavits certifying that certain 27 men had been at work throughout the entire day of April 29, and to my certain knowledge could have had no possible part in the blowing up of the mine. They were men who worked for me and with me, and I knew personally that they were at work, in the mine, at the time the disturbance occurred at the Bunker Hill and Sullivan, almost 20 miles away. They were men of unimpeachable character. I needed them, being skilled men, to put the machinery of the mine to work. I was told that Bartlett Sinclair would have to order the releases. I saw him and showed him the affidavits. He told me he did not desire affidavits to show the innocence of those men; what he wanted was affidavits to show their guilt. "However," he said, "your affidavits may be considered only as a presumption of their innocence, but it will have no effect on me, neither one way or another; but the release of these men will be brought about through my information and correspondence with them individually." I told him that my affidavits were correct, and that I was responsible for them, and that on investigation he would find out that those men had nothing to do with the blowing up of the mill, that I knew the men personally, that they were employed by me, and worked with me. None of the men were released then; they were kept in confinement for several weeks. I do not know that these men belong to any labor organization, as I do not myself, and have no means of knowing. I was told that all the men employed at the mine belonged to the union. I know those men were innocent, and made affidavit to the fact, yet they were held in the bull pen for weeks. When I was in Wardner, I went to the bull pen, and saw the men confined there, standing in a body. There seemed to be a very great number to be confined in so small a place. Many of those men were in their mining clothes; they were black and dirty, and miserable looking. Men with whom I was familiar I could not at first recognize. In the mine the temperature is about 105° about the pumps; at any portion it is uncomfortable. The men wear only an undershirt, and overalls, and a gum coat, in the mines, and are always as wet as possible to get. Outside, at that season, it is very chilly, and the men on coming out put on heavy flannel clothing. When they were arrested they were not allowed to change their wet, thin clothing, and suffered severely from cold, and many took pneumonia; one died from it. I remained in charge at the mine six weeks after I returned from Wardner. In regard to the time the pump men left work, I will state that I went down to the manager's office. He was there at the time and I reported to him that the pump men had stopped work and that the mine was filling with water. Lieutenant Lyon was there at the time and Culbertson said to him, "I have done everything I can do; what can you do?" Lieutenant Lyon did not reply to him at the time, but turned to me and asked if I knew whether any outside influence had been brought to bear on the men. I told him that I thought not; that I was in a position to know, and did not believe there had been. The position the men took was that they had been informed that men were coming to take their places and they preferred to quit rather than be discharged. Lieutenant Lyon went out and I remained with Mr. Culbertson; he said he thought Lyon would try to put the men to work by force and asked me if I thought anything could be accomplished by working men at the point of the bayonet. I told him I did not think there could, as it required all to work together at the best of times. Lyon went to the hall and soon after Mr. Culbertson went there also. I saw Lieutenant Lyon and a number of men go into the hall and went there myself.

Mr. Gill's testimony corroborated the scene described by Mr. Cornell and the speeches as stated by Mr. Cornell.

I went to my supper and then went to the mine, and took charge of the men who had reported there. The men said they had quit work because they did not propose to stay there and train men to do the work upon which they themselves depended for the support of their families. I never heard of any prearranged plan for destroying the Bunker Hill and Sullivan mill. I believe if the men working with me had known of any such conspiracy, they would have told me. The men were of exceptionally good character in that mine; they had held their positions for years, accumulated money, and most of them had families and homes of their own. They were superior as a class of citizens to the miners in any community with which I have ever had any experience. There was the most friendly relations existing between the men and the owners, and there never was any disorder in Burke.

TESTIMONY OF L. J. SIMPKINS.

L. J. Simpkins, a resident of Wardner, age 34 years, an electrical engineer, testified as follows:

I did not participate in the disturbance at Wardner on April 29, 1899, and knew nothing of it until it had transpired. I was arrested at my place of business on the morning of May 3 by four negro soldiers. They came into my room and said to me, "Come on here; we want you." They had no warrant, and refused to say on what charge I was arrested. They took me out into the street and placed me in line with five or six other men they had arrested. They marched us up to the Last Chance office, and kept arresting persons as we went on. They arrested every one we passed on the street. Two men who were strangers from Portland, Oreg., were standing on the street and a soldier said to them, "What are you looking at?" They replied, "Looking to see what you are going to do with those men." The soldier said, "You get in here; I will show you what I am going to do with them," and they threw them into line. The men had only come into the town the day before. There were about 150 employees of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan mine, running about with guns and acting as spotters, pointing out about every one they passed, and the soldiers arrested them. I knew a great many of these spotters. (Witness named a number of them and the positions they held in the Bunker Hill mine.) The soldiers took us to where Captain Batchelor had his headquarters at the baseball grounds, where we were searched and everything taken from us. Here we were kept until night; and the soldiers continued bringing in prisoners all day. At night there were over a hundred of us, all citizens of Wardner except the two strangers just mentioned. It was a cold, drizzly day, and at night we were marched by a guard of soldiers to Kellog's old stable and put in the loft. Captain Batchelor gave us to understand that he was not compelled to do this, that it was just an act of mercy on his part, to see that we were taken in out of the storm. They continued bringing in prisoners all night. The next day they brought a large number of men from Burke and put them on the lower floor of the stable. At that time we were so crowded that there was scarcely standing room. The men were getting sick; some of the sickest were allowed to sit on a board along the fence. One man, a Swede, was taken with a fit and began to jump around in a queer way. A soldier hollered, "Halt," but of course the man did not heed him, and the soldier struck him on the head with a gun and said, "God damn you, I will learn you to halt when I say halt." He had knocked the man down and called the corporal of the guard. The corporal came, turned the man over with his foot and said, "I guess you fixed that man all right." Then they threw some water on the man and he came to. Although it was raining and cold we had no blankets and no fire, and consequently we suffered very much. We were so crowded in this stable that only half of us could lie down at a time. Captain Batchelor came up and told us that he had given orders to the soldiers that if the stable caught fire and we attempted to escape to shoot us, so we would have to be careful about matches. Then we called a meeting and appointed men to watch continually to see that no one struck a match. At night we had two candles lit, so that we could watch and see what the men were doing. The corporal came up with four or five soldiers and said, "What are you God damned sons of bitches doing with these lights up here?" I was on guard at the time, and tried to explain to him that the lights were to enable us to watch the men. He said, "Well, you put those lights out; and the first son of a bitch that lights a light I will bore him full of holes." From that time we were in darkness. We had nothing to eat until the next day at about 4 p. m. When they fed us a man was given a pan with food and told to take 25 men with him to eat out of the pan. We had no knives, forks, or spoons, and the men from Burke were just as they came out of the mines, with their mining clothes on (or almost no clothes), and their hands and faces grimed with slime and grease from the mines. You had to dive in with all that filth and eat your mulligan and bread just like a lot of hogs. For three or four days it went on that way before we had a chance to wash, and then our friends brought us the basins, soap, and towels. In the meantime from the food and exposure many of the men were taken with diarrhea, and as only one man at a time was allowed to go to the closet, a great many could not control themselves and were obliged to relieve themselves on the floor. The stench was something terrible. One evening a man named McClellan went to the closet. I was watching him, as it was my time next. After he came out of the closet I saw the soldiers halt him, two of them. They made him hold up his hands, and went through his pockets and robbed him of his money. I saw them take the money—saw the bills in their hands. I asked him when he came in, and he said they had robbed him of ninety-odd dollars. On the third day I was there we were in the yard and two soldiers came up to me, and one said, "Is your name Simpkins?" I said, "Yes." He said, "We want you." "What do you want?" I said. He replied, "We will show you what we want; we will fix you; come on." They took me to a lumber yard back of the building and said, "Stand up there with your back against that building." I said, "What for?" "God damn you," they replied, "stand up there," and they jabbed me with the bayonet up against the building. One said, "Stand there, or we will fix you." They stepped off 10 or 15 feet and cocked their guns. Then Burch, the superintendent of the Bunker Hill mine, stepped up and wanted to know what I was there for, and I told him I would like to know myself. He said, "Well, do you realize the position you are in?" I said, "It is a pretty hard matter for a man to realize any position at this time." "Well," he said, "Simpkins, they have got enough evidence against you to hang you, but if the court is real lenient you might get off with fifteen or twenty years. Now," he said, "you have got a patent that is worth considerable money; what good is it going to do you if you are in jail fifteen or twenty years or if you are hung? I come here to give you a show for your life. Tell me who blew up the mine and I will see that you get clear." I told him I did not know who blew up the mill nor anybody connected with it. Then he wanted to know who the leaders were. I told him I did not know. Then he wanted to know where they were. I told him I should judge they were out of the country, as they had plenty of time to get out; that I neither knew who nor where they were. "Well," he said, "you wont tell me?" I said, "I can't tell you." He returned to the soldiers and said, "I am through with him; throw him back in the pen," and they put me back.

Mr. SULZER. "When the soldiers compelled you to stand up against the house and cocked their guns were you afraid they were going to assassinate you?—A. Yes; I expected to be killed.

Mr. SULZER. And while you were in this condition this man Burch, superintendent of the Bunker Hill mine, made those propositions to you?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Mr. SULZER. What is this patent you have?

Answer. A patent on a rotary engine and waterway.

Mr. SULZER. What have you been offered for it?

Answer. Nineteen thousand dollars for a third interest.

Mr. SULZER. Did any other representative of the Bunker Hill mine approach you or make any offer to you?

Answer. Yes, there was a man named Jack Donaldson came and had me called to him. He said he was authorized by Mr. Forney to come and make me an offer if I would implicate two men in the blowing up of the mill. I asked him what offer he had to make, and he said he was authorized to offer me $10,000. He said it did not matter who I implicated, so that I implicated two men; one was Mike Dowd, the assessor of Shoshone County, and the other either Dan Kildee or Bill Kennedy, of Gem. These two were miners, and I had never met either of them, and of course knew nothing of them. He said somebody had to suffer for blowing up the mines, and they wanted to hang these men, or put them in the penitentiary, or run them out of the country. The Bunker Hill and Sullivan Company had had trouble with the assessor, because he had advertised the property for sale for nonpayment of taxes.

Mr. SULZER. How long were you incarcerated in the bull pen?

Answer. From May 3 to September 20; then I was taken to Wallace and put in the jail and kept over two months.

Mr. SULZER. Were you charged with any crime?

Answer. I could never learn what they charged against me; there was never any indictment shown or read to me.

Mr. SULZER. Did you ask for counsel.

Answer. I did, and it was refused me.

Mr. SULZER. Who had charge of feeding the prisoners?

Answer. A man named Tony Tubbs, the steward of the Bunker Hill mine. He has charge of their boarding house now, and has had for three or four years.

Mr. SULZER. Explain your treatment by the Federal soldiers.

Answer. Our confinement was very close; we had no room for exercise. Through the summer the heat was intense. Some of the men would cut holes through the boards for fresh air, and Captain Edwards would have them put in the guardhouse on bread and water for seven days for such an offense. If they did anything that did not please the cook or the deputies, they met the same punishment. If anybody entered a complaint against a prisoner, the unfortunate prisoner went to the guardhouse for seven days on bread and water. Two days of the week were set apart as visiting days, and when our friends came to see us we were called out and allowed from three to five minutes to converse with them, but there was always a spotter or soldier to listen to what we said.

Mr. SULZER. During the time you were there, was there much sickness?

Answer. Yes, sir; while I was there four or five men I knew died. The first three or four days they would not allow a doctor to come in; afterwards they did.

Mr. SULZER. Do you know of the death of Mike Devine?

Answer. Yes, sir; I nursed him when he was sick. We had a little hospital, about 10 by 12 feet. It had no floor, and the men laid on straw on the ground. It was raining and the water running through wet the straw and blankets. The night Mike Devine died it rained so that we had to keep moving his bed from place to place to keep him out of the water. It was so with the others there. The leaks from the roof, and the water running on the floor, kept them all saturated. The sides of the shed were so open that we had to put paper cones around the candles, to keep the wind from blowing them out. Devine died about 8 o'clock in the morning. I was giving him his medicine every hour, and toward evening I noticed the rattle in his throat that I have noticed in the cases of other dying

men, and I told him I thought he was dying. He said he thought so himself, and asked me to do him a favor. I told him I would, and he asked me to go for a priest for him. I promised him to do so. I asked the guard to call the corporal, and told him I wanted to go to Captain Lavelle's office. The corporal took me to the captain, and I told him Mike Devine was dying and wanted to see a priest, and asked permission to send for one. Captain Lavelle said, "Neither Mike Devine nor any of the rest can see a priest or anybody else. Those are my orders, and they must be strictly obeyed." When I told Mike he could not see a priest, he wanted to see his partner, Bill Kennedy, who was also in the bull pen, as he wanted to tell him how to dispose of his property. Captain Lavelle refused this request also, and Devine died about 8 o'clock in the morning. He died of exposure; he was an old man, over 60, I should judge. His request was that he should be buried in the Miners' Union Cemetery at Wallace. The women of Wallace took the body and buried it themselves—all the men of the village were in the bull pen.

Mr. SULZER. Tell us of the death of McMillan, and what he said to you.

Answer. McMillan died from the result of exposure; he took cold, and his death was the result. He said he never had believed that a being in the form of a man could treat his fellow-man as he had seen men treated there by United States soldiers. He attributed his death to the treatment he had received, to the want of clothing, shelter, and decent food.

Mr. SULZER. Tell us what you know of the death of Johnson.

Answer. Johnson's mind had become unbalanced from the effect of the treatment he had received, and he believed that he was to be put to death. Johnson was ordered to be sent to the lunatic asylum, and Dr. France, with a guard of soldiers, took him to the depot. The bull pen stood on an elevation just above the depot. My attention was attracted by hearing some shots fired, and I went to the side of the building and looked through a crack. I could see the river quite plain. I saw a man in the river, and heard two or three shots fired. I saw the negro soldiers on both sides of the river running one way and another, and saw them go to a clump of bushes and pull a man out. A soldier by the name of White, who did the shooting, told me afterwards when he came on guard that when they got to the station Dr. France went into the depot and left Johnson with him. He said that he walked along the depot platform, and the first thing he knew someone called out, "There goes your man!" He said he looked up and Johnson was running across the street, and he followed him, and Johnson ran onto the bridge and jumped off into the river. He said Dr. France came running up and called out, "Shoot! shoot!!" and he shot. Johnson was taken out dead. A young Swede also died in the bull pen. He came in suffering from fistula, and the doctor said he died from exposure and bad food. On November 15 I was taken from the bull pen to the jail in Wallace. A deputy came to me and said, "I have orders from Captain Edwards to take you to Wallace. We have just three minutes to get to the train." I said, "I want to get my things." He said, "We haven't got time." So I went and left my belongings. He took another man named McKelvey, also. I said, "Well, boys, I will escape this bread and water racket anyway," but when I got to the jail, the jailor said he had orders from Captain Edwards to place me in solitary confinement on bread and water. I was kept on bread and water for nine days, and in solitary confinement in a dark cell for about 60 days. I was not allowed to see or speak to anyone for that length of time."

Mr. SULZER. What was the object of persecuting you in this way?

Answer. I have never learned; there was never any charges brought; I was told that it was the orders of Captain Edwards.

Mr. SULZER. Who is this Captain Edwards?

Answer. Capt. F. A. Edwards, Troop L, First United States Cavalry.

Mr. SULZER. Do you know why he persecuted you in this way?

Answer. I don't know; he never gave any reason.

Mr. SULZER. Do you know anything of the attempt to escape, by digging a tunnel, which was made by the men?

Answer. There was talk of our being held in the pen until January, and the men dreaded the cold winter in such a place, so they attempted to dig a tunnel with knives they had stolen from the cook's place. The tunnel was discovered about 4 o'clock on September 18 or 20, and the next morning a deputy came in and said Captain Edwards wanted us. The captain and his orderly took us out back of the bull pen, and said, "I want a ditch dug here." Buck Robertson was the first man he spoke to and said, "Will you dig that ditch? Robertson said, "No, sir." He said, "Strone, will you dig that ditch?" "No, sir," said Strone; and so he asked all five of us who were there, and all refused. He said, "Stand up there, facing the barbed fence, five paces apart; and, guard, if any of those men move, shoot them." Well, they kept bringing out the men, five at a time, and I began to get curious to see all who were coming out. I looked around, and Captain Edwards saw me. He said, "God damn you, Simpkins, right about face there. Guard, if that man or any other moves, shoot him in his tracks." So they kept on bringing out the men, and all refused to dig, until they had all the men on the line. We stood up all that day until night; some were barebended, and others in all sorts of conditions. We were not allowed to move; we were inside the barbed wire inclosure, and the soldiers in line in front of us. When all were brought out, Captain Edwards said, "I will see that you work; I'll keep you here till you rot—until I make you work." Some one said, "We haven't got any permit from Steunenberg to work." I don't think the captain understood the joke, or at least what was said; anyway he said, "You are a lot of damned cowardly curs. Damn you, anyway. Damn you all; I will make you work, or I will starve you to it." We were kept there till night, and then marched into the bull pen and searched; everything was taken from us. The straw was taken out of the bunks, and we had to sleep on the hard boards, which ran crosswise in the bunks.

Mr. LENTZ. State whether you heard the officers or soldiers use the term "sons of bitches" in addressing those in the bull pen.

Answer. That was a common expression used by the soldiers. One morning when we were being taken out to work there was in the line an old soldier, a Grand Army man, who drawa a pension. He had been badly wounded in the hip, and limped painfully, throwing his head and shoulders from side to side. One of the negro guards said to him, "Walk straight there, you God damned son of a bitch. What are you jumping around that way for?" The old man said, "I am a cripple; I can't walk straight." "Cripple be damned!" said the negro, "I'll cripple you;" and he struck him with his gun and knocked him down and kicked him. The old soldier's name was James. He was from Ohio. At another time we were being led out to be fed, and we had to go down a narrow plank way. They led us out 25 at a time to get our food in the pans I have described. The men were hungry and crowded forward, and the soldiers held them back with their guns held crosswise. Captain Batchelor said, "God damn them, knock them down, and explain to them afterwards," and he walked away. A negro soldier said, "You heard them orders, you God damned dynamiting sons of bitches; stand back there or I will put a bayonet through you." The expression was very common among them.

Mr. LENTZ. You said you went before Dr. France's coroner's inquest. Did you know any of the jury?

Answer. Yes; I know them all personally. They were all employees of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan mine. Their pay from the Bunker Hill Company was $4.50 per day, and they were also paid by the State. My counsel was not allowed to speak to me. He was kept away from me by the soldiers. I was released about November 15.

TESTIMONY OF LEVI P. MILLER.

Levi P. Miller, a resident of Burke, Idaho, age 55 years, and served the Union during the civil war, and on April 29, 1899, a watchman at the Tiger-Poorman mine, testified as follows:

On April 29 I was in the Providence Hospital, near Wallace, and I was convalescent. There was an hour or two of sunshine, and I walked up into town, 500 or 800 yards. It is only a small village. I walked down there to get a little exercise, and to get a paper. I did this when the weather would permit. On the 29th I was in the town before noon. There seemed to be a little excitement on the street, and persons were calling to each other, "Why, look up at the Northern depot, look at the people." It was said they were miners coming down from the mines. I saw quite a lot of people. They were climbing onto the car catcher and onto the cars. I saw one man coming up town. He had a mask and a gun. Well, that aroused my American spirit. I said I did not believe in that sort of thing; according to my views, a man would hide his face to do anything derogatory to the good name of American citizenship, and I had belonged to a miners' union. I went to the hospital after that and had my dinner. About 3 in the evening I walked over to the town again, and passed by the O. R. & N. depot. Mr. Lambert, the agent, was a very pleasant gentleman, and I asked him, "What is the news?" He said there was a telephone message to the effect that there had been some shots fired down there at Wardner. I said: "Mr. Lambert, that is terrible; if they start that way, there will be some terrible deeds committed there, which will reflect upon the whole country—not only on the miners, but on the whole community." He said he regretted it very much. I went on down town, and while I was there heard a report that an explosion had been heard, but I did not hear it. They said the Bunker Hill mine had been blown up. That seemed to throw a pall over the community; many people felt sad, and expressed their regret that such a thing should or could occur. After supper I went to the village again. But few people were on the streets and the saloons were closed. I saw the train going back with the men on it, when it stopped and pulled out again. On Tuesday the doctor gave me some medicine, and told me I could go home; if I would be careful and not get wet or take cold, I would get along very well. I went home that afternoon. On Wednesday I was choring around home. On Thursday there was still some snow on the ground, and I was cleaning it up, when about 12 o'clock the train came in with soldiers on it. They got off the cars and walked up the track, passing my house. I am a bachelor, and myself and brother live together, and I do the cooking. The soldiers posted sentinels above my house, but I did not go near them. About 5 o'clock my brother came from work; he was shift boss at the Tiger-Poorman mine, and he came to change his clothes. I asked him what was going on, and he said a number of men had already been arrested; I said, "Well, I will go up town and see what is going on." I got part of the way up, when I met Mr. Townsend, a messenger on the Northern Pacific Railroad, and he whispered to me, "You had better go back or they will gather you in and take you along." I turned leisurely, so as not to excite suspicion, and walked slowly back, so the soldiers would not think I was trying to run away. By this time my brother had changed his clothes, and I told him what I had learned. He said, "Well, I am going uptown anyway, and will get my supper there." Well, he went uptown, and was gathered in without his supper. The crowd kept drifting down toward me. I saw some civil officers coming down the wagon road, approaching my house. They went in the house above mine, where a widow, Mrs. Holloman, lived. I saw them coming to my house, and the thought struck me, "If they are going to search I had better get my purse," which contained $315 in gold, and I put it in my pocket just as they came in. They looked around and asked me, "Have you got any arms here?" I said, "No; I have not; you can look for yourselves." "Oh, no," he said, "we will take your word for it." They started to go out and I said, "Don't you want me?" He replied, "No." I stood in the door and saw a soldier talking to Mrs. Holloman. She told me afterwards he asked her, "Who is that man?" She said, "Oh, you don't want him, he's just out of the hospital." The soldier replied, "No; we don't want sick people." In the meantime the shift had just come out of the mine, and they were all taken, without supper or opportunity to change their wet clothing. The railroad crossed the creek just above my house, and a soldier standing on the bridge called to me, "Hello," and beckoned to me to come over to him. I said, "Do you want me?" He said, "Yes; come over here." I went in, locked the doors, and came out the back way. I went down the road crossing to the bridge and went over into the crowd. The crowd drifted farther down to the wagon bridge, where we were huddled together, while the soldiers continued to arrest everyone they saw. While standing there I spoke to some of the soldiers, and told them that I had been a soldier, and would like to speak to an officer, as I did not think they would arrest me. I had not the faintest idea that such things could be done under the American flag as I saw done afterwards; that a citizen of good character and standing could receive such treatment as I saw them receive. I was willing to obey any order, because I thought they were helping to further justice. They told me that there would be some little examination and that would be the end of it, and I thought the same. Finally there was an officer placed on the middle of the bridge and we were told to come up, one by one, and give him our names, and we did so. As they gave their names the men went over to the train and were put into the freight cars. I had to be lifted or pulled into the car. I was not able to get in unassisted. I saw another old veteran there—a man about .62 or 63 years of age—who was very lame, and another with an artificial leg. They also had to be lifted into the car. The train soon pulled out and we were soon at Kellogg or Wardner Junction. By this time it was quite dark, and raining and chilly. I had no overcoat, and nothing to put around me. We were taken out of the car and grouped together in the rain on the platform. After standing there in the rain for half an hour we were told to march, and we tramped through the mud and slush to a large building which afterwards proved to be a large barn. It stood in a sort of depression, and we halted in front of it. They would call out "Five of you step forward," and five negro soldiers would search them. Some of the men did not obey orders promptly, and the soldiers used some pretty bad language to them. One white officer said, "God damn you, we will teach some of you how to behave yourselves." I am sorry to say so, but this was said by a white officer. The only thing they found on me was two knives. I omitted to tell you that at Burke I called Mrs. Holloman to me and gave her my purse, and I was very glad I had done so. When we were searched we were told to go into the barn. It was dark in there and every little while some one would shout, "Get off of me; don't tramp on me." I groped my way about until I got my back against a beam, and sat in that position all night. I noticed when daylight came that there had been stalls in there which had been taken out, but some of the uprights were left standing, and it was against one of these that I was reclining. At about 4 o'clock in the morning I wanted to go out, and made my way to the door over the sleeping men. I found a great crowd at the door waiting their turns to go out. I pushed by them and told the guard I wanted to go out. He said, "Well, you can't go; get back there," and he put his bayonet against me. Some of the men called "Miller, Miller, come back." Finally the guard took me out, and on the way back he said, "Get along lively there; get along lively." I said, "Look here, my friend, be a little lenient with an old man; I can't walk fast; thirty-four years ago I was down South helping to free such people as you. You weren't born then. I have an honorable discharge from the United States service, something which perhaps you will never get."

He said, "I don't give a God damn what you've got; dis gun wants to smoke anyhow," and he threw a cartridge into his gun, and I turned and said, "Shoot, you black son of a bitch; I am old enough to die," and I have seen things since then, which have made me feel that I ought to have died right then. The corporal sang out and said, "Put the bayonet to him; put the bayonet to him." He put the bayonet to my back and pushed me along. When I got back to the stable there was some difficulty in getting in through the crowd, and I wanted to remonstrate with the corporal, but he pulled a pistol on me and told me to get inside and keep quiet. The men inside cautioned me to keep quiet and said, "For God's sake don't make such a row as that; you will make it worse for all of us." There were hundreds of them in there who were just as good as I am, or better, possibly, and were not dynamiters or anything of the kind. About 11 o'clock we were called out to get something to eat. That was the first meal we had had since we were arrested. I probably did not feel as badly as the rest of them, because all the men had been arrested as they came off shift, and had had no supper, and were held in their wet mining clothes, which they were not allowed to change. Eight or ten men were called out at a time, and each man was given a piece of boiled meat, a potato, a piece of bread, and a tin cup of coffee; then he would fall back anywhere in the yard, sit down on the ground, and eat as best he could. Mr. Whitney had sent me a pair of blankets for myself and a pair for my brother from home, and toward evening I located where I would camp in the hay on the floor and spread my blanket there. Many of us were fearful of fire and that the men would light matches to smoke, so we appointed Mr. Cornell to watch. That night, while trying to go to sleep, all at once I felt a lot of water coming down on me, and I heard others calling out about it. There were men above us who would have to attend to the call of nature, and it would run down through the cracks in the floor upon us below. I, myself, twice during the night, had to void urine alongside of my blankets, because I could not get out, and, after my experience of the morning, I thought it the easiest way out of the trouble. That day (Friday) some of the men had been smoking, and a negro corporal came in and pulled his pistol, as he walked in and carried it in his hand. He did some of the worst cursing I ever heard. He said, "God damn it, I want you fellows to understand that there is no smoking allowed here," and then he gave some other orders and said, "By God, I will shoot the first son of a bitch I find disobeying those orders." On Saturday at noon I was released. I was only in the bull pen two nights, but it was two hundred years too long. I protested against the inhumanity and brutality of the treatment as much as I dared.

Mr. LENTZ. State whether you saw any evidence of lawlessness or insurrection at Wallace, or Burke, or along the railroad, or elsewhere between May 2 and 4.

Answer. No, sir; it was the quietest time I ever saw in Burke, up to the time the troops came there.

Mr. LENTZ. Did you make a statement before the Industrial Commission?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Mr. LENTZ. Was your statement correctly reported?

Answer. No, sir; they sent me a copy, which was not at all what I had stated, and I made a great many corrections and sent it back, but my statement was published without the corrections. My statement as to my treatment by the soldiers was cut out entirely, not published at all; and I most certainly did testify to it. My whole statement was garbled and edited, and not at all what I testified to.

Mr. LENTZ. Were citizens arrested for talking?

Answer. Yes; there were some miners brought in from Missouri, and Sinclair issued an order to arrest anyone who was found talking to them. Several were arrested for that.

TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM R. SHIELDS.

William B. Shields, age 70 years, a traveling salesman, resident of Mullan, Idaho, testified as follows:

I left Mullan on April 30, to make a trip into Montana until about May 9. I was at a little station called St. Regis, in the State of Montana, about 32 miles from the Idaho line. I met there an acquaintance named Charles Francis, who was boarding at the restaurant and who told me he had been working for the St. Regis Lumber Company. He told me he had been there for six months. Upon the day of which I speak a train came down with some troops on it. Some of the troops were guarding some prisoners in a box car. The train stopped, and Francis walked up the track to where it stood, and it seems he recognized one of the prisoners and was talking to him. I could hear them. All at once a white man and five or six negro soldiers came out of the coach and told Francis "to get in there, we want you too." Francis said, "What do you want me for?" They said, "Well, just get in there; no more words." "Get on there;" and they put him on the box car. He was in his shirt sleeves at the time. I walked down, keeping, however, at a very respectful distance. I heard him say, "If you will give me a chance, I can prove that I have not been in the Cœur d'Alenes for six months." I suppose they had been accusing him. I did not hear what they said to him, but I asked him if he had any money, and he said "Not a cent." I said, I have a couple of dollars, and started up to give it to him (it was all I had). A negro soldier said to me, "Old man, you had better stand back, if you don't want to take a trip to Wardner." As I did not want to take a trip, especially on that train, I stood back. Francis said, "I have no coat." I said, "Well, I will step across to the restaurant and have them send your coat to you," and a negro soldier said to him, "Never mind, we will get his coat." So I took no further action, but the train left, taking him along without any coat. While the train stood at the depot they threw out some guards around the planing mill, but arrested no one else. I said to one of the negro guards, "Are you people arresting men in Montana?" and he replied, "Yes, we arrest the damned sons of bitches wherever we can catch them." I asked, "Who is in command of these troops?" He replied, "Lieutenant Lyon." I saw no warrant shown or read to Francis.

TESTIMONY OF WILBUR H. STEWART.

Wilbur H. Stewart, 32 years old, a newspaper publisher and a resident of Wallace, Idaho, testified as follows:

My paper was a sort of free lance, affiliated neither with the miners' union or any other organization, industrial or political. On the morning of April 29, 1899, I slept late, as the night before I had run off the issue of my paper, which occupied the greater portion of the night. About 9 o'clock in the morning of the day referred to my wife called me and said there was something going on in town, as there were so many men around she feared some one had been killed in the mines. I got up and went out to learn what the excitement was about. There had been no disturbance of any kind before this, nor was there any lawlessness at Mullan on that day, nor after that. I had been among the miners at Mullan a great deal and had never heard of any demonstration of any kind to be made either there or elsewhere. A train was at the depot with a large number of men on it, and a good many boarded it at Mullan and went to Wardner. I did not know for what purpose, and knew nothing of the blowing up of the Bunker Hill mill until after the occurrence. On the afternoon of May 25 Bartlett Sinclair and Major Smith came into my office and Mr. Sinclair said, "I find you have been publishing a seditious paper, inciting riot and insurrection, and have concluded the publication of your paper must cease." This charge was absolutely false, as no such article had ever appeared in the paper, as the files will show. Major Smith said, "You may consider yourself arrested and get ready to go with us." I asked the privilege of getting out that issue, as I had some legal matters, land office notices, applications for patents on mining claims, which required legal publication, but I was refused, and told all work must be stopped right there. Major Smith told me to come along, and not keep them waiting. I was taken to Wallace, and put in jail and kept over night. The next afternoon I was taken to the bull pen. Major Smith was in command of the troops of the First United States Cavalry at Wallace. I was taken to the bull pen on the evening of May 26, and arrived there just at the time the prisoners were having their afternoon meal. I had had nothing to eat that day, and was very hungry, but could not eat such stuff as I saw fed to the men, and under such conditions. It was raining, and the men were sitting around the inclosure, in the mud, eating from the pans. I was given a bunk in the shed, and slept on the straw. The first day or two I was compelled to do the most revolting and filthy work, carrying out garbage and the contents of privy vaults. It made me sick, and it was impossible for me to eat anything; besides, I was subjected to insults and indignities from the negro soldiers, on every hand, that were humiliating in the extreme, perfectly unbearable. I became so sick that I was ordered to the hospital—that was on Sunday. Sunday night I slept none, and about 4 o'clock Monday morning a negro soldier came up and shook me and said "Here, get up here, I want you." I asked him what he wanted. He said, "I want you to go out there and help empty those privy vaults." I said, "I am sick; I'm not able to go; I have been sick two days, and have been ordered to the hospital this morning." He said: "It don't make any difference, I want you to go and do this work." I told him I had been exempted from work, and was sick, and I would not do it. He said: "It don't make a damned bit of difference if you die, you have got to get up there, you white sons of bitches, you are getting too familiar around here, and we have got to put a stop to it." I called the corporal of the guard; he came and had quite a dispute with the guard. The private insisted that I should be made to work; that I was no better than anybody else, and that he would like to see such "sons of bitches" made to do a little work of that kind, as it would do them good. I told him if I went out they would have to carry me, and they finally left me. About 9 o'clock Dr. Stratton came and took me to the hospital, where I remained a week. The general treatment of the prisoners was something terrible, revolting to an independent American citizen at all times, at other times there was some very severe, uncalled for, and humiliating treatment and insults. The men were cursed and abused by the negro guards and the officers, and called the vilest names; the most abusive epithets were applied to them. I was in the bull pen just two months and two days; I was released July 27.

Mr. LENTZ. Were you ever given a trial of any kind?

Answer. No, sir.

Mr. LENTZ. Were you allowed to consult an attorney?

Answer. No, sir. I repeatedly asked to see Mr. Jones or Mr. Reddy; in fact, I do not think a day passed that I did not make the demand, but I was never allowed to see an attorney.

Mr. LENTZ. After you were released from prison did Mr. Sinclair ever say anything to you about publishing a paper which would support him and his methods?

Answer. At the time of my release, July 27, there was an order sent down to Captain Edwards to release me to come to Wallace to report to Sinclair. My wife came to me and advised me to accede to all of Sinclair's demands to secure my release, as I was sick. I went to the hotel at Wallace, and my wife went out and found Sinclair. He came to the hotel parlor. There were some other parties in the room and he asked them to retire, as he wanted to talk to me privately. After they had gone, he asked me what I intended to do. I told him I did not know whether I would go back to the bull pen or not. He told me it would depend on circumstances whether I would be released or not, and went on to say that he hoped I would return to Mullan and resume the publication of my paper. I told him I could not, as the authorities held the material. He said, "I will see that it is returned to you." I told him it would be of no use, as the stuff was all pied, jumbled up, and useless. He said that he would have it returned, and said, "I hope you will conclude to come out on the side of law and order, and support the State and military authorities in the policy they are pursuing here." I told him I considered I had always been on the side of law and order, and would continue on that side, but I did not think I would continue publication under those conditions. He told me that I should remember if I did resume publication, and continue to pursue my former policy of attack on the authorities, I could expect to go back in the bull pen. For that reason I did not resume the publication. He told me that I should remember that in a fight of this kind, where the State took up the fight against an organization of laboring men or any other classof individuals, my judgment should show me, that the State would win; that there was no question as to which side would be victorious. He said, "It is only a matter of policy with you anyway whether you support the State or the labor organizations—a question of dollars and cents." He said, "If you will do as I suggest, we will see that you are nothing the loser; we will see that it will be to your financial benefit to do this."

Mr. LENTZ. Tell us what you know of the death of Johnson.

Answer. He was a foreigner, I believe, a Swede or a Finlander. He was taken before Dr. France's kangaroo court (as it was called) and examined. When he came back he told us they had told him they were going to hang him if he did not give the names of some men who were implicated in the blowing up of the mill; he talked of it for two or three days, and seemed to be thoroughly convinced that they would hang him. He was taken up the second time and after he returned, told us the same thing. They were erecting a guardhouse near the prison, and Johnson took up the idea that they were erecting a scaffold to hang him on, and that excavation was to be his grave. As I was going to the kitchen one time I saw him pounding himself on the head with an Indian club. This was taken away from him, and some of his friends took charge of him and prevented him from doing violence to himself, and reported the matter to the sergeant of the guard. That was about 2 p. m. About 7 in the evening, two soldiers came in and took Johnson out. The next morning I heard some shots fired outside. I was looking through a knot hole in the side of the pen, watching the soldiers drill. The shots were fired down towards the other end of the bull pen. I got up on the rafters and crawled to the window in the end of the barn. I saw from the window the soldiers running around, and heard other shots fired, but I could not see what they were firing at. I watched them till they went down to the river, and saw them run into the water to a little strip of land, a sort of island; they ran up that and into the water again, and after they left the water they picked up this man Johnson. It appeared to me that they picked him up out of the bushes. He was carried back and I saw him unloaded from an army wagon at the guardhouse, dead. I was told afterwards that he was shot through the head. I understood that he had been pronounced insane by a commission, and was being taken to an insane asylum when he was killed.

TESTIMONY OF EDWARD J. FLANNAGAN.

Edward J. Flannagan, age 41 years, a resident of Mullan, Idaho, for fourteen years, a justice of the peace, testified as follows:

At the time of the explosion of the Bunker Hill mill I was at the Northern Pacific depot at Mullan, ready to take the train to Wallace to attend to some private business; there was no unusual excitement at Mullan nor had there been. I know of no instance where civil process had been resisted, or any indication of insurrection or rebellion against the constituted authorities. I was arrested on May 6 by a State deputy and 3 negro soldiers; no warrant was served on me, nor was I informed of the charge, if any, held against me. The circumstances of the arrest were these: I was on the opposite side of the street from my office, and I saw that there was some one in the room searching. I have two rooms, my business office in one and the other I use as a sleeping room and have a folding bed,

which stands near the window. On this day the folding bed was not closed, and from the opposite side of the street I saw some one raise the mattress off the bed. The building was guarded by soldiers back and front; I immediately went across the street and as I went into my office I saw the deputy take a buckskin purse out of my valise and put it in his pocket. I asked him what he was doing and he replied, "We want you, too." He turned to the negro soldier and said, "You take this man," and I went out in the hallway with the soldier. I asked the negro what the deputy had taken out of my valise, and said that I saw him take one article; the soldier said he had taken more than one. They took me to the lower end of town, where they had gathered a number of other citizens, and kept me till 6 o'clock in the evening, when I was identified, by acceptable witnesses, as having had nothing to do with the explosion of the mill, and released me. I went home and found the deputy had stolen from my valise a purse containing $12, two silk handkerchiefs, and a Colt's revolver valued at $26. These things I have never recovered, although I have demanded them from the authorities, nor has the deputy been prosecuted. Four days after this, I was arrested by a deputy from Wardner, on orders from Bartlett Sinclair, but without a warrant. I was taken to Wallace that evening and put in jail and kept there until the next day at 2 o'clock, when I was taken to Wardner. When I came to the bull pen, Edmonston, the famous permit man, said to me, "Your name is Flannagan?" I said, "Yes, sir." "Are you an American or a foreigner," he asked. "I am an American," I replied. "You can go in the bull pen," he said, and I went in. None of the civil officers ever asked me a solitary question about the explosion of the mill, or my personal connection with anything concerning it. I was there for eighty-seven days. The treatment of the men confined there was brutal and inhuman in the extreme; the food was vile, and not fit for human beings to eat, and the serving of it was filthy beyond expression. One man was kept in the guardhouse a week because he threw a pig's foot, which was putrid and unfit to eat, into the slop trough. On the 19th of September all the men in the prison were put on the standing line for refusing to dig a ditch, and kept all day, under the most torturing conditions. At this time I was sick, but nevertheless met the same tyrannical treatment that was meted out to my companions in misfortune. The circumstance was this: The men had attempted to dig a tunnel, as a means of escape, and it had been discovered, and Captain Edwards had determined to dig a ditch to prevent any further attempts of this kind. He called out the men in squads of five, and ordered them to dig this ditch. Every man refused, and was ordered to stand up in line. When my time came I told him I was sick, the doctor had given me medicine the night before, and had been treating me for three weeks for granulated eyelids. The captain told me to go and see the doctor, which I did, and he said, "You go on and go to work, and when you drop I'll get you excused." I went back and told Captain Edwards what the doctor had said; he asked me if I would work, and I told him no. He said, "Get out on the standing line." When all the men had refused and were on the line, Captain Edwards said, "I want you men to understand that I will keep you on bread and water for thirty days if you don't perform this work." One of the men said, for a joke on the permit system, "We have no permit to work." I think the captain misunderstood him, or did not see the point of the joke; anyway he turned around and said, "You are a God damned set of cowards and curs." He said to the soldiers, "If any man steps off the line, shoot him in his tracks," and during the day the soldiers threw down their guns on the men several times. The day was extremely hot, and a number of the men had not brought their hats, and, of course, were bareheaded. The force of the sun was terrific, and the men suffered for water; only one was allowed to go to the tank at a time, and it was over two hours before a man could get a drink of water. These men had worked under ground all their lives, and the exposure to the fierce rays of the sun was a terrible ordeal to them. It caused me much suffering with my eyes. The hay was taken from our bunks and burned before our eyes, and we were compelled to sleep on the bare boards for fifteen days, and were kept on sour bread and water as our only food and drink for nine days. For two weeks we were not allowed any tobacco, and between three and four weeks we were not allowed to see any visitors. The men were on the standing line from 8 o'clock in the morning until 4 in the evening, and were not allowed to move.

Mr. LENTZ. Was there any provision made either by the State or military authorities for the support of the families of the men who were confined in the bull pen all this time?

Answer. None whatever. The only resource they had to depend on to save them from starvation and destitution was the labor organizations, and they established supply depots in charge of women who looked after the families.

TESTIMONY OF THOMAS HENEY.

Thomas Heney, a miner, 40 years of age, a resident of Mullan, who worked upon his own mining property, testified as follows:

For the first few years I worked under ground; for many years past I have been working mining property of my own. I served two years as sheriff of Shoshone County. I am a property owner of Shoshone County; my property consists of real estate and mining claims. I own six buildings in Mullan and some lots in the town of Kellogg. On April 29 I was acting as deputy sheriff, guarding the Bunker Hill and Sullivan mine. On the morning of the 29th the foreman came to me and said, "I am afraid there is going to be some trouble, the men in the Last Chance are not working." I said to him, "It does look a little suspicious; they have all been laid off." He said he thought we had better fix up some breastworks around the mine, as they would probably come up and try to run out the miners; he said, "There is a very bitter feeling against these men who are working here." So they run all of the ore cars they had out of the mine—some 30 or 40 of them. They piled them up around the edge of the dump, in front of the mine, and he sent several men down town to pick up what militia guns they could; they brought these up, and the men were armed and made ready to defend the mine. About 10 or 11 o'clock we heard that 700 or 800 men were coming from Wallace, Mullan, and Burke; and the foreman said, "I think the best thing I can do is to tell all of these men to get away from here"—there were about 90 or 100 men in the mine. I told him I did not know but that would be a good idea. He said, "If they come up here they can not do much harm, except to run these fellows out." He said, "I'm going to tell these men to look out for themselves and get away as soon as they can." So he gave that general order to the men, and they skipped out of there as fast as they could, some walking and some running. Every one about the mine left. They took their rifles with them and went down the gulch, not toward town. They were not in a body, but went in groups. There were 70 or 80 of these men, and they all had militia rifles. I did not remain at the mine, but went to town and closed up all of the saloons. I expected the men I had heard were on the road would come to Wardner. There was no force left to defend the mine, and I was left alone, so I did the best I could devise to protect the property. I thought the attack would be made on the mine and did the best I could to protect it, but they left the mine and went to the concentrator, which is about 2½ miles from the mine. When I returned to the mine the rioters were all gone. I was arrested on June 23 by 5 soldiers and a man named Rose, who represented himself as a deputy. At the time of my arrest I was an officer of the court. I had been appointed to serve some papers in a civil suit. The court was in session and I was arrested in open court. Five soldiers came into the court room with this man Rose—a corporal and 4 privates. Rose came over and tapped me on the shoulder and said, "We want you to come along with us; we are going to place you under arrest." I was a little surprised, and asked him what for. He said he did not know. I asked him if he had a warrant; he said "No." I asked him who ordered my arrest. He said, "I don't know; come along; no arguing here." This was on June 23, and I stayed in the bull pen until October 2 and no charge was ever preferred against me. The treatment of the prisoners was cruel and brutal in the extreme. (Witness corroborated many of the acts of cruelty testified to by the witnesses who preceded him.) I was put on the standing line already referred to and kept standing in the hot sun in one position from 8 o'clock in the morning till 4.30 in the evening. I heard the words of Captain Edwards when he swore at the men and called them cowards and curs. He was known among the prisoners as General Weyler. Captain Edwards told me one day that a pipe cutter was lost, and that he thought the men who cleaned up the yard had stolen it. He ordered me to find it. The men said they had not seen it and knew nothing of it. He ordered the two men who did the cleaning to be confined in the dark cell in the guard-house for seven days, and the day they were released the pipe cutter was found where it had been used a week before. A young man named Hassett was confined to the dark cell and his eyes permanently injured in consequence of the confinement. There were never any charges preferred against him and he was released in October without a trial. He had been ordered to move some hay by Lieutenant Smithers and did not obey promptly. The lieutenant threatened to have him tied up by his thumbs. On September 22 Mr. Sinclair came into the bull pen and sent for me. When I met him he asked, "Is your name Heney?" I said "Yes." "Well," he said, "we have investigated the charges against you and have decided to release you." I replied, "I am very glad of it, Mr. Sinclair, and now that you have decided to release me I would like to know what charges you had against me?" "Well," he said, "you were assisting in the defense of the Corcoran case." I said "That is not a fact, because I was arrested nearly a month before the Corcoran case came up, and I could not have had anything to do with it." He said, "Well, you are released by the State authorities. I will turn you over to Captain Edwards, here." The Captain said, "You report to me to-morrow morning at 9 o'clock." This was on Saturday evening, and I said, "Captain, I am sick and I would like to report this evening, so that I can get home, as I have been released by the State authorities. You know that I am innocent, and I don't want to stay any longer here than is absolutely necessary." He said, "I have been twenty years in the Army and I know my business; you report to me in the morning at 9 o'clock." The next morning at 9 o'clock I went to the guard and told him the Captain had ordered me to report at his quarters at 9 o'clock, and that I wanted to go there. He said, "I have nothing to do about that, I am on guard here." So I did not get out. When the guard was changed at 10 o'clock I tried again and failed, and again at 12, and kept on as the guard was changed throughout the day, but I did not get out. The Captain sent for me the next morning, and asked me if I wanted to go to work. I asked him for how long. "That ain't it," he said, "do you want to go out and obey my orders and go to work?" I told him I was sick and could not work. "Take him back," he said; and he kept me until October 1. We were on bread and water all the time, from September 22, when I was released by the State authorities, until October 1. So I was held purely by the military authorities without any charge against me for ten days, and compelled to do penal labor by the officer in charge.

TESTIMONY OF JAMES R. SOVEREIGN.

James R. Sovereign, 47 years of age, a farmer, formerly commissioner of labor statistics for the State of Iowa, and later general master workman of the Knights of Labor, testified as follows:

I arrived in Shoshone County, Idaho, on September 1, 1898. I went there under contract with the Democrat Publishing Company to take charge of the Idaho State Tribune, a paper published by that company. I assumed charge of the paper early in October and was in Wallace, performing my duties as editor, on April 29, 1899. I had no connection with the labor organizations other than editing their official organ. I was at a meeting of the Western Labor Union, at Gem, on the night of April 28, when it is charged plans were laid for the disturbances which occurred the next day. I remained at that meeting till most of the members were gone, about 11 o'clock. The Bunker Hill situation was elaborately discussed, but no intimation was made of any demonstration of any kind. The conclusion arrived at was that the strike was a failure, and that the Bunker Hill Company could operate their mine in spite of opposition by the miner's union, and that no further consideration would be given the matter. I went home to Wallace, retired very late. I neither heard nor saw any disturbance of any kind. The next morning I met the superintendent of the Standard mine, and he told me the mines on Canyon Creek were closed. The Standard was already closed, making repairs, and about 250 men were idle. I was on the street, in front of my office, soon after this when a man came along on horseback, and called out, "Sovereign, they are coming!" "Who is coming?" I said, and he replied "The Canyon Creekers," and rode on. In a minute or so I heard the train whistle, and saw it round the curve; it was filled with men. I thought there must be some kind of an excursion going on, and called those in the office to look out so they might see what was going on. I then thought, if anything was going on, as a newspaper man it was my duty to find it out, and I started down to board the train, but it pulled out before I reached it, and went on to Wardner, leaving me behind. No one in Wallace seemed to know anything of what was going on; some thought it an excursion, others a parade or meeting at Wardner, and others feared some violence was probable. This train went about 10 o'clock, and at 12 o'clock the regular passenger train came along, and I got on it and went to Wardner. There was not an unusual number of passengers, nor was there anything unusual to note on the way. I got off the train about 50 yards from the depot, and walked up; the train I had seen pass Wallace was standing at the depot. Just as I reached this train, the first explosion at the mine occurred. Two other explosions occurred in rapid succession. I was in full view of the mill at the time. It was probably a half a mile away. The train was filled with men at the time, and as I passed some one called out, "Here is Sovereign; pick him up and throw him on a box car." They did this, and I jumped off. It was instantaneous. I went and stood on the platform at the depot for a few minutes, when there began a promiscuous firing of rifles on the train, by way of jubilation, I suppose, as the guns were fired in the air. I thought it would be safer for me on the train, and so got on the engine. In about fifteen minutes the train pulled out and went back to Wallace. When we reached Wallace I got off the train and it went on to Burke. There was no disturbance then or afterwards. I never saw anything to indicate a state of insurrection or the least disorder or bad feeling of any description. On May 3 I received a telephone message from Dr. France, asking me to come to Wardner and testify at the coroner's inquest. This I did. Attorneys Lindley and Beale interrogated me. They are both attorneys for the Bunker Hill and Sullivan mine. They did not question me at all in regard to the killing of the two men, or anything in regard to their death. While at Kellogg and Wardner, and on the way from Wallace, I noticed no signs of insurrection or disorder, and saw no necessity for the use of soldiers; the civil authorities, I think, could have controlled the situation without interference or resistance. As editor of the official organ of the miner's union I never wrote an article inciting riot or disorder of any kind. I always counseled peace and respect for the law and the constituted authorities. The files of the paper will bear me out in this. In October, 1898, a man named Conners was run out of the Cœur d'Alene by four masked men. This was charged against the miners' union, and I condemned the act in the paper very severely. The union took official action and passed strong resolutions condemning such acts and the men who perpetrated them, and offered the services of the organization in suppressing such acts and running down and bringing to

justice the perpetrators of any lawlessness. The men engaged in this act were expelled from the union. I saw the men who were arrested at Canyon Creek, when they came down under guard, with their wet clothes on, shivering, in the box cars. I rode to the bull pen and saw the treatment of the men confined there. I sat in the saddle in front of it for an hour. At that time the soldiers on guard were all negroes, and they seemed extremely domineering and overbearing. While I sat there at that time, some one in the bull pen was calling roll and the men were getting into line for some purpose, and as they came into line in the rear they crowded the front ranks forward; the soldiers were very abusive to them. They said, "Stand back there, you God damned white sons of bitches; stand back." After I had heard this repeated a great number of times I rode up close to the gate and asked the men in the bull pen whether the words "son of a bitch" was the military countersign. Being asked if he thought there was more crime or lawlessness in the Coeur d'Alenes than in the city of Spokane, Wash., Mr. Sovereign replied: "I do not think there was as much; I think there has been more crime committed since martial law has prevailed than has ever been known prior to this in a corresponding length of time. There have been more dissipation, drunkenness, and street brawls, more murders; the gambling places are all carried on openly, in violation of the civil laws, and negro soldiers insulted and humiliated the wives and daughters of the men in the bull pen, sending them indecent proposals in writing, and even attempting to force entrance into their houses. In one instance a so-called deputy tried to force an entrance into the room of a lady whose husband was in the bull pen. She swore out a warrant for his arrest, and he was tried by a justice of the peace, who sentenced him to jail. For this the justice was arrested and sent to the bull pen, and the deputy released by the military authorities. So it came about that the justices were afraid to issue processes or attempt to try criminals for fear that they themselves would be thrown in the bull pen." Mr. Lentz asked: "Have you any knowledge of anything being done by any miners' union, anywhere in that region, with reference to the destruction of the property of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan, or any other property, or with reference to any injury to any person?" Answer. "No, sir; I have not." Mr. Lentz. "State whether the labor unions are criminal organizations or whether it is even possible with their constitution or their membership to advocate or discuss the committing of a crime?" Answer. "No, sir; the miners' unions are not criminal organizations. One might as well expect to organize the lower House of Congress into a criminal organization to blow up the National Library under some real or imaginary grievance as to expect to organize a criminal organization out of a labor union. In the first place, it is a physical impossibility. The radical members always stand in fear and dread of the conservatives, and it only requires one or two conservatives to convict an entire membership if they propose a crime. There has never been a time to my knowledge in the Coeur d'Alenes when the mine operators did not have more or less cordial friends inside of the miners' organizations, and they were welcome friends. It would be impossible to organize a labor organization in direct conflict and in antagonism to its own test of membership, without some objector. I know it is charged that the conservatives in the Cœur d'Alenes yield through the fear of the radicals, and a long chain of crime is laid at their door. Now, there are criminals in all organizations; in the boards of trade, in the directors and officers of banks, in chambers of commerce, even in the churches; but that does not make the organizations criminal. You can go to New Orleans or Galveston and find in the court records crimes committed by longshoremen as great as have ever been committed in the Cœur d'Alenes, but to say these crimes were sanctioned by the union is absurd and preposterous. I desire to say, further, that a great number of the crimes instanced by the governor, in his appeal to the President for the continuance of Federal troops, are crimes that had no relationship to the existing conditions, or no relationship between employer and employees, or between miners' organizations and mining companies, but were a difference and contention between individual members of organizations.

Mr. LENTZ. Is there anything in the law, written or unwritten, of the labor unions which would require you, as a member of it, or any member of a labor union, to conceal the name of a criminal who happened to belong to it?

Answer. No, sir; no more than in the Masons, the Elks, or the church. The fact is quite the contrary. If any member knows of any criminal resolution or action passed by the union, he is at perfect liberty to make it public, just as much as any other law-abiding citizen would be. The unions are law-respecting organizations, and it is their duty and object to further and aid good government, law, and orderly conditions and further the maintenance of justice. The miners' union built and equipped a hospital in the Cœur d'Alenes at a cost of $35,000; they maintain this by an assessment on each member of $1 per month. The equipment is the best and most complete in the West. The unions also have a sick-benefit fund of $10 per week while disabled from work and a funeral benefit of $100. They also own a cemetery, where the members and their families are buried, and also own halls in Gem and Burke; all public meetings of every character are held in these halls—religious services, church entertainments, literary exercises, joint debates, etc. They have reading clubs, and distribute books and pamphlets among the members. They have debates upon economics and sociological questions. There are many improving and refining features connected with these unions.

Fourth. It is charged that Brig. Gen. H. C. Merriam did, in defiance of and contrary to the provisions of the fourth amendment of the Constitution, subject the persons, houses, papers, and effects of citizens to unreasonable and arbitrary search and seizure. The fourth amendment herein referred to is as follows:

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched and the persons and things to be seized.

The testimony of every witness examined shows the most flagrant and defiant violation of this provision, especially as it relates to persons and property. The testimony of Mr. A. F. Gill alone is fully sufficient to sustain this charge. Mr. Gill says:

I was very close to Major Morton all the time. I observed his actions and the actions of his soldiers. The soldiers were arresting men and searching houses. I heard Major Morton direct a soldier to break into my house (just in front of us) in these words: "Break into those houses and search them." The soldiers went up to my house (my wife was out at the time, and the door locked). I watched the soldier turn the knob of the door; it would not yield, and he jammed it in, broke the glass in the door, and went in and searched the dwelling. He had no warrant. I observed several other similar acts.

Mr. DICK. Did you understand that this order to break into houses was from the military commander or the State deputies?

Answer. I know the order was from Major Morton. I was standing near to him and heard him give the orders to the soldiers in a number of different cases. I saw a number of houses forcibly broken into by the soldiers. In some cases they broke the glasses out with their rifles and went in through the windows. I heard Major Morton order a soldier to break into the house of the foreman of the Hecla Mining Company. The soldier tried the door, and it was locked; he then went to the side window, broke it in with his rifle, and went in through the window. I was not more than 25 yards from the house at the time.

Mr. Gill states that hundreds of citizens of Burke, of all callings—preachers, school teachers, justices of the peace, merchants, etc.—were seized without warrant or charge of any kind, and they were men who would be considered good citizens here in Washington. Later than this there was some whisky and some glasses stolen from a saloon kept by a prostitute. A deputy named Murphy (an ex-convict, who had served a term in the penitetiary for cattle stealing) went, in company with this prostitute, and broke into and searched the residences of a number of respectable citizens on a pretense of looking for these glasses. When asked for his warrant, Murphy would put his hand on his pistol and say, "This is my warrant." In company with this prostitute, Convict Murphy went through the houses of the citizens in this way. In some cases they broke in; in others they pushed aside the persons at the door and forced an entrance. Captain Batchelor, in his telegraphic report to General Merriam, says he arrived at Wardner May 2, at 2 o'clock p. m., and began a search for arms. This proves, by admission, that the soldiers were searching the houses of citizens, without warrant, twenty-four hours at least before the proclamation of the governor was written.

Mr. Edward J. Flannagan, a justice of the peace, a resident of Mullan, testified that a deputy, with a guard of soldiers, entered his sleeping apartments, and made thorough search of all his effects, taking from a valise, and appropriating, money, his property, to their own use, and that he never recovered his property—they had no warrant or other civil process—and also seized him (Flannagan) and held him in durance. His testimony, under charge 2, sets out all the incidents in detail. Mr. Stimson, one of the county commissioners, testifies that when he was arrested in his place of business, the lodge room of the Odd Fellows, which is located in the same building, was searched. Mr. Stimson says in regard to this, "I recognized the deputy as an Odd Fellow, and I told him there was an Odd Fellows' room upstairs, and that there was a paraphernalia room there, and as I did not care to have anyone not a member of the order intrude there, I asked if he would not search that room himself, as I knew they were searching every house for arms. He searched the lodge rooms, and reported to Lieutenant Murphy, who said it would not be disturbed further. They showed no warrant or other civil process. Mr. Wilbur H. Stewart testified that his house was searched, and his printing material seized by Major Smith and Bartlett Sinclair without a warrant or other civil process, and its return upon a demand by writ of replevin refused, and that he himself was seized and imprisoned without warrant.

Fifth. It is charged that the military commander arbitrarily and in defiance of the civil law ordered the arrest of the sheriff of the county and the board of county commissioners, and subsequently deposed them from office on the unproved pretext of neglect of duty. This charge is fully sustained by the statement of nearly all of the witnesses, especially by Mr. William R. Stimson, one of the commissioners; by Mr. Forney, the prosecuting attorney; Mr. Flannagan, Governor Steunenberg, and Dr. France. There can be no denial of the full proof of this charge.

Sixth. It is charged that the military commander, immediately upon the arrival of troops, ordered the arrest of every man who was a member of the miners' union, and also of all citizens who were supposed to sympathize with the cause of organized labor. The proof of this charge is admitted by General Merriam in his telegram of May 2, when he said, "This is martial law." Every settlement in the mining district was dragneted by soldiers, and every miner and his friends, regardless of occupation or affiliation, was seized and thrown into prison. There were not enough men left in Gem, Burke, Wallace, or Mullan to bury their dead, and it was necessary for the women to perform this service. They were compelled to take charge of and distribute the supplies sent by outside labor organizations for the relief of the destitute families of the men arbitrarily held in prison without any charge preferred or any trial.

Although General Merriam denies that he issued a specific order to his subordinate officers to arrest all members of the miners' union, yet the fact remains proven that the miners' union was declared a criminal organization; and Governor Steunenberg testifies to the fact that he gave a blanket order to arrest everybody in Shoshone County whom Mr. Sinclair should desire arrested. Dr. France testifies, as well as Mr. Sinclair, that orders were given to arrest all union miners at the various mining centers, and it is conclusively proven that about 300 arrests of miners were made at Burke by soldiers under the command of Major Morton, and the same thing was done at Mullan. Indeed, there is no lack of testimony to prove that all arrests were made virtually by the soldiers, the deputies merely serving to point out individuals. Mr. Sinclair in his cross-examination was asked:

Mr. HAY. Could you maintain martial law without the aid of United States troops?

Answer. No; if the troops were withdrawn the governor would be compelled to declare martial law at an end.

Mr. HAY. Are not the troops ordered there by the President of the United States?

Answer. Yes.

Now the conclusion is obvious. All of these outrages are only made possible by the presence of the troops sent there by the President, and all of these outrages upon the Constitution, the laws, and the rights of citizens are the outcome of the acts of the President through the power exercised by the military officer in command in the district. All this pretense of State authority, of sustaining the constituted authorities, and the commissioning of deputies is a mere farce and subterfuge. The fact is patent that the management of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan dictate a policy in their own interest to a handful of so-called State representatives who serve their policy, and these, with the aid of Federal bayonets, impose any hardship, any injustice, any oppression they may desire upon a defenseless and helpless community, and worse still, these so-called representatives, and especially the chief of them, Sinclair, are a lot of transient interlopers, nonresidents, men of no responsibility or character in the community, and they dominate, oppress, and tyrannize over a community, residents for years in the locality, whose industry and energy have developed the resources of the locality, retrieved it from its primitive wildness, made there homes for their families, and surrounded them with the comforts of civilization.

Seventh. It is charged that these citizens were imprisoned in what is known as the "bull pen," a place unfit for human habitation, and that so brutual and degrading was the treatment inflicted on the prisoners by the United States soldiers under the orders of their commanders that one unfortunate man became insane, and upon being taken to the county jail he broke from his guard and jumped into the river, and a negro soldier, at the command of Dr. France, the physician for the Bunker Hill Mining Company, fired three shots at him and he was taken from the river dead; and that another unfortunate prisoner, dying in the "bull pen," begged for a priest, and his dying request was denied.

These facts are testified to by almost every witness put upon the stand; the special acts were stated by Mr. Simpkins, Mr. Stewart, and Dr. France himself. The brutality and inhumanity of the treatment is the theme of every witness, and the filthy and unsanitary condition proven clearly; the beastly manner in which the prisoners were compelled to secure and eat their food is revolting beyond expression.

Eighth. It is charged that the imprisoned citizens were denied the opportunity to confer with their counsel and members of their families, and were denied the right of speedy and impartial trial; were held in this vile and inhuman imprisonment for several months, without charge or indictment against them, although two sessions of the grand jury were held in the meantime, and during their confinement were treated by the officers and soldiers of the United States Army as convicted felons, and compelled to work at penal employment; were subjected to cruel and degrading punishments, such as being compelled to sleep on bare boards, were placed on a diet of bread and water for ten days, and compelled to stand seven hours each day (erect) in the hot sun, under penalty of death if they attempted to sit down or even move. These two latter unlawful punishments were inflicted upon them by the orders of Captain Edwards, United States Army, who amused himself by calling the prisoners "cowardly curs."

All of these charges are fully sustained by every witness examined, and there can be no question as to their truth. Reference is made to all the testimony under charge 3.

Ninth. It is charged that, by the use of the military power, the writ of habeas corpus was suspended for months in Shoshone County, and the right of free speech, free press, and peaceable assemblage were denied to the peaceable citizens of that community, without any excuse or justification whatever. Under this charge, it was proven that Mr. Cornell and others were arrested and imprisoned "for talking too much;" that men were arrested for talking to certain men from Missouri who came there to work in the mines; one man, even, in Montana, who had not been in Idaho for six months, was seized for merely talking to prisoners, and others were arrested for expressing their disapproval of the methods of those in power. Mr. Stewart's paper was suppressed, his material confiscated, and himself imprisoned, for alleged criticism of the authorities. Probably the most contemptible and puerile exhibition of petty tyranny and vindictive spite which has ever disgraced the annals of any community, in this or in any other country, since the days of mediæval slavery, was enacted by Bartlett Sinclair, in Shoshone County, Idaho, when by proclamation he denied the right of peaceable assemblage to the women and children, the wives and mothers and sisters of the men who at that time were held in duress under the bayonets of the Federal soldiers. This exhibition of bullying tyranny was perpetrated under the most aggravating conditions, which would make it contemptible and disgraceful even if it were not in open defiance both of the Constitution of the United States and of that of the State of Idaho. The circumstances are as follows:

There is located at Wallace a cemetery belonging to the miners' union, and there all deceased members are buried, and there the family of each member has a burial plat. It is customary annually, on July 11, for the various unions to assemble at this cemetery with their wives and children to hold memorial services for the dead and to decorate the graves with flowers. The occasion is similar to the Decoration Day ceremonies held throughout the Union, but purely local there. On July 11, 1899, almost the entire male mining population of Shoshone County was imprisoned in the bull pen, at any rate all the union miners, which of course precluded an observation of the day by them in the usual manner, and consequently the women of the community determined to carry out the usual custom, as far as they were able, and in pursuance of their intent caused to be published the following notice:

The Cœur d'Alene miners' memorial day, Tuesday, July 11, is to be fittingly celebrated. The wives, daughters, and sweethearts of the imprisoned men of Wardner, Mullan, and Canyon Creek, together with the women of Wallace, have arranged short commemoration exercises. No display or ostentatious demonstration will be attempted, but a fitting tribute will be paid to the memory of those who gave their lives to the labor cause in 1892.

This piteous endeavor of the weak and helpless to show their loving remembrance of their dead called forth the following heartless, brutal, and unmanly declaration on the part of the petty despots in power at the moment:

NOTICE TO ALL RESIDENTS OF THE CŒUR D'ALENES.

Whereas the authorities have been reliably informed that a number of residents of Shoshone County propose to celebrate on July 11 certain acts committed in violation of law and order, and to incite rioting and resistance to the laws of the State and United States: Now, therefore, this is to notify all persons that no such celebration in Shoshone County will be permitted. All persons giving encouragement by holding meetings, or giving contributions, or otherwise, and all persons taking part, or encouraging others to take part in such celebration, or permitting others to take part in such celebration, over whom, by reason of relationship, they exercise control, will be liable to arrest and imprisonment.

The peace officers of the county are instructed to deny the use of the public highways for all such disgraceful and unlawful exhibitions in commemoration of said criminal acts.

This proclamation was signed by Bartlett Sinclair, and silently acquiesced in by the military commander on the ground, and therefore constructively having his approval and support. On the cross-examination of Bartlett Sinclair, Mr. Robertson asked:

Question. Was it not generally understood that the miners' union men who could be arbitrarily arrested were not going to make a celebration?

Answer. That is what I heard, and for that reason I said in that notice that those who had control over those people by reason of relationship would be arrested.

Question. You did, then, intend to cause those to be arrested who permitted their wives and children to parade on that day?

Answer. That they would be liable to arrest.

Mr. ROBERTSON. You gave notice to that community that if those little children and those women attempted to carry out any programme on July 11 and used the highways they would be incarcerated?

Answer. That they would run the risk of it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Now, Mr. Sinclair, it has been testified to that on July 11 it was customary to decorate the graves of those men with American flags and flowers, and that peaceful memorial addresses were made over the graves of the dead. Did you think that you had the right to prevent the wives and children of those people from assembling and marching there in a body of one or ten thousand if they saw fit?

Answer. Not if it were for that quiet purpose and not to excite riot; but the minds of the people were very much inflamed, and it would take very little to bring about a concerted attack on the constituted authorities.

Mr. ROBERTSON. But you have testified that nearly all of the miners' union men were in prison, at least a large portion of them.

Answer. Yes; they must have been.

Mr. ROBERTSON. There were about 1,000 Federal soldiers there, the mining centers were filled with deputies armed with revolvers, and there was the sheriff and his deputies; yet, Mr. Sinclair, you would not permit these women and children to parade on that day because they would incite a riot.

Answer. It was not the women, it was the men.

Mr. ROBERTSON. But you have just testified that you knew the women and children would meet, and the men would not?

Answer. If the women did not meet, I felt sure the men would not; it was a celebration I would have prevented if in my power.

Mr. ROBERTSON. You would prevent anything which you did not like, possibly. Now, you said, "The peace officers of the county are instructed to deny the use of the public highways." Do you not know that the public have the right peacefully to use the public highways?

Answer. Yes; peaceably.

How did you have the right to anticipate, in advance of a meeting that was ostensibly called for a peaceable purpose, that they would unlawfully use the highways?

Answer. You see I conceived the notion that it was not to be a peaceful or law-abiding gathering. I wished to prevent anything leading to insurrection.

Now, do you not know that on July 4 all the mines on Canyon Creek, at Mullan, Gem, Mace, and Burke were closed, and celebrations held, and that only the Bunker Hill and Sullivan mine was the only one which was not closed down?

Answer. I did not hear of it; it might have been the case.

Surely there is no further evidence necessary to prove the charge that the constitutional right of peaceable assembly was denied in the most tyrannical and arbitrary manner, and yet this testimony is corroborated by nearly every witness. Comment upon this act of petty despotism and puerile arrogance is unnecessary.

Tenth. It is charged that when the Industrial Commission sat in Wallace all union men who had been long residents of the county were in the bull pen, and had no opportunity to appear before the commission; others were arrested on their way to Wallace to appear before the commission, and thrown into the bull pen, until after the commission adjourned. The fact that all the union men were in the bull pen when the commission held its sitting, and that the commission never went to the prison, or asked for any of the prisoners to testify before it, is fully shown by the combined testimony of all the witnesses, as there is practically no denial that all the members of the unions were arrested, and that fully 1,200 men

were held in the prison. That arrests of men were made on their way to testify before the commission is shown by the evidence of William Powers, a resident of Mullan, of which place he had been a resident for more than ten years. At the time of his arrest he was a civil officer of the county, a constable of the town of Mullan. Mr. Powers testifies:

On July 27 I was standing on the street, waiting for the stage, to go down and testify before the Industrial Commission. I was summoned to appear before that body on that day; and while I was waiting for the stage a man named Perrin, who up to that time had been in the employ of the Bunker Hill Company and at that time was a member of Doctor France's jury, tapped me on the shoulder and told me I was his prisoner. I asked him what charge he had, or what right he had to take me. He whipped out his gun and made a crack at me with it. I dodged the gun; and he struck with such force that his cuff button scratched my face as it passed, and the gun went about half way across the street, out of his hand. I grabbed his hands and got him a little foul. "Now," I said, "that is your charge and you have lost it. Now, what charge have you got?" He asked me if I was going to resist arrest. I told him, No, if he had any right to arrest me; but I intended to find out, if I could, what authority he had to arrest me or what papers he had directing him to take me. At that time a soldier came up and told me to consider myself under arrest. I said, "I am willing to submit to arrest to anyone who has authority to arrest me. Are you going to arrest me for not holding my head for that man to hit me with a gun?" He said, "No; I will take that man, too," but he said he would take me down first. We were both finally taken before the lieutenant in charge, and I said to him that I was on my way down to answer to a summons of the Industrial Commission, and that if it was possible for him to let me respond to that summons I would like to do so. He told the guard to take charge of me. I still wanted to get an answer from him, and he told me the less I had to say the better it would be for me. I was carried to Wallace and thrown into jail. I sent word by a friend to the members of the commission that I was under arrest, and would be glad to appear before them if they would send for me. My friend brought back word that they would come to the bull pen and get my testimony; that there were others there whose testimony they wanted to get, and they would get all at the same time. They never came down there at all, nor did they ever to my knowledge send for any man confined there to testify before them. Nothing was ever done with Perrin. I was detained ten or twelve days and released; no charges were ever preferred.

The further fact that the evidence given before them by Mr. Simpkins, Mr. Sovereign, Mr. Cornell, and others was so garbled and distorted in their report that it was not recognizable or recognized by the witnesses themselves proves that the so-called investigation was merely a perfunctory affair, intended to serve a purpose, and utterly regardless of justice, truth, or the rights of the people affected by it. Its report is unworthy of credence or the respect of the country.

Eleventh. It is charged that the following proclamation, in gross violation of the Constitution of the United States, and of the constitution and statutes of the State of Idaho, was issued and enforced by General Merriam, to wit:

PROCLAMATION.

Whereas the following notice has been served upon the mine owners of Shoshone County by the duly constituted State authorities, by whom martial law has been declared, to wit:

"To the mine owners of Shoshone County:

"Certain organizations or combinations existing in Shoshone County have shown themselves to be criminal in purpose, inciting and, *as organizations*, procuring property to be destroyed and murders to be committed, by reason whereof it has been twice necessary to declare martial law in Shoshone County.

"You are therefore notified that the employment of men belonging to said or other criminal organizations during the continuance of martial law must cease. In case this direction is not observed your mines will be closed."

Therefore, in order to carry into effect the spirit of the foregoing notice and restore the industries of the district as far as possible, it becomes necessary to establish a system by which miners who have not participated in the recent acts of violence, and who are law-abiding people, may obtain work, and, that order and peace may be established, the following is promulgated for the guidance of all mine owners and employees in the affected district:

All parties applying for underground work in any of the following mines will be required to obtain from Dr. Hugh France, the duly appointed and authorized agent for the State of Idaho for this purpose, or his deputy, at Wardner or at Wallace, a permit authorizing said person to seek employment in any of the following mines: Bunker Hill and Sullivan, Last Chance, Empire State-Idaho, Consolidated Tiger and Poorman, Hecla, Mammoth, Standard, Helena-Frisco, Gem, Morning, Hunter, and such others as may be hereafter included in the above list. Parties applying for such permits must be prepared: First, to deny all participation in the riots of April 29, 1899, in Shoshone County; and, second, to deny or renounce membership in any society which has incited, encouraged, or approved of said riots or other violation of public law.

Mine owners must refuse employment to all applicants for underground work who do not present a duly signed permit authorizing the same. Such permit will be deposited in mine owners' office subject to periodical inspection.

All parties now under employment by any of the mines above named will be required to procure, within ten days from this date, the permits above referred to as a condition to their remaining in the service of their respective companies.

By order of the governor and commander in chief:

BARTLETT SINCLAIR, *State Auditor.*

Examined and approved:

H. C. MERRIAM,
Brigadier-General, U. S. Army.

Dated May 8, 1899.

"The application for permits to seek employment which union men must sign is as follows:

"'APPLICATION FOR LEAVE TO SEEK EMPLOYMENT IN THE MINES OF SHOSHONE COUNTY.

"'To Dr. HUGH FRANCE, *State Representative.*

"'SIR: I hereby make application for issuance to me of a permit allowing me to seek employment in the mines of Shoshone County.

"'I am a ——— by occupation.

"'I am a native of ——— and am a ——— citizen of the United States.

"'I last worked at the ——— mine in ———

"'My shift boss was ——— ———.

"'Heretofore I have been a member of ——— Miners' Union.

"'I did not participate actively or otherwise in the riots which took place at Wardner on the 29th of April, 1899. Believing that the crimes committed at Wardner on said date were actively incited, encouraged, and perpetrated through and by means of the influence and direction of the miners' unions of the Cœur d'Alenes, I hereby express my unqualified disapproval of said acts, and hereby renounce and forever abjure all allegiance to the said miners' union, of which I was a former member, and I solemnly pledge myself to obey the law and not to again seek membership in any society which will encourage or tolerate any violation of law.

——— ———.

"'Dated this — day of ———, 1899.'

"The application which nonunion men must sign is as follows:

"'APPLICATION FOR LEAVE TO SEEK EMPLOYMENT IN THE MINES OF SHOSHONE COUNTY.

"'To Dr. Hugh France, State representative.

"'Sir: I hereby make application for issuance to me of a permit allowing me to seek employment in the mines of Shoshone County.

"'I am a ——— by occupation.

"'I am a native of ——— and am a ——— citizen of the United States.

"'I last worked at the ——— mine in ———.

"'My shift boss was ——— ———.

"'I have not been for ——— years a member of any miners' union.

"'I took no part, either actively or passively, in aiding, assisting, or encouraging the perpetration of the crimes committed at Wardner on the 29th of April, 1899.

"'I solemnly pledge myself to obey the law.

——— ———.

"'Dated this — day of ———, 1899.'

"At this writing no union men are permitted to work in the county; the meetings of the miners' union are prohibited."

General Merriam admits his participation in the composition and issue of this proclamation in his report, as he says:

Proof copies were furnished to me of the matter in the form of a poster. I thought an improvement could be made; Mr. Sinclair agreed to this and, at his request, I wrote an addition to the central paragraph. I authorized my name to be printed at the bottom of the poster, under the words "Examined and approved."

This makes the transaction the work of General Merriam, as much as if he had written the entire instrument. It was done under his approval after examination, and consequently becomes his act, and men were refused the inalienable right to earn an honest living by honest labor, except by permission, granted by an arbitrary, unconstitutional, illegal and usurped authority, under the most humiliating and tyrannical conditions.

In the cross-examination of Dr. Hugh France, the recognized executive of this infamous usurpation of power, and the man who assumed to deny to citizens of a free country the right to labor for a support for themselves and their wives and children, the following facts were brought out. Under the cross-questioning of Mr. Sulzer, Dr. France said:

I was present in the room when the permit system was first discussed. There were present besides myself General Merriam, Bartlett Sinclair, and part of the time Mr. Lindley (the attorney for the Bunker Hill Mining Company). Bartlett Sinclair drew up the proclamation, so far as I have any knowledge.

Mr. SULZER. Who deputized you to look after this permit system?

Answer. Bartlett Sinclair deputized me to see the permit system enforced.

Mr. SULZER. If any man went to work without your permit, he was arrested?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Mr. SULZER. The permit system is still in force there, is it not?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Mr. SULZER. And it has never been changed since May 8, 1899?

Answer. I believe not.

Mr. SULZER. How many permits have you issued since May 8, 1899?

Answer. About 7,000.

Mr. SULZER. Every man who is now working in the Cœur d'Alenes works now under your permission?

Answer. He is, so far as I have any knowledge.

Mr. Robertson then took up the cross-examination as follows:

Mr. ROBERTSON. You were never elected by the people of the State of Idaho or the county of Shoshone to the office you administer?

Answer. No, sir.

Mr ROBERTSON. The authority you exercise you got entirely from Bartlett Sinclair?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Mr ROBERTSON. Since receiving this appointment from Sinclair you have exercised the authority to arrest such persons as you deemed to have violated the proclamation of the governor?

Answer Yes, sir.

Mr ROBERTSON. And those persons you arrested without warrant and without complaint, upon oath of any person whomsoever?

Answer. That is correct.

Mr ROBERTSON. When men were working without a permit you directed them arrested?

Answer. I did; yes, sir.

Mr ROBERTSON. Was there any length of time specified in any proclamation, by any authority whatever, to which a person would be subjected for working without a permit?

Answer. Not that I am aware of.

Mr ROBERTSON. You held them for a certain length of time and terminated their imprisonment when you saw fit?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROBERTSON. What length of time did you have in your mind, as the term of your sentence, when you imprisoned these men?

Answer. I had not made up my mind on that subject.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In fact, you might keep them one hour or for six years; it was optional with you? Now Dr. France, did you not issue commitments on printed forms ordering the confinement of men, and deliver them to Mr. Edmonston and others, so that they could arrest whom they chose and enter the name afterwards?

Dr. France denied this.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Did you not incarcerate one Allen C. Austin on one of these commitments for working without a permit?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROBERTSON. A man who wants a permit must first apply for it, must he not?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And that written form contained a statement that the man applying had not participated in the riots of April 29?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROBERTSON. So that the application itself was used as a means or method of ascertaining whether or not the applicant was qualified to obtain employment?

Answer. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Now, then, you compelled a man to disclose to you facts that would disqualify him from obtaining employment, in order to obtain employment?

Answer. That is correct, I believe. Therefore a man under this system must bear witness against himself and deprive himself of the right to earn a living.

Mr. ROBERTSON. If the rolls of the Canyon Creek mines showed that a man was not at work on April 29, was that not used by you as evidence tending to show that the man was an aider in the conspiracy?

Answer. That was one of the means used; yes, sir.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Now, on April 29, 1899, there was a statute existing in the State of Idaho which punished the crime of murder, one that punished arson, and another conspiracy. Is that correct?

Answer. I believe so, sir.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And none of those statutes, to your knowledge, provided that, before conviction or incarceration, the person accused of any of those crimes should not be permitted to work, did they?

Answer. Not that I have any knowledge of.

Mr. ROBERTSON. So that this permit system, which was by you made to apply to all persons you deemed to be guilty, adopted on May 8, provided an additional penalty for such crimes, and that punishment was that such persons should not be permitted to earn a livelihood?

Answer. You might call it a punishment; they were not permitted to work.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Then, I will ask you if the inauguration of the permit system, having been devised subsequent to April 29, 1899, and after the crime it sought to punish had been committed, was not an ex post facto rule of law with reference to that crime?

(This question was objected to by a party vote as calling for a conclusion.)

Mr. ROBERTSON. Dr. France, did you not, on May 12, 1899, make a return into court that you had summoned a grand jury?

Answer. Yes, sir; I made that return.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Now, did you encounter any difficulty in serving the venire and summoning that jury?

Answer. I did not.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And from May 12, 1899, until they adjourned, you know they did investigate the crimes committed at Wardner April 29, and that they indicted Paul Corcoran and several others?

Answer. That is correct, I think.

Mr. ROBERTSON. After the indictment was found Judge Stewart proceeded to try Paul Corcoran for murder, and he was convicted by a jury and sentenced for murder in the second degree?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Now, so far as you know, was the State able to secure the attendance of witnesses and proceed to the trial of criminals without hindrance?

Answer. So far as I know; yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. About September 1 there was another term of the court held?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROBERTSON. During that term a soldier was tried for murder at Wallace, during the existence of martial law, and acquitted by a jury, was he not?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Did the State encounter any opposition in the prosecution of the soldier?

Answer. No, sir.

Mr. ROBERTSON. During these two sessions of the court, civil cases were also disposed of, were they not?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And about September 1 there was also a term of the Federal court held at Moscow, Idaho, was there not?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Now could you not have delivered to the State or Federal courts any man you had in the bull pen just as you delivered Paul Corcoran and Mr. Butler?

Answer. I think so.

Mr. ROBERTSON. So that while the civil courts were open, in unobstructed exercise of their jurisdiction, you continued to hold men for an indefinite period, under martial law, without delivering them to the courts, or filing any charges against them at any time?

Answer. Those men were held by the governor and Bartlett Sinclair; I held them under their authority.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In January, 1900, you ordered the arrest of Charles Tilford for working without a permit, did you not?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And you committed him to the custody of Angus Sutherland, to hold as a military prisoner, for an indefinite length of time?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Was there a warrant issued for the arrest of Tilford?

Answer. No, sir; there was no warrant issued.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Do you not know that while Charles Tilford was in custody, arrested without a warrant and delivered without a trial, to be held until you should see fit to discharge him, he filed a petition in the district court for a writ of habeas corpus, and that it was refused, because he was held under martial law and the court could not release him?

Answer. I understand the writ was denied.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Tilford was held under your orders at the time this petition was filed, was he not?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it not a fact that similar petitions were prepared on behalf of Lewis Dahl, A. J. Huff, and Joseph Gim at about the same time, all of these arrested by your order for working without a permit?

Answer. I do not deny that these men were arrested, but I do not remember the cases.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Now, as this permit system was inaugurated after the establishment of martial law, did not this legislative rule prescribing a crime not make yourself and those who were administering martial law in that locality the supreme legislative power during the continuance of martial law?

Answer. I do not know, sir.

Mr. ROBERTSON. No one else had any right to make that rule, that men could be arrested and held for working without permits, had he?

Answer. Not that I am aware of.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Nobody could repeal that rule, except those who had inaugurated it, could they?

Answer. No one except Bartlett Sinclair and Governor Steunenberg.

Mr. ROBERTSON. They needed no legislative sanction to do it, after it was inaugurated, before it became operative, did they?

Answer. I think not.

Mr. ROBERTSON. So that as a matter of fact, you and Bartlett Sinclair and the governor did exercise in that county the supreme legislative control with reference to arresting persons for violating this proclamation?

Answer. I exercised certain authority under the governor.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That was supreme authority?

Answer. I don't know.

Mr. ROBERTSON. You took your orders from no one except the governor and Sinclair, did you?

Answer. That's all.

Mr. ROBERTSON. You received no orders from any prosecuting attorney or court, did you?

Answer. No, sir.

Mr. ROBERTSON. So you did exercise, in effect, supreme legislative functions in that county?

Answer. I should not call them so.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Now in making your judgments with reference to the guilt or innocence of a person for violating a rule of martial law, did you call to your aid any court or magistrate?

Answer. I did not.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And you did it without swearing any person?

Answer. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. So that under martial law, you, Bartlett Sinclair, and the governor exercised the supreme judicial function of determining the guilt or innocence of a person for a violation of that rule, without interference from any other branch of government?

Objected to on party vote.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In exercising the judicial functions that appertain to material law, in the trial of these men, to determine their guilt or innocence, you, alone, decided upon the weight of evidence, the credibility of witnesses, and the right to release or imprison?

Answer. There was no trial.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Then you exercised those functions without giving the accused or suspected an opportunity to be heard?

Answer. I exercised them upon positive information.

Mr. ROBERTSON. You gave them no opportunity to produce evidence to show that you might have been wrongly informed?

Answer. I never prevented them from bringing such evidence.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In other words, you did not proceed even as courts-martial proceed in military organizations to try persons—by bringing them before a military board; you had no board or any other place where a man could be heard in his own defense, either with or without counsel? What kind of court was there, that gave any man any right to be heard in his own defense?

Answer. I never heard it called any kind of court.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In other words, when you got ready to arrest a man, you simply told a deputy to go and take him and put him in jail?

Answer. When I had information; yes, sir.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Now, at the time you arrested these men without warrant, and without giving them a hearing, did you not know that the constitution of the State of Idaho provided that no person should be held to answer for any crime unless he was indicted or informed against according to the law of the land.

Answer. I was not holding them under the constitution, I was holding them under the authority of the governor.

Mr. ROBERTSON. So that you did not consult the constitution or its limitations in your acts?

Answer. I did not; no, sir.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Doctor, if a man had no permit, he was arrested wherever he was working in a mine?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROBERTSON. So that if he had no permit, he could not work upon any property, whether he was the owner or not; he was subject to arrest if he did?

Answer. That is substantially correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In the month of March I see what purports to be a list of permits issued by you. By occupation there were 231 miners; laborers, 168; mill men, 17; engineers, 12; blacksmiths, 7; machinists, 6; carpenters, 4; electricians, firemen, and cooks, 2 each; steam fitter, machinist, helper, blacksmith, painter, pipeman, and sorter, 1 each; so as a matter of fact you not only issued permits to miners, but to all classes of artisan labor?

Answer. No, sir; only in the mines.

Mr. ROBERTSON. If a man took out a permit as a laborer, he could get a job as a miner, or a stenographer, or anything else. That permit was sufficient, was it?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROBERTSON. It was simply a permit to work at any job he could get?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROBERTSON. You say you have issued 7,000 permits to work?

Answer. Approximately.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Seven thousand men have been compelled to apply to you for permission to earn a support for themselves and their families?

Answer. Yes; to me or to the deputies.

Mr. ROBERTSON. So that you, to the extent of 7,000 persons at least, control the liberties of that number of citizens of the United States?

Answer. I do not consider that I control their liberties.

Mr. ROBERTSON. You control them to the extent of forcing them to obtain permits, or you arrest them if they work without?

Answer. That is practically the case.

Mr. ROBERTSON. So that you have the liberties of 7,000 men in your keeping in Shoshone County?

Answer. You may say that; yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it not a fact that you uniformly refuse members of the Western Federation of Miners permits?

Answer. The members of the Cœur d'Alene Miners Union have been almost unanimously refused permits.

Mr. ROBERTSON. How many do you estimate these to be?

Answer. Perhaps 1,500.

Mr. ROBERTSON. So practically you have refused 1,500 men the right to earn a living in Shoshone County?

Answer. I refused a great many.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Now, Dr. France, if the permit system had been placed in the hands of a union man, he could have shut out all the nonunion men in the Cœur d'Alene, could he not?

Answer. I suppose so.

Mr. ROBERTSON. You were shutting out the union men, were you not?

Answer. The Cœur d'Alene Miners Union.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Doing yourself what you defined as criminal on the parts of the unions. Now, do you not know that many of the men of families were compelled to leave the Cœur d'Alenes, because they refused to sink their citizenship to the extent of making an application to you for a permit to seek honest employment?

Answer. I do not, sir.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Did you not think you were doing wrong when you refused to men permits, who had wives and children in the community, who needed support?

Answer. I gave a great many permits; I don't believe there were over 100 members of the unions who applied for permits.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The majority of them you did not; practically all of them did not have permits?

Answer. Not more than 100.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Did you not think that the law which was established for the adjudication of men's rights by criminal punishments provided all the remedy that the State was entitled to resort to in suppressing that rebellion?

(Objection made and sustained by party vote.)

Mr. ROBERTSON. You think that permit system is now necessary in the Cœur d'Alene, and that civil law can not now, even with the presence of the military, protect the citizens there?

Answer. I think the civil law is protecting them now.
Mr. ROBERTSON. Which is in force there now?
Answer. I understand martial law is still in force there now.
Mr. ROBERTSON. But you say the citizens are protected in their rights by civil law, and now say that martial law is in force?
Answer. It does not interfere with the administration of civil law.
Mr. ROBERTSON. Martial law is superior to civil law, because you could arrest this man Tilford and hold him?
Answer. Yes.
Mr. ROBERTSON. Now, answer direct, if you can. Do you mean to say that, although General Merriam and the Federal forces have been in the county for more than ten months past, and martial law has been maintained during the entire time, that it would be unsafe for you to restore to the citizens the right to labor there?
Answer. I have no right to restore anything; I am only carrying out the orders of the governor.
Mr. ROBERTSON. Do you mean to say that you think it dangerous for the community for a man to labor in that community now?
Answer. No, sir; I do not think so.
Mr. ROBERTSON. You arrested Tilford for working in a mine?
Answer. Yes, sir.
Mr. ROBERTSON. And, according to your own testimony, if he had gone to Wallace and worked on the sewer you would not have arrested him?
Answer. The permit system had nothing to do with men working on a sewer.
Mr. ROBERTSON. In other words, you claim the right to arrest a man for working in a mine and immune from arrest those working on a sewer?
Answer. You may so state it.
Mr. ROBERTSON. In other words, you single out the profession of mining and submit it to the arbitrary control of the permit system. That is the proclamation. A blacksmith could work at his forge, a shoemaker at his last, a carpenter at his bench, a laborer could dig a sewer, and yet if a man worked for a mining company he was subject to arrest?
Answer. The proclamation was directed to the mining companies.
Mr. ROBERTSON. Do you not know that a law or a regulation which is not general in its application and does not apply to all classes of persons similarly engaged in business, whether of the same character or not, at least of the same grade, and attempts to discriminate against one class, is itself a violation of the Constitution of the United States?
(Objection made, and sustained by a party vote.)
Mr. ROBERTSON. Then if a man desires to follow mining, and nothing else, he would be subject to criminal arrest?
Answer. He would be required to secure a permit to work.
Mr. ROBERTSON. Do I understand that that requirement was made to prevent the members of the Western Federation from mining in that county, as well as nonunion men?
Answer. It was intended to prevent those who participated in the riot from working.
Mr. ROBERTSON. And you also did it to prevent the members of the Western Federation from securing work?
Answer. It was directed chiefly toward them.
Mr. ROBERTSON. So that it practically not only proscribed the 1,000 or 1,500 men in the Cœur d'Alenes from working, but the 100,000 miners of the West that belong to that organization?
Answer. It was directed against the unions of the Cœur d'Alenes.
Mr. ROBERTSON. I will ask you if six of the members of the coroner's jury [naming them] were not the same whose names appear upon the petition, introduced in evidence here, sustaining the Bunker Hill and Sullivan Company in opening their mines at a lower rate of wages than the union rate?
Answer. The names are identical; the probability is they are the same individuals.
Mr. ROBERTSON. Now, Doctor, part of your finding is in these words: "We charge the murders of said Schmidt and Cheyne to have been perpetrated by the said miners' unions and their respective members who were present and participated in any of the deeds of that day. Said miners' unions and their members aforesaid were aided, abetted, and assisted by the said Sheriff Young and Moses S. Simmons, William Boyle, and W. R. Stimson, county commissioners." I will ask you if you do not know as a fact that after this coroner's jury pretended to brand as criminals the county commissioners, as well as Sheriff Young, the testimony taken before that coroner's inquest was sealed up, so that the falsity of the charges could not be proved by a resort to the evidence?
Answer. It was sealed by request of Mr. Forney.
Mr. ROBERTSON. So you did have a secret inquisition?
Answer. A secret investigation—yes.
Mr. ROBERTSON. And you prevented the counsel of those men from attending that investigation?
Answer. Yes.
Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Reddy was the counsel of those men accused of crime, was he not?
Answer. They were not accused of crime.
Mr. ROBERTSON. You arrested them because you believed them guilty of crime?
Answer. Yes.
Mr. ROBERTSON. You don't think you have a right to go out in the highways, and with a drag net, and bring in innocent citizens to jail?
Answer. I don't think so.
Mr. ROBERTSON. Do you not know that the powers you are exercising of arresting persons without warrants who are not charged with crimes are known as despotic powers, and that your action there is the power of a despot, so far as the liberties of the citizens are concerned?
Answer. I have no knowledge as to that, sir.
Mr. ROBERTSON. Do you believe that the policy which you and the military authorities are pursuing there in preventing those men from earning a livelihood will ultimately lead to bloodshed and rebellion, if unrestrained?
Answer. It is my opinion it will prevent bloodshed and rebellion.
Mr. HAY. What connection did you have with the United States troops? Was it to aid you in carrying out the permit system?
Answer. The troops did not aid me.
Mr. HAY. Then why was it necessary to have troops there to carry out the permit system?
Answer. In my opinion if they were withdrawn there would be resistance.
Mr. HAY. If that is true then it is the United States troops who are carrying out the orders of the governor and Bartlett Sinclair?
Answer. That is not correct according to my understanding.
Mr. HAY. If that is not correct then you can go along without United States troops?
Answer. I think if it were not for the troops the deputies would be overpowered and there would be rioting.
Mr. HAY. Then it follows, as night follows day, that the United States troops are carrying out martial law in the Cœur d'Alenes?
Answer. I should not put it that way.
Mr. HAY. There is no insurrectionary spirit there now, is there?
Answer. There is none now.
Mr. HAY. Can the presence of United States troops, if kept there for an indefinite length of time, produce any more quiet an appearance than there is now?
Answer. That would be merely my opinion.
Mr. HAY. You have been giving your opinion about nearly everything on earth; I would like to hear about that?
Answer. It is my opinion that it is their presence which keeps this insurrectionary spirit from manifesting itself.
Mr. HAY. When do you think this insurrectionary spirit will cease to exist—after you get all the members of the federation and miner union in that district out of the country; is that your idea?
Answer. I have no knowledge of that.
Mr. HAY. Was it not the object of the permit system to drive out of that country all members of the Western Federation of Miners.
Answer. We did not attempt to drive them out; we only denied them permission to work.
Mr. HAY. That is practically the same as driving them out; would you not consider it so?
Answer. Probably.
Mr. HAY. Then I say the purpose of this permit system is to get rid of these men who you say belong to these criminal organizations.
Answer. It is to prevent them from working in the mines.
Mr. HAY. If that is true, until you can get rid of those people you would think that troops ought to remain there?
Answer. I should say so; yes.
Mr. HAY. So that the matter resolves itself down to this, that until the members of the Western Federation of Union Miners are, by the permit system which prevents them from getting work, driven out of the Coeur d'Alenes, it is proposed to hold troops there. Is that the truth?
Answer. I do not know whether it is true or not.

This permit system is clearly shown to be unlawful in the case of Ex parte Garland & Cummings *v.* State of Missouri, in Fourth Wallace; also in the case of Parrott, 1 Fed. Rep., it is clearly laid down that the State had no right, under any condition, to prevent a portion of the residents of the State from freely working when opportunity offered; that attempting to deprive a person of the right to follow his chosen avocation by law as a punishment for a crime that had been theretofore committed was an ex post facto law, a bill of attainder, and neither the State through its constitution or its legislature nor the United States through the Congress of the United States could enact or enforce any law or regulation which directly or indirectly accomplished such ends. The deprivation of the right to labor deprives one both of liberty and property, and as this is now done in Shoshone County without any trial or procedure of court the citizens in that county have been and are now deprived of their property and liberty without process of law.

Twelfth. It is charged that during the months when a great portion of the male citizens of Shoshone County were thus unlawfully held in imprisonment by the U. S. troops, the wives and families of the said citizens were subjected to insult and outrages by the soldiers of the United States stationed in said county.

The evidence substantiating this charge is in the form of affidavits, which were forwarded to the President, and are now in his possession. The minority asked five separate times that the committee should request the President to furnish to the committee said affidavits, but this motion was refused by a party vote, consequently the evidence is not of record. However, copies of these affidavits have been secured, which fully prove the charge. The only case admitted to the record will be found in the evidence of James R. Sovereign, under the third charge in this summary.

Thirteenth. It is charged that the outrageous misuse of the military power of the United States, hereinbefore mentioned, was brought about at the instigation and in the interest of the owners of the Bunker Hill mines, who, it is also charged, are the owners and manipulators of other similar trusts.

This charge seems to be fully substantiated by a connected chain of evidence, setting forth the developments from a long time prior to the outbreak of April 29, 1899, and up to the present time. The incipiency of the trouble was prior to July, 1892, which was a contest between the miners' union and the mine operators in regard to wages. This disagreement culminated in a struggle on July 11, 1892, in which battle several men lost their lives on both sides, but the final outcome was that all the mines agreed to pay the union scale of wages, except the Bunker Hill and Sullivan, which continued to employ nonunion miners and pay a reduced rate of wages. Since that time there has been the most perfect good feeling and harmony between the mine owners and the miners' unions throughout the entire district, with the exception of the Bunker Hill Company.

In the spring of 1899 the same old quarrel between the Bunker Hill and Sullivan and the unions grew again to be very bitter, and on April 13 a climax was reached in the controversy, which was the starting point from which the deplorable conditions, now under investigation, developed. The details of the controversy between the Bunker Hill and the unions are fully set out in the testimony of Mr. Robertson.

Prior to April 13, 1899, the Bunker Hill and Sullivan seems to have been the one disturbing element in this section. All the other mine operators and owners seemed to have been perfectly satisfied, and perfect harmony existed between them and the union miners, who are now represented as such a turbulent, dangerous, and criminal class as to require the force of the United States Army to hold them in check, and yet, during the years from 1892 to 1899, under the industry, energy, and labor of these same men, the section has developed in a most phenomenal manner. Towns have been built, railroads constructed, mines developed, machinery put in opera-

tion, homes have been founded, millions of value have been dug from the earth, fortunes have been amassed by the very men who now seek to oppress and persecute those who raised them to affluence and put them in the position of power and influence which makes it possible for them to turn and rend the friends who made them.

But this is the true mercenary spirit, and the conditions now existing are the natural outgrowth of this mercenary spirit when encouraged by success. Not satisfied with a degree of financial success really phenomenal, the devil of avarice and mercenary ambition beckoned them on, and they desired to add more to their gains by taking from the meager share of those who delved in the darkness and danger that lurks in the bowels of the earth, who risk their lives in the slime and filth and deadly damps of the mines from day to day, from year to year, without hope of more than a meager existence. Their intent was to force the wages of the miners to the very lowest possible rate, to such an extreme that it would make existence a struggle and their employees helpless dependents upon their despotic will, cringing, servile vassals, mere chattel slaves, who would submit to any conditions imposed for the miserable boon of life. They wanted slaves, serfs, obedient to their every whim. They feared the manliness, the spirit of independence that is sustained by organization and combination among the industrial masses, which is the true American spirit. They wanted to import foreign serfs to usurp the opportunity and occupy the field created by this American labor for itself as much as for the owners. The field had been opened by this body of organized men, and now the operators hoped to occupy it for their own profit alone. That this is really true is shown by Governor Steunenberg's own statement in regard to the beginning of this trouble. Governor Steunenberg said on the 26th day of April, 1899, he received this telegram:

FAIRFIELD, WASH., *April 26, 1899.*

FRANK STEUNENBERG, *Governor, Boise, Idaho:*

Armed mob stopped our men this morning and prevented them from working. We have raised wages, and men are satisfied and want to work, but are intimidated by miners' union, who seek to force recognition of their organization and to dictate terms and conditions here under which we shall work. County authorities unable to cope with mob, and we appeal to you for protection for ourselves and our men. Please answer—Wardner.

FREDERICK BURBRIDGE.

Now, here in this first move on the part of the Bunker Hill management there is a false statement of fact as to existing conditions. It fails to state that although wages had been raised, employment was refused to union miners, and such as had been employed were discharged. It fails to state that union miners had been discriminated against, and that the raise was a mere subterfuge to enable them to fill their mines with imported labor and then reduce the scale again. And again it is an arrogant assumption of authority upon the part of a man wiring from a point far removed from the scene of disturbance, in the State of Washington, that the county authorities were unable to control the situation. How could he know such to be the fact, and why should the governor believe him when he had no such information from the civil officers on the ground. The governor surely had no right to regard such information when it was in his power to communicate with the officers of the county, whose duty it was to call on him if they needed his assistance. The governor says that he wired Burbridge:

Matter stated in your telegram to-day will be speedily investigated. Your attention is further called to State law providing for arbitration of controversy or difference.

FRANK STEUNENBERG, *Governor.*

At the same time he wired Sheriff Young at Wardner as follows:

I am informed that armed mob stopped men from working in mines at Wardner, and that county authorities are unable to cope with mob. Wire me immediately the situation.

FRANK STEUNENBERG, *Governor.*

To this Sheriff Young, who was on the scene, replied:

Am on the ground. All is quiet. No armed mob. Matters are orderly. Will do all in my power to preserve order. The county authorities were not applied to until 10 o'clock a. m.

JAMES D. YOUNG, *Sheriff.*

Here is direct denial by the sheriff of the county, who was at the point of disturbance, and this clearly shows the animus of the man who sent the first sensational dispatch from a point far removed from the theater of trouble. The next day, April 27, the governor says he received the following dispatch:

WARDNER, IDAHO, *April 27, 1899.*

FRANK STEUNENBERG, *Governor, Boise, Idaho:*

Trouble with the Last Chance settled. Union men satisfied. No disturbance.

JAMES D. YOUNG, *Sheriff.*

Here is further proof of the falsity of Mr. Burbridge's report, and the animus of the man is shown by his telegram in reply to that of the governor, advising arbitration, in which he said:

Nothing to arbitrate. I again renew my request for protection.

This was an open defiance of the statutes of the State and clearly illustrated the dictatorial bearing of the Bunker Hill management. Although the law required that they should submit to arbitration, they defiantly refused, and demanded that the power of the State be brought to bear to compel submission to their dictation. After having thus refused the suggestion of the governor and openly refused to submit to the requirements of the law, this dictator, on April 29, had the audacity to send this dispatch:

WARDNER, IDAHO, *April 29, 1899.*

FRANK STEUNENBERG, *Governor, Boise, Idaho:*

All miners on Canyon Creek have laid off to-day for purpose of coming to Wardner in a body to coerce our men. Apprehend serious trouble, and again appeal to you for protection.

FREDERICK BURBRIDGE.

Now, this man had it in his power by merely performing an act of justice to avoid and prevent any further trouble or controversy, and that act of justice would merely have been a compliance with a principle that underlies our free institutions. If he had merely agreed not to discriminate between individuals and give equal opportunity and recognition to union and nonunion men, there would have been no further difficulty; or had he been willing to submit to the law of the State and agree to arbitration, all would have been well; but he chose to defy the law and arbitrarily discriminate against a class of citizens in a country whose Constitution declares that all are equal and entitled to equal opportunity under the law.

On April 29 the dispatch from A. L. Mohler, president of the Oregon Railway and Navigation Company, referred to on page 4 of this report, reached the governor, and on the strength of such information at 6.30 p. m. on the same day, April 29, the governor made his appeal to the President for troops. Nor had the same influence which had been brought to bear upon the governor been idle in this field of authority. A flood of telegrams from bankers, corporations, and trust manipulators and money magnates from all over the country poured in upon the President. Among them the following dispatches are in evidence:

SEATTLE, WASH., *April 30, 1899—12.33 p. m.*

SECRETARY OF WAR, *Washington, D. C.*

An armed mob have taken possession of Bunker Hill and Sullivan property at Wardner, Idaho. Have destroyed the mill and very expensive works by blowing them up with powder. Local and State authorities have been appealed to for protection of life and property, but no relief can be expected from those sources. State militia in the Philippines.

D. O. MILLS.

Now, Mr. Mills is a corporation magnate, and one of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan owners. Where does he get his authority to appeal to the Secretary of War for troops? and, besides, his reference to the militia being in the Philippines suggests that he must have heard from the governor even at that early date, as it is the puerile excuse which he made use of; and as no one else would have conceived such a reason, it is probable Mr. Mills had been requested to use his influence. The following was sent to his friend, Secretary Alger, by one of the Bunker Hill Company, who confidently requests his friend, the Secretary, to please comply, not for any legal or official reason, but simply to oblige his friend, who considers he has a claim upon him.

WINNEKTA, ILL., *April 30, 1899.*

R. A. ALGER,
Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.:

Armed mob of strikers have destroyed our mill at Wardner, Idaho. Governor has appealed for Federal troops. Please comply and save immense damage and probable bloodshed.

JAMES L. HAUGHTELING.

How did Mr. Haughteling, away off in Illinois, know at that early date that the governor had appealed for troops; and if he did know, what influence did he expect his request would have superior to that of the governor of the State? Here is another:

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., *April 30, 1899.*

WILLIAM MCKINLEY,
President United States:

As representative and treasurer of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan Mining Commany I earnestly indorse the request of the governor of Idaho to the effect that Federal troops be ordered to protect our property now in course of destruction.

WILLIAM S. CROCKER,
Banker, San Francisco.

And why banker? Is the title one which commands especial respect in the quarter it was intended to reach? Why should the indorsement of a banker be supposed to strengthen the legal and official request of the governor of a State? Is the title a talisman with the Administration? Mr. Crocker's financial interest in the mine and the fear of money losses might have led him to do an indiscreet, even a silly thing, but why should he have added the title of "banker" to his signature? Is there a mystery here?

Here is another confident appeal for aid purely through personal influence and interest, with no reference to legal or constitutional reasons, or in the interest of the common welfare and the maintenance of justice.

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 30, 1899.*

J. ADDISON PORTER,
Secretary to the President:

An armed mob has destroyed valuable property at Wardner, Idaho, in which Jack Hammond, James Haughteling, and others are interested. The governor has asked for Federal troops. Please lend your interest to this appeal with the President.

HERMAN B. BUTLER.

This appeal for Federal troops merely because property belonging to friends of the President is in possible danger is getting the conception of the power of the President down pretty close to the autocratic point, and yet this individual seems to have thought it sufficient reason for concentrating the Army of the United States. From all the facts it is evident that the influence brought to bear, both upon the governor and the President, was from the same source. There is no appeal from the constituted authorities of the county, no demand for protection from any class or body of citizens against the unlawful aggressions of any other body or faction; no appeal from the civil authorities, asking for military support.

There is no revolt against the authority of the courts or their officers, no resistance to the execution of any civil process, but only the appeal of a certain clique of speculators, of money controllers, for military force to compel submission to their dictation of conditions, which would influence and control the comfort, liberty, lives, and happiness of a large proportion of the people of that particular section, the product of which this combination desired and were planning to control for their own financial profit and benefit. The appeal is made for the protection of one class of property and the protection is extended to that by the practical confiscation, or rather the destruction, of another by the infamous permit system which would have been looked upon with horror, as tyrannical and inhuman if it had been resorted to by Weyler in Cuba. Indeed it is a parallel and companion piece to that "butcher's" reconcentrado oppression. The result was identical with that.

Anyone familiar with the rudiments of law knows that labor is property, and the right to dispose of this property is inalienable and innate. Upon this right the very right to live depends, and yet this fundamental right is prohibited and denied to one class, upon the pretense of protecting another class of property, the possession of which is less vital—of far less importance. Either the obtuse perception of both executives failed to recognize anything except physical and tangible possessions as property, or there was a total disregard of justice, and the innate rights of the citizens in the determination to further the pecuniary interests of a certain combination for special and unexplained reasons. Indeed, the entire transaction seems to point to a conspiracy on the part of the corporation, entered into by the governor, and backed up and supported by the President, to dominate, arbitrarily, a certain industry in that district, and in order to do this it was necessary to trample on the rights, persecute and drive out of the section, a certain class of citizens, who have not only shown that no charges could be sustained against them, or indeed were ever preferred, but those citizens have proven themselves to have been law abiding, industrious, and peaceful, in perfect harmony and on good terms with every other corporation operating in that locality, and further, that their organization was not only lawful and peaceable, but specially recognized and protected by statutes of the State which the Bunker Hill and Sullivan management openly defied and ignored.

Not only the conduct of the governor goes to prove this charge of collusion and conspiracy, but that of all his subordinates in the conducting of affairs in that locality, and their acts were only possible through the aid and support of the military of the United States, under the approval and authority of the President. This is not only proven but admitted by Sinclair, Dr. France, and the governor himself. After the demonstration of April 29 the governor did not, himself, go to the scene of disturbance, nor did he, as required by law, send the lieutenant-governor, who alone is authorized to represent him in case of emergency, but he deputized the State auditor, who was a political accident, virtually not a resident of the State, a sort of political nomad who had wandered over the entire continent and trained with every sort of political combination, in every section, in search of office, and to him he pretended to delegate his constitutional powers, both civil and military.

Under a severe cross-examination by Mr. LENTZ, the governor admitted that when he, himself, went to Wardner, in May, 1899, he held a consultation with Mr. Lindley, a California lawyer, who was the attorney of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan; Mr. Forney, who was also an attorney of the same company; Dr. France, the mine physician, to whom the company turned over $1 per month of each man's pay; F. W. Bradley, president of the company, and C. W. Beale, attorney for the company at Wallace; that the papers relating to the permit system were drawn by Mr. Lindley and Bartlett Sinclair, except as modified by General Merriam, and that this system was discussed and agreed upon. The governor further admitted that a meeting of all mine owners was called at Spokane about May 12, and at that meeting all of the mine owners of the Cœur d'Alenes were present, and that all protested against the enforcement of the permit system, except the representatives of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan Company.

All of the mine operators, with the exception of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan, insisted that they should be allowed to employ union labor; that their miners were the most skillful, and the best in the United States; but this permission was denied, and those owners were notified that they would not be permitted to employ union miners. In this way an injustice and outrage was perpetrated upon one class of citizens by denying them the right to work, and on another class by denying to them the right to employ whatever class of citizens they might choose to perform such service as they required.

Could any more arbitrary, more despotic, more infamously tyrannical act have been perpetrated than this? Why, the Sultan of Turkey could do nothing more despotic, and yet it was not possible for these conspirators to have accomplished what they did except through the support rendered by Federal bayonets, with the approval of the President. Bartlett Sinclair testified, on his cross-examination by Mr. Cox, that he went to Wardner upon the verbal authority of the governor, without any written commission or instructions limiting his power in any manner. Indeed, he went with instructions to act practically as he chose.

Nothing is developed as to what was discussed in the private interview between himself and the governor prior to his starting to Wardner. Indeed, the first act of Sinclair after receiving the governor's instructions was to stop at Spokane, on his way to Wardner, and hold a consultation with Mr. Bradley, the president of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan Company, Mr. Burbridge, the superintendent, and Mr. Beale, the attorney. After his arrival at Wardner he held consultation with the various officials of the Bunker Hill Company and, indeed, seems to have consulted them exclusively, and appointed almost his entire list of deputies from men in the employ of the company.

Dr. France, the physician of the company had charge of the investigation in a secret inquisition, over which he presided, and the entire jury, under his direction, was made up of employees of the Bunker Hill Company, or men who furnished them supplies, and was entirely under the control of that company. Mr. Forney, who was not a resident of the county and had been attorney for the company—indeed, he testified that he was such at the time—was appointed a special prosecutor, and Mr. Lindley, not even a resident of the State, but the attorney of the company, residing in San Francisco, was principal examiner and general director of proceedings in this inquisition.

About half of the jury were under pay of the company at the time they served upon this inquiry. Mr. Lindley was special adviser to Mr. Sinclair in all his so-called official acts, and is admitted to have drawn up the papers for the permit system. Whatever was desired or suggested by the Bunker Hill and Sullivan management was ordered by Sinclair, and carried out by the United States soldiers on duty there. The whole citizenship of the county was held by the United States soldiers at the mercy of these mine operators, and not only that, but the other mine owners were not only compelled to submit to their dictation but to ostracise and refuse employment to trusted and experienced servants, and to submit to financial loss and disturbance of their business, at the dictation of these conspirators.

Nor is this all that goes to prove the infamy of this diabolical and treasonable outrage. A petition was circulated in the disturbed district by parties interested in the conspiracy, especially the so-called deputies, asking the Secretary of War to continue the United States troops in the county, and indorsing and commending the action of State authorities and military. This petition was brought to Washington and filed in the War Department by the governor himself, and even before the petition reached the Secretary there was a flood of affidavits from citizens of the county declaring that the petition was a fraud; that many of the signatures were forgeries, and that others were obtained by duress. Indeed, there is no question that a great many signed this paper, presented to them by deputies, under fear of arrest and imprisonment in case of refusal, and a large portion of the names are written in the same handwriting.

The committee, upon a strictly party vote, refused to admit these affidavits in evidence, unquestionably fearing to expose the part taken in this diabolical outrage by the Administration, and by their various acts making the Republican party a participant in this outrage upon the constitutional rights of citizens of the United States. The connection of the President and the governor with this conspiracy was further demonstrated in a severe cross-examination of Governor Steunenberg by Mr. LENTZ, during which the governor tried by every means possible to conceal damaging facts, which were finally wrung from him in spite of his endeavors to evade the truth. The cross-examination shows plainly the realization on the part of the governor that both he and the Administration were in jeopardy, and it is unfortunate that it can not be given at length. Mr. LENTZ asked:

Governor, when you came here in October last, you brought with you a letter answering an inquiry made of you by the President, did you not?
Answer. Yes, sir.
Mr. LENTZ. Did you present the letter to the President when you saw him and conversed with him?
Answer. No, sir.
Mr. LENTZ. What did you do with the letter?
Answer. I presented it to the Secretary of War.
Mr. LENTZ. When was that letter delivered to the Secretary of War?
Answer. In the latter part of October.
Mr. LENTZ. Your letter was dated on the 10th of October, was it not?

Answer. About that time.
Mr. LENTZ. Why did you not mail that letter instead of carrying it here yourself?
Answer. Well, there had been so many statements made to the War Department in regard to affairs in Idaho that I considered misrepresentations that I thought, by coming in person, I could discuss the matter with the Secretary and probably impress him with the importance of the situation as I saw it.
Mr. LENTZ. How long were you here?
Answer. Two weeks.
Mr. LENTZ. You say that so many statements had been made to the Department that it was necessary for you to come down here and see the Secretary in person; to what statements do you refer?
Answer. Once I saw in the dispatches that Mr. Ed. Boyce had visited the Secretary or the President in person.
Mr. LENTZ. That is one statement. Who else made statements?
Answer. Well, that is enough.
Mr. LENTZ. I thought you said there were many statements; was that communicated to you by the President?
Answer. Yes, sir.
Mr. LENTZ. Did you meet Mr. Dick, Mr. Hanna, or Mr. Babcock when you were here on that occasion?
Answer. No, sir.
Mr. LENTZ. How did your answer, which you wrote in Boise, and which you brought down here, get into the Ohio campaign?
Answer. I do not know.
Mr. LENTZ. Did you not prepare that letter after you got to Washington?
Answer. No; the letter was sketched in a rough draft before I left Boise.
Mr. LENTZ. Now, where was the final draft made?
Answer. It was made at the Willard Hotel in Washington.
Mr. LENTZ. The letter was not written on the 10th of October at Boise, but here in Washington after you had some talks?
Answer. It was just as I have told you.
Mr. LENTZ. Is it a fact that you did not get to the Willard Hotel until about October 19?
Answer. Some time about that date.
Mr. LENTZ. How many times did you go to the White House?
Answer. I think twice.
Mr. LENTZ. How many times did you go to the War Department?
Answer. Three times.
Mr. LENTZ. Whom did you see at the War Department?
Answer. Secretary Root.
Mr. LENTZ. When did you first see Mr. Root?
Answer. The morning after I got into Washington.
Mr. LENTZ. When did you see the President first?
Answer. Not for several days after I got to the city.
Mr. COX. How long had you been in Washington before you finished and presented your letter?
Answer. It must have been four or five days.
Mr. LENTZ. You did not write this letter until about October 24 or 25, did you?
Answer. About that time.
Mr. LENTZ. You left a day or two after you delivered your letter?
Answer. That is my recollection.
Mr. LENTZ. Then you dated and signed your letter about fifteen days earlier than it was actually written?
Answer. Yes, sir.
Mr. COX. You had a talk with the Secretary of War before you put the finishing touches upon it?
Answer. Yes, sir.

Now the inference is too patent to require any suggestion. That this was a war against the union miners, waged by the representatives of the State authorities, is not only proven, but admitted. That it is aided and made possible only by the presence of United States troops is also proven and admitted by the chief inquisitor himself, Bartlett Sinclair; and that it is instigated by and in the interest of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan Company and the money power behind this corporation seems sufficiently evident from evidence set out under this charge.

The influence brought to bear upon the President is clearly shown by the telegrams quoted to be the same which served to control the action of the governor and Bartlett Sinclair, who is, beyond the equivocation of a doubt, but the willing and irresponsible tool of combined capital to carry out its despotic policy, regardless of the Constitution, of the rights of citizenship, of statutes of the State; in contempt and defiance of the spirit of free institutions, and a fair illustration of the spirit of imperialism and centralization which is controlling the Administration and the party and influences which support and maintain it.

The President of the United States is the Commander in Chief of the Army of the United States, and although not personally present in the county of Shoshone is charged with the duty of superintendence and control of the military as the responsible head of the Army, and if General Merriam acted under instructions from the Commander in Chief, the President himself is responsible for the deplorable conditions existing in that district. If General Merriam has acted outside his instructions and has violated the authority by law vested in the military arm of the Government, then it is submitted to the War Department that General Merriam has proved himself to be incompetent under any emergency to control the Federal forces of the United States in dealing with labor disputes, and that such action be taken as the rules of the War Department require in such cases.

It is further submitted to the War Department and to the President that the troops of the United States have abused the liberties of individual citizens; that the constitution of the State of Idaho and of the United States have been suspended and ignored in the county of Shoshone, Idaho, for more than a year, and that the strong arm of the Army of the United States has been illegally called into action at the instance of the governor of a State who has confessed himself incompetent to control; that the President forthwith notify the governor of the State of Indho that the Federal forces can not be used to uphold the illegal acts of persons claiming to be deputies of the State of Idaho in arresting and retaining persons without a warrant of law. It is demanded that the Federal authorities, in so far as practicable, cause the permit system to be abrogated, the writ of habeas corpus to be restored, and that arbitrary and indiscriminate arrests under martial law shall be caused to cease.

There can be no dispute as to the fact that each and every charge as set out in the resolution has been fully proven and sustained, and that such action should be taken as will not only remedy existing evils, but prevent a repetition of such wrong and injustice forever in the future.

Late Representative Sydney P. Epes.

REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS R. LASSITER,
OF VIRGINIA,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Saturday, March 24, 1900.

The House having under consideration the following resolutions:
"*Resolved*, That the business of the House be now suspended that opportunity may be given for tributes to the memory of Hon. SYDNEY P. EPES, late a member of the House of Representatives from the State of Virginia.
"*Resolved*, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, and in recognition of his eminent abilities as a distinguished public servant, the House, at the conclusion of these memorial proceedings, shall stand adjourned.
"*Resolved*, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.
"*Resolved*, That the Clerk be instructed to send a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased"—

At a later day—
Mr. LASSITER said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I was too close to him whom we mourn to write his epitaph or to pronounce his public eulogy. Just as we commit the final rites of our dead to hands less associated with his living form, so these ceremonial observances flow usually with more propriety from the lips of friends somewhat removed from his daily life.

We shared our hopes, fears, aspirations, successes, and defeats as naturally as what was often very nearly our last dollar.

From boyhood we walked in that clear light of friendship which only comes with youth, trusting each other so implicitly that one intuitively assumed the act or thought of the other.

I dare not touch upon his qualities, lest in asserting that I was admitted to his friendship I arrogate more honor than I own. Yet how often have the great of heart loved lesser men.

There is a consideration, however, which, while it loosens my halting tongue to-day, restrains the tears which would misbecome this presence. When death removed the mortal part of my friend, a part of his that was mortal fell to me. We had often talked, as youths do, of careers and things achieved.

One of his dreams already realized was worthily to represent the people of his beloved Commonwealth. He shared the youthful hope that one day I, too, might be called to this high estate. Alas! how prayers are answered, hopes fulfilled! Could we have imaged a Providence so fantastical that must cast across my mortal orbit the shadow of his immortal course?

Yet, in taking up a portion of his cares, I stand before you not less the friend of Sydney Epes, but the Representative of a generous and affectionate people, who expect of my official part an instrument to voice their sense of loss and grief.

When Senators and Representatives in Congress, senators and members of the house of delegates of his native State, the courts, public corporations, party committees and press of every county and city of his district have inscribed the record of his life upon their records or upon the public prints, nothing remains of the historical for the present occasion. It is for me to speak only of that record written in the hearts of this generation of his own people and lasting as the traditions of a free people, who remain free while they revere and remember the patriots who loved their native soil and served its children in their day and time.

Beneath the oak or the pine, under the manor tiles or cabin roof, throughout that tier of counties of Southside Virginia, which have in past days given so much blood and genius to the country, this memorial to SYDNEY PARHAM EPES has already been inscribed, without money and without price, the spontaneous offering of gratitude and love. He walked among us the perfect product of a civilization never equaled and perhaps never to be approached. In other lands aristocracies have been perpetuated by wealth and power, decaying when wealth decayed and too often characterized

by the vices of power. Our friend was the representative of an aristocracy in the true sense of the word.

His ancestors from the first settlement of his native land were leaders of action and opinion, not by reason of landed estates or hoarded gains, though often they possessed both, but because of that heaven-given gentleness of character and integrity of thought which persevered in the blood and worked its sweet influences whether the individual wore velvet or ate his daily bread in primeval sweat. Thank God this civilization is still known as the civilization of old Virginia. We feel that in his death he realized the highest aspiration of his life—the reputation of a Virginia gentleman without stain.

And art thou gone, and gone forever?
And hast thou crost that unknown river,
Life's dreary bound?
Like thee, where shall I find another
The world around?

Trusts.

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. ZENOR,

OF INDIANA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, June 1, 1900.

The House having under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 138), proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States—

Mr. ZENOR said:

Mr. SPEAKER: The house joint resolution 138, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and House bill 10539 to amend an act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890, having been reported by the Judiciary Committee, with special rules for their consideration, are now pending to be taken up, considered, and disposed of under a most extraordinary procedure, considering the importance of the questions involved. Mr. Speaker, the concurrent submission of these two important propositions at the very close of the present session of this Congress has not been the result, in my judgment, of accident. That two such important measures should be held up during this long session and not even reported to this House until after the majority had presented and passed a resolution fixing the date of adjournment within six days from the time of their submission, and then accompanying their presentation with most drastic rules, is in the nature of a deathbed confession, and is, to say the least, very significant and conclusive evidence that this is a part of a well-considered and deliberately planned scheme of the Republican party to secure some mean partisan advantage of the political situation. Not that they mean to be serious or in earnest in this effort to deal with the evils of monopoly, trusts, and their allied interests, but to square themselves, if possible, with the country upon this most important question.

It is perfectly obvious to the most unthinking that unless the party charged with the responsibility of the present Administration initiate some move—take some steps, raise some cry against existing trust evils—looking toward the control in some way of these gigantic law-defying institutions before the adjournment of this Congress, that they will have no answer to make to the rank and file of their party and the people of the United States when confronted in the coming campaign with the charge of their duplicity and subserviency. Hence this precipitate action upon the part of the Republican party, through its leaders, the majority of this House. In order, however, that it may be understood under what rules these measures are being considered and the arbitrary manner in which the minority are denied all right to present any kind of motion to amend, modify, change, or alter in any way the constitutional amendment pending, and to force a vote thereon in the exact form in which the majority has reported it, I desire to print in my remarks the rules as reported. They read as follows:

The Committee on Rules, to whom was referred House resolution No. 273, have had the same under consideration and report the following as a substitute therefor:

Resolved, That House joint resolution 138, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, be made the special order in the House and taken up immediately on the adoption of this order; that general debate shall continue during the day and during a night session from 8 to 10.30 o'clock, and until 5 p. m. Friday, June 1, when the previous question on the resolution and amendments thereto reported from the committee to its final passage shall be considered as ordered, and the vote taken thereon without delay or intervening motion.

That the bill (H. R. 10539) to amend an act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890, be made the special order in the House and taken up immediately after the disposition of said House joint resolution 138; that general debate thereon be limited to one hour, thirty minutes on each side, and that the same be then considered under the five-minute rule as in the Committee of the Whole until 4 o'clock p. m. of Saturday, June 2, when the previous question on the bill and pending amendments shall be considered as ordered and the final vote taken; that at the opening of the general debate on House joint resolution 138 the amendments to H. R. 10539, proposed on the part of the minority in their views as filed, shall be read from the Clerk's desk and considered as pending when the vote is taken on said bill H. R. 10539, the time occupied in such reading not to be taken from the time of any member; that all members have leave to print upon such measures or either of them within five days after final vote taken.

This rule shall not interfere with the consideration of conference reports.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania has explained the object of the rules and the effect of their adoption. It will thus be seen that the design of these rules as reported by the committee and adopted by the majority vote of this House is to bring the House to a vote upon the amendment as presented by the majority of the Judiciary Committee, and deny to the minority or to anyone the right to offer any amendment thereto, although amendments have been prepared and presented, and if accepted by the majority or adopted by the House would doubtless secure the passage of this proposed amendment without opposition from the minority.

But it seems it does not suit the arbitrary purpose of the majority nor subserve their interests to permit any suggestions to be made by the minority in framing this important amendment. A proposed amendment to the organic law—the Constitution of the United States—which has up to this time been held so sacred that for more than one hundred years of our history it has not been deemed wise or expedient to amend, except to meet changed conditions, the result of a civil war and bloody revolution, and to secure the results of that civil conflict. It would seem to occur to ordinarily fair and conservative minds that a proposition of such transcendent importance to the people, and of such far-reaching consequences, that debate with the right of amendment should be most liberal, indeed should be given the widest possible range, with the the opportunity to exploit all vulnerable points and wisely and judiciously shape, strengthen, and perfect the same with a view to the promotion of the best interests and general welfare of the whole people.

If it be claimed that the session is drawing to a close and the exigencies of the public business will not admit of more time, then it becomes necessary to explain why it was that a matter of such vital moment should have been delayed until such a late hour or why this session might not be prolonged. No adequate excuse can be found. No reason can be assigned for such unreasonable action. But whatever excuse or reason may be offered, whether satisfactory or otherwise, the fact remains that we are now confronted with these two most important measures of legislation, and we are compelled to meet them. We do not shrink from the task. The good faith of Republicans has been challenged, if not by their own action, by the newspapers of the country of both political parties, as well as the independent organs. They understand the situation. The independent, as well as party organs, have all characterized the effort now being put forth by the dominant party in respect to this proposed amendment, and they all unite in saying the only object is to make and accumulate cheap political party capital. Your purpose is transparent and will fail.

Mr. Speaker, I undertake to say that if the Republican party think they can deceive the country by this pretense of hostile legislation against trusts they underestimate the intelligence of the American people, and instead of deceiving them they will deceive themselves. It will not be forgotten that when the present Administration was inaugurated, after the party now in power had won the contest of 1896 and elected their President upon the money question, as they claimed, they came into control of the Government on the 4th day of March, 1897, and since that day have had control of both branches of Congress. Within eleven days from that time the President convened Congress in extraordinary session for the avowed purpose, as set forth in the President's message, of repealing the then existing law and passing a new revenue law. Notwithstanding you had won at the ballot-box in the contest of the preceding year upon the monetary issue, yet that question was not put forward or in any manner referred to as important in that message, and Congress was convened to legislate upon the tariff.

The sole result of that session was the passage of what is known as the "Dingley bill." That legislation, in my opinion, has done more to breed, foster, and propagate trusts than any other one act put upon the statute books in our history. That was the first session of the Fifty-fifth Congress. That entire Congress of three sessions passed out of existence and into history and not a single measure was introduced or step taken by the party to legislate in restraint of trusts or protect the country from their injurious effects. The present Congress assembled in December last and,

more than six months having elapsed, now, in the expiring hours of the session, within six days of the date fixed for adjournment, the dominant party presents this body with a resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution and a bill to amend the existing anti-trust law, known as the Sherman Act. This proposed amendment to the Constitution is embodied in the following language:

SECTION 1. All powers conferred by this article shall extend to the several States, the Territories, the District of Columbia, and all territory under the sovereignty and subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

SEC. 2. Congress shall have power to define, regulate, prohibit, or dissolve trusts, monopolies, or combinations, whether existing in the form of a corporation or otherwise.

The several States may continue to exercise such power in any manner not in conflict with the laws of the United States.

SEC. 3. Congress shall have power to enforce the provisions of this article by appropriate legislation.

It will thus be seen that the first section of this proposed amendment announces a new departure in the doctrine of constitutional law, a new rule of construction. Heretofore throughout all our history no authority has yet been found, and no necessity supposed to exist, to justify this new, novel, and extraordinary phraseology in a constitutional amendment declaring it should extend to operate and have effect in the several States, the Territories, the District of Columbia, and all territory under the sovereignty and subject to the jurisdiction of the United States. Not until the exigencies growing out of the imperial policy adopted by the Republican party demanded, was this dangerous and revolutionary interpretation of the organic law ever thought to be necessary to exploit the force and effect of a constitutional provision. This theory, so cunningly devised and ingeniously framed in this proposition, is the reiteration of the same startling doctrine advanced by the dominant party in their contention in support of the Porto Rican tariff. It is the position the Republican party has assumed since it repudiated "our plain duty."

The majority of this House and the leaders of the Republican party in their rash and inconsiderate zeal to lay the foundation of a policy of European colonization by forcible annexation here in this country; to set the pace for subsequent legislation in relation to our new possessions, made the mistake of undertaking to convince the American people that the Constitution did not extend to our Territories of its own force; that this instrument only went where Congress said or might say it should go; that the Constitution and flag were inseparable parts of each other in the States, but that the flag was greater and possessed more vitality and expanding power than the Constitution; that it could go to Porto Rico, the Philippines, or anywhere beyond the confines of the States and remain there without Congressional aid or sanction, but that the Constitution remained at home under the guardianship of the Republican party and subject to its arbitary will, to be projected here and there as best subserved to the political whims or partisan caprice of that party; that under the views now held by the leaders of the Republican party—I say leaders advisedly, for I do not believe that the great mass of the rank and file share these un-American ideas—the supreme and paramount law of the land, the great charter of American liberty and constitutional government has no permanent abiding place, no fixed and definite meaning, no well-defined and clearly drawn limitations and restrictions upon the powers of the Congress of the United States; that under this fundamental and hitherto supposedly all-pervading law of the land, no obligations, no prohibitions or restrictions are imposed upon the right and power of Congress to legislate and govern territory lying beyond or outside of the limits of the organized States of this Union, or restraining power to guide and control the arbitrary will of Congress in the enactment of laws for the government of the people of such possessions. The assumption and exercise of such power was for the first time in our history employed in the Porto Rican tariff legislation, but recently enacted by this present Congress, by which it was demonstrated that under this Republican theory of the Constitution Congress can levy and assess tariff duties and taxes against our own people, if they have the misfortune of residing within a Territory or dependent possession, without their consent or representation.

Such a theory and doctrine was so revolutionary and revolting to the minds of men accustomed to reading the pathetic story of heroic sacrifice from Bunker Hill to Yorktown that the Republican party found itself in an attitude of hostility to the almost universal sentiment of the people. Finding itself in this situation, and realizing that something heroic must be done *in extremis* to recoup some of the advantages they had lost and realign their party with public sentiment, it is not and will not be a great surprise to the country, and the country will thoroughly understand it, that the alert and ever sagacious and masterful genius of Republican leadership should seize upon some favorable opportunity to create for their party some plausible excuse and justification for their course and failure to legislate for the relief of the country against trusts.

The apology they now offer is the suggestion of a remedy in which they have no confidence, and which they well know will never pass, and was not so intended when it was reported—a remedy by way of a constitutional amendment requiring a two-thirds majority in both branches of Congress to propose and three-fourths of the States to ratify before it can in any event become a part of the organic law. When it is remembered that the ratification by thirty-four States of the Union is essential to make effective the proposition now being considered, even admitting the possibility of its ultimate success, everyone who is honest and sincere, and earnestly desires the immediate application of some effective and wholesome legislation against trusts must admit that the remote and far-off remedy by constitutional amendment is not the remedy sought by the appeals of the trust victims of the country, if there exists any other.

Mr. Speaker, I contend, and the Democratic minority in this House contends, that Congress now has ample power under the Constitution to legislate effectively to destroy every trust, illegal combination, and monopoly that to-day menaces the public interests and threatens the public weal. There is scarcely an honest pretense made, and certainly no convincing arguments advanced by the proponents of this resolution, that all power under the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution has been exhausted by the law enacted July 2, 1890, known as the Sherman anti-trust law—a law I desire to remind our Republican friends that was supported by every Democrat of the House who voted, as the records show. This is the much-vaunted Republican law that is now claimed to have exhausted the power of Congress to legislate against trusts, so frequently referred to in argument in this discussion, as the ground and only excuse our Republican friends have for insisting upon the necessity of this amendment. They claim that having gone to the full limit of Federal legislation upon this subject in the Sherman law, and the provisions of that law having proved inefficient to suppress trusts and afford the people adequate relief, that therefore they must have additional power, and this additional power must be granted by this proposed amendment, demanding of the States a surrender of all State jurisdiction over the subject and vesting in Congress absolute and exclusive power to deal with the questions involved.

This is a grave and serious proposition. Any proposition that involves the surrender by the States of the power and jurisdiction to govern and control their own domestic concerns and place that power beyond recall in the Federal Government, when addressed to a thinking and considerate man, must, it seems to me, cause him to hesitate and carefully pause before he can obtain his consent to commit himself to such a proposition and be willing to confer on Congress so vast a power. Such a vital and radical change in the organic law can only be justified, in my judgment, upon the clearest grounds of public necessity. It can never be excused or defended when sought in the interest of some partisan advantage or political maneuver. Believing as I do, and as I believe the leaders of the dominant party as well as the country at large do, that there exists no present urgent necessity for any enlargement of the powers of Congress to effectively legislate against trust evils and that this movement is an effort to shirk a pressing and imperative duty, I am therefore unable to give this resolution the sanction of my vote.

I firmly believe with the minority that Congress has ample power and jurisdiction under the Constitution as it now is, and if it will but employ and exercise those powers in the proper manner and right direction it will be enabled to legislate effectively to crush out of existence every unlawful combination, trust, and monopoly that now curses the land. If our Republican friends could be induced to recall a memorable utterance of their President, inseparably associated with the legislative history of this session and destined to project itself into the political literature and campaign parlance of the country in the near future, and would summon to their aid moral courage sufficient to obey its injunction, "it is our plain duty," they would find in this a speedy and ample remedy for all the evils with which we are now confronted growing out of trusts and criminal conspiracies. There are more remedies than one to meet these combinations.

Our Republican friends will not be able to divert public attention nor deceive the people by their clamor about constitutional amendments. They know, and the people understand, that these gigantic trusts and criminal conspiracies have been bred, fostered, and fed by class legislation, high protective tariffs, railroad rebates, financial laws, and bank monopolies. They know and understand that if the shelter under which they have been enabled to amass their mighty power and wealth is removed that it will prove a potential factor in their destruction. Under the present Administration and the operation of the Dingley tariff during the last three years there have been organized more trusts, aggregating more capital, than in all the previous history of the country. Up to November 30, 1899, there were organized over 200 corporate trusts and 65 principal, unincorporated trusts. During the present Administration six billions of property and

"water" have been capitalized by different corporations, trusts, and combines.

Why, Mr. Speaker, it is said that in the single State of New Jersey, the home of the Attorney-General of this Administration, the fees and charges alone for recording and issuing certificates for the incorporation of these concerns have been sufficient to defray the entire expense of maintaining the public schools of the whole State of New Jersey. Not only the luxuries but most of the necessaries of life in this country are to-day within the grasp of some gigantic trust or combine. From the farmer's nail to the last article in his catalogue of supplies, from the swaddling clothes of the new born to the winding sheet of decrepit old age, all pay tribute and sacrifice to some mighty trust. Mr. Speaker, I have read in the public prints that during the last campaign in the State of Ohio a distinguished leader and chairman of the Republican national committee in some of his public addresses to the people of that State apologized for these trusts and excused their existence as the natural evolution of the phenomenal development of the business prosperity of this Administration.

The country, doubtless, well remembers with what luminous prophecy the campaign of 1896 abounded. Our Republican campaign orators from every stump fired the partizan zeal of their followers by portraying to the fancy in extravagant phrase and spectacular speech the marvelous transformation that would result from the success of their party. Surely the picture was not overdrawn if these political seers had in contemplation the abnormal growth and phenomenal development of criminal combinations, trusts, and conspiracies. If these were to be the symbols of Republican victory and types of that legitimate thrift, push, and energy that was to signalize the advent to power of the Republican party, then certainly the prophecy of our friends has been abundantly fulfilled. Nay, more. These hydra-headed monsters have by far outrun the most extravagant calculations of their friends, and have become so defiant, arrogant, and fearless that they now even threaten the overthrow of that party, unless some well-devised and tactical movement is initiated before the close of this session of Congress by its leaders to quiet the alarm and stay public sentiment.

To divert public attention from their failure to deal with this monstrous evil, and to deceive and delude the country, they now pretend that Congress has no further power to legislate to suppress these evils under the Constitution—as it now exists—and bring forward this proposition. They thereby hope to appear anxious and willing to do something for the relief of the people against trusts. They imagine that by proposing this amendment, however vicious and monstrous its provisions, the people will not stop to criticise or study their real purpose, but in their eagerness to rid themselves of the tyranny and oppression of the trusts, will array themselves in hostility to any party who may dare to oppose their suggestions or exploit their schemes. They hope to put—they imagine they will put their adversaries at a disadvantage before the American people by assuming an attitude of hostility to the trusts in such a way and manner that, however insincere and disingenuous they may be, and however impracticable and hopeless of success the methods employed, their opponents dare not challenge their sincerity or question those methods.

They forget that an intelligent, patriotic, and earnest people believe that in politics, as in everything else, "Honesty is the best policy;" and I believe I do not misjudge their sentiment and temper when I say that I can and do repose a supreme reliance in the ability of the American people to recognize and appreciate upright motives, and to detect, censure, and condemn all manner of deception and fraud by whomsoever practiced. They will easily see and understand, as the public prints have already suggested, that a vote for this proposed amendment is a vote in favor of doing nothing against trusts. They will readily comprehend that a vote for this proposed amendment is an admission of the validity of the claim now made by the dominant party in excuse for their failure and refusal to enact legislation throughout all these years against the trusts. Every intelligent citizen knows that this is not true. The party itself here and now openly confesses that this is not true. The pending bill (Littlefield bill, No. 10539), concurrently reported with the pending joint resolution by the Judiciary Committee, is a solemn confession by the Republican party that they have not yet exhausted all constitutional power to further legislate against the trusts.

This very bill now pending, and to be taken up and considered by this House immediately after the vote upon this resolution, proposes several amendments to and enlarges the power and scope of the present existing antitrust law of July 2, 1890. It is the judgment of many of the best-informed lawyers of the country, who have given this subject special study and attention, that the present existing antitrust law, with such additional amendments as is within the constitutional power of Congress to enact, will furnish ample and complete legal authority when exercised concurrently with the power of the several States, to oust every illegal combination, trust, and monopoly that now afflicts the body politic. I am firmly persuaded to believe, that with the additional legislation proposed in the Littlefield bill now pending and the amendments proposed thereto by the Democratic minority of the Judiciary Committee will, if passed by this House, furnish ample and complete Federal authority when supplemented by proper State legislation, to control and dislodge the trust combines. And there is no doubt of the passage of this bill; both parties and the members of this House, regardless of politics, will support it.

I heartily approve of the amendments offered to the bill by the minority of the committee, as I know my Democratic colleagues do, and we sincerely hope they may receive the support of enough members on that side of the chamber to adopt them. I trust this will be done because, in my judgment, they very much strengthen and render more effective the law. If, however, I and the minority of this House shall fail to realize our hope in this regard; if these amendments shall be defeated, I will then give my vote for the bill as the best that can be done at this time. But, Mr. Speaker, before I forget it, I wish to call attention to the further provision—section second of this proposed amendment. I have already alluded to the fact that a further and more serious objection to this proposition was the strong, emphatic, and sweeping language of this second section. For convenience I insert the full text of this amendment.

ARTICLE XVI.

SECTION 1. All powers conferred by this article shall extend to the several States, the Territories, the District of Columbia, and all territory under the sovereignty and subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

SEC. 2. Congress shall have power to define, regulate, prohibit, or dissolve trusts, monopolies, or combinations, whether existing in the form of a corporation or otherwise.

The several States may continue to exercise such power in any manner not in conflict with the laws of the United States.

SEC. 3. Congress shall have power to enforce the provisions of this article by appropriate legislation.

This language is much more comprehensive, perhaps, than would occur to the casual reader without pausing to weigh and measure its full significance and far-reaching effect. It was the evident purpose of its author to vest practically absolute power and jurisdiction in Congress over the subject-matter of the proposed amendment. This will more clearly appear when considered in connection with that other provision of the Constitution which declares that—

This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof * * * shall be the supreme law of the land; anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

If, therefore, the proposed amendment as drawn shall become a part of the Constitution, no State could pass or enforce any law upon the subject of trust combinations and monopoly conspiracies not in harmony with the Federal laws, and State jurisdiction would be entirely subordinated to the Federal jurisdiction. This is the first time in our whole legislative history that it has been suggested, by way of constitutional amendment, to extend the Federal jurisdiction to the control of the domestic institutions of the States.

The first proposed innovation upon our dual system of government; the first demand made upon the States for a surrender of those rights hitherto guarded with such jealous vigilance and care; another effort put forth to centralize more power in the Federal Government at the sacrifice of the States. Before consenting to such a grave step—such a vital and fundamental change in the distribution of the legislative powers of our Government—conservative and thinking men and lawmakers may well pause and deliberately reflect. In my opinion a proposition of such doubtful propriety and questionable wisdom should not be entertained in the absence of the most overwhelming and convincing reasons. They do not now exist. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it is my deliberate judgment, after the most careful thought I have been able to bestow upon this question, that the adoption of such a resolution as this, if otherwise desirable, would be to defeat the very purpose in view.

To withdraw from the States or destroy their power to legislate in aid of the suppression of trusts, and transfer that power exclusively to the Congress would, in my humble opinion, be welcomed by the millionaire and multimillionaire-trusts and combines of this country as the greatest concession ever yet made to their interests. The States are regarded by these interests as the most potential foes they have. They have up to this time, except in very few instances where they have completely surrendered to trust control as a matter of business, as in New Jersey, done more to restrain and cripple the trusts by their antitrust State laws and their honest and vigorous enforcement than all the Federal laws upon the statute book.

In the States of Texas and Arkansas they have literally rid their States of their operation and freed their people from their influence. No greater mistake could possibly be made than to deprive the States of their jurisdiction to deal with and control their own domestic concerns, including their power to regulate, control, and manage all corporations created under their authority and located

within their respective boundaries; to prescribe the terms and conditions upon which foreign corporations may be permitted to do business within their jurisdictions. The trusts, their hired counsel and agents, are watching every move that is made. The people are impatient and demand some immediate, effective, and practical relief. Neither of these interests, in my judgment, believe any constitutional amendment necessary to accomplish the complete overthrow of the trust power. That if the power now vested in Congress is courageously exercised and appropriate laws passed within the scope of that power and vigorously enforced, it is the consensus of the most enlightened public opinion, in my judgment, that these public enemies of our country will be driven from their fields of operation.

It is not sufficient to answer that the Supreme Court has held that existing law does not and can not control manufacture or production except when and as they become a part of interstate commerce. The court was here discussing the distinction between manufacture or production and interstate commerce not only as abstract propositions but as related to each other and the point of time when an article passed from the control of the State and became a part of interstate commerce. In this very opinion rendered by Chief Justice Fuller in the Knight Case (156 United States, page 11) the court draws this distinction very clearly.

Doubtless the power to control the manufacture of a given thing—

He says:

involves in a certain sense the control of its disposition, but this is a secondary and not the primary sense; and although the exercise of that power may result in bringing the operation of commerce into play, it does not control it, and affects it only incidentally and indirectly. Commerce succeeds to manufacture and is not a part of it. The fact that an article is manufactured for export to another State does not of itself make it an article of interstate commerce, and the intent of the manufacturer does not determine the time when the article or product passes from the control of the State and belongs to commerce. * * *

It is true that the bill alleged that the products of these (sugar) refineries were sold and distributed among the several States, and that all the companies were engaged in trade or commerce with the several States; but this was no more than to say that trade and commerce served manufacture to fulfill its function. Sugar was refined for sale, and sales were probably made at Philadelphia for consumption, and undoubtedly for resale by the first purchasers throughout Pennsylvania and other States, and refined sugar was also forwarded by the companies to other States for sale. Nevertheless it does not follow that an attempt to monopolize or the actual monopoly of the manufacture was an attempt, whether executory or consummated, to monopolize commerce, even though, in order to dispose of the product, the instrumentality of commerce was necessarily invoked.

This decision was made under the provisions of the present Sherman antitrust law of 1890. The court further says in this same opinion that—

It can not be denied that the power of a State to protect the lives, health, and property of its citizens, and to preserve good order and the public morals, "the power to govern men and things within the limits of its dominion," is a power originally and always belonging to the States, not surrendered by them to the General Government, nor directly restrained by the Constitution of the United States, and essentially exclusive.

The relief of the citizens of each State from the burden of monopoly and the evils resulting from the restraint of trade among such citizens was left with the States to deal with, and this court has recognized their possession of that power even to the extent of holding that an employment or business carried on by private individuals, when it becomes a matter of such public interest and importance as to create a common charge or burden upon the citizen; in other words, when it becomes a practical monopoly, to which the citizen is compelled to resort and by means of which a tribute can be exacted from the community, is subject to regulation by State legislative power. On the other hand, the power of Congress to regulate commerce among the several States is also exclusive. The Constitution does not provide that interstate commerce shall be free; but, by the grant of this exclusive power to regulate it, it was left free, except as Congress might impose restraints.

He also says:

That which belongs to commerce is within the jurisdiction of the United States, but that which does not belong to commerce is within the jurisdiction of the police power of the State.

And—

The argument is that the power to control the manufacture of refined sugar is a monopoly over a necessary of life, to the enjoyment of which by a large part of the population of the United States interstate commerce is indispensable, and that, therefore, the General Government, in the exercise of the power to regulate commerce, may repress such monopoly directly and set aside the instruments which have created it. But this argument can not be confined to necessaries of life merely, and must include all articles of general consumption.

Doubtless the power to control the manufacture of a given thing involves in a certain sense the control of its disposition, but this is a secondary and not the primary sense; and although the exercise of that power may result in bringing the operation of commerce into play, it does not control it, and affects it only incidentally and indirectly. Commerce succeeds to manufacture and is not a part of it. The power to regulate commerce is the power to prescribe the rule by which commerce shall be governed, and is a power independent of the power to suppress monopoly. But it may operate in repression of monopoly whenever that comes within the rules by which commerce is governed or whenever the transaction is itself a monopoly of commerce.

In this same case, on page 25, Mr. Justice Harlan remarks:

But a general restraint of trade has often resulted from combinations formed for the purpose of controlling prices by destroying the opportunity of buyers and sellers to deal with each other upon the basis of fair, open, free competition. Combinations of this character have frequently been the subject of judicial scrutiny, and have always been condemned as illegal because of their necessary tendency to restrain trade. Such combinations are against common right and are crimes against the public. To some of the cases of that character it will be well to refer.

And at page 24 says:

If it be true that a combination of corporations or individuals may, so far as the power of Congress is concerned, subject interstate trade, in any of its stages, to unlawful restraints, the conclusion is inevitable that the Constitution has failed to accomplish one primary object of the Union, which was to place commerce among the States under the control of the Common Government of all the people, and thereby relieve or protect it against burdens or restrictions imposed, by whatever authority, for the benefit of particular localities or special interests.

And again he says:

In my judgment the General Government is not placed by the Constitution in such a condition of helplessness that it must fold its arms and remain inactive while capital combines, under the name of a corporation, to destroy competition, not in one State only, but throughout the entire country, in the buying and selling of articles—especially the necessaries of life—that go into commerce among the States. The doctrine of the autonomy of the States can not properly be invoked to justify a denial of power in the National Government to meet such an emergency, involving, as it does, that freedom of commercial intercourse among the States which the Constitution sought to attain.

And again, at pages 44 and 45:

We have before us the case of a combination which absolutely controls, or may at its discretion control, the price of all refined sugar in this country. Suppose another combination, organized for private gain and to control prices, should obtain possession of all the large flour mills in the United States; another, of all the grain elevators; another, of all the oil territory; another, of all the salt-producing regions; another, of all the cotton mills; and another, of all the great establishments for slaughtering animals and the preparation of meats. What power is competent to protect the people of the United States against such dangers except a national power—one that is capable of exerting its sovereign authority throughout every part of the territory and over all the people of the nation?

Mr. Speaker, according to the views expressed by Judge Harlan, he does not seem to be in harmony with the position assumed by the majority of this House. He seems to think that the General Government is not placed by the Constitution in such a condition of helplessness that it must fold its arms and remain silent while capital combines, under the name of a corporation, to destroy competition, not in one State only, but throughout the entire country, in the buying and selling articles that go into commerce among the States. This eminent judge does not question the power of the General Government under appropriate legislation to cope with the trust problem. He makes no suggestion of the necessity of a Constitutional amendment to confer additional power upon Congress to accomplish the desired end. Hence I take it that no such resort is demanded.

But, Mr. Speaker, I desire to call brief attention to the situation with reference to House bill 10539, proposing amendments to the Sherman antitrust law of July 2, 1890, and the attitude of the minority of the Judiciary Committee and of this House in relation to the same. It seems the committee divided somewhat along political lines, it is true, not upon the main propositions involved, but the difference has arisen as to the extent and scope of the proposed amendments. The majority assert that the bill reported by them with amendments which they recommend go to the full limit of their constitutional authority upon this question, while the minority contend that such bill and amendments do not exhaust the full power of Congress over the subject, and report and recommend the adoption of several additional amendments making the law still more sweeping and drastic in its provisions.

Now, while I am not fully prepared to determine with absolute confidence the merits of this contention, yet I am fully prepared to say that I am perfectly willing to go to the utmost limits of constitutional power in amendments to this law to meet the emergencies of the present situation, and no gentleman upon this floor will in my opinion be excused or escape just censure from the people for doing less. If anything was needed to emphasize the importance of the situation and the imperative duty of this hour, it is the universal demand coming from every quarter and section, from every home and hamlet, from every business avocation and enterprise throughout the land, calling for substantial, effective, and immediate relief from the remorseless grasp of these heartless and soulless monsters of commercial greed and organized robbery, who stalk the streets of our great commercial centers and highways of trade as fearless and arrogant as they are soulless and heartless. I, for one, shall not stop to split hairs about nice technicalities of constitutional power in dealing with this subject, as our friends upon the other side have not done upon several other occasions in dealing with Porto Rico and our newly acquired possessions. I am willing for once to join them in going to the doubtful verge, and if they are as courageous in this emergency as they have been in the recent past to suppress this all-pervading evil, I have but little fears that this House will adopt all these amendments. I fear, however, they will not follow in this instance where duty and patriotism lead, for already the leaders upon that side of the chamber are giving out evidences of their failing courage as they face the real thing.

It seems one thing to defy constitutional limitations when you come to deal with a helpless and impotent people across the

waters, and quite a different thing to deal with organized greed and trust magnates on this side. Here you are strict constructionists of the old-fashioned Democratic school; there you are latitudinarians of the most pronounced and dangerous type. I shall support these amendments offered by the minority, and if the sincerity of our Republican friends is equal to their pretended zeal in fighting the trusts, they too will support them, and thereby make this law what it ought and should be. If defeated in this, I will, as suggested, still support the original bill with the majority amendments. That these minority amendments may be understood and their merits judged of, I wish to insert them as part of my remarks. They are as follows:

Amend the new section 9 as reported by the committee as follows: Strike out all after figure 9 in said section and amend it so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 9. That every corporation, association, joint-stock company, or partnership formed or made, or managing or carrying on its business, in whole or in part, for the purpose of controlling or monopolizing, *or in such manner as to control or monopolize, or tend to control or monopolize*, the manufacture, production, or sale of any article of commerce or merchandise *intended for interstate commerce or commerce with foreign countries*, or for the purpose of controlling or increasing or decreasing the cost or price of the same to the purchaser, user, or consumer thereof, for the purpose of preventing, *or in such manner as to prevent*, competition, or of preventing competition in the manufacture, production, or sale thereof, is, for the purposes of this act, hereby declared to be illegal *and a monopoly; and all such corporations, associations, joint stock companies, and partnerships, and their officers, agents, managers, and attorneys, are hereby forbidden and prohibited from shipping or putting in transit any such article of commerce or merchandise to any State, Territory, foreign country, or place, outside the State, Territory, or place in which it was manufactured or produced, and from selling or offering to sell any such article or merchandise to be so shipped or put into any such transit, unless for the private or personal use of the consignee; and for any violation of this provision shall be deemed guilty of an offense against the United States, and on conviction shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 nor more than $5,000, and by imprisonment not less than thirty days nor more than six months.*

"*All such corporations, associations, joint-stock companies, and partnerships as above declared illegal shall be, and hereby are, forbidden and prohibited the use of the United States mail in aid or furtherance of any such business or purpose, and all laws now in force for the prevention of the fraudulent use of the mails, so far as the same may be applicable, shall apply in the execution of such prohibition.*

"*Any such corporation, association, joint-stock company, or partnership* may be proceeded against at the suit of any person or persons, or corporation, or association, or by and in behalf of the United States, and perpetually enjoined and restrained from doing or carrying on any interstate or foreign commerce whatever, either with the States or the Territories of the United States or the District of Columbia, or any foreign country; and no article of commerce produced, or manufactured, or owned and dealt in by any such corporation, association, joint-stock company, or partnership so organized, formed, managed, or carrying on business, shall be transported or carried without the State or Territory in which produced or manufactured, or in which same may be, or without the District of Columbia if produced, manufactured, or found therein, by any individual, corporation, or common carrier, in any manner whatever. All such articles of commerce, shipped in violation of the provisions of this act, shall be forfeited to the United States, and may be seized by any marshal or deputy marshal of the United States, or by any person duly authorized by law to make such seizure, and when so seized shall be condemned by like proceedings as those provided by law for the forfeiture, seizure, and condemnation of property imported into the United States contrary to law."

SEC. 11. That every contract, combine, device, trust, or combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, tending to create a monopoly in the manufacture, production, sale, exchange, transportation, or dealing in any article of commerce or merchandise, entering into trade or commerce among the States or with foreign countries, or designed to create impediments to, or resulting in restrictions to, such trade or commerce or aids to commerce, or to limit or to control the manufacture or production of such articles or merchandise, for the purpose of increasing or decreasing, or operating in such manner, or with such result, as to increase or decrease the price of such article or merchandise to the user or consumer, for the purpose of preventing competition in the manufacture, production, sale, exchange, transportation, or dealing in such articles or merchandise, or to give power to charge unreasonable prices for merchandise or articles produced or manufactured to be bought, sold, exchanged, dealt in, or transported in such trade or commerce, or for the purpose of imposing, or in such manner as to impose, unjust or onerous restrictions upon, or impediments to, the lawful business of any person, company, or corporation engaged in the production or manufacture of such merchandise or articles, is hereby declared to be illegal and a monopoly within the meaning of this act, and every person who shall make, or enter into, or engage in, any such contract, combine, device, trust, or combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, or shall be a promoter thereof or officer or agent therein, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 and not exceeding $5,000 and by imprisonment not less than six months and not exceeding one year.

A new section 12, as follows, viz:

SEC. 12. That whenever the President of the United States shall be satisfied that the price of any commodity or article of merchandise has been enhanced in consequence of any monopoly as defined in this act, he shall issue his proclamation suspending the collection of all customs duties or import taxes on like articles of merchandise or commodities brought from foreign countries. Such suspensions shall continue as long as such enhancement in price of such commodity or article of merchandise exists, and until revoked by the proclamation of the President.

A new section 13, as follows, viz:

SEC. 13. That whenever any State or Territory shall, in any law against trusts, combines, combinations, or monopolies, provide that no foreign corporation, association, joint-stock company, or partnership, or stockholder, member, or officer belonging to or interested in any such trust, combine, monopoly, or combination of any kind, shall be permitted to carry on or do any business, or have any office or place of business, in such State, or shall make provision to regulate or suppress the business of any such corporation, association, or partnership, or prohibit the sale or offering for sale in such State of any article or merchandise produced by it, every such corporation, association, or partnership carrying on, or attempting to carry on, or do any business or have any office or place of business therein, and all its articles or merchandise carried thereto, shall be subject to the operation and effect of such law, to the same extent and in the same manner as though it had been incorporated, organized, or formed in such State and such articles or merchandise had been made and not brought therein; and no such law shall be regarded as in any way trenching upon the power of Congress to regulate commerce among the States or with foreign nations: *Provided, however*, That such articles or merchandise may be shipped and transported into any such State or Territory for the personal and private use of the consignee.

A new section 14, as follows:

SEC. 14. That every corporation, association, joint stock company, or partnership in the United States, or any Territory thereof, or in the District of Columbia, whether organized or formed under and pursuant to the laws of the United States or of a State or of a Territory, owning or controlling any plant or business, or a majority of the stock in any plant or business, similar to its own, in any other State, Territory, or place outside of the one in which it was first chartered, organized, or formed, shall, before being permitted to ship, consign, take, carry, or transport, or sell or deliver for shipment, to any other State or Territory, or into or from the District of Columbia, or any foreign country, any article of commerce or merchandise of its own production or manufacture, or receive consignments or shipments of articles of commerce or merchandise, manufactured or produced in any other State or Territory, or in the District of Columbia, or any foreign country, file in the office of the Secretary of State of the United States a certified copy of its articles of incorporation, association, or partnership, together with a duly verified statement showing the article or articles or merchandise manufactured, produced, or dealt in by it or intended to be manufactured, produced, or dealt in by it; a copy of its by-laws, rules, and regulations; the names and places of residence of its officers and stockholders; the amount of its capital stock and the amount thereof actually issued; the amount thereof actually paid in in cash; the nature and value of the property owned by it, and also a full statement of all its debts and liabilities; the number of its employees and wages paid; the dividends paid, if any; the amount of its surplus, if any; the character of additions and improvements made each year and the cost thereof, and a statement of its operating and other expenses, together with a balance sheet showing its profits and losses; and shall annually thereafter file in said office a report, verified by a majority of the directors of a corporation, or by a majority of the members of an association, joint stock company, or partnership, showing the same facts as then existing, and shall, before shipping, or offering or attempting to ship, or sell or deliver for shipment, or put in the way for transit, to any other State or Territory, or the District of Columbia, or any foreign country, any article of commerce or merchandise manufactured, produced, or dealt in by it, plainly and conspicuously stamp thereon, when susceptible of being so stamped, and also on the outside of packages, boxes, or tanks containing the same, the name of the article or merchandise, and the name of the corporation, association, joint stock company, or partnership manufacturing, producing, or dealing in the same, and the place from and to which it is to be shipped or transported.

Every such corporation, association, or partnership as referred to in this section, and every officer, agent, or attorney thereof, that shall ship, or offer or attempt to ship, or sell or deliver for shipment, or put in the way of transit, to any other State or Territory, or to the District of Columbia, or to any foreign country, any article or merchandise dealt in, manufactured, or produced by it, or shall violate or fail to comply with any of the provisions of this section, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 and not exceeding $5,000, and by imprisonment of not less than six months and not more than one year.

Mr. Speaker, section 12 offered as one of these amendments will give the relief that has been contended for several years should be given, not only by Democrats, but by many independent Republicans and some of the ablest and most influential of the Administration newspapers of the country. I quote upon this question an editorial of the Washington Post of March 23, in which it makes a short quotation from the Hartford Courant, both supporters of the present Administration and high protection in politics. The Post editorially uses this language:

[From the Washington Post, March 23, 1900.]

CONGRESS AND THE TRUSTS.

When the elections of 1898 had assured Republican ascendancy in both Houses of the Fifty-sixth Congress, the Post mentioned as one of the important duties that would devolve upon that body the accomplishment of some practical antitrust legislation. It was evident then, and it has become more apparent every day since that time, that the trusts would be one of the leading issues of the Presidential campaign. The Post suggested then, and has ever since persistently urged the necessity of depriving monopolistic combinations of any chance for shelter behind tariff schedules. As a consistent advocate of the doctrine of protection, the Post has protested and will continue to protest against its abuse. Attention has been called in these columns to trade combinations in protected industries that were and are stifling competition while paying large dividends on enormous overcapitalization. Testimony given before the Industrial Commission by managers of such combines convicts them of exploiting almost fabulous amounts of fictitious stock. Similar testimony shows that such combines sell their products all over Europe at lower prices than are charged for them to domestic consumers. These facts we have from time to time pointed out, and in the interest of the great principle of protection to which our marvelous development and splendid prosperity are largely due, the Post has advocated the reduction, not in all cases the destruction, of schedules thus outrageously abused.

What is Congress going to do in order to put the Republican party in good form for the campaign? The President has called the attention of Congress to the trust evil and left to that body the duty of devising and applying such remedies as are in the scope of national legislation. It is admitted on all sides that some of the trusts are beyond the reach of national authority. It is admitted by all fair-minded men that there are some trade combines which have by legitimate means reduced the cost of production while increasing wages and not increasing prices. No indiscriminate warfare on trusts is called for. But against the sort of combines that are taking advantage of protective duties to prey on the public there is a remedy at hand, and every Congressman knows what it is.

The Post has long looked and hoped for Republican cooperation in its effort to induce the Republicans in Congress to apply that remedial agency. There has been any amount of general denunciation of trusts in our Republican contemporaries, but until this date we have waited in vain for them to join us in advocating the only immediate and practicable plan for relief. At last, however, we have the excellent company and good-fellowship of the Hartford Courant, a leading Republican journal in a State devoted almost exclusively to manufactures. That paper refers to and pointedly condemns the proposition of Judge RAY, of New York, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, to amend the Constitution in a new spot by tacking upon it an article delegating to Congress "the power to regulate and repress monopolies and combinations, to create and dissolve corporations, and dispose of their property."

This attempt to utilize Mr. Bryan's abandoned thunder finds no favor with our Hartford contemporary. After cauterizing with ridicule, the Courant squarely plants itself alongside the Post with this plain declaration:

"But if Judge RAY wants the strongest and heartiest support the Courant can give him, let him induce his friend and colleague, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, to bring forward a bill striking from the Dingley tariff every protective duty behind which one of the vicious trusts is known to be snuggling and bloating. That's a practical remedy, right at hand. Such a bill, if Judge RAY and his associates put their shoulders to it in earnest, can be rushed through the House and sent to the Senate before the end of next week."

The antitrust amendment device is too shallow to deceive anybody with sense enough to decline an invitation to buy a gold brick or go out as bagholder on a snipe-hunting expedition. The Post is bound to credit Judge RAY with such intelligence and general information as must render it impossible for him to believe that his edition of the Bryan recipe has a ghost of a chance for adoption. Where is there a single State that would be willing for its legislature to vote for it? But the tariff-reduction specific would reach the disease promptly. It is of the kind that "attend strictly to business and don't go loafin' round." Will Congress apply it to those enemies of protection, those rapacious ingrates whom the tariff shelters?

This, Mr. Speaker, is but a sample of many other able editorials appearing in the columns of Republican organs throughout the country; and yet in the majority report of the Judiciary Committee reporting this bill, as well as by the distinguished chairman of that committee, Mr. RAY, of New York, and my distinguished colleague, Mr. OVERSTREET, from Indiana, upon the floor of this House, denounce and characterize this proposition as a vicious and malignant Democratic assault upon the protective system, and would, if adopted, ruin the business industries of the country. Such a proposition, they say, would not only afford no relief against the trust evil, but would establish free trade and prove disastrous to our industrial system.

Again, our friends lose their nerve and grow less and less heroic amid the conflict of contending interests. In the presence of an evil which they charge upon the floor of this House has outgrown the power of the States to successfully cope with, and which they denounce in the most unmeasured terms, it will hardly be accepted as satisfactory by the great body of intelligent citizens of this country to say that, notwithstanding the manufacturer of an article that has become the subject of a trust under the operation of the protective "Dingley bill," it will not do to strike from the law the duty upon that article, because, perchance, it might strike a blow to a pet political system of the Republican party. As between an incalculable good to the great mass and a theoretical injury to the favored few, the Republican majority of this House do not hesitate to side with the favored few. A day of reckoning will come, and in the crucial test of public opinion you will be weighed and measured. It may be then that you will regret the decision you now make and the company you now choose.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this struggle is on and the contest will not cease until it shall be determined whether the people of this country are the sovereigns or the money power, trust combinations, and organized greed are to prove themselves masters. A free people will not willingly yield up their liberties and obsequiously consent to trusts and financial serfdom. They have already borne much with patience and may yet endure, but these, of all times, are full of wholesome warning to the rich and powerful not to abuse their wealth and power, but to obey and respect the laws of the land and aid and assist in their enforcement. No class of people have so much of interest in the maintenance and enforcement of law and order as the men of wealth and fortune. Upon the integrity of our legislative bodies, courts, and administrative officers depend the safety and security of person and property. As an evidence of the spirit of unrest and the trend of thought, even among the magnates and princes of Wall street, concerning the present situation, I quote what Mr. James R. Keene, of Wall street fame, is reported to have said a short time since:

The people of this country must arouse themselves. The coming election is of more importance, from the standpoint of a pure and true Americanism, than any that has transpired since the second election of Lincoln. Money is in the saddle; it is riding down the institutions of this country with a confident insolence that tells of its firm belief in its own invincibility. It is running the Government to-day in its every branch and arm.

If money's power in molding public affairs goes forward for four years more as it has for four years past, the name of American liberty will only be worth a recollection as a matter of history. Money is pressing the people backward step by step. What is to be the end? If it goes on, there are, as matters trend, but two solutions. One is socialism, and the second is revolution. The American people must defend themselves from money just as they once guarded their forest frontiers from the savage. Unless they come solidly shoulder to shoulder for their rights, and come at once, Bunker Hill will have been a blunder, Yorktown a mistake.

Mr. Speaker, we believe we are right upon the question of this constitutional amendment. We believe that our friends upon the other side of this Chamber have not been candid, open, and frank in their advocacy of it. To show the lack of sincerity of some of the gentlemen upon that side of the Chamber, I will print as part of my remarks a clipping from a prominent newspaper what the distinguished leader and reputed mouthpiece of the Administration, Mr. GROSVENOR of Ohio, had to say just prior to the assembling of the present Congress in reference to the sufficiency of our antitrust laws, and the jurisdiction of the several States upon the subject of the control and restraint of trusts and corporations. It would seem from this published statement of the venerable statesman from Ohio that he at least would have been found joining hands with us in this controversy. Here is what the distinguished gentleman is reported to have said at that time:

A REPUBLICAN VIEW.

[By CHARLES H. GROSVENOR.]

The Fifty-sixth Congress comes together under peculiar circumstances. The Republican majority is commissioned by the voice of the people to do certain things in any event, and to do certain other things if found to be wise and judicious.

As to the things which the Republican majority has been commissioned to do:

First, and most conspicuous of all, it has been delegated to revise the statutory financial condition of the country; that is to say, it has been decided by the people of the country, in the election of McKinley and the upholding of the platform at St. Louis, that the unwritten law of the Treasury, which for twenty years has paid gold upon every obligation of the Government, shall be now ordered by statute to continue that process. This is simply to enact into law the declaration of the Republican platform, which ordained the existing gold standard.

When Congress shall have approved of this measure, either in the form it comes to the Senate or in such form as may afterwards be agreed upon, there will be no free and unlimited coinage of silver in this country for the next eight years in any event, because the Senate is absolutely sure to be against it during that period of time.

While the Dingley bill has produced a great and gratifying return of revenue to the Treasury, there is yet, nevertheless, a demand that must be heeded, that there shall be economy in the public expenditures, needless expenditures must not be made, and many needful things must be postponed to a later and future day.

As to trusts and combinations, it is my judgment, and I so said to a reporter of this paper some days ago, that the Sherman law of 1890, which was a Republican measure and which has now been put into full force and effectiveness by the Republican Administration, gives all the remedy needful in the control and overthrow of illegal trusts and harmful trusts which can be made by the action of Congress.

This legislation, thus upheld by the Supreme Court, covers the whole ground of Congressional action, and all other laws should be enacted by the legislatures of the several States. I repeat what I said before: I am opposed to any interference by Congressional action with the right of the States to organize, create, control, limit, and regulate their own corporations in their own way, and for Congress to impair it by limitation upon the operation of State corporations other than that which was enacted in the interstate-commerce law would be such a violation of the right of States that it is not to be thought of for a moment.

Again, the Washington Post, while perhaps not a Republican organ, yet, as a general rule, supports the Administration, in an editorial appearing in its issue of May 31—the very day this measure was taken up in the House—had this to say upon the subject of this amendment and the Democratic position in relation thereto:

By supporting this constitutional amendment Democrats would have deliberately connived at the permanent retirement of the trust issue, withdrawn it from the campaign, and thereby robbed their party of one of its most powerful engines of war.

I will publish the editorial as a portion of my remarks.

DEMOCRATIC POSITION ON TRUSTS.

Our Democratic friends in Congress are to be congratulated upon the attitude they have assumed toward the constitutional amendment proposed by the House Committee on the Judiciary, of which Hon. GEORGE W. RAY, of New York, is the chairman. Mr. RAY's proposition is obviously impracticable, and, as many believe, was intended to be so. By supporting it the Democrats would have deliberately connived at a virtually permanent retirement of the trust issue, withdrawn it from the campaign, and thereby robbed their party of one of its most powerful engines of war. They express their utter disbelief in the sincerity of any representative Republican effort to curtail the power of the trusts. It would have been, therefore, suicidal on their part to commit themselves to an arrangement most palpably calculated to serve the alleged purposes of their antagonists.

There was still another serious objection, which is set forth in clause 3 of the resolution adopted by the Democratic caucus on Tuesday night:

"3. We oppose and urge Democrats in Congress to vote against the constitutional amendment proposed by the Republican majority of the Judiciary Committee, unless amended by striking out section 1 thereof and adding thereto, in section 2, in lieu of these words, 'The several States may continue to exercise such power in any manner not in conflict with the laws of the United States,' the following: 'Nothing in this article, nor any act of Congress in pursuance thereof, shall operate to abridge or impair any of the rights or powers held by any of the States prior to its adoption.'"

It seems to be the case, therefore, that the Democrats regarded the Ray proposition not only as a scheme to postpone, perhaps indefinitely, all governmental action against the trusts, and incidentally to entrap the Democrats into withdrawing the issue of the campaign of 1900, but also, in case the amendment should be finally adopted, as an abridgment of the rights and powers of the States. Certainly, holding such opinions, they could not have taken any course other than that referred to. Their present position, in this matter at least, seems to be unassailable.

Mr. Speaker, the present session of this Congress is now rapidly approaching its close. In looking back over the history of its seven months of legislation nothing will be found in the shape of relief to the great body of the people from the burdens of taxation, while the appropriations have grown and the expenses increased almost beyond calculation. Notwithstanding the country was assured by the late distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. Dingley, that the war-revenue bill, enacted as an emergency measure, would be repealed as soon as the war was over and peace declared, and notwithstanding that war ended now nearly two years ago, and many hundreds of petitions and memorials have flooded members of Congress from all parts of the country, praying for a repeal or modification of this onerous tax, and many bills have been introduced and referred to the proper committees, where they are still buried, asking for a repeal of this tax, in whole or in part, no sign or indication has ever been given of any hope or expectation of securing such repeal.

If no relief can be had by repeal of the war taxes, if the burdens of the people can not be lightened by any form of reduction in the exactions of taxation, let us at least go to the extent of performing a long-neglected duty, and place upon the statute book of the nation a law that will equalize in some degree the opportunities in life to meet these burdens—a law that shall be framed in the interests of the people, the whole people, adaquate and sufficient in every respect to meet, overthrow, and outlaw in whatever phase or form they may present themselves every trust, combine, and conspiracy operating in restraint of trade and commerce and to the prejudice of free and open competition and the rights of the great mass of consumers throughout the country, and we will have then atoned for many sins of omission in the past. Not only this, Mr. Speaker, but when the law is ingrafted on the statute book let it be understood by those in authority that it is meant to be and must be enforced.

Much of the existing condition of things in relation to the growth, power, and insolence of these trusts is due to inefficient, corrupt, or subservient officials charged with the duty of prosecuting these dignified and well-to-do violators of the law. It requires no ordinary amount of legal ability and moral courage to face this class of criminals in a court of justice with a vigorous criminal prosecution. They are usually able to command, in addition to their high social and business standing in the community, not only the very best legal talent of the country, but too often the influence and sympathy of the political party of which they are members, especially if they have been permitted to enjoy the satisfaction of having rendered campaign tribute to that party for their special rights and privileges. And thus the difficulties and embarrassments multiply to overawe and prevent a successful prosecution.

This, Mr. Speaker, is no fancy. It is but what has often happened in many instances. Loud and bitter complaints have been heard all over the country of the fact that, if a poor unfortunate wretch is overtaken and brought within the punishing power of the law, though his offense may have the mitigating element of having been committed to appease his own hunger, or maybe that of his wife and little ones, he is certain to suffer the full penalty of the law, while the rich and well-to-do—the man who can organize a gigantic conspiracy to fleece and rob a nation—the Government official who can filch from the public a thousand, a hundred thousand, or maybe a million of dollars according to his opportunities, challenges public sympathy, if not favor, and places himself in the "heroic rôle," and is often able to baffle and defeat the law; and if perchance he is arraigned at the bar of justice, if not acquitted, secures a comparatively light sentence—with the almost certain assurance of executive clemency and pardon, after short imprisonment if that should be a part of his punishment. This sentiment, while much at fault, is not entirely without some grounds of support. Confidence in the courts and public officials charged with the responsibility of administering the laws of the country has ever been the chief reliance of our people for security and protection. It is one of the highest duties of government to faithfully execute all the laws—to exert all its legitimate functions to secure an honest and upright administration of justice, in a spirit of the utmost fairness and impartiality to all. That this has not been done with reference to our antitrust laws by the Republican party goes without saying.

If proof of this fact was needed, I would not have to go further than the State of Ohio, the President's own State, and the home of Senator HANNA, his campaign manager and most trusted friend. I would only have to recall the heroic struggle of the late Republican attorney-general, the Hon. Frank S. Monnett, in his efforts to enforce the antitrust laws of that State against the Standard Oil Company. General Monnett happened to be one of those Republicans rarely found in public office, who believed that the pledges made in the platform of his party meant what they said. He was elected in that State to the office of attorney-general upon a platform strongly denouncing trusts, and especially the methods of the Standard Oil Company, within his State. He at once set on foot a vigorous prosecution against the Standard Oil Company, and honestly and faithfully pressed that prosecution with a view to the enforcement of the law and the suppression of the trust. What success and encouragement he met at the hands of his party and party organs can best be told in the language of General Monnett himself in a recent interview published in one of the prominent and reliable newspapers of the country. Here is what he himself says about his party and the newspapers of his party in relation to his efforts to administer the law against trusts in the State of Ohio:

M'KINLEY MAY LOSE OHIO.

Ex-Attorney-General Frank S. Monnett, of Ohio, in an interview on the 19th instant, says Ohio will be lost to the Republicans this fall.

"I do not see how the Republican party can escape punishment this fall," said he.

"The platform of the Republican party in Ohio strongly condemns the trusts and their unlawful methods. I was elected as attorney-general of Ohio on such a platform, and as the officer of the State and the representative of the party I carried out as best I could the platform of the party. Yet I was not supported in this by many of the leaders, and the party organs criticised me for doing just what the platform of my party pledged me to do. Newspapers of the State, about 110 of them, printed paid articles criticising my actions, and they, too, party newspapers.

"This is not all. The legislature which has just adjourned killed the Russell bill and the maximum freight bill, and that too by almost a strict party vote. Will not the people punish the party for such actions upon the part of its servants? The party, as such, is not in sympathy with such methods. Although the Russell bill was bill No. 10, it was side-tracked by the trust lobbyists and held back until near the adjournment and then over the protest of some of the best men of the party, and almost all of the Democratic members, it was defeated. This was a repudiation of the party platform and the sentiment of the party. I can not believe that we will escape punishment, and I believe it will come this fall. Why should not the party be punished when the men who control its actions disregard the will of the people?"

The opinion thus so freely and frankly expressed by General Monnett is shared generally throughout the country. If the Republican party feels hampered through obligations, sympathy, or filial duty to these legitimate offsprings of Republican policies; if, Mr. Speaker, it is compromising to the Republican party to enforce these antitrust laws, as it appears to have been in the case of General Monnett; if the attempt to redeem your platform pledges and carry out your solemn promises to the people sounds the political death knell of your honest and faithful public servants and prosecuting officials, as seems to have been the case with General Monnett, then we ask you in the name of the great masses of the common people of this country, in the name of law and order, in the name of the army of unemployed, the great labor organizations, and the millions of victims everywhere of these grinding and remorseless monopolies, to turn the control of this Government over to Mr. Bryan and the Attorney-General he will place at the head of the Department of Justice, and we promise you that without the aid of further constitutional amendments the Democratic party will not fail to observe "our plain duty," and will speedily employ and honestly put into full force all the legitimate powers and agencies of the Government to terminate the existence of these enemies of the national weal.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to print as an appendix to my remarks a list of trusts and combines in the United States—list prepared for Commercial Yearbook by Byron W. Holt—together with the names, where incorporated, location, and capitalization, to May 27, 1900, and the amount of "common" and "preferred" stock of each:

Present name of trust.[2]	Where incorporated.	Location principal office.	Capitalization.[3]	
			Common stock.	Preferred stock.
Adams Express Company	New York	New York City	[5]$12,000,000	
American Automatic Weighing Machine Company (three companies—all in U.S.)	England	New York (?)	£135,000	£135,000
American Axe and Tool Company (16 plants)	Kentucky	New York City	$3,872,500	
American Beet Sugar Company			15,000,000	$4,000,000
American Bell Telephone Company (owns American Telephone and other telephone companies).	Massachusetts	Boston	25,886,300	
American Birch Company (to control New York market)	New Jersey		4,000,000	6,000,000
American Brass Company	Connecticut	Waterbury	20,000,000	
American Bridge Builders' Association (trust forming 13 firms)	Pennsylvania	Philadelphia	[1]30,000,000	
American Caramel Company (all export trade of United States)	do	do	1,000,000	500,000
American Car and Foundry Company (railroad cars)	New Jersey		27,600,000	27,600,000
American Cereal Company (much larger company forming)	Ohio	Chicago	3,400,000	
American Cotton Oil Company (123 properties)	New Jersey	New York City	20,237,100	10,198,600
American District Telegraph Company[4]	New York	do	3,844,700	
American Electric Heating Corporation		Boston	10,000,000	
American Express Company (not incorporated)[1]	New York	New York City	18,000,000	
American Felt Company (nearly all companies in United States)	New Jersey	do	2,500,000	2,500,000
American Fisheries Company (menhaden oil, 15-18 companies)	do	do	8,000,000	2,000,000
American (Window) Glass Company (majority in United States)	do	Pittsburg	20,000,000	
American Glucose Sugar Refining Company (opposition company)	do		3,000,000	
American Glue Company		Boston	1,400,000	700,000
American Hay Company	Michigan		[2]5,000,000	
American Ice Company (forming; to control ice output of Maine)	Maine		60,000,000	

Present name of trust.[a]	Where incorporated.	Location principal office.	Capitalization.[a]	
			Common stock.	Preferred stock.
American Indies Company (gas, electric, etc., new colonies)	New Jersey		$13,000,000	$5,000,000
American Jute Bagging Manufacturing Company			2,800,000	
American Lamp Chimney Company (one-third total United States)	West Virginia		500,000	
American Last Company	Ohio		2,000,000	250,000
American Linseed Oil Company (82 plants; 85 per cent of all in country)	New Jersey	Chicago	14,250,000	1,500,000
American Lithograph Company	do	New York	8,000,000	14,250,000
American Machine Company (sewing)	Ohio	Cleveland	[b]10,000,000	3,500,000
American Malting Company (30 companies; nearly all in United States)	New Jersey	New York City	13,750,000	12,540,000
American Ordnance Company (guns, projectiles, etc.)		Washington	2,500,000	
American Pegamoid Company			5,000,000	
American Pipe and Foundry Company (5 plants in South; bigger trust forming)			[b]10,000,000	
American Potteries Company (forming; nearly all in United States)	New Jersey	New York City	17,000,000	16,000,000
American Powder Company		Chicago	1,500,000	
American Preservers' Company	West Virginia	do	2,500,000	
American Radiator Company (4 companies; 75 per cent United States product)	New Jersey	do	5,000,000	3,620,000
American Saddle Company (bicycle saddle consolidation)	do		1,000,000	800,000
American Screw Company	Rhode Island	Providence	3,250,000	
American Sewer Pipe Company (forming, with 51 big companies)	New Jersey (?)	Pittsburg (?)	12,500,000	12,500,000
American Silk Manufacturing Company (silk thread)	Connecticut	New London	7,500,000	5,000,000
American Skewer Company (all manufacturers in United States)	Indiana (?)		300,000	
American Soda Fountain Company	New Jersey	New York	1,250,000	2,500,000
American Spirits Manufacturing Company (whisky; 18 distilleries)	New York	do	28,000,000	7,000,000
American Steel and Wire Company of New Jersey (controls wire industry, etc., in United States).	New Jersey	Chicago	50,000,000	40,000,000
American Steel Casting Company	do		4,200,000	
American Stove Board Company (7 manufacturers)	West Virginia	New York	81,100	
American Strawboard Company (19 plants)	Illinois	Chicago	6,000,000	
American Sugar Refining Company	New Jersey	New York City	36,968,000	36,968,000
American Telegraph and Telephone Company (controls long-distance lines)	New York	do	25,000,000	
American Thread Company (13 cotton-thread companies)	New Jersey		6,000,000	6,000,000
American Tin Plate Company (231 mills—95 per cent of all)	do	Chicago	28,000,000	18,000,000
American Tobacco Company (plug business sold in 1898)	do	New York City	21,000,000	14,000,000
American Type Founders' Company (23 companies in United States)	do	do	4,000,000	
American Whip Company (20 manufacturers)	Massachusetts	do	250,000	
American Woodworking Machinery Company (14 firms)	New Jersey		2,000,000	2,000,000
American Woolen Company (men's woolens—mills in New England; forming)		New York City	30,000,000	20,000,000
American Wringer Company	Rhode Island	Rhode Island	850,000	1,650,000
Ammunition Manufacturers' Association (cartridges)		New York City	[b]4,000,000	
Anaconda Copper Mining Company	Montana		30,000,000	
Associate Wine Dealers (agreement with California Winemakers' Corporation		San Francisco	[b]5,000,000	
Association of Boat Oar Manufacturers of United States; (agreement on prices)			[b]500,000	
Association of Fire Underwriters for Arkansas (44 companies)[g]	Arkansas	Little Rock (?)	39,694,226	
Atlantic Dynamite Company (giant powder, etc.)	New York	New York City	[b]2,500,000	
Atlantic Passenger Steamship Pool (renewed in 1899)			[b]100,000,000	
Atlantic Snuff Company (all but 2 companies)	New Jersey	Nashville	2,000,000	8,000,000
Atlas Tack Company	Massachusetts	Boston	700,000	
Atwood-Morrison Company (consolidation of 3 silk and cotton machinery companies).	New Jersey		300,000	
Baltimore Electric Light Company (3 electric companies of Baltimore)			5,000,000	
Barber Asphalt Paving Company (pools with other companies)[c]		New York City	5,000,000	
Bay State Gas Company (several gas companies in and near Boston)	Delaware		100,000,000	
Bessemer Ore Association		Cleveland	[b]20,000,000	
Bolt and nut (several associations—carriage, stove, tire, etc.)			[b]10,000,000	
Booth, A., & Co. (fish and oysters; 43 concerns)	Illinois	Chicago	3,000,000	2,500,000
Borax Consolidated, Limited (absorbing Pacific Borax, etc., Company)			£2600,000	£800,000
Boston Fruit Company (4 companies, controlling output from West Indies)		Boston (?)	[b]10,000,000	
Boxmakers' Combine (of California-Oregon)		San Francisco	1,000,000	
Brass Foundry and Machine Company (iron and brass castings)	New Jersey	Jersey City	6,000,000	
Brooklyn Rapid Transit (most streets, ways, elevated and Brooklyn)		New York	45,000,000	
Brooklyn Union Gas (7 companies)	New York	Brooklyn	15,000,000	
Brooklyn Wharf and Warehouse Company[c]	do	do	5,000,000	$7,500,000
Broom Manufacturers' Association of United States (regulates prices)		Chicago	5,000,000	
Broom Twine (selling combine)			[b]500,000	
Brunswick-Balke-Collender Company (billiard tables, etc.)	Ohio	New York City	1,500,000	
Buffalo City Gas Company (4 companies; consolidated with People's Gas in 1898).[c]	New York	Buffalo	5,500,000	
Buffalo Traction Company (consolidation pending)		do	5,370,500	
California Raisin Growers' Association (2,000 growers and 60 packing houses; controls 95 per cent of crop).			[b]5,000,000	
California Winemakers' Corporation (allied with California Wine Association)[c]	California	San Francisco	10,000,000	
Cambria Steel Company (owns Cambria Iron Company; plants in five counties in Pennsylvania).	Pennsylvania	Philadelphia	16,000,000	
Cedar Shingles Manufacturers' Association (Washington State; limits production).			[b]5,000,000	
Celluloid Company	New Jersey	Newark	3,000,000	
Central Coal and Coke Company (selling agency)[c]	Ohio	Columbus	500,000	
Central Coal and Coke Company of Kansas City, Mo.[c]	Missouri	Kansas City	1,500,000	1,500,000
Central Electric Railway of Kansas City, Mo. (all companies)		do	500,000	
Central Lumber Company of California[c]			[b]$70,000,000	
Central New York Brewing Company	New Jersey		2,200,000	1,800,000
Central Union Telephone Company (consolidation of Bell Telephone in Indiana, Illinois, and Ohio, except certain cities).			6,605,300	
Central Union Gas Company (17 gas and electric lighting companies in Ohio and Indiana).	Virginia		5,000,000	9,000,000
Central Walnut Association (California; fixes prices)			[b]2,000,000	
Chain Manufacturers' Association (trace, wagon, etc.)			[b]3,000,000	
Charleston (South Carolina) Consolidated Railway, Gas and Electric Company (forming with all in city).			1,500,000	
Chemical (Pharmaceutical Manufacturers') Combine		Philadelphia	[b]50,000,000	
Chicago and Northwestern Granaries Company (agreements with other companies).		Chicago	£120,000	£120,000
Chicago City Railway Company (cable, electric, and horse lines)		do	$14,000,000	
Chicago Consolidated Traction Company (8 suburban companies)	Illinois	do	14,400,000	
Chicago Edison Company (absorbed 4 companies)		Chicago	4,975,900	
Chicago Junction Railway and Union Stock Yards Company (meat packing and cattle; consolidation 3 companies).	New Jersey	do	6,500,000	$6,500,000
Chicago Milk Company (forming to supply three-fourths of city's milk)		do	3,000,000	3,000,000
Chicago Packing and Provision Company (Limited)		do	£200,000	£200,000
Cincinnati Gas-Light and Coke			$9,000,000	
City of Chicago Brewing and Malting Company (English and American companies).		Chicago	£625,000	£625,000
Cleveland and Sandusky Brewing Company (11 breweries)			$3,000,000	$3,000,000
Colorado Fuel and Iron (connected with Colorado Coal and Iron Company)	Colorado	Denver	11,000,000	2,000,000
Columbia Electric Car Lighting and Brake Company	New Jersey		10,000,000	
Columbia River Canneries Company (fish packers; re-forming, 1899)		Portland	[b]2,000,000	
Columbia Spring Company	Ohio	Cleveland	2,000,000	
Columbus (Ohio) Gas-Light and Heating Company (will own 2 big companies)	West Virginia	Columbus	1,700,000	3,300,000

Present name of trust.[2]	Where incorporated.	Location principal office.	Capitalization.[2]	
			Common stock.	Preferred stock.
Commercial Chemical Company, United States (paris-green manufacturers form selling agency).	.....	New York City	[5] $2,000,000	.....
Commonwealth Electric Company (12 companies; pools with Edison)	.....	Chicago	3,000,000	.....
Consolidated City Water Company (3 companies, Los Angeles, Cal)	.....	Los Angeles	2,480,000	.....
Consolidated Gas of Baltimore City [6]	Maryland	Baltimore	10,770,968	.....
Consolidated Gas Company of Newark, N. J. (all gas companies between Passaic and Elizabeth).	New Jersey	Newark	6,000,000	.....
Consolidated Gas of New York City (all but New Amsterdam Company)[6]	New York	New York City	9,078,000	.....
Consolidated Gas of Pittsburg (5 companies in west Pennsylvania)	.....	Pittsburg	4,000,000	$2,500,000
Consolidated Ice (10 or 12 companies in New York and Maine)[6]	Maine	New York City	6,500,000	3,500,000
Consolidated Packing Companies (Beef)	.....	.....	5,000,000	.....
Consolidated Smelting and Refining Company (forming with 11 big companies in United States and Mexico).	New Jersey	.....	27,000,000	27,000,000
Consolidated Street Railway Company	.....	Grand Rapids	1,600,000	1,419,000
Consolidated Traction of New Jersey [6]	.....	Newark	15,000,000	.....
Consumers' Ice Company (all dealers of Indianapolis)	.....	Indianapolis	[6] 1,000,000	.....
Continental Cement Company	New Jersey	.....	5,000,000	5,000,000
Continental Tobacco Company (7 plug companies and plug interests of American Company).	.....do	New York City	30,000,000	30,000,000
Copper Sheets and Bolts, Manufacturers' Association (fixes prices)	.....	Pittsburg	[5] 5,000,000	.....
Denver City Tramway Company (consolidated street lines)	.....	Denver	5,000,000	.....
Denver Union Water Company (complete plant) [6]	Colorado	.....do	5,000,000	2,500,000
Derby Hat Pool (4 big companies sell together)	.....	.....	[5] 3,000,000	.....
Detroit Citizens' Street Railway Company [6]	.....	Detroit	2,050,000	.....
Detroit City Gas (all natural and artificial gas companies in city) [6]	Michigan	.....do	4,560,000	.....
Diamond Match Company (mills all over United States)	Illinois and England	Chicago	11,000,000	.....
Dry Dock Trust (Philadelphia syndicate) [6]	.....	.....	1,000,000	.....
Dynamite Pool (3 big California companies)	.....	San Francisco	[5] 2,000,000	.....
Eastern Burial Case Association (big trust forming in 1899)	.....	.....	[5] 4,000,000	.....
East Jersey Electric Company	.....	.....	1,000,000	.....
Edison Electric Illuminating Company of Boston	New Jersey	.....	3,744,000	.....
Edison Electric Illuminating Company of New York [6]	.....	New York City	9,200,000	.....
Electric Boat Company	New York	.....	5,000,000	5,000,000
Electric Company of America (gas and electric companies just outside of Philadelphia).	New Jersey	.....	25,000,000	.....
Electric Storage Battery Company (absorbed other companies in 1895)	.....do	Philadelphia	8,500,000	5,000,000
Electric Vehicle Company	.....do	.....	5,000,000	1,000,000
Electrotypers, New York city and vicinity [6]	.....do	New York City	[5] 5,000,000	.....
Erie Telegraph and Telephone Company (controls 4 telephone companies in 7 Western and Southern States).	.....	Cleveland	5,000,000	.....
Factory Insurance Association, 29 companies ††	.....	Hartford	34,655,000	.....
Federal Steel Company (owns many mills and properties)	.....	New York City	46,484,000	52,767,000
Fire-Proofing (9 Ohio companies sell together)	New Jersey	.....	[3] 3,000,000	.....
Five States Milk Producers' Association (farmers to keep prices of milk up, as against the trust.)	.....	.....	[20] 20,000,000	.....
Fox River Birch and Tile Company (consolidated 15 birch yards in Wisconsin)	Wisconsin	.....	200,000	.....
Francis Gowdy Distilling Company (combination Eastern gin companies)	Connecticut	.....	100,000	.....
General Chemical Company	New York	.....	12,500,000	12,500,000
General Electric; pools with other companies	New York	Schenectady	18,276,000	2,551,200
General Electric Company of Minneapolis; light, heat, and power	New Jersey	.....	2,100,000	.....
Glucose Sugar Refining Company; nearly all in United States	.....do	Chicago	24,027,300	12,619,000
Granite Ware Trust; 4 companies combining	.....	.....	[20] 20,000,000	.....
Grape Growers' Pool; agree on prices in northern Ohio	.....	.....	[2] 2,000,000	.....
Havana Commercial Company (Cuban tobacco, etc.)	New Jersey	.....	10,000,000	6,000,000
Havana Electric Railway; electric, gas, telephone, etc	.....do	.....	5,000,000	.....
Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company	.....	.....	2,312,755	.....
Hecker-Jones-Jewell Milling Company [6]	New Jersey	New York City	2,000,000	3,000,000
Herkimer County Light and Power Company; companies in 3 cities in county	.....	Herkimer (?)	400,000	.....
Herring-Hall-Marvin; reorganizing	New Jersey	New York City	1,650,000	1,650,000
Illinois State Board of Fire Underwriters; 72 companies [3]	.....	.....	49,430,760	.....
Indiana League of Fire Underwriters; 27 companies [3]	.....	.....	10,028,568	.....
Indurated Fiber Industries Company	New Jersey	New York City	1,000,000	.....
International Air Power Company; plants in Massachusetts and Rhode Island	.....do	.....	6,400,000	600,000
International Cement Company; forming	.....do	.....	25,000,000	25,000,000
International Heater Company; 4 companies	New York	.....	900,000	900,000
International Paper Company; 25 news and printing paper manufacturers east of Chicago.	.....	.....	16,040,400	20,530,700
International Silver Company; 24 companies—75 per cent silver plate companies	New Jersey	.....	11,000,000	5,000,000
International Steam Pump Company; 5 biggest companies in United States	.....do	.....	12,500,000	15,000,000
Kansas City (Mo.) Gas Company	Missouri	Kansas City	5,000,000	.....
Kentucky Distilleries and Warehouse Company; 57 "bourbon" plants	New Jersey	.....	18,500,000	10,500,000
Kings County Electric Light and Power Company; all electric companies in Brooklyn except one.	.....	Brooklyn	1,968,000	.....
Knickerbocker Ice Company, Chicago; 28 companies, all in Chicago	.....	Chicago	4,000,000	3,000,000
Kodak Limited Company; consolidated English, French, German, and American companies.	.....	.....	£1,000,000	£600,000
Laclede Gas Light Company;[4] controls all in St. Louis since 1880	Missouri	St. Louis	$7,500,000	$2,500,000
Lake Carriers' Association; 3 lines; pool prices	.....	.....	[6] 10,000,000	.....
Lake Dredgers' Association; 123 owners of dredges on Great Lakes	Illinois	.....	$5,000,000	.....
Lake Superior Consolidated Iron Mines [6]	.....	New York City	28,450,000	.....
Lanyon Zinc Company	New Jersey	.....	1,000,000	$2,000,000
Lexington (Ky.) Railroad; 4 companies	.....	.....	800,000	.....
Linen Thread Company; selling agency 3 manufacturers	New Jersey	Paterson (?)	[5] 4,000,000	.....
Lumber Carriers' Association; vessels on Great Lakes	.....	Detroit	[6] 6,000,000	.....
Manhattan Spirit Company; wood alcohol	.....	.....	5,000,000	.....
Manufacturers' Paper Company of Chicago; selling agency for many mills	.....	.....	[5] 10,000,000	.....
Maple Flooring Manufacturers' Association; fixes prices	.....	.....	[5] 2,000,000	.....
Marsden Company of Philadelphia (cellulose trust)	.....	.....	30,600,000	1,500,000
Martin Kalbfleisch Chemical Company	..... York	New York City	1,450,000	.....
Maryland Brewing Company; 17 brewery companies of Baltimore	.....	Baltimore	3,250,000	3,250,000
Mass Consolidated Company; 5 copper properties in Michigan belt	.....	.....	2,500,000	.....
Metropolitan Street Railway Company [6]	.....	Kansas City	5,586,800	.....
Metropolitan Street Railway; most in New York city	.....	New York City	40,000,000	.....
Metropolitan Tobacco Company; selling combine	New York	.....do	500,000	500,000
Michigan Salt Association	.....	.....	[5] 4,000,000	.....
Milk Combine of Scranton, Pa.; entire supply	.....	Scranton	[5] 1,000,000	.....
Milwaukee and Chicago Breweries Company; English and American companies	.....	.....	£775,000	£775,000
Milwaukee Electric Railway and Light Company; all in city	.....	Milwaukee	$5,494,500	.....
Minneapolis General Electric; plants in city	New Jersey	Minneapolis	1,500,000	$500,000
Minnesota and Dakota Fire Underwriters; 53 companies [3]	.....	.....do	45,119,740	.....
Mississippi River Steamboat Pool; 3 companies pool	.....	.....	[6] 10,000,000	.....
Missouri Edison Electric Company [1]	Missouri	St. Louis	[5] 4,000,000	.....
National Abrasive Manufacturing Company; controls corundum and other abrasive materials.	.....	.....	1,000,000	.....
National Association of Axle Manufacturers	.....	Pittsburg	[15] 5,000,000	.....
National Biscuit Company (90 per cent of large bakeries in United States)	New Jersey	Chicago	29,000,000	23,000,000
National Carbon Company (all companies in United States and three-fourths in world).	.....do	Cleveland	5,500,000	4,500,000

Present name of trust.[2]	Where incorporated.	Location principal office.	Capitalization.[3] Common stock.	Preferred stock.
National Casket Company		New York City	[4]$10,000,000	
National Electric Car Lighting Company			2,000,000	
National Enameling and Stamping Company (consolidation of 4 principal companies in United States).	New Jersey		20,000,000	(?) $500,000 10,000,000
National Harrow Company (spring-tooth harrows)	New York		[7]2,000,000	
National Lead Company (28 white lead, etc., plants)	New Jersey	New York City	14,905,400	14,904,000
National Mirror Manufacturers' Association (40 companies; fix prices, etc.)			[5]5,000,000	
National Rice Milling Company	New Jersey	New Orleans	1,867,000	1,320,000
National Salt Company of New Jersey (forming to control salt interests in the East).		New York City	[5]5,000,000	
National Saw Company (controlled by Diston)	Kentucky	do	[2]2,000,000	600,000
National Shear Company	New Jersey	Newark	1,500,000	1,500,000
National Starch Manufacturing Company (20 plants; price agreement with other companies in 1898)	Kentucky	New York City	3,233,000	4,066,200
National Tin Plate and Stamped Ware Company (opposition to National Enameling Company).	New Jersey		10,000,000	10,000,000
National Steel Company; expects to control 20 plants	New Jersey		32,000,000	27,000,000
National Tube Company; forming with 17 companies	do	Pittsburg	30,000,000	30,000,000
National Wall Paper Company; 28 companies in 1892, absorbing 2 or more in 1899; forming.		New York City	27,931,500	7,500,000
New Amsterdam Gas Company; consolidates 3 companies in New York City		do	12,000,000	9,000,000
New England Gas and Coke Company of Boston; all in Boston except Bay State.[6]	Massachusetts	Boston	14,000,000	
New England Dairy Company; milk companies	New Jersey		600,000	250,000
New England Telephone and Telegraph Company		Boston	11,986,400	
New England Insurance Exchange; 84 fire-insurance companies[8]		do	58,537,167	
New Orleans Water Works Company[6]		New Orleans	2,000,000	
New York and New Jersey Telephone		Brooklyn (?)	4,662,400	
New York Arch, Terra-Cotta Company; allied with other companies	New York	New York City	[4]2,000,000	
New York Gas, Electric Light, Heat and Power Company of New York City	do	do	36,000,000	
New York Suburban Gas Company (5 companies in Westchester County)	do		1,500,000	
Nicholson File Company; 5 plants—70 per cent product		Providence	[6]2,000,000	
North American (owns street railways and electric companies)	New Jersey	New York	39,733,600	
North Carolina Pine Timber Association; fixes prices			[5]20,000,000	
North Jersey Street Railway Company; consolidated trolleys and 2 ferries	New Jersey		5,000,000	
North River Light, Heat and Power Company	do	Hoboken	300,000	
North Shore Traction Company; controls railways around Boston	do	Boston	4,000,000	2,500,000
Oilcloth Pool (table, enamel, etc.)			[5]1,500,000	
Oil Well Supply Company	Pennsylvania	Pittsburg	1,000,000	
Omaha Street Railway Company[6]		Omaha	5,000,000	
Otis (Passenger) Elevator Company; 13 companies—85 per cent of product	New Jersey		6,000,000	4,000,000
Pacific American Fisheries Company	do	Chicago	5,000,000	
Pacific States Telephone Company; 4 telegraph and telephone systems of Pacific coast.			[5]10,000,000	
Paducah (Ky.) Railway and Electric Light Company; all railway and electric-light plants of Paducah.			200,000	
Paterson and Passaic Gas and Electric Company; consolidation of 4 companies	New Jersey		5,000,000	
Pennsylvania Central Brewing Company; 12 breweries in Wyoming Valley	Pennsylvania		2,800,000	2,800,000
Pennsylvania Manufacturing Light and Power; all electric companies of Philadelphia.[6]	New Jersey	Philadelphia	15,000,000	
People's Gas Light and Coke Company of Buffalo; consolidated		Buffalo	4,975,000	3,025,000
People's Gas Light and Coke Company of Chicago; took in new Chicago companies in 1898.[9]	Illinois	Chicago	28,750,000	
People's Light and Power Company; 14 companies in New Jersey		Newark	20,000,000	
Petersburg, (Virginia), Railway and Electric; consolidation of all companies		Petersburg	500,000	
Photographic Paper; 24 companies, manufacturers of sensitized paper			2,000,000	
Pillsbury-Washburn Flour Mills Company (Limited)	Minnesota	Minneapolis	£500,000	£500,000
Pittsburg Brewing Company			$6,500,000	$6,500,000
Pittsburg Plate Glass Company		Pittsburg	9,850,000	150,000
Postal Telegraph Cable Company		New York City	15,000,000	
Pressed Steel Car Company; consolidates Fox and Schoen companies and has a monopoly.	New Jersey	Pittsburg (?)	12,500,000	12,500,000
Print Cloth Pool; 30 mills; restrict production and fix prices			50,000,000	
Pueblo Traction and Electric Company; owns 3 electric light companies of city	California	Pueblo	500,000	
Reading Company (Anthracite Coal Trust)			[5]150,000,000	
Refrigerator Trust; 36 firms; 80 per cent of trade			[6]8,000,000	
River Coal Operators' Company; Pittsburg to New Orleans			[7]11,000,000	
Royal Baking Powder Company; consolidation of all companies	New Jersey	New York	10,000,000	10,000,000
Rubber Goods Manufacturers' Company; consolidation of mechanical goods companies.	do	New York city	25,000,000	25,000,000
Saginaw Valley Traction Company; consolidation of 4 companies		Saginaw	700,000	400,000
San Francisco Breweries, Limited (agreement with other breweries)		San Francisco	[6]20,000,000	
Santy-Kalsomine Company (Plaster Trust)	Michigan	Grand Rapids	[5]3,000,000	
Sash and Door Combine; 26 companies; fix prices		Chicago (?)	[5]15,000,000	
Shelby Tube Company; weldless tubes		Shelby, Ohio	5,000,000	
Shot and Lead Manufacturers' Association; fixes prices			[5]2,000,000	
Shovel Makers of United States and Canada; international agreement			[6]6,000,000	
Southeastern Tariff Association; 67 fire insurance companies[8]		New Orleans (?)	$41,424,318	
Sperry Flour Company; California	California		10,000,000	
Spirits Distributing Company; selling agency for American Spirits and Southern Distributing companies.	New Jersey		3,675,000	3,676,000
Springfield Coal Association; 10 companies	Illinois	Springfield	[5]4,000,000	
Standard Distillingland Distributing Company; whisky	New Jersey	New York City	16,000,000	8,000,000
Standard Oil; controls petroleum refineries, etc., in United States		do	97,250,000	
Standard Rope and Twine Company; sells through Union Selling Company	New Jersey	do	12,000,000	
Standard Sardine Company			5,000,000	
Standard Telephone Company; bought Central Missouri Company in 1898	Missouri (?)	Kansas City	[5]10,000,000	
Steel Beams Association; fixes prices		Pittsburg	[5]20,000,000	
Steel Rail Manufacturers' Association; all big companies agree			50,000,000	
Steel Steamers; forming with all manufacturers on Great Lakes			[5]15,000,000	15,000,000
Steel Tired Car Wheel Company; 6 or 7 car-wheel companies		Trenton	2,000,000	
Swift and Company (beef)	Illinois	Chicago	20,000,000	
Syracuse Rapid Transit Railway Company; all in Syracuse		Syracuse	2,750,000	1,250,000
Temple Iron Company; consolidated 7 anthracite coal companies in Pennsylvania.				
Tennessee Coal, Iron and Railroad Company; plants in Tennessee and Alabama		Birmingham	20,000,000	1,000,000
Theatrical Trust; 50 big ones work together			[5]30,000,000	
Tidewater Oil Company; consolidation of 4 companies	New Jersey	New York City	5,000,000	
Torrington Needle Company			1,500,000	1,500,000
Trenton Gas and Electric Company; 4 companies		Trenton	[5]2,000,000	
Tubular Dispatch Company; consolidated 2 companies			2,100,000	
Twin City Rapid Transit; all street railways in Minneapolis and St. Paul[6]	New Jersey	Minneapolis	15,000,000	2,462,200
Umbrella Hardware Company	do		2,000,000	
Underwriters' Association of State of New York; 72 companies		Syracuse	56,428,711	
Union Bag and Paper Company	New Jersey		16,000,000	11,000,000
Union Carbide Company (acetylene consolidated)	Virginia		6,000,000	
Union Light and Power Company; 4 companies of Salt Lake and Ogden, Utah.	Utah		4,250,000	300,000

Present name of trust.[2]	Where incorporated.	Location principal office.	Capitalization.[3]	
			Common stock.	Preferred stock.
Union Switch and Signal Company; consolidated with National Switch and Signal Company.	.....	.....	$997,950	$397,000
Union Tobacco Company; absorbed Durham Company	New York	New York City	12,000,000	7,350,000
Union Traction Company; all trolleys in Philadelphia[6]	Pennsylvania	Philadelphia	30,000,000	.....
Union Typewriter; 5 leading companies	New Jersey	New York City	10,000,000	8,015,000
United Breweries Company; 13 breweries, Chicago	....do	Chicago	5,463,000	.....
United Electric Company of New Jersey; to unite all companies in North, New Jersey.	....do	.....	20,000,000	.....
United Gas Improvement Company	Pennsylvania	Philadelphia	15,000,000	.....
United Ice Cream Company; 4 companies in Chicago	Illinois	Chicago	300,000	.....
United Lighting and Heating Company; 8 companies; oil lighting interests of United States.	New Jersey	.....	6,000,000	6,000,000
United Paper Company (tissue)	....do	Paterson	1,500,000	1,500,000
United Railways and Electric Companies of Baltimore; all in city	Maryland	Baltimore	24,000,000	14,000,000
United Shoe Machinery Company	New Jersey	.....	8,625,000	8,625,000
United Traction Company; controls all electric roads in Reading, Pa	.....	Reading	1,400,000	.....
United Traction and Electric Company; all roads in and near Providence[4]	New Jersey	Providence	8,000,000	.....
United States Cast Iron Pipe and Foundry; 13 companies, practically all in South and West.	.....	.....	12,000,000	12,000,000
United States Dyewood and Extract Company; to unite all in United States	New Jersey	.....	4,000,000	6,000,000
United States Elves Trough and Conductor Pipe Association	.....	Pittsburg	[5] 2,000,000	.....
United States Envelope Company; 10 companies; 90 per cent product in United States.	Maine	.....	750,000	3,750,000
United States Express; not incorporated	New York	New York City	10,000,000	.....
United States Furniture Company (school; enlarging and reforming in 1899)	.....	Chicago	[5] 10,000,000	.....
United States Glass Company; flint glass	Pennsylvania	Pittsburg	3,458,100	600,000
United States Leather Company	New Jersey	New York City	62,854,600	62,254,600
United States Oil Company	.....	Boston (?)	1,250,000	.....
United States Playing Card Company; allied with 3 other companies	.....	Cincinnati	3,000,000	.....
United States Rubber; controls boot and shoe output of United States	New Jersey	New York City	23,666,000	23,525,500
United States Varnish Company; organizing with all in United States	....do	.....	18,000,000	18,000,000
Vermont Marble Company[6]	New York	New York City	3,000,000	.....
Virginia-Carolina Chemical Company; 27 fertilizer factories	.....	.....	4,363,900	5,085,000
Virginia Electric Company of Norfolk; consolidated all companies in city	Virginia	Norfolk	450,000	.....
Virginia Iron, Coal, and Coke Company; properties in Virginia	.....	.....	7,500,000	.....
Welsbach Commercial Company; owns Welsbach light; 3 companies	Colorado	Philadelphia (?)	3,500,000	3,500,000
Wells-Fargo Express	.....	.....	8,000,000	.....
Western Elevator Association; 40 leading in Buffalo	.....	Buffalo	[5] 15,000,000	.....
Western Factory Insurance Association; 23 companies[3]	.....	Chicago (?)	23,802,500	.....
Western Live Stock and Land Company	Colorado	New York City	408,000	.....
Western Strawboard Company; plants not in American Company	.....	.....	2,500,000	2,500,000
Western Union Fire Insurance Association; 59 companies in Western and Southern States.[8]	.....	Chicago	47,902,398	.....
Western Union Telegraph; consolidated other companies in 1881, 1887, and 1894.	New York	New York City	97,370,000	.....
Westinghouse Air-Brake Company; bought American and Boyden companies in 1898.	Pennsylvania	.....	10,950,000	.....
Westinghouse Electric and Manufacturing Company; pools with General Electric and owns United States Electric Locomotive Company and Walker companies.	....do	Pittsburg	8,987,950	.....
Wholesale Druggists' National Association; 25 firms.[9]	.....	Philadelphia	[5] 25,000,000	.....
Wholesale Grocers of New England.[10]	.....	Boston	[5] 75,000,000	.....
Window Shade Manufacturers' Association; nearly all in country	.....	.....	[5] 2,000,000	.....
Wire Cloth Manufacturers' Association of America; 12 firms agree on prices	.....	.....	[5] 5,000,500	.....
Writing Paper Trust; forming with 35 mills in Connecticut Valley	.....	.....	[5] 40,000,000	.....
Yarn (cotton hosiery) Manufacturers; fix prices	.....	Philadelphia	[5] 3,000,000	.....
Yellow Pine Company[6]	New Jersey	New York City	2,500,000	.....
Totals	.....	.....	4,247,918,981	870,575,200

[2] A few of the trusts included in this list are not at this particular time in full force. In most such cases new agreements are pending, and it is unlikely that, having realized the benefits of combination, capital in these industries will long continue to compete with itself. Some trusts, like the Michigan Salt Association, are renewed every five years, or at other regular or irregular periods. The Paris Green Combine is likely to make its appearance during, or previous to, the potato-bug season.

[3] When a trust is incorporated the amount of capital reported as issued is usually taken, though it is often far above or below the actual capital employed. When not incorporated, the capital employed in the allied concerns is estimated.

[4] Unincorporated trusts pay no dividends, though they often make profits to the constituent companies. Sometimes the rate of dividends on preferred stock is averaged for two or more kinds of such stock. In bonded indebtedness several kinds of bonds are often grouped together.

[5] Estimated.

[6] Only typical trusts are taken in these industries. Such trusts are duplicated in many other cities or sections of the country.

[7] This association maintains prices of proprietary medicines by refusing to handle goods sold to wholesalers who cut prices. Similar local associations cover all sections of the United States and regulate prices of most leading articles. Jobbers and retailers have similar combinations in States, counties, and cities.

[8] Wholesale grocers' associations exist in all parts of the country. By means of rebates, etc., they assist the manufacturers of sugar, starch, baking powder, and of hundreds of other leading articles in maintaining uniform prices.

ADDITIONS TO TRUSTS AND COMBINATIONS.

The following are some of the industrial trusts formed and projected since about the middle of March to May 27:

Present name of trust.	Where incorporated.	Location principal office.	Capitalization.	
			Common stock.	Preferred stock.
Amalgamated Copper Company; to acquire copper properties	New Jersey	.....	$75,000,000	.....
American Agricultural Chemical Company; 23 fertilizer plants	Connecticut	.....	17,000,000	$17,000,000
American Bicycle Company; 100 plants—85 per cent in country	New Jersey	.....	45,000,000	35,000,000
American Chicle Co.; forming with 6 chewing-gum plants	....do	.....	6,000,000	3,000,000
American Gas and Electric Lighting Fixture Company; forming with 14 plants	....do	.....	9,000,000	6,000,000
American Hide and Leather Company; 30 companies—85 per cent upper leather output.	....do	.....	40,000,000	30,000,000
American Plow Company; forming—17 agricultural implement manufacturers, Chicago.	.....	Chicago	[5] 65,000,000	.....
American Plumbing Supply and Lead Company; 45 companies	.....	.....	25,000,000	10,000,000
American Railways Company; to control electric railway companies in United States.	New Jersey	.....	25,000,000	.....
American Railway Equipment Company; forming—18 freight-car equipment companies.	....do	Chicago	9,730,000	7,730,000
American School Furniture Company; school and church furniture	....do	.....	10,000,000	.....
American Shipbuilding Company; shipbuilding, etc., on Great Lakes	....do	.....	10,000,000	10,000,000
American Smelting and Refining Company; controls many big companies[1]	New Jersey	.....	27,400,000	27,400,000
American Steel Hoop Company; 10 hoop, tie, and band companies	....do	.....	19,000,000	14,000,000
American Stoneware Company; forming—25 potteries companies east of Mississippi River.	Delaware	Akron	2,500,000	.....
American Window Glass Company; forming to control 80 or 90 per cent of all	.....	.....	30,000,000	.....

Present name of trust.	Where incorporated.	Location principal office.	Capitalization.	
			Common stock.	Preferred stock.
American Writing Paper Company; forming with 21 mills in Massachusetts[2]	.....	Holyoke	$12,500,000	$12,500,000
Automobile Machine and Screw Company; forming—9 screw manufacturers in United States.	.....	.....	6,000,000	4,000,000
Boston Breweries Company; forming—6-10 breweries	New Jersey	Boston	3,250,000	6,500,000
Carnegie Steel Company; forming—includes 15 Carnegie & Frick iron, steel and coke companies.[3]	....do	Pittsburg	125,000,000	125,000,000
Central Hudson Steamboat Company; 9 Hudson River boats[4]	....do	.....	1,000,000	.....
Consolidated Street Car Company; 5 of largest manufacturers	....do	.....	10,000,000	8,000,000
Chamber Furniture Manufacturers' Association; 50 manufacturers of sideboards, etc.; fixes prices.	.....	.....	[1]10,000,000	.....
Chicago Laundry Combine; forming with 75 steam laundries	.....	Chicago	[1]4,000,000	.....
Chicago Sash, Door, and Blind Company; 35 Chicago companies	New Jersey	.....	3,500,000	2,500,000
Columbian Car Lighting and Brake Company; 3 companies	....do	.....	10,000,000	.....
Consolidated Ice Company; all artificial companies in Pittsburg	.....	.....	2,000,000	2,000,000
Continental Cotton Oil Company; 7 Southern companies	New Jersey	.....	3,000,000	3,000,000
Continental Packing Company; with Standard Company; controls sardine output.	....do	.....	3,000,000	.....
Cotton Yarn Combination; forming—7 mills in Massachusetts	.....	.....	8,460,000	.....
Encaustic Tile Company; to control all companies	.....	.....	4,000,000	3,000,000
Federal Sewer Pipe Company	Delaware	.....	10,750,000	10,750,000
Hot Air Furnace Manufacturers' Association; fixes prices	.....	Pittsburg	[1]5,000,000	.....
International Automobile and Vehicle Tire Company; 3 rubber-tire companies.	New Jersey	.....	1,500,000	1,500,000
Ledger Paper Combination; forming with 4 Massachusetts companies	.....	.....	[1]1,000,000	.....
Macbeth-Evans Glass Company; forming—5 chimney concerns, all in the United States.	.....	.....	2,000,000	.....
Manufactured Rubber Company; to control output	New Jersey	.....	5,000,000	1,000,000
National Association of Wagon Manufacturers; fixes prices	.....	.....	[1]40,000,000	.....
National Car Equipment Company; forming in California	California	.....	10,000,000	.....
National Carpet Company; forming—nearly all mills in United States	.....	.....	[1]50,000,000	.....
National Dining Table Association; 39 firms; fixes prices	.....	Chicago	[1]2,000,000	.....
National Glass Company; 17 flint bottle, etc., companies	.....	.....	4,000,000	8,000,000
National Screw Company; forming—includes American and 13 other companies.	.....	.....	10,000,000	.....
National Strawboard Company; forming; will act with American Company	New Jersey	.....	2,000,000	2,000,000
Pacific Coast Biscuit Company; forming with 7 big companies[5]	....do	.....	2,500,000	1,500,000
Patent Leather Combination; forming; 95 per cent of United States product	.....	Newark	[1]23,000,000	.....
Pittsburg Laundry Company	.....	.....	1,750,000	1,750,000
Puget Sound Packers' Association; 8 big salmon packers; fixes prices	.....	Seattle	[1]1,000,000	.....
Republic Iron and Steel Company; all bar and forge iron companies, etc	New Jersey	Chicago	30,000,000	25,000,000
Soapmakers' Combination; most of big Western companies	.....	.....	[1]25,000,000	[1]25,000,000
Southern New England Brick Manufacturers; trust forming	.....	.....	[1]5,000,000	.....
Springfield (Mass.) Breweries Company; 4 breweries[7]	.....	.....	1,150,000	1,150,000
Standard Metal Company; forming—10 companies, car-journal bearings, etc	.....	.....	4,000,000	1,800,000
Standard Chain Company; forming—95 per cent machine-made chains	.....	.....	3,250,000	3,250,000
Union Steel and Chain Company; forming	Delaware	.....	30,000,000	30,000,000
United Fruit Company; 10 big companies; tropical fruits	New Jersey	.....	20,000,000	.....
United Power and Transportation Company; to control street railways in Pennsylvania.	....do	.....	12,500,000	.....
United States Dry Paint Company; forming—mineral paints	New Jersey	.....	[1]3,000,000	[1]4,500,000
United States Flour Milling Company; forming—19 mills ††	.....	.....	3,500,000	5,000,000
United States Glue Company; forming to control glue product	New Jersey	.....	15,000,000	10,000,000
United States Worsted Yarn Company; forming to unite 19 largest mills	....do	.....	20,000,000	16,000,000
United Zinc and Lead Company; to unite mills in Missouri and Kansas	....do	.....	5,000,000	1,000,000
Western Drug Jobbers; forming—Western combination	.....	.....	[1]15,000,000	[1]15,000,000
Total	.....	.....	962,740,000	490,830,000

[1] Estimated. [2] $2,133,000 bonds. [3] $17,000,000 bonds. [4] $100,000,000 5 per cent bonds. [5] $500,000 bonds. [6] $1,500,000 6 per cent bonds. [7] $1,150,000 bonds. [8] $7,500,000 6 per cent bonds.

In the above list only the capital stock and bonds actually issued or proposed to be issued at once are given, when known. Some of the trusts in this list include trusts in the main list. Thus the United Fruit Company includes the Boston Fruit Company; the United States Flour Milling Company includes the Hecker-Jones-Jewell Milling Company, etc. Some of the trusts are under different names, since being formally organized. Thus the Chicago Sash, Door, and Blind Company probably includes but little more than the Sash and Door Combination; the American Shipbuilding Company is the incorporated name of the Steel Steamers Combination. Some of the trusts marked "forming" are so far advanced that retraction is hardly possible. Others have simply secured options on plants and are attempting to float the bonds and stocks.

Trusts.

SPEECH

OF

HON. TOWNSEND SCUDDER,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, June 1, 1900.

On the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 138) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. SCUDDER said:

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not probable that the people of this country will be misled by the crafty tactics of the majority into believing that an honest, sincere attempt to restrict trusts was the actuating motive of the Republican leaders on the floor of this House when they conceived and brought forth this proposed constitutional amendment "to define, regulate, control, prohibit, or dissolve trusts, monopolies, or combinations." It has been ably pointed out by my Democratic colleagues how apparent is the trickery behind this political maneuver of our opponents.

The Republicans have been in power four years without taking any steps to regulate and curtail the greed of unlawful combinations and trusts. Now, just six days before the end of this Congressional session, when time is lacking for deliberate and intelligent consideration and action, this important legislation is sprung upon the Congress and the people.

It will require a two-thirds vote to pass the amendment. This number you know you can not muster in your own ranks, gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber; your majority is not sufficiently large, notwithstanding your successful efforts to increase it by unseating Democratic members; and while you were engaged in that unholy business I have no doubt you would have gone further and unseated more and sufficient had you entertained serious intention to enact this legislation.

Your lack of the requisite vote in your own party you think will make it possible to charge the defeat of this anti-trust bill to the Democratic party if it does not vote with you on the proposition as submitted by you without the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t," and with no opportunity afforded to improve the bill by amendment.

For one, I believe your scheme will miscarry. The people are vigilant; they have not forgotten that the trust evil was occupying their attention during the life of the Fifty-fourth and Fifty-fifth Congresses, and that during the sessions of those Congresses you had larger majorities than you have now. Drawing, then, from your own ranks alone you could have come much nearer mustering the necessary two-thirds vote than you can now, and yet you took no steps to suppress the evils of trusts, though the chances of success were good and all the credit was within your grasp. The credit you would have enjoyed, but it came too high. You knew it would cost you a shrinkage in the contents of your strong boxes and cut down your campaign contributions.

On this side of the Chamber the most serious objection to the passage of this amendment lies in the fear of our Southern brothers that its adoption into the organic law will deprive the States of certain rights. In the light of history this objection is entitled to respect, and can not be construed as springing from any desire to favor or foster trusts on the part of these Southern

friends. On the other hand, my friends of the majority are well aware that their amendment can not be passed by the requisite two-thirds vote except these Democrats, who feel they can not vote for it, brush aside their scruples or prejudices, as you may be pleased to call them, and give to it their support.

No injustice is done, Mr. Speaker, by the statement that if the Republicans had a two-thirds majority in the House to pass such an amendment to the Constitution, they would not propose it. They are now moving to do what they know they can not do, and what they would not move to do if they could do.

It is your purpose and hope, gentlemen, to point to a solid Republican vote in favor of an impossible proposition and to Democratic opposition, in the hope that a large proportion of unthinking citizens will conclude that one party opposed the trusts and the other party befriended them. Children do that sort of thing, but in their case their innocence and youth is the excuse that they do it sincerely, impulsively, and unintelligently. When grown-up men do the same thing insincerely, deliberately, and with a clear realization of its emptiness, the action may be called politics, but it is better entitled to be named humbug.

The worst of it is that the trusts are an economic issue of very grave importance. The public welfare demands an enlightened and just solution of the problems their existence presents. We are groping for the solution, trying to devise restraints that shall protect the people against the extortions of criminal monopolies, yet not interfere with the salutary activities of corporations that benefit the consumer by lowering the cost of production and the selling price of their products.

We have not yet hit upon the just way. Twenty-seven States have passed laws of great severity that if enforced would destroy the good and the bad trusts alike. The executive power hesitates to enforce laws that would work such business havoc. In their sober second thought the people, represented in their legislative bodies, or in the Congress, will enact juster and more discriminating laws. But this dishonest and hypocritical use of the trust issue for partisan profit puts off the day of sober thought.

Trusts are the result of the tendency in business to combine resources for the purpose of increasing power and of decreasing the friction and cost of avoidable competition. The application to the field of mechanics of the same faculties of the mind from which trusts have come in business resulted in the substitution of machinery for hand labor, by which substitution types are set, fields plowed, grass and grain mowed, shoes made, fabrics woven, and the like, in the manner in which they are now done.

The advent of machinery was resisted by the men and women in hand industry just as the advent of combination in business has been resisted by the representatives of small establishments. The incoming of machinery displaced many hand artisans, but infinitely multiplied employments in which they found work. The course of combination in business has driven out of business many small dealers, but has also had the tendency in many instances to multiply and cheapen products, diversify occupation, and magnify employment.

I make this assertion advisedly and on account of the many sides this great subject presents. I deplore the headlong speed and irrational impulse which forces its inadequate and unintelligent consideration at this time and in this manner.

I am not a believer in the theory that through legislation the progress of commercial combination can be stopped any more than I believe that legislation can check the progress of mechanical invention, but legislation can and should throw conditions and safeguards of publicity, equity, and humanity around these combinations.

But, Mr. Speaker, this is a work in which there should be no partisanship and in which none should be attempted. This proposed amendment is a mere political pretext: it was not meant to be adopted; it was proposed on the eve of the approaching campaign as a trick—and a cheap one at that—that appearance of fighting the trusts might be to the credit of the Republican party and cause it to escape the storm of popular indignation that threatens to smite it in the coming elections. Gentlemen of the majority, the people of this country are not backward; they know as well as you know whence you draw your sinews of war, and they know that willingly you would do nothing to cut off your base of supplies.

You may be fortunate in your professed antitrust attitude on account of the willingness of many Democrats to destroy the effect of their advocacy of stringent antitrust legislation by voting against this proposed amendment because it does not satisfy them, but I honor them for standing by their convictions notwithstanding that it may be good politics to vote for the amendment, and thereby avoid being placed in the position of opposing a proposition to do something to restrict and cure the abuses of trusts.

I regret that they are forced to lose the opportunity this situation affords them to vote with practical unanimity for this amendment and thus avoid playing, as I fear they are, into the hands of our crafty opponents. It is clear the Republicans will claim in the approaching campaign that they tried to do something against the trust evils and that the Democrats were obstructionists and defeated the only adequate remedy for the evil. With the unthoughtful our charges of Republican insincerity will not avail us as they should. It is unfortunate that our party must be placed in a position where explanations are necessary. It is doubly so at this time, with the outlook for its success so bright, but in this particular case much comfort can be had in the knowledge that this party sacrifice springs from honest conviction and a willingness to suffer for principle and sense of right.

I do not agree with my colleagues, that this amendment is dangerous to the States, I see no good reason why trusts should not be controlled by the Federal Government. Centralization so far as trusts are concerned I believe will be an improvement and benefit the country by bringing them more under the control of the people than ever before.

May not the natural desire of some States to lighten the burdens of direct taxation of their inhabitants prove an effective barrier to concerted, harmonious legislation by the States having for object an equitable control and supervision of trusts? They afford a tempting means of collecting revenue which it may not be easy to resist. That it may be known how rich a field in that direction liberal corporation laws afford—perhaps I could characterize them better by the use of the words loose corporation laws afford—and therefore how great is the temptation to enact laws which will be attractive to those interested in the organization of trusts, I point to the record of the State of New Jersey, which has found a gigantic profit in trusts.

This year that State's income from this source will be increased over last year by $652,848, and the total amount it will collect on the stock of its capitalized trusts will amount to $1,554,126.

Why, the fees and charges alone collected for recording and issuing certificates for the incorporation of these combines the past year have been sufficient in amount to defray the entire yearly expense of maintaining the public schools of the whole State of New Jersey.

Have we not reason to fear that if the control of trusts is left to the legislatures of the several States, some other States may be induced to enter into competition with the State of New Jersey with a view of breaking up its monopoly in the trust-creation business and sharing the profits with it?

But if there be no just cause for fear in this direction, is it not possible, even probable, that these several legislatures of the several States will fail to enact harmonious laws and the lack of harmony in their laws will afford loopholes through which the trusts will effect their escape? For one I do not feel the country has any cause to be proud of the treatment this great subject is receiving at the hands of its Congress; but I have confidence that this great American Congress, if the power be vested in it that is carried by this amendment under discussion, will rise to its great opportunity and high responsibility, and for one I am willing to intrust it with the duty of solving this national problem.

Should Congress fail the people, the people will know how to reach Congress and care for the delinquents; therefore I will vote in favor of the constitutional amendment giving to Congress the power to define, regulate, control, prohibit, or dissolve trusts, monopolies, or combinations. [Applause.]

Trusts.

SPEECH

OF

HON. MITCHELL MAY,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, June 2, 1900.

The House having under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 138) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States—

Mr. MAY said:

Mr. SPEAKER: It was indeed a surprise to me when a few days ago I learned that it was the intention of the Republican party to offer a bill and a constitutional amendment to the members of Congress to be voted upon, and which bill and constitutional amendment it was contended and advertised would result in the cure of the baneful trusts which rest so heavily upon the people of our country. It seemed a radical innovation on the part of that party which has been recognized and known throughout this country as being the patron and supporter of these gigantic institutions which have developed into such an abnormal size during the past few years, but more especially since the enactment of that much-heralded panacea for the tariff ills, the Dingley bill. It seemed more surprising to us on this side of the House in view

of the fact that the platform adopted by that convention which nominated the present incumbent of the Executive chair as its candidate failed to insert therein any means whereby, at least, those evils which have developed so enormously could be curtailed in their workings and in their actions. It seemed surprising in the light of the fact that in the two planks adopted by the Republican party in 1888 and 1892 there was set forth clearly, emphatically, and unequivocally the opposition the Republican party claimed to have against the trusts, and the proposition on their part to use their best endeavors in the limitation of the workings of these organizations.

There seemed though, during the course of the campaign of 1896, a reasonable explanation why such a plank had been omitted in their platform; and on further thought and deeper study that explanation not only seemed warranted but justified, in view of the actions and the conduct of the Republican party since their success at the polls in that year. It was rumored about, and has since been ascertained to be the truth beyond peradventure of a doubt, that the great campaign fund used by the Republican party, the like of which has never before been known, reached its abnormal size by reason of the paternal interests, as it were, that these large instruments of torture had in that party. We have been waiting patiently while the trusts have been thriving, not slowly, but quickly and effectively, until to-day they are a full-developed evil, an evil whose ill effects reach almost every homestead of the poor, and which lays a heavy hand upon the independence and the spirit of the workingman. But we have waited in vain, and as we look at the kind of legislation the Republican party offers us we find that the expected, the hoped-for and promised legislation has not come. We were promised a substantial present; we find on closer acquaintance that the large, substantial present was a load of pig iron.

There can be no doubt in the mind of any reasonable man that the sole object and purpose of the Republican party in offering for the consideration of Congress measures labeled anti-trust legislation were to overcome, if that were possible, the record of the present Administration in dealing gently and kindly with these octopuses. Their object was to eliminate that question from the present campaign, because they knew that the attitude and the conduct of the present Administration could not bear the light of day, nor the investigation of a much-tried, patient, and intelligent people. The Republicans waited and waited until the last day of the session, when suddenly, with all the magnanimity for which they are known, and which is so characteristic of their every action, they offer us this something in the nature of a contemplated amendment to the Constitution. When they were anxious to pass a measure, as, for instance, the Porto Rican tariff bill, they waited not until the curtains were about to be drawn upon the Congress, but in due season and in good time they enacted that legislation so it might go out to the world. It is not my intention now to criticise that act; suffice it to say that it was a violation of trust, of confidence, and of a promise. The same attitude that the Republican party takes in this measure they took regarding the reduction of the obnoxious war taxes. There was no man within the length and breadth of our great country who raised his voice or used his efforts or objected to the enactment of that legislation which was necessary for us in order to support and uphold the dignity, the honor, and the soldiery of our country.

But that time has long since passed. There is no occasion, there is no emergency which requires that this baneful tax should be kept upon the people of the country. What do we get? What we expect. At the last moment almost the Republican party with all kindness and generosity offers a resolution granting permission to the Ways and Means Committee to meet during the coming summer, in order to enact legislation tending to the reduction of these war taxes. It requires neither the brain of a genius nor the eye of an eagle to understand and to see that the only idea that the Republican party had in view in the submission of such an apparent compromise resolution was to eliminate also that subject from the present campaign. They must have deluded themselves into the belief that the American people are composed of ignoramuses or fools, and their attitude now in adopting the same course of procedure as regards trust legislation seems to indicate that there is a firm impression in their minds that the people are, if anything, worse than fools.

I have always believed, and there is nothing now that can make me doubt, that the American people have their eyes open to the things which so vitally, materially, and closely interest and affect them. I believe that they are wide awake to the situation as it exists at present, and that they know the difficulties they are laboring under, the difficulties which surround and apparently surmount them, and which if continued in the same line of progress as during the past few years will ultimately result in their becoming vassals and serfs. There was a period in the history of Rome when the people were divided into what were designated as patricians and plebeians. It was that system which ultimately brought to ruin the great Roman empire, the history of which in many ways has taught us lessons and showed us a course whereby those pitfalls and snares which threaten destruction might be avoided, and those obstructions in the channel of progress might be escaped. Are we coming to that now in this great country, whose greatest pride is that all men are created equal, that before the law every man has equal rights and privileges, that under the Constitution no man can be deprived of his life, liberty, or property without due process of law?

Have we arrived at that period when we are going to overrule, override, and overcome all those things which the fathers have taught us, the principles which have aided in making us the greatest Republic in the world, and become a nation of classes, a nation where royalty and peasantry exist side by side, but where the line of demarkation is so strong that even he who runs can see it? Have we concluded that a government of, for, and by the people is a failure? This measure shows to what extent, to what means, a party caught in the snares will resort to. That the Republicans have the temerity to proffer the most scandalous kind of legislation will occasion no astonishment; but that they, at this time, should attempt to impose upon the credulity of the American people by offering them a gold brick as a universal cure for all ills of a Republican government is proof of the saying that "Necessity is the mother of invention." While the Republican party fooled the people in 1896, I believe they have in the last four years learned a lesson which has opened their eyes. They are willing to receive their medicine from the hands of reliable, trusted physicians, but they all know that the remedy which is advertised to cure the corns and bunions of the body politic, even though it should succeed in that direction, would scarcely be of value in reaching an ailment so deep seated that it affects the very heart. But such trifles seem not to affect them.

They have offered to our people a cure, and they have labeled it "Antitrust," with directions to use liberally and at all hours of the day. They have proclaimed aloud that it could be taken either by the teaspoonful or by the gallon, and that no harm could possibly follow, but a cure was bound to be effected. They offered us a bottle, however, that was tightly corked, with strict instructions not to open and examine until the same had been accepted and paid for, as premature investigation might result in a serious explosion, making the contents valueless. They further insisted that the label be not removed, as the light of intelligence or the rays of investigation would materially alter its composition and it would be seen to have changed its color and its general appearance; and, therefore, in order to prevent damage arising to the great American people, they maintained their secrecy, and at the moment of dissolution of Congress they spring this proposition upon an unsuspecting people, hoping that an opportunity would not be afforded to make a careful analysis of the subject.

The suddenness, while bewildering because unsuspected, caused little astonishment in comparison with the confusion created by the statements of the Republican party, even though late, to do something affirmative to relieve the people from the weight, the burden, and the oppression of the trusts. Yet they labeled their compound "Antitrust." They inscribed directions on it; they proclaimed the benefits to be derived from its use; but oh, my friends, contrary to their expectations, their hopes, perhaps their very prayers, the Democratic party was not to be stifled into submission, was not to be overwhelmed by cajolery nor deceived by mere idle words or idle sentiments. They placed this "Antitrust" panacea under the microscope of experience; they analyzed it in the light of the past; they submitted it to pressure, and lo! behold, their conclusion left no doubt that what was first expected was found to be true: It was a "fake." This decoction, wrapped up so carefully, advertised so extensively, and which, it was promised, would meet the trying conditions which now confront us, was neither more nor less than sugared water.

Let any intelligent man sip this magnetic, this marvelous antitrust cure, and it will require not more than one dose to convince him that while sweet to the taste it is sour to the stomach.

The proposition that it requires a constitutional amendment to successfully combat the evils of the trust is without foundation. While it may be true with an amendment properly drawn to meet the present emergency much might be accomplished by reason of the greater power and latitude given to Congress, we who have given the question thought and attention have arrived at the conclusion, of which there can be little doubt, that there exists at present sufficient law to permit us to overwhelm the forces of these great combinations. While it is true that the Democratic party would lend itself to the enactment of any legislation which would accomplish the defeat of the trusts, thereby affording opportunity for individual work and individual independence, nevertheless it would be a stultification of itself were it now, if only by a negative act, to consent to the proposition set forth in the constitutional amendment offered us.

It seems surprising, nay astounding, that anybody could have the audacity to offer an amendment to the Constitution drawn, conceived, and proffered as was this one. We all realize that the amending of the Constitution is one of the most serious problems; that it

is one of those things which require the greatest care, the greatest deliberation, and the utmost investigation, for that Constitution has been found in all emergencies to meet the requirements of our country. We have seen how our country has grown and expanded from a little nation of a few millions to the mightiest republic of the world, and yet, in all its history, with all the changes which have marked the past century, there never has been any occasion when our Constitution was not able to cope with all the difficulties which surrounded us.

It probably is true that occasions will arise in the future when by no other way can a difficulty be met than by an amendment of the Constitution in some single instance. But we have seen that it is a difficult matter to impress upon the American people the necessity for the same.

But once in the past hundred years has it been amended, and it was only at that time effected through streams of blood and by the sword. Those amendments were the results of that struggle which at one time threatened to dissolve our Union and be a death blow to republican institutions. That was a time when the blood of man was heated, when all were brought face to face with problems so difficult, intricate, and complex that nothing short of such an amendment would meet the conditions of that period.

Once in a hundred years, I have said, was the Constitution amended, and then, while the problems were, in a sense, of no more vital importance than the question of trust legislation is to-day, there were no other means left at the disposal of the Republic to continue in the course which destiny seemed to have marked for it; while to-day, if the laws now on the statute books are carried into force and effect, they will be found to have all the efficacy and power of any constitutional amendment.

Who ever heard of a proposition of this kind, with all that it means to the people of our country, not being submitted to a close, careful, and direct examination by all parties? Who ever heard of a party offering an amendment to the Constitution without even granting permission to anyone to change, alter, or modify it in any one particular, especially when one considers that such amendment was conceived and drawn by one of the great political parties and upon the eve of an election? If the Republican party were true to the people, if it were earnest in the determination to grant effective legislation, it would have granted the Democratic party, even if not taking that party into its confidence, a hearing on the subject. It is rather an innovation that any part of any committee of the House of Representatives should have conceived and constructed legislation without conferring with the rest of that committee. In this instance the Republican members of the Judiciary Committee, without consultation with their Democratic confreres and without accepting any suggestions on their part, drew this proposed constitutional amendment.

And further than this, when the question was submitted to the House, they, being in the majority, drew the rules under which this question was debated and argued, and under which they would submit to nothing which would modify or alter this amendment in any single particular, and they substantially informed us that we would have to take what they gave us or take nothing at all.

It requires no searching investigation to discover that the only object in view was to construct something which appeared to be or bore a resemblance to antitrust legislation, but which, by reason of its faulty and pernicious arrangement, must be so obnoxious in the eyes of all well-meaning individuals, be they Democrats, Independents, or even Republicans not bound body and soul by the organization, that they could not honestly and consistently support it.

They framed it so that it would be impossible for the Democratic party or the members in the House of Representatives on that side to support or to uphold it, and then they shouted aloud to the world that the Democrat was again a party obstruction and in the way of legislation which would remedy current evils. Again they must have acted under the supposition and belief that the American people were blinded either by ignorance or by mere idle sentiments which mean nothing.

And what would this proposition have involved, in the event that it passed by a two-thirds vote of the House of Representatives? It would have required its submission to the Senate for passage there, and nobody, as far as I have learned, would have the termerity to say that that august body would for a moment have considered it seriously.

But let us accept the view that it would have passed successfully both Houses of Congress. It would require then that it be submitted to the legislatures of the forty-five States of the Union, three-fourths of which would have to indorse and ratify it. When we stop and reflect about the mighty power and great influence wielded by these trusts, it would be simplicity itself for us to understand how a little influence here and there would tend to defeat the final enactment of such a proposition as a part of the organic law of our country. In the first place, under the most favorable auspices and with everything working harmoniously, it would require a period of at least ten years before that proposition would finally be incorporated in the Constitution. In the interim the Republican party would say to the world that they had done all that lay in their power to overthrow these institutions, but that nothing could be done until the Constitution was amended.

In the meantime the people would continue to suffer more and more, and the greater the possibility of the eventual enactment of this constitutional amendment, the greater would be the efforts of these trusts to grind the people in order to make hay while the sun shone. Should we stand idly by for such a period of time, and more especially when the likelihood of the enactment of such legislation is not apparent? We know what the Republican party would do against the trusts. No better illustration could be afforded than the work accomplished by them in the State which prides itself in its sons, William McKinley and Mark Hanna, "the power behind the throne."

The State of Ohio enacted laws which would meet the requirements of the case sufficiently if properly carried into execution, and was fortunate in the possession of an attorney-general who not only was capable and intelligent enough to carry the laws into effect, but who had the will and the determination to enforce them; but scarcely was he placed in position to afford some relief to the downtrodden people before he started the machinery of the law in motion with all the vigor and energy of a young, honest, and efficient servant of the people. Nothing could daunt him. Bribes so large that even the most upright and honest of men might be tempted were no obstruction in his path of duty.

This was one of the instances where the Republican party had submitted, by reason of the awful clamor of the people, to the enactment of suitable legislation, possessed, however, with the idea that these would be mere statutes upon the books to be overlooked and to remain quiet and passive. They failed to consider that even some of their own officials would not permit themselves to be lashed into quiet submission by the organization and be bound by its demands. They failed to consider that there might be some Republican whom they had elevated to office who was too honest for their purposes. The Republican party seeing that their attorney-general, Frank Monnett, was not to be swayed in his determination to enforce the laws without fear or favor, took the only initiative remaining to them and relegated him into political obscurity.

It were idle for me to discuss further the state of affairs in Ohio. It is a part of the history of the past few years, well known to the reading public, and I would be unnecessarily taking up the time of the members in discussing it. But it is only one other link in the chain of evidence tending to prove that the Republican party harbors and supports the trusts.

Before many days have elapsed, the question of the constitutional amendment will be known to the American people. It will be easy for them to see through this "confidence game," and they will demand from the Republican party an explanation. The American people are quiet and submissive, and at times, in order to effect good results, they close their eyes to the failures of legislation when small things are affected; but at all times, when great forces are tearing at their very heartstrings, they are not wont to sit idly by and do nothing, or permit themselves to be deceived by the acceptance of "sugared water."

Let us analyze for a few moments the different propositions contained in this constitutional amendment, and it will not take us long to lay bare its faults, weaknesses, uselessness, and its dangers. In the paragraph marked "1" there is what might be termed, hidden in its very link, a little "joker." It says that this amendment shall apply to the States, Territories, the District of Columbia, and the Territories under the sovereignty and jurisdiction of the United States.

Some time since the Republican party, false to the promises it had made and in violation of all laws of decency and morality, enacted tariff legislation affecting the island of Porto Rico. We all remember the time the American forces under General Miles landed there; how the people welcomed and embraced our soldiers; how they accepted us as their saviors and benefactors; how they promised allegiance to the American laws, and how gratefully and honestly they submitted themselves to our care. We were all filled with pride at that time, and more especially when we read of the promise made by General Miles, in behalf of the United States, that all the privileges and benefits of our country would be afforded to Porto Rico. We applauded that course and, further, the position taken by our President that the island should be afforded the same privileges as all the States and Territories of our country. But we were seriously shocked when, within a short period thereafter, the Republican party formulated laws which had for their object the advancement of the proposition that that island was not under the Constitution and was not a part of the United States.

This position was so contrary to the spirit of American institutions that it revolted within us. The Democratic party contended

for the rights of these people who had willingly placed themselves under our guidance and care, and not only because they had submitted without force or pressure, but because we recognize that wherever our flag flies there liberty holds forth; that wherever the hand of America rests there freedom flourishes, and that wherever the American Government was in control there the Constitution followed.

The Republican party, swept away by the knowledge of its strength and power, took advantage of the situation they found themselves in and enacted that tariff legislation which is obnoxious in the eyes and abhorrent to all good, loyal Americans who love their country and their Constitution.

The proposition contained in this first article of this amendment has for its object the indorsement of the position taken by the Republican party that none of the territories under the sovereignty and jurisdiction is a part of the United States and under the Constitution, and that consequently it had the power to tax the starving inhabitants of Porto Rico. Even accepting that position as true, we can see the utter futility of incorporating such an amendment in the Constitution. If the Constitution does not cover the territories under our jurisdiction, then Congress has full power to deal with them as it sees fit, and it requires no Constitutional amendment to grant them such power.

If it required a constitutional amendment to do so, then it would have required a constitutional amendment for us to enact that odious tariff law against that island. Then, if that be the case, what other object could the Republican party have in view? It was not mere idle thought or fancy that these words were placed in that amendment; it was done with care and deliberation and with malice aforethought; it was done to prevent the Democratic party subscribing to that proposed amendment; it was done because it knew that if it were indorsed or supported by the Democratic party it would practically mean a stultification of the Democratic party and place it on record as indorsing the actions of the Republican party in violating the laws of decency and morality in placing this tariff amendment upon the statutes.

It was contended by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LITTLEFIELD], who in his manly fight against the Porto Rican tariff so nobly stood out in the cause of the right, when in support of the Constitution he not only opposed by his vote but by his eloquence and logic the proposition that the Constitution would not follow the flag. The attention of all America was called to the man who had the strength and the courage to oppose his party's wishes in a matter of right, which in his mind could admit of no doubt. How different his present attitude! While still maintaining his former position that it was unnecessary to incorporate this in the Constitution, he took the ground that even he, great as he was, might be mistaken, and when the question was put to him by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND], why, if that were true, there was any necessity for the placing of these words in the amendment, since in that case Congress would of itself have power to deal adequately with the Territories, he failed to answer. I knew if there was any excuse that could reasonably be offered there was no man on the other side of the Chamber who could do it so well as he. And I was in hopes that he would be able at least to make some attempt at supporting his present position, but the result proved that the position was unsupportable. And look at the anomalous position this enactment would occupy in the Constitution. It would, in effect, mean that while the whole of the Constitution affected the States, the Territories, and the District of Columbia, that only 1 per cent of it would apply to the territory under the sovereignty and jurisdiction of the United States. Instead of the Constitution being a source of pride to the American people, it would be held up as a laughing stock to the whole world.

Nothing would have caused more terror in the ranks of the Republican party than to have had this measure receive support at the hands of the Democratic party. It may seem strange in view of the fact that by such action it would be a recognition of the position taken by them in the Porto Rican matter. But they knew if that question ever came before the American people it would appear so transparent and flimsy a makeshift that anybody having the audacity to present it for the purpose of hoodwinking them would at the polls be eliminated from the political world for all time. Their only salvation lay in the defeat of the measure, and in order effectually to dispose of it they placed this obnoxious clause in the first paragraph.

If the Republican party had admitted of an amendment or a change in one or two particulars in order to make the same effective, and in order to open a way whereby the evils of the trusts could be remedied and, if possible, absolutely defeated, the Democratic party would have gladly welcomed such an opportunity. But no! Such a change the Republican party could not dare to afford, because the moment that effective legislation against the trusts became a law, that moment it lost its most effective and best financial backers; that moment would see the dwindling of the Republican campaign funds into an insignificant sum; that moment would see them with no financial weapon to meet the conditions of the next Presidential election.

Our requests were spurned, our demands were ignored, and the result is that the people will continue to suffer until they place in the hands of other official servants the power to do away with these pests so inimical to the free institutions of America.

The real gist and substance, however, of this amendment lies in the second paragraph, which gives absolute power to Congress to define, regulate, etc., the trusts, monopolies, and combinations. No one could object, possibly, to the enlargement of the powers of Congress in this particular, but at all events there should be some limitations placed upon it. The idea that one body should have the absolute, unrestricted right to define a combination!

It has been contended by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LITTLEFIELD] that the word "combination" must be taken in conjunction with its surroundings, and in the light of a trust or monopoly. In some instances that probably were true, and if the word "defined" had been omitted, the probabilities are that it would have been true in this case, but when Congress is given an absolute right to define what a combination is, who is there to curtail that right? Can the Supreme Court do it? The answer, though we might regret it, must be no. That would grant permission to Congress to ruin any partnership, any combination of two or more individuals doing any business enterprise, to interfere with and destroy and disorganize legal organizations, and would afford the opportunity for the greatest scandals in the history of the Republic.

Does any one doubt that these trusts would place hundreds of thousands, aye, millions of dollars in two or three vulnerable places to prevent any effective legislation which would or might tend to interfere with their actions? The result would be that the most corrupt place known would be the Congress of the United States.

But it may appear strange that a Member of the House of Representatives should oppose enlarging the powers of Congress. It is done, not because we question any individual, not because we doubt the sincerity or honesty of the present Congress, but because it means that temptations threaten us so large and so apparent that there would be many weak ones who might stumble by the wayside. "Lead me not into temptation" were better to be borne in mind.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not tire you by a recital of the great influences wielded by the trusts, the great harm done to the spirit of independence, the great interference with personal ambition, or the serious evils which result from their growth. There is scarcely a man outside the pale of these organizations who has not felt the hands of the trusts at his throat. There is hardly to be found one who finds that it does not interfere with his progress in this world. And so it were idle for me now to make any further statements about them. We deplore the fact that they exist, and there is a duty devolving upon us as servants of the people to do something, and that immediately, whereby their evil aims can be frustrated.

Sir, I should lend my aid to any legislation which, in my humble judgment, would have the slightest tendency to meet these crying evils. I believe that no stone should be left unturned, that no work should be too great to stop their further advancement, and I regret the fact that under the rules adopted by the Republican party we are not permitted to avail ourselves of an opportunity to strike an effective blow at these combinations.

I had hopes when I entered as a member of this Congress that one of the first pieces of legislation that would be offered for our consideration would be in the nature of antitrust legislation. But, as days and weeks passed by, my hopes changed to distrust, and when I was confronted with the proposition now before the House I knew that I erred not in my opinion and judgment of the Republican party that it was the friend and supporter of trusts.

I have no fear that the American people are not able to see through this weak attempt to deceive them. I have no fears that they will be deceived by a label. I have no hesitancy in saying that the mere words "antitrust legislation" convey to them nothing, but that sincere antitrust legislation means everything to them. They well know what is best and good for them, and when they have fully studied, as they will, the questions involved in this constitutional amendment, they will show by their votes on next election day their detestation of that party that would stoop to such deception, and so low and petty a trick.

I shall vote against this amendment, although, as I have previously said, I would be only too willing to vote for any measure which would result in the curtailment of the powers of the trusts, but I would be untrue to my principles, untrue to my people, untrue to my country and to myself, were I to support or indorse or ratify a proposition, which, if anything, would aid in the strengthening of these great combinations.

Favorable Credit Conditions Handicap the Trusts.

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE P. LAWRENCE,

OF MASSACHUSETTS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, June 2, 1900.

The House having under consideration the bill (H. R. 10539) to amend an act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890—

Mr. LAWRENCE said:

Mr. SPEAKER: One of the issues which has been made by some of the members of the opposition party in this debate and elsewhere, bearing upon the subject of trusts, has had reference to the issue of money and the extension of credit by national banks. The charge has been made by the leaders of the opposition party in the last Presidential campaign that the grant of the note-issuing power to national banks, with comparative freedom from restrictions, gives to the banks a greater control over credit and the volume of currency than if the issue of currency were under the direct control of the Government. The State platform adopted this spring by the Democrats of Nebraska, demanded "the retention of the greenbacks as they now exist and the retirement of national-bank notes as rapidly as greenbacks can be substituted for them." It was not set forth in the platform how these greenbacks were to be substituted for bank notes. If it was proposed that the Government should print the greenbacks, constituting an obligation of the Government, and pay them out in exchange for bank notes, the latter being an obligation of the banks which issued them, I am sure that such liberality would be cordially welcomed by every national banker.

I do not believe the Republican party is prepared to go to such a length of generosity to the national banks as this project seems to imply. What we might properly do, however, in order to place credit on the lowest terms within the reach of every solvent business man, is to remove the fetters from banking operations as far as can be done consistently with the rules of safety and uniformity which constitute the great merit of the national banking system. I am not afraid to face the proposition that giving greater freedom of action to the banks tends to create a banking trust. I believe the exact contrary is the fact, and that it can be demonstrated to the satisfaction of any candid man who will give the subject a half hour's consideration. What is proposed in increasing the liberality of note issues is only to take away from the banks the excuse for charging high rates of discount and refusing loans, upon the ground that they are hampered by the restrictions of the national banking law. Comparative freedom of note issues only throws the field wide open to competition and takes away what there may be of the character of monopoly in the present system of issuing notes.

If the more than thirty-six hundred national banks of the country could be gotten together in a great conspiracy to cut their own throats by refusing accommodation to business, freedom of competition would enable anyone who had negotiable capital to take out a charter, hire temporary banking quarters, and destroy the conspiracy by offering to loan our notes freely at low rates to the business community. I do not believe that such a conspiracy is possible or probable under any conditions. If it is conceivable, however, it would be infinitely more easy for a group of trust magnates in New York to get together and corner the currency under existing conditions than if reasonable freedom of note issue prevailed. They would know at the outset just how much currency and what kinds they had to deal with under fixed Government issues. They would not know this under a system which permitted any group of citizens to form a note-issuing bank when a business demand existed for its operations.

I do not propose to discuss this problem at length, but only to point out the folly of the charge that giving proper elasticity to our banking system would encourage a banking trust and the cornering of money. It must be remembered that the banks have the power now to refuse loans and contract credit, subject to the two conditions that it is not for their interest to lock up money without return and that they are always at the mercy of their depositors, who would withdraw their deposits in full if they found that they were being refused reasonable accommodation in respect to loans. What is proposed by those who advocate a little greater elasticity in note issues is only to remove the needless fetters from a single form of credit. There are few restrictions imposed upon the issue of checks and drafts by national banks. They are negotiable forms of credit, and the bank note is only another form of such credit. It differs chiefly from checks and drafts in a higher degree of transferability. It differs, therefore, in being more convenient for use in parts of the country removed from the banks and where the use of checks and drafts has not become a habit of the people.

Freedom of competition among all who have negotiable wealth, the bringing to the country by bank notes of the same facilities for exchange enjoyed by the great cities through checks and drafts, the consideration of the interests of the borrower as well as the lender, the promotion of our foreign trade by making credit as low and convenient to our manufacturers as to those of Europe, and consequently the continued employment of labor at remunerative wages in production for the foreign market—these are the great objects of a well-secured but flexible bank-note currency, such as I believe should be provided to gradually take the place of the bond-secured currency, as the supply of bonds ceases to be adequate for the needs of our expanding trade.

This subject has been so fully and carefully discussed in its bearings upon our foreign trade and the interest of the farmer and the laborer, in an article prepared by my friend, Mr. Charles A. Conant, of Boston, that I propose to include it in my remarks. Mr. Conant has spent many years of study upon this subject, and is the author of a well-known work on "The History of Modern Banks of Issue." The article to which I refer was printed in the New York Bankers' Magazine in February and March last, and has been widely circulated as a monograph. Its text is as follows:

THE BENEFIT OF A BANK-NOTE CURRENCY.

Having sketched the origin and development of bank notes and defined their functions and qualities,* it is proper to consider their benefits to the community. Some of these benefits are those which naturally arise from the banking function in concentrating and distributing capital without the power of note issue. This power, however, greatly quickens and promotes the process of bringing capital into active use, especially in communities where credit is not well developed, and where a sparse population renders banks less accessible than in commercial centers. The bank note economizes the use of metal, and to this extent diminishes the amount of real capital required for the circulating medium. Bank notes issued under such conditions constitute a loan from the public to the banker, but compensate the lenders by affording a convenient medium of exchange. The benefits of the public are not limited to the mere convenience of the paper in comparison with coin, but include a share in the lower discount rates and greater facilities extended to commerce by the capital saved for productive purposes by the economy of the metals. The note-issuing function, moreover, affords a method of introducing other forms of credit, and thus by degrees extends to an undeveloped country all the benefits of the modern credit system. These advantages of bank-note issues may be set forth with more precision and detail under the following heads:

1. Economy of the precious metals.
2. The accumulation and distribution of capital.
3. The reduction of the rate for the rental of money.
4. The adjustment of the currency to business needs.

I.—ECONOMY OF THE PRECIOUS METALS.

The issue of bank notes, even where they are protected by large metallic reserves, results in a considerable economy in the use of the precious metals and in the cost of handling money. In so far as a paper medium of circulation will do the work of money, without involving any question as to its safety and exchangeability, the community gains by the amounts of the metals thus economized. A gold currency is a costly investment, which can be afforded only by countries having saved capital beyond the amount required for maintaining the machinery of production, the purchase of raw materials, and the expense of distribution. The law of marginal utility will almost inevitably reduce a poor country to the lowest minimum of metallic money required for exchanges and even below the minimum of convenience, because its available capital will be required for the material and machinery of production.

To reduce this argument to its simplest terms, it is obvious that a primitive community, which was barely able by all the efforts of its members to obtain their necessary food, could not employ any part of its energy or set aside any part of its products for the purpose of obtaining clothing and shelter. When there came to be a margin of producing capacity, which gave additional purchasing power, clothing and shelter would be the first objects for which this power would be exerted. In a more advanced community a medium of exchange would be found highly desirable, but if such a medium required the expenditure of labor, like the mining of gold or silver, the labor required would be devoted to this purpose only after the necessary requirements for food and the minimum requirements for clothing and shelter had been complied with. In a community still further developed, where organized industry existed, the necessity for a medium of exchange would be so pressing that a small portion of its capital would probably be invested in this direction, even while the machinery of production and distribution was incomplete. There would be, however, a constant tendency to reduce this medium of exchange to a minimum and to part with it to other communities in exchange for the tools of production and the comforts of life. By the law of marginal utility the individuals of the community would exchange the products of their labor, first, for the most necessary articles, and then by a graded series of steps for articles having successively lower degrees of utility.

An alternative resource is open to communities whose producing power is on the margin of the capacity for investing capital in a metallic currency. This resource is the employment of paper credit. The tendency to devote saved capital to the increase of the goods necessary for comfort and for effective competition with other communities, is so persistent that in a community whose saved capital is close to the margin necessary for these purposes, there is a constant substitution of paper credit for metallic money up to the margin of safety and even beyond this margin. This tendency is aided by the demand for notes as a tool of exchange, which keeps them in circulation even when the security for them is not of the best. This is the explanation of the abuse of banking credit in comparatively poor communities. How this condition was brought about in the early history of the United States is thus set forth by Professor Newcomb:†

"In new countries, where the rate of interest is high and the demand for loans great, the temptation is much stronger than elsewhere. Thus arose the 'wildcat' banking which was so prevalent in our new States during their early history. When a 'wildcat' bank was established its practice was to loan its own notes on interest. The banker knew that there was little immediate danger of these notes coming back in great numbers, because the community was too much in want of them as money. He was, therefore, tempted to loan them on insufficient

Vide "The Principles of a Banking Currency," Bankers' Magazine for May and June, 1899.

†Principles of Political Economy, p. 171.

security, especially as good security was difficult to obtain under the circumstances. If he could induce his customer to carry the notes to a great distance, the danger of their being returned for payment became still less. So long as people would take his notes he was thus enabled to draw a high rate of interest on a very small capital."

The safeguard against such abuses is the adoption of a prudent banking policy, either by union among bankers or by the mandate of law, which shall not permit the metallic resources of the country to fall below the margin of safety. There is no reason, when this margin is ascertained, with a proper excess for emergencies, why the economy of paper credit should not be availed of to the entire amount consistent with this condition. Such a policy has the advantages of affording a country the most effective and economical use of its saved capital. The bank note, although it has been the most useful form of paper credit in poor communities, is the only form which has become a subject of serious controversy, because it has not always been employed with moderation and skill. In its essence, however, the bank note involves no greater danger in use than checks and deposit accounts, and still less danger when surrounded by the safeguards which have been provided in modern commercial States in order to permit its circulation as a substitute for money.

BENEFITS OF AN EFFICIENT CURRENCY IN FOREIGN COMPETITION.

It is not merely a local advantage that a country should have an economical circulation. It may directly affect the competition of one nation with another. Assuming that this rivalry is reduced to the closest conditions, it is obvious that the economy of the currency may play the same part in facilitating competition as economy in any part of the machinery of production. A nation which used old and cumbersome wooden machinery could not successfully compete in the world's markets with one which used the most modern and efficient machinery. Other things being equal, a nation which unnecessarily invested a large part of its capital in a costly and cumbersome tool of exchange, could not compete upon favorable terms with one which adopted the most economical means of exchange. Undoubtedly the most economical means includes the safest means, but this safety need not be carried to excess in respect to the currency any more than in the case of machinery, which might be made unnecessarily cumbersome with the object of preventing breakdowns. The disadvantage which might result from an excessive investment of capital in currency becomes obvious if one considers how much capital would be required if the United States or any other country should decide to abolish all forms of banking credit as well as note issues. If every transaction had thus to be settled in coin instead of by checks and commercial bills, the entire savings of the country for several years would have to be applied to the acquisition of a sufficient supply of metallic money to the impoverishment of every other part of the machinery of competition. It is obvious that the country adopting such a policy would soon cease to be a serious competitor of the well-organized industrial nations.

So far as note issues exceed the metallic reserves held for their protection, they may be considered as an economy of capital. This economy is multiplied many times when the cost of the original investment in a gold currency is supplemented by consideration of the annual interest charge upon it. The cost of maintaining £95,000,000 in gold, silver, and copper money in circulation in Great Britain in 1876 was estimated by Mr. Jevons at £2,972,000 ($14,500,000) annually, of which £2,850,000 was for interest upon the principal at the rate of 3 per cent.* The annual average circulation of European banks of issue in 1898 was 14,668,000,000 francs, which was protected by a gold reserve of 8,182,000,000 francs, leaving an uncovered circulation of about 6,500,000,000 francs ($1,200,000,000). The interest upon the latter amount at 3 per cent would amount to $36,000,000 a year. This is a material saving of capital for application to productive industry. The excess of uncovered note issues was much larger a score of years ago than at present, but the great surplus of saved capital in recent years, and the extension of other forms of credit, by the growth of banks of discount and deposit, have permitted a large investment in the gold supply from the mines without a corresponding extension of credit in the form of notes.

A considerable saving is obtained from the use of a bank-note currency in a more modest way, even where the volume of notes does not greatly exceed the metallic reserve. This saving results from the fact that the use of paper certificates in ordinary circulation avoids the wear of the metallic pieces. The loss by wear upon a gold currency is very considerable where it is in actual use as a medium of exchange. The coins surrendered by the Bank of England to the British mint for a period of about four and a half years, from March, 1893, to September 30, 1897, included coins under the legal limit of weight showing a loss of 134,294.8 ounces, or at the mint value a loss of £522,910 ($2,500,000). This represents a loss of about $500,000 per year upon the coins passing through the Bank alone.† A portion of this loss is paralleled by the cost of printing and handling a paper currency, but on the other hand a small gain accrues to the issuers by the losses of such currency.

Bank notes do not cease to have a high degree of usefulness, even in communities which have an ample supply of saved capital for investment in a metallic currency. The extent of the use of notes under such circumstances depends to some extent upon the customs of the community, but the notes are more readily transferable than coin, and when exchanged in large amounts between banks and their correspondents cost much less for carriage.‡ The practical benefits of handling notes instead of coin were set forth in a forcible manner in a letter written in 1841 by Roger Aytoun, esq., manager of the Renfrewshire Bank at Greenock, at the time of the proposals to abolish notes for £1 in Scotland. Mr. Aytoun said upon this point:§

"At present the business of the Highlands is transacted by means of bank notes of £1, with some larger notes on occasions, and that with the greatest facility. Cattle dealers and all others having to pay away money to any amount in small sums to a number of people, as in the instances mentioned, prepare themselves by a mixture of notes, some large and some small, accompanied by a few pounds of silver, and everything goes on well. These notes are preferred by the country people before gold, both because they are unable to distinguish between the genuine and base metal and because coins are more liable to be lost from their pockets than notes; and they have no reason to repent their confidence in the stability of those banks whose notes they have been accustomed to receive for so many years in their transactions. But if small notes are superseded and gold substituted it is not easy to see how the supply of gold is to be kept up to carry on the business and transactions of this country. Should a quantity of it be received into the circulation, it would not remain long, but find its way into the banks, who will not give it out again in bills as they do their notes, and it will immediately become a scarce article in the country. A person, then, having to pay in small sums will on every such occasion be obliged to send his large notes to the bank that issued them, perhaps a hundred miles off, to receive gold and silver in their place to answer his purpose."

II.—THE ACCUMULATION AND DIFFUSION OF CAPITAL.

One of the great benefits of a banking currency is its service in the accumulation and distribution of capital. This benefit is in some degree the consequence of all banking operations, which attract into the custody of the banks the scattered savings of the community. The progress in this concentration of saved capital in hands which render it productive has been marked within the past century. The savings of capital themselves have greatly increased, partly as the result of the increased productive power derived from the use of machinery, but largely also from the stimulus to saving afforded by modern banking methods. The savings banks and stock exchange securities have become to a large extent the reservoirs of these savings. These institutions are not closely related to the functions of note-issuing banks, but the preliminary education in the use of banking credit which led to savings deposits and investments in securities was afforded by these issuing banks. The bank note is the form of credit which under certain conditions is most convenient and performs most efficiently the work of saving the use of metallic money. To quote from the exposition of the Monetary Commission (page 16):

"A borrower at a bank will usually ask for that means of payment which his situation and the business habits of his community demand. If he can not get it in that form, his loan is ineffective. Hence the habits of the community determine which form of liability the bank will make use of; it is not determined by the will of the bank. If the latter is not able to conform to the business habits of its customers it can not loan in that district. In the interest of borrowers, therefore, a proper banking system should be so ordered that it can adjust itself to the needs of its constituency. If banks are given perfect freedom in conducting their business, whether they issue notes or not is a question merely of convenience to their customers; to a large city bank the privilege of issuing notes is of almost no advantage."

Banks having the power of note issue have been, therefore, the pioneers of credit in their respective localities. They have made the owners of capital familiar with the note-issuing system, which required only passive action, and have paved the way for other systems of credit which appealed to the direct initiative of the small capitalist. The operation of this tendency is thus described by Professor Leroy-Beaulieu:*

"It has been demonstrated by experience that the issue of bills, when they have been made under regular conditions, has served in a notable manner to render a banking system popular and to spread banking operations among the public, not so much by the advantage resulting to the banks by the absence of interest on the sums which they procure with their issues, as by the general notoriety given to their establishments, the confidence which the public place in them when they hold their obligations, and the habit which they acquire of recurring more and more to their aid for the various operations of payment and collection."

The issue of notes which pass into general circulation permits an extension of credit in a community which might not be possible if there was only a metallic currency. The manufacturer who is able to borrow notes from a bank in the course of his commercial business, which are accepted by his employees and pass into general circulation, thereby aids the bank in borrowing the capital of the community without obtaining it by direct deposit. The holder of a bank note under such conditions has in a sense lent his capital to the bank in return for a printed promise to pay money, but he is not a loser by the transaction, since the promise serves all his purposes as a medium of exchange with the same efficiency as metallic money. If he considers the substitute less efficient, it is within his power to demand the fulfillment of the promise by presenting the note for redemption in standard coin. The holder of the note, indeed, so far from suffering by lending his credit to the bank, is a partner with the whole community in the benefits derived from a larger medium of exchange than would be available if bank notes were not permitted and in the increased activity of business transactions which such a medium of exchange allows.†

This increased activity of business transactions is one of the natural results of the transferability of capital which is promoted by the banking system. The power to issue notes increases the ability of the banker to aid new industries and to keep production in useful channels. It is the banker largely who determines the direction of industry by his willingness to make loans to industries which are profitable because they are meeting a demand and by his withdrawal of loans from industries which are ceasing to be profitable because of overproduction and diminished demand. How this process operates is thus set forth by Mr. Bagehot:‡

"It is the money lender in a primitive community whose capital is first transferred readily from occupation to occupation. Suppose a new crop, say cotton, becomes suddenly lucrative; immediately the little proprietors throng to the money lender to obtain funds to buy cotton; a new trade is begun by his help, which could not have been begun without him. If cotton ceases to be a good crop, he ceases to lend to grow it."

ADVANTAGES OF A BANKING CURRENCY TO THE WAGE EARNER.

The freedom of bank-note issues is of more direct advantage in some respects to the wage earner and small trader than to the manufacturer and capitalist. The latter classes are able to conduct most of their operations by means of other forms of credit and with only a limited use of bank notes. Their individual credit is of such a character that their checks and promissory notes serve the purposes of a medium of exchange in their larger transactions. To this extent these instruments take the place of credit in the form of notes, because their credit is well known and commands sufficient confidence among those to whom these instruments are tendered. The bank note, as Leon Say declared in a debate in the French Senate in 1884 on the renewal of the charter of the Bank of France, "is the deposit account of humble citizens and small merchants. The rich obviate the use of money by taking a check book; the humbler citizen deals in a sort of deposit account on the bank by taking its bills."§

The essential benefit of a bank note to the wage-earner or farmer over other forms of credit lies in the fact that he can exchange it almost anywhere for what he wishes without discount. A wage-earner who is paid weekly or monthly earnings in a single check often has difficulty in converting it into money in a community where currency is scarce, even though the maker of the check is well known and of unquestioned credit. A small commission is likely to be charged by any storekeeper to whom the check is tendered in payment for the necessaries of life. The situation is still worse for the wage-earner if he obtains only an open credit at the store, whether in return for a check or whether the

---

*"Investigations in Currency and Finance," p. 206.

†London Economist, July 15, 1899, LVII, page 1012. The British Government, by the coinage act of 1891, established a coinage fund of £400,000 to cover the cost of the restoration of the gold currency. This fund with the accumulated interest, was nearly exhausted by the operation of 1898, but was increased by a further charge upon the public revenues under an act of 1893.

‡It is a regular practice of the interior banks of the United States to direct the deposit of gold by their New York reserve agents with the subtreasury of the United States in New York, in exchange for the shipment of notes from Washington to the interior point where they are desired. This method is always preferred to the shipment of gold from New York, because the express rates upon gold are nearly double the rate upon notes. The bankers' express rate, for instance, from Washington to St. Louis in 1899 was $1 per $1,000 on gold, while the rate on currency was only sixty cents per $1,000. Such shipments of currency against deposits of gold in New York were $19,718,000 in the fiscal year 1898.

§Gilbart, The History, Principles, and Practice of Banking, II, page 222.

*"*Traité d'Économie Politique*," III, p. 474.

†"The entire community is enabled to profit by that which tends to facilitate exchanges and circulation. If the founders of a bank are the first, perhaps, to benefit by their creation, the durable success of such an establishment is possible only so far as the public finds an advantage in it, as the bank responds to a real need and well fulfills its office."—Horn, p. 440.

‡"The Transferability of Capital," Works, V, p. 297.

§Arnaune, p. 524.

store is kept by his employers. He is by this mechanism deprived of freedom in the expenditure of his earnings, and has to pay whatever prices are charged him for goods. By this process country stores and company stores are likely to collect what is really a banking charge, where regular banking facilities are deficient, but which is much larger than would be collected by an organized bank.

The absence of proper credit facilities, including especially the issue of bank notes, has imposed heavy charges upon the farmers in the southern parts of the United States and in other countries. The lack of credit facilities has even changed the direction of agriculture in many of the Southern States and has depressed the price of cotton. Cotton is the most negotiable commodity of the Southern farmer, because it is the most certain crop and can always be sold at a price, even when prices are depressed by the excessive supply. When the Southern farmers at the close of the civil war found themselves without money to buy seed and tools for resuming production, they obtained advances from the storekeepers and merchants in the market towns upon their growing crops, but these advances were made only upon cotton crops. The farmer thus bound himself to the storekeeper to buy everything at one place without regard to the price, and bound himself to raise cotton, however excessive the supply and however much the price might be depressed. The process is thus described by a writer who has investigated the subject:*

"The merchant consented to advance to the farmer, be he owner or tenant, the provisions, implements, seed, farm animals, and other requisites for making a crop, provided the farmer would consent to plant his cultivated land in cotton, to give to the merchant a mortgage or lien on his crop to the extent of his purchases, and pay for these supplies in cotton when the crop was harvested. The cotton prices of the merchandise thus advanced were usually from 20 to 60 per cent higher than the cash prices of the same articles. But for the farmer there was no alternative. He was glad to accept credit upon even such unfavorable terms, trusting that a high price of cotton would enable him to repay his indebtedness and free himself from the necessity of securing loans in the future."

THE EMANCIPATION OF THE FARMER.

This seridom to the storekeeper would have been remedied to a large extent if the first loan had been made with bank notes which gave their holder the power to make purchases wherever the notes might be accepted. A sufficient supply of circulating notes in a community means that the man of small means, whose transactions are mostly for cash, escapes the payment of high commissions to storekeepers, because he receives compensation for his goods or services in a form of credit which is readily exchangeable. If the use of capital is obtained in any form by the individual, it is desirable that it should be in the form most useful to him. For the rich man, as pointed out by M. Say, the check book constitutes such a medium; for the wage-earner and man of small means the bank note is more convenient, useful, and beneficial. The same distinction lies to a large extent between the city man and the countryman. As stated by Mr. Hammond:†

"The city dweller is content to have his loan in the shape of a transfer of credits on the bank's books in such a way as to permit him to check against the account. He has no use for currency except to make minor payments. But the average farmer does not use checks to any considerable extent. He desires cash in exchange for his produce and he expects to pay cash when making his purchases."

The fact that the bank note constitutes a loan from the public to the bank is sometimes made the basis of the argument that the profit derived from this loan should go to the Government, representing all the people, rather than to an individual banker or corporation. This argument ignores the utility of the banks in affording reservoirs of credit and channels for its distribution and in meeting the costs of providing the medium of exchange.‡ The Government can not distribute credit except through the instrumentality of a bank, and most governments have failed disastrously when they have undertaken to do a banking business.

III.—REDUCING THE RATE FOR THE RENTAL OF CAPITAL.

The economy in the use of precious metals, and the concentration of small private capitals which result from a liberal system of bank-note issues, yield an important profit to the community. This profit would inure in the first instance to the banker, who by the note-issuing system obtains the use of private savings at small cost, if he was not compelled to share it with the entire producing community under the law of competition, which tends to bring to a level the profits in all enterprises. Under the operation of this law the profit resulting from the economy of the metals and an adequate medium of exchange is distributed in such a manner that hardly any member of a producing community fails to receive some share. This is the case with any mechanism which saves labor and capital, even where the device is a patented monopoly. Such an article can not be disposed of for profit unless the price affords a saving to the users of it. Much more is this the case when competition is open to all comers having circulating capital, as under the operation of a liberal banking law.

It is worth while to examine somewhat more minutely the process by which a bank-note currency benefits the banker and reduces the cost of management of all industries. The banker who keeps afloat a given volume of notes borrows the amount without interest from the public. He can grant applications for loans only by the possession of capital or the control over it. If he receives large deposits, they provide sufficient capital for making all the loans which are asked of him. If deposits are not received in any considerable amount, either because of the lack of surplus capital in the community or the lack of education in the use of banking facilities, the banker is without any resources for making loans beyond the amount of his original capital. If, however, he has the power to issue notes which are accepted by the public, he can extend his loans to the limit of his power of note issue under the law or under the rules of prudent banking. Such notes only represent another form of credit from that brought to the bank by the producer or trader in the form of commercial paper. It is when the trader is able to pay out these notes for capital or services that they are converted, in a sense, into a loan of capital from the public to the bank.

The community by the process of bank-note issues obtains the use of a sufficient supply of the tools of exchange without sending abroad capital to the full amount of these tools. It is able by this means to exchange its products for others which are more beneficial than coined money. The amount which might originally have been invested in a metallic currency remains permanently available for increasing the machinery of production, acquiring a larger supply of raw materials, and producing a larger quantity of finished goods. The paper medium of exchange thus affords a sufficient currency, where one could not be obtained in the form of metallic money, or could be obtained only by serious sacrifices. The tool of exchange is the vital representative of circulating capital. The circulating capital of the community is enlarged by the issue of bank notes—not because bank notes are the creation of capital, but because they give mobility to capital which would otherwise remain in fixed form, or be in such minute subdivisions in the hands of individuals as not to be available for the processes of production. Thus, at low cost, the bank appropriates to its use the scattered capital of small holders and places it at the disposal of the community. How essential it is that this should be done under the fewest possible restrictions is thus pointed out by Professor Nitti:*

"If the credit circulation partially replaces the metallic circulation, it is because it costs less. If the cost of production is artificially enhanced, the advantage which might result from it is reduced or suppressed. It is so much the more harmful, since it is the mass of the users of credit—that is, the mass of the public—who benefit by every reduction."

If an adequate mechanism of exchange is obtained for one-quarter or one-half the investment of capital which would be required for a metallic currency, it is obvious that a material saving has been made. This saving is likely to prove in practice, even if the proposition can not be demonstrated mathematically, much more important than an equal saving in any other form of capital. The tool of exchange is so important to the successful workings of the other parts of the industrial mechanism that a deficiency of it is likely to hamper all branches of industry and a sufficiency to stimulate them into increased producing capacity.

When, therefore, a bank-note currency permits an increased offer of the tools of exchange to those who desire to obtain them, the effect upon the rental value of money is plainly felt. This value is determined by the comparison of the supply of the medium of exchange with the effective demand. The effective demand consists of the commercial paper whose owners can afford to pay the rental prices of money, as expressed by the discount rate. This demand must necessarily be shut within narrow limits where the discount rate is so high as to detract materially from the profits of commercial operations. The holder of commercial paper may prefer to go without the quantity of the tool of exchange which would be useful to him rather than pay the rental price fixed by the supply. His rates of commercial profit may not enable him to pay for a sufficient supply of the medium of exchange when the amount is small and the price is high.

The rental price of money responds, like the price of other goods and services, to the law which Ricardo applied only to the products of agriculture, but which has been found to be an almost universal law of economics—that the price of the entire product or service is fixed by the price at which the last increment of the goods can be produced or the last increment of service rendered at a profit. Competition among the owners of the supply of money attracts borrowers to those offering money at the lowest rate, in just the same manner as competition among dealers in wheat attracts purchasers to those offering wheat at the lowest price. The effort to maintain a higher price in either case than that fixed by the average profits upon invested capital, other elements in the problem being given due weight, would attract many competitors, but would in the case of money tend to dry up the sources of banking business.†

Competition leads each banker who controls a part of the supply to underbid his competitor in order to earn a profit by putting his commodity to use. The fact that this competition is closer and more acute in the case of circulating capital, as represented by the tool of exchange and the command over credits, than in the case of most other commodities, is indicated by the rapid changes in the rates charged for money in organized money markets. These rates sometimes rise in periods of stringency to 30 or 40 per cent a year, but fall within a few days to 4 or 5 per cent when the demand is relaxed and the supply increases. Each owner of circulating capital or each banker who controls it begins to lower his rental price when he finds that his supply is not absorbed by the effective demand at prevailing rates.

It is obvious, therefore, that with a given demand in the form of commercial paper and other legitimate appeals from borrowers an increase in the supply of circulating capital by a device which converts into such capital the scattered resources of individuals must produce a marked decline in its rental price. If this increased supply brings down the rental price to a point which greatly increases the demand, one of two classes of benefits, and probably both, must result for the community. If producers and traders are able to borrow who were not able to do so before, their productive capacity will be materially increased and their benefits will be distributed over the whole community through the payment of wages, increased purchases of materials, and the exchange of their products for increased quantities of foreign products.

If, on the other hand, it be assumed that no new class of borrowers comes into the field, and that the increased supply of the tools of exchange is available only for the use of the original number of borrowers, they will obtain the use of the medium at a greatly reduced cost. Their productive power and profits will be so increased that a portion can be spared for investment in a metallic currency, if it is needed. The more probable result, representing the leveling effects of several causes, is that industry will be stimulated, that the reduced rental for circulating capital will afford the means of production upon a larger scale to an increased number of borrowers, and that the enlarged profits of the community will afford a surplus for obtaining sufficient metallic currency to form the security of additional note issues to meet the expanding needs of business, without the sacrifice which would be involved in the attempt to maintain a currency consisting purely of metallic money.

Circulating capital is the most mobile form of wealth. According to the maxims of political economy, it should flow so freely from the point where its rental is low to the point where its rental is high that only trifling differences should exist in any part of the world. This absolute fluidity is not realized in fact because of the friction which attends the movement. There are different degrees of safety in making loans in different communities which affect the rental price of money, there are costs of transportation, and there are differences in the notoriety of credit even where the credit itself is equally good. Perfect freedom of movement on the part of circulating capital is hampered also by customs laws, by commissions and profits charged by brokers and bankers, and many other influences. Between two organized markets the difference in the rental price of money should vary only by the cost of transferring gold, but even this difference is subject to modification by losses of interest in transportation, the alarm of confidence caused by political events, the hopefulness or doubts of lenders, and by the facility for converting fixed into circulating capital.

NEEDLESS RESTRICTIONS ON BANKS ARE TAXES ON THE PEOPLE.

These differences in the rental price of money are greatly increased when that freedom which is often assumed for the operation of economic laws is hampered by legal restrictions upon the issue of credit. If the use of checks was taxed 10 per cent in the commercial centers, and no other forms for transferring the titles to money were equally convenient, the rental price of circulating capital would be increased and its movements would be greatly hampered. Prohibitions upon note issues destroy in the same manner the most convenient mechanism of credit in country districts, where the deposit system has not obtained a footing or where banking offices are not conveniently at hand.

That the absence or the severe restriction of the note-issuing function has increased the rental price of money is plain from comparison of the banking his-

*M. B. Hammond, "The Southern Farmer and Banking Reform," "Sound Currency" (December 1, 1898), V, p. 379.

†"Sound Currency" (December 1, 1898), V, p. 378.

‡Professor Nitti says of the note-issuing banks, "not only do they carry on gratuitously a great part of their operations, not only are they exposed to the risks and losses of ordinary banks of discount, but, if their organization is not perfect, they run much more considerable risks, considering their large scale of operations."—*Revue d' Economie Politique (1898), XII, p. 593.*

*Revue d'Économie Politique (1898), XII, p. 821.

†"If the money obtained by discounts was obtained at a price superior to the mean of the profits of all transactions, there would logically be no more commercial transactions, or rather there would cease to be recourse to the bank. Hence in an ideal régime of the economy of credit the maximum limit of the rate of discount is determined by the average of profits."—Nitti, Revue d'Économie Politique (1898), XII, p. 377.

tory of different countries. In England, where the restrictive policy was adopted in 1844, the discount rate was changed 330 times from 1844 to 1890, while at the Bank of France it was changed only 110 times.* The autumn months called almost invariably for an advance in the rate of the Bank of England because of "the dispersion of money in wages during the summer, and the absorption of money and capital in buying up the produce of the harvest."† No provision for relieving this demand by note issues is made by the English banking law, and every unusual demand for currency has to be met by an increased investment in metallic money, often at heavy cost to the producers of the country. In Germany high discount rates became the rule at the Imperial Bank as soon as the business of the country grew up to the limit of note issue fixed by the law of 1875. The average rate was under 3½ per cent from 1891 to 1895, but rose to 3.66 in 1896, 3.806 in 1897, 4.267 in 1898, and 4.93 in 1899. Much worse is the situation in the United States, where the rates in the rural districts have often stood at 10 or 12 per cent. That this is not a necessary condition of new countries is shown by the conditions in Canada, which possesses an economical banking currency.

The fact that the returns upon circulating capital differ so widely in different communities seriously impairs the efficiency of the whole economic system. A high rate for money in a given locality indicates that not all of the circulating capital which could be profitably employed is obtainable. The community is not able to invest the capital required in a costly tool of exchange and is not able to pay the rental price for borrowing an adequate supply. Industry is therefore hampered, because its tools are abnormally costly. The differences between the compensation earned by different industries and between different communities indicates a lack of efficiency in the distribution of industry, a deficiency in the maximum product which might be obtained under a proper organization, and a disadvantage in competition with better organized communities. As the proposition is reasoned out by Professor Von Wieser:‡

"Uniformity in the percentages of increment, and a uniform rate of interest, are, where they exist, proofs, economically speaking, of a well-balanced distribution and disposal of capital. They are proofs that the economically indicated limits of the employment of capital are everywhere equally respected; that nowhere is there any falling short, and nowhere any overstepping of them. In the principle which demands that the employment of capital shall be guided by the rate of interest, and that all employments which fail to return the customary interest be left alone, we find the marginal law brought into one common expression as regards all the different forms of capital."

IV.—The Adjustment of the Currency to Business Needs.

The greatest benefit of a banking currency, derived in some measure from the functions already ascribed to it, in the economy of the precious metals and the accumulation of credit, is in keeping the volume of currency constantly adjusted to the requirements of production and trade. This adjustment to business needs, coupled with the necessary condition of security, should be the object of every sound monetary system. A bank-note currency is especially fitted to fulfill this object, because it is based upon business transactions. A bank note, when issued in pursuance of legitimate banking business, is the offspring of a credit operation. The issue and retirement of notes is the consequence of business transactions and not the cause.§

Let it be assumed, for the sake of simplicity, that there are no other forms of credit than the discount of commercial paper by the banks and the issue of bank notes, and that all business is done by means of discounts, bank notes and coin. If a loan is made to a trader, which is issued to him entirely in bank notes, he is compelled upon its maturity to find a sufficient amount in bank notes to pay back into the bank the sum borrowed. If there were but few transactions the fluctuations in the volume of notes in circulation would respond visibly to the loans and the payments as they occurred. When a bank is making loans daily to a great number of persons, the effect of a single loan may not be obvious and striking upon the number of notes in circulation. The notes pass into many hands, but if notes and standard coin constitute the sole medium of making payments, a merchant having a loan to repay must surrender to the bank as many notes as he originally obtained or an equal amount in coin. In the one case, the outstanding debts of the bank are reduced by the withdrawal of the notes, which are the printed promises of the bank to pay coin on demand. In the other case—payment in coin—the outstanding debts in excess of the reserve are reduced by the deposit of a quantity of coin fully covering the amount of the loan and capable of redeeming in full the notes which may be still outstanding.

The operation of a banking currency under such conditions results in the automatic adjustment of the amount to the needs of the business. If the number of business transactions is large, many bills of exchange are brought to the bank and many notes are issued. A large volume of business transactions usually implies increased employment for labor and larger payments for wages and in retail purchases, requiring an increased supply of the circulating medium. A larger volume of notes is absorbed at such times than in times of dull trade. If business transactions become less numerous, the paper presented to the bank for discount becomes less, fewer notes are issued, and the retirement of the outstanding notes takes place as traders having commercial bills to meet from day to day pay notes for them into the bank. With many transactions consummated daily, the volume of a banking currency is thus kept in close relations with the needs of business. If the number of notes in the hands of the public becomes excessive, they may prefer to exchange them for standard coin by presenting them for this purpose to the bank. They will be led naturally to make such exchanges if the excess of the circulating medium operates to increase the supply of loanable capital, to depress interest rates, and thereby to attract money to other countries. Metallic money is the only money acceptable for export, and it would be necessary to present notes for redemption in coin in order to meet the demand for exportable currency.

When the deposit system is introduced, another element enters into the regulation of the volume of bank notes. If the supply of currency in the hands of the people becomes large, they begin depositing both notes and coin to their credit in the banks. Notes thus received on deposit are retired and are not reissued unless there is a demand for discounts. An excess of currency in circulation is thus rectified by the reduction of the notes in the hands of the public. The deposit constitutes an obligation of the bank, the same as the notes, and requires a sufficient cash reserve to provide for its payment on demand. The conversion of the note liability into a deposit liability prevents further issues of notes, if the reserve has been reduced nearly to the minimum limits required by law or by sound banking policy. This is usually the case when note issues tend to become excessive. Thus, in any given community, a combination of causes operates to keep a redeemable bank-note currency within the limits set by the requirements of business at any particular moment. An expanding volume of trade results in an expansion of note issues, in the form of loans, while a contracting volume of trade brings notes daily into the bank in payment of obligations which are not renewed. A contracting volume of trade also relaxes the demand for currency and increases the accumulation in individual hands, from which it is promptly carried to the banks to be deposited.

The automatic operation of a banking currency not only keeps the circulation within a country within limits adapted to business needs, but affords the means of keeping its commercial operations in harmonious relations with those of the world. The operation of the foreign exchanges comes into play when there is a greater accumulation of circulating capital in one community than another. The market for such capital is governed by the discount rate. If there is, for instance, an excess of capital upon the London market, the offerings exceed the effective demand, and under the law of supply and demand the rental price of circulating capital falls. Such conditions create an inducement to transfer capital to other markets, where a higher price is paid for its use. This transfer (under the supposed conditions of the absence of other banking credits) would have to be made in metallic money. The banks are the reservoirs of metallic money, and, if other means of transferring capital had been exhausted, their notes would be presented for redemption in gold, until the point was reached where there ceased to be any excess in the supply of capital at home over that in foreign markets, and discount rates again tended to become uniform. The volume of the notes in circulation in the exporting country would thus be reduced by the amount returned to the bank to obtain metallic money for export.

The conception which has occasionally prevailed, that bank notes may be issued in excess of the requirements of the community and may expel coin from circulation, is based upon the losses which have been suffered where bank notes have not conformed to the essential conditions that they shall be redeemed in coin on demand and be secured by commercial assets. The issue of notes upon any other basis than commercial assets tends to separate them from commercial business and to deprive the bank-note currency of the elasticity which it derives from such a connection. Professor Price, in answer to the question, "In what numbers will convertible bank notes circulate?" makes this answer:*

"The answer is the same as that which has already been given to the parallel question respecting coin. So many bank notes as the public has a distinct want for will circulate, and no more. It is the universal law of all commodities in use, the law of demand and supply. Neither bankers, nor Parliament, nor suspensions of the bank act, nor the need of borrowers, but the wants and convenience of the public, its willingness to hold bank notes, the number and amount of the specific payments which bank notes accomplish, with a certain spare stock as for all articles in use, can determine how many convertible bank notes will remain in circulation, and not be returned upon the bankers for payment. This is the truth of truths for a convertible paper currency. This is so obvious a consequence of the fact that bank notes are tools, and that their quantity will be regulated by the specific work which there is for them to do, that it almost seems a platitude to proclaim it."

The basis for the argument of Professor Price lies in the fact that notes are issued in exchange for commercial paper, which is the result of actual business transactions. It is the volume of these transactions which constitutes the primary demand for bank notes, not the bank notes which create transactions.† The notes constitute the supply of circulating capital which responds to the demand. The note is rarely created without demand and thrust upon the market to find an investment. The note, therefore, does not constitute the demand for loans; it is the loans which constitute the demand for the note. The most speculative demands for currency and credit are born on the stock exchanges, and they are satisfied by loans from deposits rather than from the power to create notes. The fault lies in the creation of fictitious and speculative loans rather than in the creation of bank notes. The correct reasoning upon the subject is well expressed by Professor Courcelle-Seneuil.‡

"When attentive study is given to the principles of the monetary circulation which have been set forth, the conviction remains that one or several banks of circulation, operating upon a market and committing no faults in their discounts, are never able to issue too many bills, whatever may be their efforts toward this end, because their issues have a natural and necessary limit. It may be concluded directly and absolutely that if banks commit faults it is always in their investments and never in their borrowings by notes or otherwise."

The greatest danger of excessive speculation is found in a rigid currency issued by the Government rather than in redeemable notes issued by banks. A Government paper currency is nonexportable and does not respond, either by expansion or contraction, to the requirements of trade. When the demand for currency is great, such money is often inadequate; when the demand relaxes, such money is excessive in volume and is either employed by its holders in speculation or presses heavily upon the whole volume of the money of the country, with the result of expelling the surplus by the export of gold. The same lack of responsiveness to the needs of trade is the characteristic defect of a bank-note currency secured by Government bonds or other securities which are not commercial in their character and of short terms of maturity. Such a form of security has only an indirect relation to the essential character of the notes as contracts to deliver money. To fulfill such contracts, as Prof. J. B. Say well says, "It is necessary that the bank have in its possession not merely securities of thorough soundness, but those always available and convertible instantly into money; for a holder of bills who thinks himself likely to be paid in lands or houses will not consent to receive the bills as cash."§

The issue of bank notes upon convertible commercial assets affords, therefore, the best means of giving elasticity to the currency and keeping it adjusted to the requirements of trade. What is meant by this elasticity is well set forth by Professor Dunbar:¶

"It means responsiveness to present increase or diminution of demand—the power of adaptation to the needs of the month, the week, or the day, whether rising or falling. * * * Elasticity implies the operation of counter forces, in a currency as well as in a steel spring. That a currency may be responsive to demand it is necessary that the forces tending respectively to expand or to restrict should be forces at work in the daily business of the bank, where it is brought into contact with the community by the stream of loans, deposits, and payments."

THE BENEFITS OF ELASTICITY.

Elasticity is one of the most important qualities of a good currency. This elasticity must be derived either from such a movement from place to place of a fixed volume of currency as provides the amount required at every given point or from such a capacity for increase or decrease in volume as meets the changing needs of trade. Experience has shown that a fixed volume of currency is not always equal to the demands put upon it and causes unnecessary advances in the rate for the rental of money. In every country there is usually a much greater demand for currency at certain periods than at others, and this enlarged demand happens to be almost simultaneous in several of the chief civilized countries which deal with each other as reciprocal producers and consumers of food products and finished goods. This special demand is most intense in the autumn, when the cereal crops and the cotton crop are harvested and taken to market. At such times there is not only unusual activity in the money centers, but a pressure for currency in the producing sections, which requires an enlarged supply of the circulating medium if reasonable wants are to be fully supplied.

*Nitti, Revue d'Économie Politique (1898), XII, p. 383.
†Jevons, "Investigations in Currency and Finance," p. 172.
‡"Natural Value," p. 146.
§"The issue of bills in connection with loans for short terms and made rigorously convertible is only the effect of transactions and not the cause of these transactions."—Juglar, p. 211.

*Currency and Banking, p. 54.
†Every market having to provide for a certain quantity of exchanges has need only of a certain quantity of instruments of payment.—Leroy-Beaulieu, Traité d'Économie Politique, III, p. 567. An increased equipment of the tools of exchange will eventually stimulate the volume of exchanges, but the notes can only be issued as demand for them arises.
‡Traité des Opérations de Banque, p. 224.
§Traité d'Économie Politique, p. 306.
¶"Quarterly Journal of Economics" (October, 1897), XII, p. 14.

There are other periodical demands for currency which affect banking accounts in a considerable degree, but the movement of the autumn is the most widespread and prolonged. Mr. Jevons, although an opponent of a true banking currency, admitted the periodical character of this pressure in England in an article on "The frequent autumnal pressure in the money market and the action of the Bank of England."* A largely increased volume of exchanges requires an increase in some manner in the medium of exchange. This increase may be obtained either by the mechanism of the deposit and check system, by the borrowing of money by one bank from another, or by the issue of bank notes. In the case of a demand for an increased medium of exchange upon the occasion of special financial operations in the cities, like the issue of a new loan or the payment of dividends, the medium of exchange furnished by deposits and loans is usually sufficient. How this system operates is thus set forth by the monetary commission:†

"The deposit currency by means of which the largest part of our commercial transactions is effected is particularly elastic. It expands and contracts automatically with every change in demand. If additional currency is wanted in a strictly commercial community for any of these extraordinary demands—by a railroad, for example, to provide for the payment of interest on its bonds—it is secured from an existing deposit, or by means of a loan granted in the form of deposit currency against which checks for the interest are drawn; and to the extent to which those to whom the interest is paid likewise make use of the check and deposit system, the whole transaction is carried through without the least trouble or friction."

While the deposit currency thus serves the purpose of the commercial centers, experience has shown that it is not acceptable and sufficient for the needs of the rural districts, and especially the producing and laboring classes. In most countries the bank-note circulation expands automatically to meet the demand for a larger means of conducting exchanges. This is not the case in the United States, because of the restrictive character of the note-issuing system. The country banks borrow regularly from the banks of New York and other reserve cities, and are thereby compelled to divide with these central banks the profits of the autumn business and to charge higher rates than would be the case if they could from their own resources provide the medium of local exchanges. The accounts of the country banks show a regular increase in the autumn in their loans from other banks, which almost disappears in the spring.‡ During January and February the country is usually emptying its idle money into New York; in March there is a slight reaction, lasting only a few weeks, and from May till August the tide again flows strongly toward New York. With August the turn comes, and the movement to the interior is again strong and continues until December.§

The effect of the withdrawal of capital from the reserve cities is often disastrous to financial operations in these cities. This demand has to be met mainly in currency, which the New York banks are required to hold as a reserve to the amount of 25 per cent of their deposits. Their losses of currency reduce their reserves, and at periods of the greatest strain have often reduced them below the legal limit.‖ This need not have occurred if greater freedom of note issue had been given to the national banks. They would then be able to meet demands for currency as they are met in Scotland and Canada, without the impairment of their reserves or the undue increase of their discount rates. The manner in which the note issues of the Scotch banks respond to the necessity for a larger medium of exchange is thus set forth by Mr. Gilbart:¶

"In Scotland the lowest point of circulation is in March and the highest in November. The advance, however, between these two points is not uniform, for the highest of the intervening months is May, after which there is a slight reaction; but it increases again until November, and falls off in December. The reason of the great increase in May and November is that these are the seasons for making payments. The interest due on mortgages is then settled, annuities are then paid, the country people usually take the interest on their deposit receipts, and the servants receive their wages. There are frequently large sums transferred by way of mortgage. It is the custom of Scotland to settle all transactions, large as well as small, by bank notes—not by checks on bankers, as in London. It is remarkable that these monthly variations occur uniformly every year, while the amount of the circulation in the corresponding months of different years undergoes comparatively little change.

"The circulation of Scotland is at its lowest point in the month of March, is higher in July, and reaches its highest point in November. In the corresponding months of different years there is but little deviation in the amount of the circulation. These facts prove that the circulation of Scotland does not produce any effect upon prices, nor, consequently, upon the foreign exchanges. It is hardly necessary to adduce evidence in proof of the fact that the prices of commodities do not go on increasing from March to November in every year; and if they do not, they can not be regulated by the currency."

The Canadian bank-note system is also directly responsive to the demands of production and exchange. Its fluctuations are thus set forth by Mr. Root:**

"As surely and as regularly as the autumn months come round and the inevitable accompanying demand for additional currency begins to manifest itself, does the circulation of the banks automatically respond; the expansion ordinarily continues until about November, when a maximum, some 20 per cent in excess of the nominal circulation during the summer months, is reached. In consequence of this prompt and adequate response to every legitimate demand of commerce for more of the media of exchange, the conditions in Canada are quite different from those to which we, in this country, are accustomed. As a prominent banker has recently stated it, 'Panics for fear of stringency are thus unknown. The Canadians never know what it is to go through an American money squeeze in the autumn.'"

The proof of this responsiveness of the Canadian currency to the needs of business is afforded by the figures of the circulation. While the Canadian banks are permitted to issue circulation to the amount of their capital, which was $63,241,533 on December 31, 1898, their note issues rise during the period of special demand for a circulating medium and are promptly reduced again under the operation of the redemption system when this demand declines. The circulation varies by 20 per cent in the course of the year. This was the case in 1892, when the minimum circulation of May was $31,383,000 and the maximum circulation of October was $38,688,000, only to fall in the following May to $31,927,000. The circulation touched even lower points under the influence of the dull business of 1894 and 1895, but rose on October 31, 1898, to $42,543,446 to fall again on March 31, 1899, to $38,409,227.

THE "CURRENCY" AND "BANKING" PRINCIPLES.

The question has been raised by a number of economists whether the saving of capital due to the employment of a bank-note currency is not obtained at the sacrifice of safety and the real economic interests of the country where such a currency is employed. The fact that systems of bank-note issues have in many cases proved defective has led to the conclusion that the theory of a banking currency was itself unsound. The subject was discussed with great warmth in England during the first half of the present century and the lines of battle were then drawn between the advocates of what was called the "currency principle" on the one hand and the "banking principle" on the other. The advocates of the currency principle laid down the proposition that bank notes should not be issued beyond the amount at which they would fluctuate exactly as a metallic currency would fluctuate. This limit they found in the issue of notes simply as certificates, fully covered by coin, or only in such amounts without a metallic cover as would constitute the minimum amount below which the circulation was never likely to descend. It was contended that credit is unduly stimulated by the issue of paper notes as a substitute for metallic money, and that in such cases "the whole money of the country, paper and gold, indistinguishably, is depreciated in comparison with the money of other countries."*

It is necessary in order to sustain an indictment against the value of a bank-note currency in promoting the convenience and the real economic interest of a community either to show that all credit is in itself injurious to the community, or that bank notes so far differ from other forms of credit that they threaten a peculiar and excessive danger. The first point hardly calls for serious discussion. The abolition of all forms of credit in business transactions would mean the arrest of the mechanism of modern exchange and the restriction of production within very narrow limits. The consummation of every transaction for cash without contracts for future delivery would require an immense volume of money, and would mean also that the prices of all commodities and services would be governed by the demand and supply of the moment instead of by sound judgment as to future supplies.

Contracts to pay money for future production would become impossible, and prices and wages would fluctuate violently under the influence of temporary causes, without the steadying effects which would be given by the ability to make contracts for future performance. Nearly all forms of credit are in the nature of contracts to deliver money at some future time. This is the nature of a bank note, a deposit account with a bank, a bill of exchange, and a promissory note. The first two forms differ from the others in the fact that the holder of the contract has the power to demand performance at any time, at his pleasure, instead of on a date fixed by the maker of the contract.

That there are certain risks involved in modern credit transactions can not be denied. Production, where it is carried on in anticipation of future demand, may be carried further in certain cases than if it were carried on only in response to immediate orders; but all such risks are controlled and reduced to a minimum by the regulating force of prices throughout the world and the existence of organized markets, especially on the produce and stock exchanges. Gen. Francis A. Walker, one of the most intelligent and candid of the opponents of a banking currency, dismisses the possibility of risk where paper is reasonably secured by the following comparisons:†

"Yet, though the issue of bank notes on a partial basis of specie under the doctrine of chances is always, in the nature of the case, at a certain risk, this does not constitute a fatal objection to paper-money banking, if it be otherwise desirable. Men and communities rightly take the necessary risk of collisions and boiler explosions for the sake of the saving in time and the gain in power which they derive from the use of steam cars and steamboats. So it might be with disasters to which, from the fault of managers or through causes that could neither be controlled nor anticipated, paper-money banking should be found subject."

Dismissing, then, the proposition that all forms of credit should be abolished in a modern industrial community, it becomes necessary to examine the proposition that bank notes constitute a form of credit involving peculiar dangers. The question was disputed in the discussion over the English bank act during the first half of the century, whether a bank-note currency fluctuated in exactly the same manner as a metallic currency. Some of the advocates of such a currency contended that its fluctuations were regulated by precisely the same laws and in precisely the same manner as a metallic currency—that an excess in the volume of currency would correct itself by the presentation of bank notes for redemption and the exportation of the surplus in the precious metals. Other advocates of a banking currency contend that it acts as a cushion for the violent fluctuations in the supply of money caused by abnormal demands for the precious metals—that, in fact, a bank-note currency need not and ought not to fluctuate, as expressed by Mr. Nicholson, "exactly as a currency composed of coin only would have fluctuated under similar conditions." The contention of the opponents of a banking currency has been that it would not fluctuate in response to the movements of the precious metals and that such fluctuations were necessary in order to apply the corrective influence of the foreign exchanges to excessive issues of paper.

There are elements of truth in the position taken by each side in this controversy. It is highly desirable that a bank-note currency should be responsive in some degree to the play of the foreign exchanges and to the volume of metallic money. Entire absence of such responsiveness would result in the same dangers as issues of inconvertible paper money. It does not follow, however, that a bank-note currency should be governed absolutely by the movement of the precious metals in the same degree as if the paper notes were themselves coined money. The law of marginal utility sends the notes where metallic money might not go, thereby equipping a country more efficiently with the tools of exchange, and the demands for metallic money are so peculiar and specific in their nature that they are often influenced by causes which ought not to be permitted to operate at once and with full effect upon the domestic circulation of a country and in fact do not thus operate upon a properly regulated bank-note currency.

Nearly all the various forms of banking credit are contracts to deliver metallic money. They are promises to pay money at some future time. Professor Jevons, an able advocate of the currency principle, says:‡

"Every one who promises to pay gold on a future day thereby increases the anticipated supply of gold, and there is no limit to the amount of gold which can thus be thrown upon the market. Every one who draws a bill or issues a note, unconsciously acts as a 'bear' upon the gold market. Everything goes well, and apparently prosperity falls upon the whole community, so long as these promises to pay gold can be redeemed or replaced by new promises. * * *

"But foreigners will not hold such promises on the same footing; and, if the exchanges are against us, the metallic, not the paper, part of the currency will

*Investigations in Currency and Finance, page 160.

†Report, page 311. Statistics of payments of interest and dividends on railroad bonds and stocks in the United States in 1897, furnished to the Monetary Commission by the Commercial and Financial Chronicle, showed such wide variations as $67,000,000 in January and $14,500,000 in February.

‡The national banks located in the Southern States have an aggregate capital of $68,680,000. On October 6, 1896, they had borrowed largely from banks in the East, to assist in handling the cotton crop, $13,548,000. On March 9 following these loans had been reduced to $2,516,200. They succeeded in borrowing for a part of their needs, but commercial necessities required more. With proper banking facilities the necessity for such borrowing now existing would be reduced to a minimum.—*Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury (Lyman J. Gage) on the State of the Finances, 1897*, page 78.

§Report of the Monetary Commission, page 320.

‖Thus Mr. A. D. Noyes says in regard to the pressure of 1893: "On the New York banks the strain was particularly violent. During the month of June the cash reserves of banks in that city decreased nearly twenty millions; during July they fell off twenty-one millions more. The deposits intrusted to them had been loaned, according to the banking practice, in the Eastern market; their sudden recall in quantity forced the Eastern banks to contract their loans immediately."—*Thirty Years of American Finance*, page 191.

¶Principles and Practice of Banking, II, page 216.

**Canadian Bank-Note Currency, Sound Currency (December 15, 1894), II, page 322.

*F. A. Walker, "Money," p. 430.

†"Money," p. 411.

‡Money and the Mechanism of Exchange, pp. 315-316.

go abroad. It is at this moment that bankers will find no difficulty in expanding their issues, because many persons have claims to meet in gold, and the notes are regarded as gold. The notes will thus conveniently fill up the void occasioned by the exportation of specie; prices will be kept up, prosperity will continue, the balance of foreign trade will be still against us, and the game of replacing gold by promises will go on to an unlimited extent, until it becomes actually impossible to find more gold to make necessary payments abroad."

These propositions contain some truth. The difficulty is that if they constitute fatal objections to bank-note issues, they also constitute objections to all other contracts for the delivery of metallic money. The condition assumed by Mr. Jevons, in which notes would continue to replace gold until no more gold remained for export, would occur only if reasonable reserves were not kept against bank-note issues. The situation would simply be that more contracts for the future delivery of money had been made than could be fulfilled. The money market would be in the same condition as the wheat market, when demands for the performance of contracts for future delivery exceeded the capacity of brokers to make delivery. In the case of money, however, the difficulty of creating a corner would be infinitely greater than in the case of wheat or any other single commodity, because the supply of money in the world is subject to narrow fluctuations and is distributed among many commercial centers, where it is held subject to rental at a price. Sound banking and sound methods of credit undoubtedly require that reasonable regard should be had in the issue of instruments of credit to the ability to fulfill the contracts which are made. This is equally true of other commodities as well as instruments of credit. There are special reasons why the State is justified in requiring guarantees of solvency from those who deal in money, but it is not necessary that these conditions should go so far as to forbid contracts in the form of bank notes for the future delivery of money.

Mr. Jevons criticised those who advocated the adoption of a true banking currency in England, upon the ground that if they wanted currency they might obtain gold by giving up capital for it. He declared:*

"This metal, again, is only to be had, in the absence of gold mines, by that state of foreign trade which brings it and does not drain it away again. The principal currency, in short, must be regarded as a commodity, the supply of which is to be left to the natural action of the laws of supply and demand. The unrestricted issue of paper representative notes produces an artificial interference with these natural conditions."

The words "natural" and "artificial" have no place in such a discussion. The issue of paper instruments of credit is just as "natural" an element of modern commerce as the evolution of stamped disks of gold as the sole standard of value. It is true that the use of paper credit modifies to some extent the movement of the precious metals which might take place if no such instruments existed, but the one influence is no more "natural" or "artificial" than the other. It is because the use of such instruments permits economies in the use of gold, and therefore interferes with "the natural action of the laws of supply and demand" for gold that these instruments are of value to the community. The opening of railways interfered with "the natural action of the laws of supply and demand" for seats in post coaches, but that constitutes no argument for the retention of the "natural conditions" of the old mode of conveyance.

Mr. Jevons appears to share the opinion of General Walker, that the power to borrow notes from a bank is an encouragement to speculation. They reason, more or less unconsciously, as though the entire profit derived from the economy of note issues went to the borrower of the notes, instead of being spread over the whole volume of banking operations. The borrower of notes has to pay for them in the form of discount. If the public, in a period of speculation, is willing to pay for the use of currency by high discount rates, they will be able to obtain it in the form of gold. There is nothing in the possession of a gold currency which prevents the wildest speculation. Gold can be obtained at a price, if it is required, in any country where the speculative spirit runs high, and experience has shown that other forms of credit are quite as useful in promoting speculation as the issue of bank notes. The rental price of gold might be slightly higher than the price of bank notes, so far as either was required in speculative transactions, but the difference would hardly be such as to check the demand for money during a period of speculation.

Bank notes may facilitate speculation just as other forms of credit may. The proposition that credit should for this reason be suppressed has already been dismissed with the consent of General Walker. As a matter of fact, it is generally admitted, even by critics of a bank-note currency, that notes are not the primary cause of speculation. It is simply contended that they provide it with a convenient tool. But deposit accounts, the check system, and certified checks also provide such a tool of a much more efficient character and in much greater volume than bank notes.† These other instruments of credit constitute the mechanism of modern wholesale transactions and speculation upon the produce and stock exchanges. Money, even where bank notes are included under the definition of money, forms but a trifling percentage in the settlement of these transactions. The issue of bank notes, therefore, can not contribute in any material degree to promoting speculation in the great commercial centers as credit is at present organized.

What then is the true law of the operation of bank notes upon credit, and the movement of the precious metals? If bank notes do not contribute materially to sustaining speculation, what aid do they give to the business community? The answer to these questions is derived largely from the law of marginal utility, which, under the clear reasoning of the Austrian and German economists, has solved with precision so many economic problems. Bank notes do not respond directly and precisely to the movements of the precious metals, because they find their employment to a large extent upon the margin and beyond the margin of the utility of metallic money. If, for illustration, notes may be issued upon a reserve of 50 per cent in coin, the community gets the use of twice the amount of currency which it would otherwise obtain at the same cost. A community capable of investing its capital in money to the extent of say $50,000,000 would thus be able to command the use of $100,000,000 in well secured circulating notes. If the law required a reserve of 50 per cent against note issues, and the notes outstanding were constantly at the maximum allowed by law, a demand for gold from abroad might lead the paper currency to fluctuate exactly as the metallic currency over its whole volume.

The usual conditions of banking and credit, however, even where fixed metallic reserves are required, do not involve the issue of notes to the utmost limit allowed by law. Such issues occur only in the poorer portions of the community, where the demand for a tool of exchange exceeds the amount of capital available for investment in such a tool. In the great commercial centers there is usually a surplus of metallic money, whose movements backwards and forwards from country to country do not necessarily involve a corresponding reduction of the domestic circulation. The domestic circulation, especially in the districts removed from the commercial centers, remains unimpaired, while the portions of the community which are engaged in great speculative movements surrender gold or borrow it back, according to the decisive question whether the price they get in the one case corresponds to the disadvantage of being without it, or the price they pay in the other corresponds to the advantage of having it. In these transactions a fraction of 1 per cent may decide the question whether gold shall move from one commercial center to another. There may be a sudden call in one of these centers for the execution of contracts to deliver gold. There is no reason why these conditions should affect the domestic circulation of the country, except so far as they indicate that the entire structure of credit has been unduly expanded. In that case the pressure will be felt upon all the issuing banks and a contraction of note issues will follow.

It has to be borne in mind that the transfer of the precious metals is not governed purely by the state of trade. The problem of international exchanges is no longer the simple shipment of gold to cover an excess of importations of merchandise. Securities often take the place of gold as payment, bills of exchange are sent to the country, where they mature or are held in the creditor country pending maturity, according to the rate of interest in either country, and gold itself is loaned on credit where its rental is highest. This being the case, a special demand for gold is created on the one hand, which is not dependent upon the domestic transactions of any one country, and a necessity is created on the other hand for a domestic medium of exchange which is not controlled absolutely by these temporary and almost arbitrary movements of the precious metals. Every community ought to take measures to maintain its solvency by retaining a certain minimum supply of the precious metals. This is a matter of sound banking policy or of government regulation, but it is very far from involving the requirement that the bank note shall be destroyed as an instrument of credit and that the surface of the domestic circulation shall be swept by every tempest upon the stock exchanges which affects the rental price of gold. The steadying and beneficial operation of a bank-note currency in these respects is thus set forth by Professor Cauwes:*

"The entire community profits by issue, at first because the circulation of bills relieves it from the purchase of a great quantity of metallic money, and then because a mixed circulation (of bullion, coin, and paper) is better regulated, according to the movements of foreign commerce, than a circulation exclusively metallic. If gold and silver were the only money it would result that every time the importations of foreign goods were in excess of the exportations, money going out of the country would subject the domestic market to a crisis having the consequence of a sudden rise of prices. Paper money, acting as an auxiliary to metallic money in quantities varying according to the needs of business, averts the monetary crisis which the operation of the foreign exchanges might otherwise occasion, and thus gives more stability to commerce."

The movements of a bank-note currency, therefore, do not and need not correspond precisely to the movements of the precious metals in order to insure healthy financial conditions. The advantage of such a currency will often be found in this very divergence from mathematical relations to the supply of metallic money. In one community the demand for tools of exchange, perhaps for only a temporary purpose, may strain the note-issuing power to the maximum limit of safety. In such a community the power to issue notes will be of the highest value, because the desired service to trade can be rendered for a fraction of the cost of bringing coin or bullion into the community for the full amount of currency required. In another community the lethargy of transactions or the preference for other forms of credit may reduce the volume of outstanding notes to nearly the level of metallic reserves or even below that level. Such a condition may permit the surrender of coin or bullion to a community where the supply is insufficient, but without destroying the power to expand the note issue within reasonable limits when there is an increased demand for the medium of exchange. The greatest use and highest value of the note-issuing function will be found on the margin where coin can not go because it is too costly. If the blanket of a metallic currency will spread over only those portions of the community well equipped with surplus capital, the use of the note-issuing function will spread a useful fringe of benefits over a wider area and protect the entire community against the inconveniences of a sudden contraction of the metallic cover.

VALUE OF NOTE ISSUES IN NEW COUNTRIES.

There are two classes of conditions under which the privilege of issuing bank notes under the minimum of restrictions is of great service. The first class of conditions are those prevailing in comparatively undeveloped countries, where the supply of capital is not equal to the demand for it for creating the machinery of production and means of transportation, and where banking offices are widely separated. So pressing is the need for an economical paper currency under such conditions that it has sprung into being beyond the law and outside the law where no legal provision has been made for it. One of the most interesting cases of a successful currency of this sort, which was maintained for several years in the face of hostile legal enactments, was that known as "George Smith's money," an episode in the early history of Wisconsin. Wisconsin, in 1838, like most of the newer Territories of the United States, was without a sufficient metallic currency and without an organized system of banks of issue. The creators of the new money were two Scotchmen, George Smith and Alexander Mitchell, who had been educated in the efficiency of bank-note issues in their native country. George Smith obtained from the Territorial legislature of Wisconsin a charter for the Wisconsin Marine and Fire Insurance Company. The bill became a law on February 26, 1839, and authorized the company to "make insurance upon life or lives, and employ such capital as may belong or accrue to said company in the purchase of public or other stock, or in any other moneyed transaction or operations for the sole benefit of the said company." There was a general clause, usually incorporated in charters, that "nothing herein contained shall give the said company banking privileges." This clause was practically ignored and the banking feature of the business done by the company soon overshadowed the insurance feature.

The company advertised to "receive money on deposit and transact other moneyed operations, in which, by their charter, they are allowed to engage." Certificates of deposit were issued in sums of $1, $3, $5, and $10, in the form of bank bills. These certificates met a popular want and they were soon found in people's pockets all over Wisconsin, Illinois, Iowa, Missouri, and Michigan. They were redeemed in specie at the central office in Milwaukee, and in New York exchange at the current rate through agencies in Chicago, Detroit, Buffalo, Galena, Cincinnati, and St. Louis. The success of "George Smith's money" was so great that the jealousy of other bankers was incurred, and repeated efforts were made to break down the bank. There was a fight running over several sessions of the Wisconsin legislature to have the charter forfeited or repealed, but in these debates no question was raised in regard to the solvency of the institution, and it was asserted without contradiction that its notes were as "good as gold."

When the other banks, the day after Thanksgiving in 1849, attempted to force the bank to suspend specie payments by gathering and presenting for redemption all the notes they could find, Mr. Mitchell directed that the bank be kept open until a late hour of the evening and that depositors and note holders be paid as rapidly as they presented themselves. Every note presented was redeemed even before the reserve supply of cash arrived which was ordered from Chicago. The issues of certificates at this time had reached about $1,000,000, having steadily grown in amount from the organization of the bank. The people of Wisconsin voted down a constitution which prohibited bank-note

* Money and the Mechanism of Exchange, p. 312.

† The practice of certifying checks where the maker of the check had not even a sufficient banking credit to cover it attained considerable development in New York during the decade from 1860 to 1870, and became an efficient aid in stock speculation. The legislature of New York passed a law to govern the subject in 1869 and the Federal Congress in 1882 imposed penalties for "overcertification," but neither of these laws sought in any way to restrict certification where the maker of the check had a legitimate credit for the amount.—*Vide* Bolles, "Financial History of the United States," III, pp. 365–367.

* Cours d'Économic Politique, II, p. 309.

issues in the State, largely because of their sympathy with the Mitchell bank. When finally Wisconsin was admitted to the Union in 1848, a general banking law was passed, under which the Wisconsin Marine and Fire Insurance Company reorganized. The advantages of this currency, the spontaneous outgrowth of business needs, have been graphically set forth by Mr. Root: *

'It is obvious that 'George Smith's money,' which played so large a part in the early settlement of the Northwest, took the place of other kinds of money, and especially of specie, for which the products of the country would have otherwise been sold. On condition that the currency should always be redeemed in specie, this was a good thing for the holders of Smith's money as well as for Smith; that is, it was an advantage to the public. It was an advantage because it was more convenient to handle and carry and count, while it performed all the local exchanges equally well. It introduced the principle of barter on a large scale. Whatever work bank checks would do in the city of Milwaukee, George Smith's money would do over the greater part of Wisconsin, Illinois, Missouri, and Iowa. It enabled the local exchanges to be carried on without specie. * * *

"In the fall, when the crops began to move, there was no lack of money for legitimate trade, because it was as easy to put out these certificates at one time as at another. In the winter, when lake navigation was closed, the certificates answered all the purposes of a local circulating medium. In the spring, when the steamboats began to move, bringing new settlers and cargoes of goods, the certificates came back to headquarters mainly for the purchase of New York drafts, after which they took their usual round again."

A like device for escaping the restrictions imposed by a too narrow note-issuing system is that of the Cheque Bank in England, which was instituted after the bank act of 1844. Money was received by this bank on deposit, and books of checks were issued for even denominations, which might be filled in for less than the denomination, but not for more. The face value of the checks issued did not exceed the depositor's credit, so that the receiver of such a check had the assurance of the bank that the depostor's account was not overdrawn. Such checks were made payable by the Cheque Bank only through some other banker and not at the counter of the bank, thereby escaping the prohibition of the law against promissory notes payable to bearer on demand.

The checks passed between individuals for cash, and the Cheque Bank established relations with some 1,500 domestic and foreign banks which agreed to receive and cash its checks. Professor MacLeod expressed the opinion that these checks, if not a violation of the letter of the law, were at least a violation of its spirit, and if not interfered with would open the door wide for any amount of issues of checks capable of circulating as money, by any bank in the Kingdom.† In this view he is correct, and such a device would undoubtedly have been widely adopted if the education of the English people in the use of other forms of credit had not made it comparatively unnecessary. The success of the Cheque Bank well illustrates the principle that the real needs of a community will usually find spontaneous relief along the lines of least resistance and will often circumvent repressive laws.

The issue of bank notes under the minimum of restrictions is of peculiar value in periods of panic, even in countries otherwise well equipped with the mechanism of credit. The demand on such occasions is for some article which is readily exchangeable and which will be accepted in the fulfillment of contracts to deliver money. Such contracts under normal business conditions are so generally cleared against each other that their fulfillment is not often demanded. These conditions change when confidence is impaired, because a great void is then caused in the usual mechanism of credit which bank notes are called upon to fill. The issues of bank notes which then occur are abnormal in their character, are not required beyond the period of accute pressure for currency, and may be issued by a sound institution without much regard to the exact proportion of notes to the metallic reserve, so long as the reserve is sufficient to meet all demands and inspire confidence in the solidity of the institution.

It is the recognition of the peculiar character of this demand for currency in periods of panic which led to the provisions of the charters of the Imperial Bank of Germany, the Austro-Hungarian Bank, and the Bank of Japan, that notes might be issued without the increase of the metallic reserves when they paid a tax to the Government at the rate of about 5 per cent a year. The undue restriction of the normal note-issuing function in these countries has compelled resort to this power on many other occasions than those of actual panic,‡ but upon all these occasions the power to issue notes, even under a heavy penalty, has proved useful to the business community.

The utility of the power to issue bank notes without fixed limits in meeting the abnormal demand of a panic has been clearly shown on all of the occasions of crises which have swept the London money market within the present century. The Bank of England was strong enough, only a short time after its resumption of cash payments, to stay the panic of 1825 by the free issue of its own notes. The display of stacks of £1 notes upon the counters of the Gurneys at Norwich was sufficient to arrest the run upon their bank.§ The bank came to the rescue of the money market in a similar manner in the crisis of 1847, again in 1857, and again in 1866. There never was a question on any of these occasions of the value of the notes of the bank as the equivalent of money. The only question which arose under the charter of the bank after the restrictive act of 1844, was the authority to issue a sufficient amount of notes to meet the demands of the commercial community.

The bank act greatly hampered the issue of notes, but authority was given to the bank by the Government on each of these occasions to disregard the limits of the law and issue as many notes as might be required. The mere fact that the authority to issue notes was given, and that currency could be had by solvent borrowers, was sufficient to stay the tide of panic in 1847. Notes which had been hoarded, under the impression that the limit of issues fixed by the law would soon be reached, came pouring from their hiding places, gold which had been stored in deposit vaults was returned to the banks for deposit, and both the metallic and banking reserves of the Bank of England rapidly rose to safe proportions. A similar experience accompanied the crisis of 1857, when £2,000,000 in notes were actually issued above the legal limit. The crisis of 1866 was met in a similar manner. The Bank of England could hardly have continued to meet its liabilities for another day if the chancellor of the exchequer had not announced in the House of Commons on the evening of May 11—"Black Friday"—that the Government had addressed a letter to the bank authorizing the suspension of the note limit.‖ The panic was again checked by the knowledge that a medium of exchange could be obtained by solvent borrowers.

The power to issue notes without a rigid limit, even if they are restricted to a fixed relation to the metallic reserve, is of value in periods of panic. It usually inspires confidence at such times for the great note-issuing banks to borrow gold from abroad. This was done by the Bank of England on the occasion of the Baring failure in 1890, when £3,000,000 was obtained from the Bank of France upon the security of exchequer bonds, and £1,500,000 was obtained from St. Petersburg. The crisis of 1890 was prevented from degenerating into a panic by a combination among the leading banks,* so that there was not much special call for currency to fulfill money contracts, and there was no tendency to withdraw deposits from the banks because of distrust. If such a panic had occurred, accompanied by a demand for deposits from the banks, the importations of gold would have proved a defective as well as insufficient resource for meeting the demand. It would have been otherwise if the gold had been availed of under such circumstances as a reserve against note issues to the amount of twice or three times its value. The potency of the gold would then have been doubled or trebled in amount and its real efficiency would have been increased in a much greater ratio by reason of the general preference for notes over coin.

CHARLES A. CONANT.

* "Sound Currency" (April 15, 1898), V, p. 129. All the facts given are from Mr. Root's paper.

† "There can be no possible doubt that these instruments, these crossed bank notes, are an utter and complete violation of the manifest purpose and intention, not only of the bank charter act, but of all our monetary legislation for the last century. For what is easier than for the bank and its customers to agree to make these checks for £1, and put them into circulation? Then we have at once £1 bank notes. So also the checks for 10s. and 5s. are the old silver notes back again. If the Cheque Bank may do this with impunity, why may not every other bank in the Kingdom do the same?"—Theory and Practice of Banking, II, p. 376.

‡ In Germany notes were issued subject to the tax during sixteen weeks of 1898, and such issues stood on December 31, at 282,955,280 marks ($70,000,000).

§ MacLeod, Theory and Practice of Banking, II, p. 118.

‖ Gilbart, II, p. 354. One of the representatives of the joint-stock banks is reported to have said to the representative of the Bank of England, at a meeting of the leading bankers just before midnight, before the limit of note issue was removed, "I can draw a couple of checks to-morrow morning which will shut you up at once."

* Mr. Lidderdale, the governor of the Bank of England, secured an agreement among the joint-stock banks of London, the leading provincial banks, and the joint-stock banks of Scotland to guarantee the liquidation of the Baring indebtedness to the amount of £15,000,000. *Vide* MacLeod, Theory of Credit, II, p. 836.

Civil Government for Alaska—This conflict will continue until justice prevails and the rights of the people are respected.

SPEECH

OF

HON. J. H. DAVIDSON,

OF WISCONSIN,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, May 28, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (S. 3419) making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes—

Mr. DAVIDSON said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: At the closing hours of this session we find many things undone which ought to have been done. That we have enacted important legislation upon a variety of subjects there is no question, but whether our sins of omission exceed those of commission remains to be seen. I do not at this time intend to comment upon the things done, but to call attention to one of the things which thus far has been left undone. I refer to the proposed legislation (H. R. 3717) intended to more thoroughly regulate and control the sale of oleomargarine.

This proposed legislation is of vital importance to the dairying interests of our country; to those who produce butter from cream and milk and who do not believe it is just or fair to compel them to compete with a substitute produced from the fats of hogs and steers, this substitute being colored to resemble butter and placed upon the market and sold as such in direct competition with the genuine article. The use of animal fats as a substitute for butter was first discovered by a French scientist named Mege during the siege of Paris in 1870 and 1871. Experience and invention have resulted in the production of a substitute for butter which now so closely resembles the pure article in color, flavor, and odor that it is difficult to detect the difference.

The marvelous increase in the amount of oleomargarine annually manufactured and sold is of especial interest to many people. The manufacturer of the article is interested and pleased because of his increased profits. The dairyman is interested and alarmed because of this undue competition. The consumer is interested and curious to know how much of this substance he has unwittingly consumed.

The present law regulating the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine was enacted in 1886. At that time, owing to the increase in the sale of colored oleomargarine, twenty-two States of the Union had passed laws intended to regulate its sale. These were found deficient, and Congress, in response to the appeal from the people, enacted a law imposing a tax of 2 cents upon each pound manufactured, and in addition required of each manufacturer the payment of a license fee of $600 per year; of each wholesale dealer $480 per year, and of each retail dealer $48 per year.

When the proposition was first presented a higher tax was desired but finally the tax was made less in consideration of another provision in the law, which was supposed to be its most important part, namely, the provision for the branding and marking of each package. It was believed then that this branding feature would compel this substitute for butter to be sold for what it was and upon its merits. Had that result been accomplished this proposed legislation would not now be necessary. Experience has proven, however, that the branding feature of that law has been of no particular value. There is abundant evidence to show that its provisions are not only violated but are avoided in many different ways.

No matter how thoroughly a package may be branded when it passes from the manufacturer to the wholesale dealer and thence to

the retailer, it is not a difficult matter to remove the brands and place this substitute upon the market as butter and sell it as such. By reason of such deception the dealer is able to realize enormous profits on the money invested, although in so doing he not only defrauds the consumer who asks for butter, who pays the price of butter, and who thinks he is receiving butter, but he perpetrates a fraud upon the great dairy interests of the country. Against such deception and rascality the dairy people now ask for protection.

I submit herewith a table which shows the amount of oleomargarine produced each year since November, 1886, when the present law went into effect:

	Produced.	Revenue paid.
	Pounds.	*Dollars.*
On hand November 1, 1886	181,090	
During the fiscal year ended June 30—		
1887 (from November 1, 1886)	21,513,537	723,948.04
1888	34,325,527	864,139.88
1889	35,664,026	804,247.91
1890	32,324,032	786,291.72
1891	44,392,409	1,077,924.14
1892	48,364,155	1,266,326.00
1893	67,224,298	1,670,643.50
1894	69,632,246	1,728,479.90
1895	56,958,105	1,409,211.18
1896	50,853,234	1,219,432.46
1897	45,531,207	1,084,129.60
1898	57,516,186	1,315,708.54
1899	83,130,474	1,956,618.56
Total	647,610,476	15,942,101.43

It will be noticed from this table that the production of this article has steadily increased, and especially is this true during the last year, when the increase was more than 50 per cent over the production of the year previous. Of the 83,141,081 pounds actually produced last year, 79,702,288 pounds were shipped to and disposed of by dealers in the several States of the Union, and, in my judgment, at least 90 per cent of this was colored in imitation of genuine butter and was sold as such. Others may say this is not true, but I think the late disclosures at Philadelphia show beyond question that this is true. In that city newspaper reporters opened a store and engaged in the business, and they state under oath that every pound they sold was sold as butter. They advertised it as butter; they represented it to be butter, and they sold it at the price usually paid for butter; and this was done under an arrangement with the wholesalers or agents of the manufacturers, by which, in consideration of an additional payment of 1 cent per pound, they were to be protected from the State authorities.

At the beginning it should be well understood that this legislation is not directed against oleomargarine as a product standing by itself and sold upon its merits, but is desired solely for the purpose of preventing the sale of oleomargarine as butter when colored in imitation thereof.

Thirty-two States, containing a population of more than fifty millions of people, have passed laws forbidding the sale of oleomargarine when colored in semblance of butter.

I submit here a list of these States, with the population of each as shown by the census of 1890:

	Population.		Population.
New York	5,997,853	South Carolina	1,151,149
Pennsylvania	5,228,014	Nebraska	1,058,910
Illinois	3,826,351	Maryland	1,042,390
Ohio	3,672,316	West Virginia	762,794
Missouri	2,679,184	Connecticut	746,258
Massachusetts	2,238,943	Maine	661,086
Michigan	2,093,889	Colorado	412,198
Iowa	1,911,896	New Hampshire	376,530
Kentucky	1,858,635	Washington	349,390
Georgia	1,837,353	Oregon	313,767
Tennessee	1,766,518	Vermont	332,442
Wisconsin	1,686,880	South Dakota	328,808
Virginia	1,655,980	Utah	207,905
Alabama	1,513,017	North Dakota	182,711
New Jersey	1,444,933	Delaware	168,496
Minnesota	1,301,826		
California	1,208,130	Total	50,117,440

The States and Territories which have not passed laws forbidding the sale of oleomargarine colored in semblance of butter are:

	Population.		Population.
Texas	2,235,523	New Mexico	153,593
Indiana	2,192,404	Montana	132,156
North Carolina	1,617,947	Idaho	84,385
Kansas	1,427,096	Oklahoma	61,834
Mississippi	1,289,700	Wyoming	60,705
Arkansas	1,128,179	Arizona	59,620
Louisiana	1,118,587	Nevada	45,761
Florida	391,422		
Rhode Island	345,506	Total	12,604,790
District of Columbia	230,392		

Now, for the purpose of showing what disposition was made of the 79,702,288 pounds of oleomargarine consumed during the last year, I submit a statement showing the States into which it was shipped, together with the number of dealers in each State and the number of pounds so disposed of:

Yellow oleomargarine sold contrary to law in 1899.

	Number of dealers.	Quantity sold.		Number of dealers.	Quantity sold.
		Pounds.			*Pounds.*
Alabama	21	226,053	New York	14	222,788
California		74,923	North Dakota	18	7,710
Colorado	95	1,123,537	Ohio	1,005	8,830,989
Connecticut	5	134,255	Oregon	3	41,250
Delaware	48	40,475	Pennsylvania	717	11,433,341
Georgia	61	495,004	South Carolina	24	256,159
Illinois	2,020	18,638,921	South Dakota	4	55,432
Iowa	3	79,922	Tennessee	83	714,640
Kentucky	217	1,490,577	Utah		8,450
Maine	17	102,274	Vermont	1	2,990
Maryland	58	1,791,950	Virginia	121	1,159,400
Massachusetts	108	2,083,889	Washington	5	63,345
Minnesota	30	1,345,865	West Virginia	172	1,206,865
Missouri	231	3,133,313	Wisconsin	23	714,742
Nebraska	73	1,024,985			
New Hampshire	19	445,583	Total	5,492	62,825,582
New Jersey	296	5,875,975			

Oleomargarine sold in States where legal to color.

	Number of dealers.	Quantity sold.		Number of dealers.	Quantity sold.
		Pounds.			*Pounds.*
Alaska	5	18,080	Mississippi	17	104,622
Arkansas	35	380,389	Montana		446,022
Arizona	5	78,767	Nevada		625
District of Columbia	61	816,848	New Mexico	12	115,650
Florida	82	590,225	North Carolina	9	110,224
Idaho	3	58,224	Oklahoma	10	117,398
Indiana	306	3,923,228	Rhode Island	333	3,594,984
Indian Territory	21	152,278	Texas	162	1,518,264
Kansas	186	1,658,544	Wyoming	5	39,547
Louisiana	140	1,043,502			
Michigan	109	2,092,521	Total	1,501	16,860,142

From this statement it will appear that out of the 79,702,288 pounds sold during the last year, 62,825,582 pounds were sold in States which have passed laws forbidding the sale of this very article. Take the State of Illinois, for instance. It has a law forbidding the sale of oleomargarine when colored to resemble butter. Yet last year there were sold in that State 18,638,921 pounds. The State of Pennsylvania has a law to the effect that the manufacture or sale of any imitation or adulterated butter not produced from pure milk or cream is prohibited, yet this State last year disposed of 11,433,341 pounds of an imitation which was not produced from pure milk or cream and which was colored to resemble pure butter.

These statements are sufficient to convince anyone that the State laws intended to regulate the sale of this colored article are inefficient, and hence the necessity for more stringent national legislation. The very fact that the laws enacted by 32 States, representing four-fifths of all our people, are openly and intentionally violated and defied by a few manufacturers should be sufficient to convince every member of this body that it is his duty to cordially support a measure which is intended to prevent such deception and fraud.

For the purpose of more clearly understanding the importance of this subject let us consider for a moment what it means when we say that 83,000,000 pounds of this article were placed upon the market and disposed of during the last year. Creamery butter is usually packed in 60-pound tubs. If this substitute was so packed there would be 1,385,684 tubs. If placed side by side they would reach a distance of 3,400 miles; and if loaded in farm wagons, as butter is usually loaded, these wagons would form a procession 400 miles in length.

This production is equivalent to the average butter production of 415,650 cows, representing a value of $12,469,500. A creamery using an average of 10,000 pounds of milk per day would require a period of six hundred years to produce as much butter as these 17 factories annually produce of this substitute.

Now, our friends upon the other side insist that this conglomeration of hog and beef fat is "just as wholesome," "just as nutritious," and "just as healthy" as pure butter, and I have no doubt they have been able to get chemists to render opinions to this effect. It should be remembered, however, that chemists do not always have the opportunity of examining samples from all kinds of oleomargarine.

Take, for instance, the statement of the manufacturers themselves. Some of them have been writing to us here this winter and they have said that oleomargarine is made, first, of oleo oil, the selected fat from beef that is obtained from caul fat; second, neutral leaf lard from the hog; and third, cotton-seed oil, and that these ingredients are churned together in milk and are salted and colored to suit the taste. Now I am ready to admit that each of these ingredients, if of

choice and selected stock and free from disease or filth of any kind, may possibly be considered wholesome; but is all oleomargarine made from only these ingredients?

Now, for the purpose of comparison, let us examine the report of the Secretary of the Treasury made in answer to our resolution and compiled from the sworn statements of the manufacturers. It reads as follows:

Quantities and kinds of ingredients used in the production of oleomargarine in the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1899; also, the percentage each ingredient bears to the whole quantity.

Materials.	Pounds.	Percentage each ingredient bears to the whole.
Neutral lard	31,297,251	34.27
Oleo oil	24,491,769	26.82
Cotton-seed oil	4,357,514	4.77
Sesame	486,310	.53
Coloring matter	148,970	.16
Sugar	110,164	.12
Glycerin	8,963	.01
Stearin	5,890	.007
Glucose	2,550	.003
Milk	14,200,576	15.55
Salt	6,773,670	7.42
Butter oil	4,342,904	4.76
Butter	1,568,319	1.72
Cream	3,527,410	3.86
Total	91,322,260	100

Quantities and kinds of ingredients used in the production of oleomargarine in the United States for the month of December, 1899; also the percentage each ingredient bears to the whole quantity.

Materials.	Pounds.	Percentage each ingredient bears to the whole.
Neutral lard	3,735,777	31.88
Oleo oil	3,369,085	28.84
Cotton-seed oil	511,157	4.34
Coloring matter	21,753	.18
Sesame	50,500	.43
Sugar	14,111	.12
Stearin	12,705	.10
Glycerin	1,212	.01
Glucose	2,340	.02
Butter	106,130	.90
Salt	800,156	6.83
Milk	1,889,467	16.13
Butter oil	727,062	6.20
Cream	471,688	4.02
Total	11,713,743	100

Here we find that something besides the three oils which the manufacturers mentioned are used. We for the first time discover that glycerin, glucose, sugar, stearin and other such ingredients are used to produce this "wholesome" and "nutritious" article of food. It should be noticed how rapidly the use of stearin is increasing. During the whole year ending June 30, 1899, it averaged only .007 per cent, while for last December it reached 10 per cent of the whole product. And what is this ingredient the use of which is increasing so rapidly? It is usually understood to be the hard fat from the beef, which ordinarily was used for tallow, soap, candles, and other such articles. There is, however, a new kind of stearin now upon the market. We find that in the manufacture of certain grades of cotton-seed oil, in the refining of which caustic soda and potash are largely used, the refuse, being the solid matter which remains, is "known as stearin and used in the butterine and soap-making industries." This undoubtedly is the ingredient, the use of which enables the manufacturers to guarantee that their product will "stand up" in hot weather and keep in any climate.

There is also proof that during the last year some one or more of these 17 manufacturers of oleomargarine have produced an article which contained from 9 to 11½ per cent of paraffin, which is "a colorless, odorless, translucent, waxy, solid mixture of hydrocarbons derived from methane, rich in carbon and indifferent to most reagents. It is contained in bituminous coal and petroleum, from which it is separated by distillation." On account of its ability to resist atmospheric action, this waxy, by-product of coal tar and petroleum has been used as a coating for the obelisk now standing in Central Park in order to prevent it from being ruined by the action of the weather. Now, possibly the human stomach can digest a substance that time and the elements can not destroy, and some may consider that this substance when mixed with the membranous fat which covers the intestines of the steer, and the leaf lard of the hog, and the oil of cotton seed, together with glycerin, glucose, and other such commodities, is "just as nutritious" and "as easily digested" and "as perfectly wholesome" as butter.

There may be many people who willingly and knowingly are anxious to buy and consume this substitute made from these by-products of the stock yards and oil refineries in place of butter from the dairy or the creamery. If so, they should be given an opportunity to procure it in its natural state and at its true value. My own judgment is that if this substitute is just as wholesome, nutritious, and digestible as butter, nature made a great mistake when it provided milk for the sustenance of the young.

Let us see what Secretary Wilson says regarding this matter. In an interview published in one of the local papers he says:

"The Grout bill, as I understand it, proposes to tax imitations of butter. I am utterly unable to find a reason why this should not be done, and I believe it to be the paramount duty of Congress to pass the bill without delay. There is no comparison between genuine butter and oleomargarine and all claims to the contrary are easily disproven. The butter of the cow, which is composed of that fat and casein, sells on its flavor. All other fats are different from this. Whenever the manipulation of cow's milk is conducted under cleanly conditions and at a proper temperature, a flavoring element enters it by reason of microscopic fat growths, which are bacteria. These bacteria make the fine flavor for which we pay 20 cents a pound and more, and also add to the digestibility and healthfulness of the product. Other fats do not contain these germs for the reason that there is nothing in them upon which they may live and multiply.

"Now, when the millionaire or the laborer go to market and are led into purchasing these cheaper fats, rigged and jockeyed in such a way as to imitate butter, they are not only deceived and robbed, but they are made to introduce into their stomachs and the stomachs of their families substances that are injurious to their health, beyond any question. The deleterious qualities, of body fat and tallow, such as are largely used in the production of imitation butter, can not be eliminated by deodorizing processes or such things."

It should also be borne in mind that the manufacturer of oleomargarine, when using oleo oil, may think the oil is the pure extract of caul fat, but he has no assurance of that fact, and under the present law the Government inspectors have no way of knowing what particular fats have been used to produce this oil. I have no doubt but what the greater quantity of this oil is made from all kinds of scraps and fats of different kinds collected from all the different butcher shops and stock yards of the country,

It can not be possible that all oleo oil is made from caul fat, and that this fat is procured at the stock yards where the cattle are inspected, because everyone who is familiar with the shipment of dressed beef from the great stock yards at Chicago and other Western cities knows that the caul or kidney fat goes with the quarter or the carcass, and if this particular fat only is used it must be collected from all the different meat dealers in all sections of the country and shipped back to the stock yards for the purpose of making it into oleo oil.

Now they come to us and say that if this legislation is enacted it will result in great injury to the stock-raising sections of the country where beef and hogs are raised in large quantities, and resolutions have been sent here by the stock-raising associations alleging that if this bill was passed it would cause a loss of from $2 to $4 per head on each steer and at least 20 cents per head on each hog.

Just consider for a moment these figures and see whether their statements are well founded.

Last year there were slaughtered at Chicago, Kansas City, Omaha, and St. Louis 3,908,985 head of cattle. Add to these the number slaughtered at other points and the grand total would be about 5,000,000 head. Now the report from the Secretary of the Treasury which I have just submitted shows that there were used during the last year 24,491,769 pounds of oleo oil in the production of oleomargarine. This from 5,000,000 head of cattle would be an average of a little less than 5 pounds per head. The average price of oleo oil during the last year was about 8 cents per pound.

The value of this production per head would then be about 40 cents, but it must be remembered that if this fat had not been used for oleo oil it would have been used for tallow, candles, soap, or other industries, from which at least one-half of its value would have been realized, so that the loss could not possibly exceed 20 cents per head. A similar calculation will show that only about 2 pounds of neutral lard was produced on the average from each hog killed during the last year, but this would have been used for lard and other products had it not been used in making oleo, so that the loss, if any, on hogs would be but a trifle.

Again they come to us and say that to enact this legislation would destroy the great cotton-seed industry of the South, and some of our friends from that section of the country have strenuously opposed this legislation on this account, and yet we find that only about 4.77 per cent of this product is cotton-seed oil, although, as a matter of fact, "butter oil," which is in the list of ingredients used, is the trade name for another kind of cotton-seed oil used in making some grades of oleomargarine, so that it is fair to say that the amount of cotton-seed oil is about 9 per cent of the whole product.

As I understand it, the manufacturers of this article agree that its natural color is white. Each of them, however, strives to so color his product that it will resemble pure butter, plainly for the purpose of defying the law and selling it, not under its true name and for what it is, but as butter. For instance, one of the largest manufacturers of this product in Chicago issues to the trade a card which shows samples of his product by color and number, and directions are given to the trade to purchase by number. I have here one of

these cards. No. 1 on this card is marked "No color;" No. 2, "Denver;" No. 3, "Wisconsin;" No. 4, "Country Rolls;" No. 5, "Cincinnati," and so on. With this he sends out a letter or a notice to the trade which reads as follows:

CHICAGO, *April 5, 1899.*

NOTICE TO THE TRADE.

Inclosed find a color card, which is as near the color of our butterine as the printer's art can represent. Our aim in sending you this card is to aid you in selecting the proper color suitable to your trade. Mistakes are easily made, but hard to remedy.

In nearly every section of the country there is a difference in the color of butter, and even in certain seasons of the year there is a change, as you will have noticed. In winter butter is of a lighter color than in summer; in many sections this is the result of the difference in feed or pasture.

We can give you just what you want at all seasons if we know your requirements. As an example, No. 1 has no coloring matter; No. 2 a little coloring, and so on to No. 8, which is the highest colored goods we turn out. Preserve this card, order the color you want by number, and we will send you just what you want.

This evidence shows that the manufacturers intentionally study to deceive the people. The notices call attention to the fact that winter butter is of a lighter color than summer butter, and in order, therefore, to more thoroughly fool the people the manufacturer is prepared to furnish a substitute colored to suit the particular season of the year. Again he says that there are "sections of the country where there is a difference in the color of butter," and he therefore is prepared to supply the different sections with a different shade of this substitute in order that the dealers may more thoroughly deceive their customers. Could anything show more positively the intention of these people to not only violate the law themselves but to urge and instigate others to violate it purely for the purpose of increasing their profits?

The fact is that they go further than this and guarantee to their trade, or to those who buy from them, protection from the laws, and in my own State where our dairy and food commissioner has undertaken to prosecute people for the violation of these laws, the oleomargarine trust of Chicago has not only hired attorneys to defend the people so complained against, but have furnished money for their bail and have paid their fines when they were convicted.

Messrs. Swift & Company, one of the leading manufacturers of oleomargarine, says they have the right to make their goods as attractive and as pleasing to the eye as they can, and for that reason they have a right to color their oleomargarine the same as the farmer colors his butter. They also make the claim that they were the originators of the use of coloring matter, and that the leading creameries throughout the country were quick to take advantage of the new idea and that now butter makers copy from them in coloring their product. Every one knows that the natural color of pure butter is yellow. In summer when the cows can feed upon green grass the butter takes on a deeper shade than in winter and for that reason we have what is known as "June color" in butter.

The use of coloring matter in butter is not for the purpose of deception, but for the purpose of giving it a uniform tint. To color butter is not to deceive. It is not colored to represent oleomargarine. It is not colored to represent anything else than butter. It is well known that while butter of the same color may differ in quality, yet the constituent parts of butter are such that no manipulation can enable it to be sold for something which it is not. It advertises itself. Its odor and flavor quickly reveal any impurities in it contained. If adulterated in any way it immediately becomes a substitute and the manufacturer is liable to a heavy penalty for violation of the revenue laws. This fact should always be borne in mind, namely, that the coloring of butter deceives no one. It is sold as butter. The purchaser knows that it is butter whether it is colored or uncolored, and he buys it as such, its value being determined not by its color, but by its quality. This is not true of oleomargarine. It is colored, not as a matter of taste, but for the definite and well understood purpose of deceiving the purchaser or consumer and compelling him to use something which he would not otherwise use.

During the Fifty-fifth Congress I introduced the first measure which proposed a tax of 10 cents per pound upon oleomargarine when colored in imitation of butter. Soon after this the editor of a western paper, in commenting upon the subject, said that it would be equally as just to impose a tax upon wool when colored as upon oleomargarine when colored. This is not a parallel case. The natural color of wool is white, or nearly so. To color it black or brown or gray is purely a matter of taste. It is still wool, and we buy the cloth knowing it to be wool, we choosing the color which we prefer. Woolen cloth is not colored black or brown or gray to represent cotton, and when so colored it is not sold as cotton. No article the value of which is above that of the substitute is made in imitation of the substitute. The temptation is to so manipulate the cheaper article that it may resemble and thus take the place of the dearer one. This is what is done with oleomargarine.

The ingredients contained in this conglomeration average about 8 cents per pound. It can be manufactured and placed upon the market at a cost, including the Government tax, of from 10 to 12 cents per pound. If sold as oleomargarine it could not be sold for more than from 14 to 16 cents per pound at retail. Knowing this, it is deliberately colored so that it resembles butter; is put in packages made to resemble butter packages, and is sold as such and at the price of the pure article, thus giving an immense profit to the dealer and furnishing the incentive for him to violate the law.

This proposed legislation is to increase the tax from 2 to 10 cents per pound when the article is colored in imitation of butter. The result will be that either oleomargarine will be advertised and sold upon its own merits and for what it is, in its uncolored state, or, if those who manufacture it desire to persist in defrauding the people and in forcing upon the market a counterfeit made in imitation of something which they know is better and which they know the people are more anxious to obtain, they must pay the increased tax and allow the Government to derive the benefit therefrom.

The coloring of oleomargarine does not add to its digestibility. If people now buy it because they want it, knowing that it is oleomargarine, they will still buy it, even though it is not colored. If there is a demand for it because of its superiority in quality, then to color it is a crime, as by so doing there is danger of deception and fraud.

Whether the increased production of oleomargarine increases the value of steers and hogs, or whether to curtail its production will increase the value of the dairy cow and the dairy farm, are not the most important questions involved in this proposed legislation. I admit that the dairymen of the country have a legitimate interest in this legislation. They do not ask for it as any matter of favor, but they do ask it and they are entitled to demand it of us as a matter of right. The dairymen of Wisconsin expect to compete with the dairymen of New York and the other States, but neither should be compelled to compete with the by-products of some other industry which is made to resemble the dairy product and placed upon the market as such.

The dairy interest is one of the greatest interests of this country; probably more people are employed in it and more people are dependent upon its prosperity than any other single industry of the country. Those engaged in it have a right to ask us to care for their interests, and it is no more than fair and just that we should recognize their claim and give them that protection which the Government has a right to give, and which in other instances it has given, against fraud and counterfeit.

The dairy interest is not the only one to be considered in this connection. The consumer has rights and he is entitled to such legislation as will enable him to know that he is receiving that for which he asks and for which he pays his money. The consumer who wants oleomargarine is entitled to have it, but the consumer who wants butter has some rights also. He is entitled to know that when he calls for butter and pays the price of butter he receives butter and not something dressed up in the garb of butter.

I care not whether this substitute is just as wholesome and nutritious as the pure article. Horseflesh may be just as wholesome as beefsteak, but when we ask for the latter we do not want the butcher to give us the former. Butter and oleomargarine are each entitled to be sold upon their merits, the consumer to have the right to purchase either at its fair value.

I have never believed and do not now believe that the oleomargarine industry should be wiped out of existence. The proposed legislation is not for that purpose; it is solely for the purpose of preventing fraud and deception and compelling the article to be placed upon the market and sold for what it is, and to prevent it from being sold for what it is not.

The first clause of this bill, that which gives to the several States jurisdiction over the original package as soon as it comes within the borders of that State, should not be objectionable to anyone. The Supreme Court have practically declared that under the police power of the State they have that right now, and especially when it involves the question of the regulation of food products. There can be no objection, however, to such legislation as will further strengthen that proposition. The second section of the bill proposes to reduce the tax from 2 cents to one-fourth of 1 cent per pound on oleomargarine when not colored. As a result, if oleomargarine is placed upon the market in its natural state anyone who chooses to buy it knowing it to be oleomargarine can then obtain it at its value and will receive the benefit of this reduction.

The passage of this bill is demanded by the dairy interests of the country. They demand this because they believe that hog butter should be compelled to go into the market under its own color and should not be allowed to steal the color of butter in order to deceive the people and increase the profits of the oleomargarine trust. That their position may be fully understood I desire to submit the following resolution, passed at the last annual meeting of the Wisconsin State Dairymen's Association, these resolutions being similar to those passed by other State associations:

Resolved, That the dairymen of Wisconsin, as represented in this meeting and by this association, which for twenty-eight years has labored to make Wisconsin a great dairy State, believe and declare—

1. That oleomargarine, colored like butter, is a commercial fraud.

2. That oleomargarine, under its own name and color, is a legitimate article of commerce.

3. That Congress has the constitutional power to tax any business to the point of extinction which it regards as prejudicial to the public welfare.

4. That the great bulk of oleomargarine colored in imitation of yellow butter is consumed as and for butter, and that in its sale the final purchaser is cheated and the producer of an honest product unfairly deprived of his legitimate market.

5. That we, as dairymen, neither desire nor ask class legislation, but we are certain of our right to ask and demand of State and national legislatures all possible constitutional restrictions upon the traffic in a counterfeit food product which must depend for its profits upon the deception of the public.

The consumers of butter products demand the passage of this measure. They have the right to know that all food products are pure and are not counterfeits and cheats. They insist that they shall be protected from the deception and fraud practiced by the dealers in oleomargarine. These people are watching us. They will know whether we have been faithful to the trust imposed. You who are obstructing the consideration of this measure will have something to explain to your people. You may be able to prevent action upon this measure at this time, but I give you fair warning now that when we meet here next December this bill will come up for consideration. Knowing the justice of our cause, knowing as I do that this is a conflict between the oleomargarine trust on the one side and the people who love honesty and despise fraud on the other, I warn you that the fight will be on till justice prevails and the rights of the people are respected.

Increasing Expenditures and Expenses of Government—If Those in High Places are Recreant to Their Trust, What Can be Expected of Those in the Lower Ranks.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN C. BELL,

OF COLORADO.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, June 2, 1900.

The House having under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 128) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States—

Mr. BELL said:

Mr. SPEAKER: At the close of the fiscal year 1895 we owed $901,672,966.74, and at the close of the fiscal year 1899 we find, under President McKinley's Administration, with the great war tariff and the Dingley law, that the debt is $1,155,320,235.19, or an increase of $253,647,268.45.

At the close of the fiscal year 1895 the population was 69,753,000, with a per capita indebtedness of $12.93. At the end of the fiscal year 1899 we had a population of 76,011,000 and an indebtedness of $1,155,320,235.19, a net increase of $253,647,268.45, or a per capita increase of $2.27.

Receipts during the fiscal year 1895 were $390,373,203, or $5.69 per capita collected from the people.

During the fiscal year 1899 they were $610,982,004, or a per capita collection from the people of $8.04, a net increase of $2.45.

During the fiscal year 1895 the total disbursements were $433,178,426, or a per capita expenditure of $6.21.

During the fiscal year 1899 the total disbursements amounted to $700,093,564, or a per capita expenditure of $9.21, an increase of $3.

Now, what is the cause of this great increase in taxation, in public indebtedness, and in public expenditure? It finds its source in the sanguinary and useless wars waged in the Philippine Islands.

Let us see what were the expenditures of the State, War, and Navy Departments in 1895, as compared with 1899:

War Department, 1895	$53,898,370
Navy Department, 1895	29,208,069
State Department, 1895	1,185,046
Total, 1895	84,291,485

In 1899 the expenditures were:

War Department	$232,395,365
Navy Department	64,354,735
State Department	22,871,614
Total, 1899	319,621,714
Total, 1895	84,291,485

Expenditures of 1899 over 1895, $235,330,229, which enormous sum is chargeable principally to the Philippine war.

There is one prominent Department and one only in which the expenses have been decreased. The payment for pensions in 1896 was $139,280,078.15. In 1899 it had been decreased to $138,355,052.95. The number of pensioners on the rolls had been increased from 970,678 to 991,519. So with over 20,000 pensioners more the old soldiers received $1,000,000 less. In 1900 the pensions for the Spanish and Philippine soldiers increase the appropriation again to $145,245,230.

The only branch of the Government which practices economy is that which provides for the old soldiers. The Pension Department for the first time since 1890 allowed fewer claims for the civil-war soldier than were filed and are therefore further behind than they were a year ago, and allowed the fewest number of claims that have been allowed since 1885.

I have obtained the figures for 1900 too late to analyze them, but I will append the same hereto that anyone desiring to extend the comparison may do so.

Appropriations, fiscal years 1897, 1898, 1899, 1900, and 1901, made by the Fifty-fourth and Fifty-fifth Congresses and at the first session of the Fifty-sixth Congress.

Title.	Fifty-sixth Congress, first session, fiscal year 1901.	Fifty-fifth Congress.		Fifty-fourth Congress.	
		Fiscal year 1900.	Fiscal year 1899.	Fiscal year 1898.	Fiscal year 1897.
Agriculture	$4,023,500.00	$3,726,022.00	$3,509,202.00	$3,182,902.00	$3,255,532.00
Army	114,220,095.55	80,430,204.06	23,193,392.00	23,129,344.30	23,278,402.73
Diplomatic and consular	1,771,168.76	1,714,533.76	1,752,208.76	1,659,308.76	1,642,558.76
District of Columbia	7,576,869.31	6,834,535.77	6,426,880.07	6,186,991.06	5,900,319.48
Fortification	7,383,628.00	4,909,902.00	9,377,494.00	9,517,141.00	7,377,888.00
Indian	8,198,089.24	7,504,775.81	7,673,854.90	7,674,120.89	7,390,496.79
Legislative, executive, and judicial	24,176,532.53	23,410,840.79	21,625,846.65	21,690,766.90	21,519,324.71
Military Academy	653,589.67	575,774.47	458,689.23	479,572.83	449,525.61
Navy	65,080,916.67	48,099,909.58	56,098,783.68	33,003,234.19	30,562,660.95
Pension	145,245,230.00	145,233,830.00	141,283,830.00	141,263,880.00	141,328,580.00
Post-Office	113,648,238.75	105,634,138.75	99,222,300.75	95,665,338.75	92,571,564.22
River and harbor	561,000.00	16,091,841.94			12,659,550.00
Sundry civil	65,298,885.95	48,385,930.86	48,490,212.26	53,611,783.38	33,096,710.19
Deficiencies	15,679,512.46	25,005,912.26	349,772,389.96	10,557,417.34	15,341,911.07
Total regular appropriations	573,517,256.89	517,558,212.05	768,835,084.26	407,657,801.40	396,375,024.51
Miscellaneous	3,500,000.00	28,744,590.24	6,560,311.29	999,057.90	416,010.06
Permanent annual appropriations	132,712,220.00	128,678,220.00	117,836,220.00	120,078,220.00	119,054,160.00
Grand total	709,729,476.89	674,981,022.29	893,231,615.55	528,735,079.30	515,845,194.57

Let us inquire if this great expenditure was necessary. To a reasonable extent, yes. There has never been an Administration of the Government more reckless in its expenditures than the present one.

There never has been an Administration of this Government that has so completely recognized bossism nor one that has secured such gross incompetency in general, nor one that has so completely recognized the claim that to the individual ward heeler and political scavenger belongs the spoils, as the present one.

Take the proverbial incompetency in the offices throughout the country; take the disgraceful incompetency of the officering of the recent Volunteer Army by the appointment of inexperienced boys of great papas which entailed untold misery and numerous deaths upon our soldiers and untold expense upon the people, and take the wholesale scandals and thieving in the Philippine Islands and in Cuba, and you have the most collossal monument establishing the folly and dire ruin that follows a government run by political heelers and men appointed merely because they are efficient ward workers.

The people are absolutely ignored in the selection of their appointive officers. The Senate and Congressional bosses are awarded the places for the purpose of building up their political

machinery, and these appointments have been made, not for the good of the service, but for the strengthening of the political machines of the direct beneficiaries.

The boast has been going the rounds of the newspapers that the depositories in the Philippines are loaded with the savings of American citizens and employees there, and following close upon the heels of that comes the dispatches that corruption, bribery, and espionage is rampant there. When you take the infinitely greater distance and the complete censorship of the press and the necessarily lax administration of affairs there, there is no doubt but the scandal in Cuba and the festering corruption in every branch of the service there is but a mere speck on the horizon as compared to the pillage in the Philippine Islands.

It was to be hoped that this spoils system might be withheld from the judiciary, but, as set forth in the public press, in the new United States judgeship at Buffalo, over the protest of the bar association and the people against allowing a mere political worker to don the ermine of justice, it was announced that both Senators recommended Mr. PLATT'S political manager in the Buffalo district, and the President could hardly turn down such a recommendation, so he was appointed.

The developments in the Senate in the last few days show how everything political is honeycombed with corruption, and it even reaches the highest places. Where the Executive of the nation is required to appoint a board of appraisers with not more than two of the same political party, he appoints two Republicans, and the notorious William D. Bynum, chairman of the Gold Democratic national committee, and who worked incessantly and untiringly for the election of President McKinley and has been standing manfully by him ever since and is known to be in the Republican party, was audaciously named by the President as a representative of the Democratic party. This was such a flagrant violation of the statute that a Republican Senate rebuked the act of the Executive by refusing to confirm the appointment.

Congress recently passed an act for the formation of a nonpartisan commission composed of five Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate, five Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and nine members to be appointed from civil life by the President of the United States, the President's appointees to draw a salary of $3,000 per annum and expenses while traveling over the country, and the other members drawing no salary and expected only to be advisory, and to give the benefit of their experience at such times as they could when not engaged in the performance of Congressional duties.

The President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives faithfully performed their duties in appointing representatives from the different political parties as contemplated in the act, but when it was passed up to the President he appointed eight partisan Republicans and one Gold Democrat, a most ardent supporter of the present Administration, as a compliance with this statute. This was such a flagrant violation of the law that a strongly Republican Senate has just voted an amendment so as to require the President to fill vacancies with other than Republicans.

The last Congress passed an act prohibiting the sale of intoxicating or malt liquors upon or about premises used for military purposes in as explicit language as it seems possible to use; nevertheless the President's Attorney-General construed the law off the statute books, and the President feigns to be bound by such an opinion, although, upon a complete poll of the House and Senate, as I understand, there was scarcely a Representative or Senator to be found, if there was even one such, who did not declare that it was the intention and understanding of all those voting upon the subject that it was absolutely prohibitive, and the President can not, as a man of ordinary sense, read the act without at first blush becoming convinced that there is a positive law forbidding the establishment of these canteens in the Army, yet he defies it.

Now, I ask, what can be expected of officials in the lower ranks or the people at large when the highest officer of the land openly defies the law and makes it subservient to his will?

We have also observed in the last few days the trust representatives in the Senate and those directly interested leading the Government into the very jaws of the armor-plate trust, and we have had the remarkable spectacle of a United States Senator standing in his place on the floor of the Senate and announcing that one of the managers of one of the great ship yards recently complained to him that the Republican campaign committee had extorted from his firm the enormous contribution of $400,000 to the Republican campaign fund upon the assurance that the Government would give his firm sufficient advantageous contracts to enable him to recoup his losses caused by this contribution.

With all these things staring us in the face and with monopolies and trusts intrenched in the Cabinet, in the Departments of the Government, and in Congress, what can the people expect but this extortionate and ruinous expenditure of their money?

What do these trusts and combines care about war taxes or other assessments so long as they can so manage the prevailing party that they may abstract their assessments tenfold from the public Treasury?

In a report a short time since the chairman of the Post-Office Committee in the House, Mr. LOUD, declared that a private individual could run our Post-Office Department as well as it is run now and make a profit of from thirty-five to forty million dollars a year. The exposure of transportation and other extortions reaching millions in this Department has not made even an impression upon those in charge of the Department.

The Commissioner of Pensions recently said to a committee of Congress that he had 100 employees on his rolls many of whom could hardly get to the office and could be lopped off without any injury to the service, but he said the moment he dropped one of them from his rolls he was set upon by the political friends of the employee and was forced to reinstate him.

And a few days ago it was developed that the chief of one of the bureaus of the Interior Department drawing a salary of $1,800 per annum and acting as Congressional clerk to his home member at a salary of $1,200 per annum, making a total of $3,000 a year, besides running a boarding house in the city of Washington, applied to Congress and it passed a bill pensioning him at $50 per month upon the theory that he was totally disabled from working for a living, in the face of the fact that his income was shown to be at least $3,000 per annum from these other sources.

Also, there has been no extravagance of this Government that approaches the promotion and schemes of retirement worked up by the Executive for the officers of the Army and Navy. Throughout the last two years he has been constantly promoting those of about the age of retirement, that they might be put upon the retired list with a princely salary, to be drawn from the pockets of the people. This has not been confined to those who earned recognition upon the field of battle. It has been most numerous among those then in civil and social life or in the War, Navy, and Pension departmental works. It seems a part of the plans of the growing aristocracy to maintain a great line of retired officers in these great spectacular social affairs. The display of their gold lace and handsome uniforms ornaments these state occasions.

The present Administration has also outdistanced anything before heard of in history in its creating of commissions to junket about the world at an enormous expense and practically accomplishing nothing.

With all of these things emanating from the highest officials in the Union, can it be expected that those in the lower ranks will practice economy or discrimination? These things are contagious and account, in a large measure, for the enormous expenditure of money under this Administration.

Importation of Farm Products.

ADDITIONAL REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD L. HAMILTON,

OF MICHIGAN,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, June 1, 1900.

The House having under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 139) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States—

Mr. HAMILTON said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I avail myself of leave to print for the purpose of printing in the RECORD a comparative statement showing importations of ten farm products through the custom-houses at Detroit and Port Huron, Mich., during the first year under the Wilson-Bryan tariff law and the first year under the Dingley tariff law. These figures are official, and were furnished me by the Bureau of Statistics of the Treasury Department.

Importations of ten farm products through custom-house at Detroit, Mich.

Articles.	First year under Wilson-Bryan tariff.	First year under Dingley tariff.
Barley.....bushels..	55,441	7
Beans and peas.....do.....	132,920	2,008
Butter.....pounds..	4,783	3,028
Corn.....bushels..	17,806	90
Eggs.....dozen..	1,790,790	415
Hay.....tons..	256	8
Hides (raw).....pounds..	1,084,609	105,563
Oats.....bushels..	603	170
Potatoes.....do.....	99,404	3,118
Wool.....pounds..	175,844	None.

Importations of ten farm products through custom-house at Port Huron, Mich.

Articles.		First year under Wilson-Bryan tariff.	First year under Dingley tariff.
Barley	bushels	2	None.
Beans and peas	do	20,032	5,452
Butter	pounds	1,656	691
Corn	bushels	10,024	224
Eggs	dozens	1,940	20
Hay	tons	199	None.
Hides (raw)	pounds	1,074,510	65,772
Oats	bushels	125	3
Potatoes	do	36,435	617
Wool	pounds	27,411	None.

Trusts.

SPEECH
OF
HON. W. H. RYAN,
OF NEW YORK,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Thursday, May 31, 1900.

The House having under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 138) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States—

Mr. RYAN of New York said:

Mr. SPEAKER: To my mind there is no matter of greater import to the welfare of our country than the question of trusts, brought to our immediate consideration by this joint resolution. I wish to have it known as far as my remarks may travel that the time spent in consideration of this measure is so many wasted moments and that there is no intention of passing it into law. I believe its foundation has been laid in insincerity. Had the Republican members of this House a determined purpose to put a stop to the crushing influence of the trusts they would not have waited until the session was drawing to a close. While at times, and at this particular time, we may question the sincerity of the Republican members of this House, we can not question their ability. If you were earnest in this matter and had a desire to regulate the trusts you could have reported a bill early in the session and put it through just as you put the financial bill through. You had no intention of passing the Nicaraguan Canal bill through both Houses of Congress. You had no intention of passing the bill repealing the stamp tax, and you have less practical purpose in introducing and reporting an anti-trust bill at this time.

The Ways and Means Committee gave extended hearings to the great interests of the country, who desire and are justly entitled to a repeal of the infamous war-revenue tax. What were they held for? Did the committee have any intention of presenting to this House a measure reducing or repealing this tax? I say no; not a bit of it.

Personally I shall vote against the joint resolution and for the anti-trust bill, and yet I know that it will not become a law. Why? Because it would cut the trusts away from governmental privileges as a reaper cleans the field. It would destroy their power to control the manufactured products of this country. It would destroy their power to control the raw material. It would destroy their power to make political slaves of the men who are forced through the very existence of these trusts to depend upon them for the essentials of life.

Without the Republican party the trusts would fall, and without the trusts the Republican party would have fallen long ago.

The growth of these trusts has never in the history of this country been so rapid as it has in the last three years under a Republican Administration. They have sprung up like mushrooms in the corner of the pasture and we begin to wonder if they will ever stop. Unluckily for the man unendowed with a heritage of wealth, and I say it with sincere regret, the trusts have been given the power to limit the reward of a faithful and persistent exercise of brawn and brain until they have "pressed down upon the brow of labor" that blistering crown of despair. Curb the trusts. Curtail their influence and power for evil. You ask me how? I say pass your bill with amendments offered by the minority, including that amendment which reads:

> Nothing in this act shall be so construed as to apply to trade unions or other labor organizations, organized for the purpose of regulating wages, hours of labor, or other conditions under which labor is to be performed.

Pass it in both Houses of Congress. Lay it upon the President's desk, and if the Administration is desirous of ending this aggrandizement of wealth and power, the President will sign it.

Will you do it?

No, my Republican friends, you will not. The country knows that you will not do it. I know it and you know it. It is useless to say more.

Mr. Speaker, I will ask the indulgence of the House while I quote here the remarks of James R. Keene, a Wall street millionaire. He says:

> The people of this country must arouse themselves. The coming election is of more importance, from the standpoint of a pure and true Americanism, than any that has transpired since the second election of Lincoln. Money is in the saddle; it is riding down the institutions of this country with a confident insolence that tells of its firm belief in its own invincibility. It is running the Government to-day in its every branch and arm.
>
> If money's power in molding public affairs goes forward for four years more as it has for four years past, the name of American liberty will only be worth a recollection as a matter of history. Money is pressing the people backward step by step. What is to be the end? If it goes on, there are, as matters trend, but two solutions. One is socialism, and the second is revolution. The American people must defend themselves from money just as they once guarded their forest frontiers from the savage. Unless they come solidly shoulder to shoulder for their rights, and come at once, Bunker Hill will have been a blunder, Yorktown a mistake.
>
> [Applause.]

A gentleman who preceded me on the floor stated that when a man gave expression to such views as these it is surely a matter of patriotic duty and of wisdom that they should be considered in the spirit of all soberness, and that men should reason together and contemplate the gravity of the situation, and I agree with him. I agree with him when I say that I envy no man because of his wealth. I would incite no difficulties between labor and capital nor widen the breach between the rich and the poor, but I believe that Mr. Keene has not misrepresented the actual situation, and that something must be done, and that speedily, to shatter the control of monopoly; to lighten the burden, to soften the yoke, and restore the confidence of the people in the equality and integrity of legislation, or disastrous consequences may be foreseen.

While on this question of deception of the people, a word for the stamp tax. The Republican party has no more intention of regulating or curtailing the power of the trusts than they have of redeeming the pledges they made to the people of the country when war with Spain was declared. They gave their promise to the country that when that war had ceased this stamp tax would be repealed. The people took them at their word. The druggists, the insurance interests, the large and small manufacturer and retailer all willingly contributed their share. With a patriotic zeal the brewers of the United States came to the front with an additional war tax of $35,000,000. Have they no rights that should be considered now?

Delegation after delegation from each of these interests have appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means but to appeal against a predetermination. The injustice of the allotment of this tax was explained to the committee, and I here quote what Mr. Charles H. Clark of Pennsylvania, who visited the committee with his fellow-druggists, said:

> It means, simply stated, if I may be permitted to use the expression in its naked deformity, you come up among the everlasting hills of where we have our factory in Pennsylvania and take $7,000 out of my pocket, which I want, and which you have no use for whatever, and you send it up to the Treasury Department and then the Treasury Department sends it over to a bank in New York and that bank loans it out at interest and puts the money in the pockets of its stockholders. [Applause by bystanders.]
>
> The whole point I want to make for myself is this: When there is war we are willing to do just as much for our country as anybody else, and we have always done it. We furnished about 600,000 pieces of material for use of the soldiers in Cuba, and we have evidence which we can produce to you showing that those articles preserved the lives of our soldiers; and on a great many of the articles we sold at about half price to the Government, on account of the competition, we were compelled to place revenue stamps, and we did not care anything about it; it was something that we did with pleasure. But when the time of peace comes and there is no exigency of war, and there is no other exigency, when you do not want that money, I say that, while you have the legal and constitutional right to do it, you have no moral right—allow me to say with all courtesy—you have no moral right to take that money out of my pocket.

Mr. Clark, in response to a question, said:

> If there is an oppressive or unjust taxation on anybody, it ought to be taken off. That is a good general statement to make. I have had the honor of speaking on the platform in political campaigns with one of the members of this committee, and I will say that if I were to go out on the stump next fall, and on the Democratic side (and I do not believe I ever would do that), I would not ask anything better than to be able to prove that a Republican Congress is permitting $30,000,000 or $50,000,000 to be taken away from the people to be sent over to be distributed through New York banks.

I personally attended the hearing given to the brewery interest of the country before the Ways and Means Committee. I do not differ with the man who believes there is merit in the manufacturing of liquor, nor do I differ with the man who does not, but when a tax of $1 per barrel additional is placed upon this product strictly for war-revenue purposes, and that war has ended and the tax is not then taken off, I differ materially with the men or party who insist upon the retention of the tax. The emergency is over, but the emergency tax is still in force. The surplus in the Treasury is increasing, and we ask what is to become of this money. Is it to go back to the people, or is it to go to those favored New York banks? I think to the latter.

The brewers paid, according to the reports of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, for the fiscal years 1898 and 1899, $108,159,979.

One-half of this amount was the extra war tax. The total increase in internal-revenue taxes for these two years was $126,748,587. The brewers alone paid over 40 per cent of these increased taxes. They can not continue to bear these burdens and continue their business. This tax could be taken off and there would still be more revenue than is needed to pay the expenses of the Government. An act of justice can be done in removing this tax and at the same time reduce the surplus of which the people complain.

William J. Bryan and the Trusts.

REMARKS
OF
HON. AMOS J. CUMMINGS,
OF NEW YORK,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, June 1, and Tuesday, June 5, 1900,

On the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 138) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. TERRY said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CUMMINGS] the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER. There is no time left to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I ask unanimous consent for the indulgence of the House for one minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks the indulgence of the House for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I trust I am old enough in political life to know a wolf in sheep's clothing. [Applause on the Democratic side.] There is one here more ravenous than the one that attacked the child of Llewellyn. Under the guise of an effort to destroy the trusts this is really a measure drawn in their interests. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It is being used to tide over a Presidential election. The House will pass it, and the Senate lay it away until after the election. I know that William J. Bryan is alleged to have advocated a constitutional amendment to down the trusts, but this in its terms no more resembles Mr. Bryan's proposition than a deck of cards resembles a Bible. [Laughter.] I would as soon drink a cocktail made out of nitric acid under the guise of a soda cocktail as to vote for this resolution. [Laughter.] No man in his right senses, it appears to me, can eat asafetida and fancy it molasses candy. I stand by the action of the Democratic caucus. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Tuesday, June 5, 1900.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, on June 1 I said that I knew that William J. Bryan was alleged to have advocated a constitutional amendment to down the trusts, but that the joint resolution under discussion in its terms no more resembled Mr. Bryan's proposition than a deck of cards resembled a Bible. This morning I received the following letter from Mr. Bryan:

JUNE, 2, 1900.

MY DEAR MR. CUMMINGS: I see that the Republicans are asserting that I think a constitutional amendment necessary for the annihilation of the trusts. I have never said or believed that an amendment was necessary. I have urged legislation which I believe to be constitutional, and have said that I favor a constitutional amendment if the decisions of the Supreme Court declare such legislation unconstitutional. The Republican party does not want to destroy the trusts. During this session of Congress the Republicans have unanimously supported a proposition to give to national banks control of the currency and thus create a paper-money trust. I inclose copy of Chicago antitrust speech, which discusses the question of constitutional amendment.

Yours, truly, W. J. BRYAN.

Mr. Speaker, that the country may distinctly understand what Mr. Bryan did say I append a copy of the speech delivered at the Chicago antitrust conference on February 19, 1900. The Democratic position is here distinctly stated:

MR. BRYAN'S ADDRESS.

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES, AND GENTLEMEN: I appreciate the very kind words spoken by Governor Stanley in presenting me to this audience. I am glad I live in a country where people can differ from one another, differ honestly, express their convictions boldly, and yet respect one another and acknowledge one another's rights. I am not vain enough, however, to think that any good will which has been expressed by the people toward me is due to personal merit. If I have had political friends it is because people believe with me in certain ideas, or, rather, because I believe with them in certain ideas. It is the idea that makes the man. The man is only important as he helps the idea.

I come this morning to discuss in your presence a great question—a question of growing importance to the American people. The trust principle is not a new principle, but the trust principle is manifesting itself in so many ways and the trusts have grown so rapidly that people now feel alarmed about trusts who did not feel alarmed three years ago. The trust question has grown in importance, because within two years more trusts have been organized, when we come to consider the capitalization and the magnitude of the interests involved, than were organized in all the previous history of the country, and the people now come face to face with this question: *Is* the trust a blessing or a curse? If a curse, what remedy can be applied to the curse?

I want to start with the declaration that a monopoly in private hands is indefensible from any standpoint, and intolerable. I make no exceptions to the rule. I do not divide monopolies in private into good monopolies and bad monopolies. There is no good monopoly in private hands. There can be no good monopoly in private hands until the Almighty sends us angels to preside over the monopoly. There may be a despot who is better than another despot, but there is no good despotism. One trust may be less harmful than another. One trust magnate may be more benevolent than another, but there is no good monopoly in private hands, and I do not believe it is safe for society to permit any man or group of men to monopolize any article of merchandise or any branch of industry.

What is the defense made of the monopoly? The defense of the monopoly is always placed on the ground that if you allow a few people to control the market and fix the price they will be good to the people who purchase of them. The entire defense of the trusts rests upon a money argument. If the trust will sell to a man an article for a dollar less than the article will cost under other conditions, then in the opinion of some that proves a trust to be a good thing. In the first place, I deny that under a monopoly the price will be reduced. In the second place, if under a monopoly the price is reduced, the objections to a monopoly from other standpoints far outweigh any financial advantage that the trust could bring. But I protest in the beginning against settling every question upon the dollar argument. I protest against the attempt to drag every question down to the low level of dollars and cents.

In 1859 Abraham Lincoln wrote a letter to the Republicans of Boston, who were celebrating Jefferson's birthday, and in the course of the letter he said: "The Republican party believes in the man and the dollar, but in case of conflict it believes in the man before the dollar." In the early years of his Administration he sent a message to Congress, and in that message he warned his countrymen against the approach of monarchy. And what was it that alarmed him? He said it was the attempt to put capital upon an equal footing with, if not above, labor in the structure of government, and in that attempt to put capital even upon an equal footing with labor in the structure of government he saw the approach of monarchy. Lincoln was right. Whenever you put capital upon an equal footing with labor or above labor in the structure of government you are on the road toward a government that rests not upon reason, but upon force.

Nothing is more important than that we shall in the beginning rightly understand the relation between money and man. Man is the creature of God and money is the creature of man. Money is made to be the servant of man, and I protest against all theories that enthrone money and debase mankind.

What is the purpose of the trust or the monopoly? For when I use the word trust I use it in the sense that the trust means monopoly. What is the purpose of monopoly? You can find out from the speeches made by those who are connected with trusts. I have here a speech made by those who are connected with the trusts. I have here a speech made by Charles R. Flint, at Boston, on the 25th day of last May, and the morning papers of the 26th, in describing the meeting, said he defended trust principles before an exceedingly sympathetic audience, and then added: "For his audience was composed almost exclusively of Boston bankers." "We thus secure," he says, "the advantages of larger aggregations of capital and ability; if I am asked what they are, the answer is only difficult because the list is so long."

But I want now to read to you a few of the advantages to be derived by the trusts from the trust system. "Raw material bought in large quantities is secured at lower prices." That is the first advantage. One man to buy wool for all the woolen manufacturers. That means that every man who sells wool must sell it at the price fixed by this one purchaser in the United States. The first thing is to lower the price of raw material. The great majority of the people are engaged in the production of raw material and in the purchase of finished products. Comparatively few can stand at the head of syndicates and monopolies and secure the profits from them. Therefore the first advantage of a monopoly is to lower the price of the raw material furnished by the people. Note the next advantage: "Those plants which are best equipped and most advantageously situated are run continuously and in preference to those less favored."

The next thing, after they have bought all the factories, is to close some of them and to turn out of employment the men who are engaged in them. If you will go about over the country, you will see where people have subscribed money to establish enterprises, and where these enterprises, having come under the control of the trusts, have been closed and stand now as silent monuments of the trust system.

Behold the next advantage: "In case of local strikes and fires, the work goes on elsewhere, thus preventing serious loss." Do not the laboring men understand what that means? "In case of local strikes or fires, the work goes on elsewhere, thus preventing serious loss." What does it mean? It means that if the people employed in one factory are not satisfied with the terms fixed by the employer, and strike, the trust can close that factory and let the employees starve while work goes on in other factories, without loss to the manufacturers.

It means that when the trust has frozen out the striking employees in one factory and compelled them to return to work at any price to secure bread for their wives and children, it can provoke a strike somewhere else and freeze the workmen out there. When a branch of industry is entirely in the hands of one great monopoly, so that every skilled man in that industry has to go to the one man for employment, then that one man will fix wages as he pleases, and the laboring men will share the suffering of the man who sells the raw materials.

"There is no multiplication of the means of distribution, and a better force of salesmen takes the place of a large number." That is the next advantage named. I want to warn you that when the monopoly has absolute control brains will be at a discount and relatives will be found to fill these positions. When there is competition every employer has to get a good man to meet competition, but when there is no competition anybody can sit in the office and receive letters and answer them, because everybody has to write to the same house for anything he wants. There is no question about it. A trust, a monopoly, can lessen the cost of distribution, but when it does so society has no assurance that it will get any of the benefits from that reduction of cost. But you will take away the necessity for skill and brains; you will take away the stimulus that has given to us the quick, the ever-alert commercial traveler. These commercial evangelists, who go from one part of the country to the other proclaiming the merits of their respective goods, will not be needed, because when anybody wants merchandise all he has to do is to write to the one man who has the article for sale and say, "What will you let me have it for to-day?"

And here is another advantage: "Terms and conditions of sale become more uniform and credit can be more safely granted." The trust can not only fix the price of what it sells, but it can fix the terms upon which it sells. You can pay cash, or, if there is a discount, it is just so much discount, and you have to trust to the manager's generosity as to what is fair when he is on one side and you on the other. I have read some of the advantages which a great trust magnate thinks will come to the trust.

What is the first thing to be expected of a trust? That it will cut down expenses. What is the second? That it will raise prices. We have not had in this country a taste of a complete trust, a complete monopoly, and we can not tell what will be the results of a complete monopoly by looking at the results that have followed from an attempt to secure a monopoly. A corporation may lower prices to rid itself of competitors; but when it has rid itself of competitors, what is going to be the result?

My friends, all you have to know is human nature. God made men selfish. I do not mean to say that He made a mistake when He did, because selfishness is merely the outgrowth of an instinct of self-preservation. It is the abnormal development of a man's desire to protect himself; but everybody who knows human nature knows how easy it is to develop that side of a man's being. Occasionally I find a man who says he is not selfish, but when I do I find a man who can prove it only by his own affidavit.

We get ideas from every source. An idea is the most important thing that a man can get into his head. An idea will control a man's life. An idea will revolutionize a community, a state, a nation, the world. And we never know when we are going to get an idea. Sometimes we get them when we do not want to get them, and sometimes we get them from sources which would not be expected to furnish ideas. We get them from our fellow-men; we get them from inanimate nature; we get them from the animals about us. I once got a valuable idea from some hogs. I was riding through Iowa, and saw some hogs rooting in a field. The first thought that came to my mind was that those hogs were destroying a great deal in value, and then my mind ran back to the time when I lived upon a farm and we had hogs.

Then I thought of the way in which we used to protect property from the hogs by putting rings in the noses of the hogs; and then the question came to me, Why did we do it? Not to keep the hogs from getting fat, for we were more interested in their getting fat than they were; the sooner they got fat the sooner we killed them; the longer they were in getting fat the longer they lived. But why did we put the rings in their noses? So that while they were getting fat they would not destroy more than they were worth. And then the thought came to me that one of the great purposes of government was to put rings in the noses of hogs. I do not mean to say anything offensive, but we are all hoggish. In hours of temptation we are likely to trespass upon the rights of others.

I believe in self-government. I believe in the doctrines that underlie this Government. I believe that people are capable of governing themselves. Why? Because in their sober moments they have helped to put rings in their own noses, to protect others from themselves, and themselves from others in hours of temptation. And so I believe we must recognize human nature. We must recognize selfishness, and we must so make our laws that people shall not be permitted to trespass upon the rights of others in their efforts to secure advantages for themselves.

I believe society is interested in the independence of every citizen. I wish we might have a condition where every adult who died might die leaving to his widow and children enough property for the education of his children and the support of his widow. Society is interested in this because if a man dies and leaves no provision for his wife and children the burden falls upon society. But while I wish to see every person secure for himself a competency, I do not want him to destroy more than he is worth while he is doing that. And I believe the principle of monopoly finds its inspiration in the desire of men to secure by monopoly what they can not secure in the open field of competition. In other words, if I were going to try to find the root of the monopoly evil, I would do as I have often had occasion to do—go back to the Bible for an explanation—and I would find it in the declaration that the love of money is the root of all evil.

I will not ask you all to agree with me; we have not met here as a body of men who agree. We have met here as a body of men who are seeking the light, and each ought to be willing to hear what every other person has to say, and each of us should desire the triumph of that which is true more than the triumph of that which he may think to be true.

Let me repeat that the primary cause of monopoly is the love of money and the desire to secure the fruits of monopoly; but I believe that falling prices, caused by the rising dollar, have contributed to this desire, and intensified it, because people, seeing the fall in prices, and measuring the loss of investments, have looked about for some means to protect themselves from this loss, and they have joined in combinations to hold up prices to protect their investments from a loss which would not have occurred but for the rise in the value of dollars and the fall in the level of prices.

Another thing that, in my judgment, has aided monopoly is a high tariff. Nobody can dispute that a tariff law, an import duty, enables a trust to charge for its product the price of a similar foreign product plus the tariff.

Now, some have suggested that to put everything on the free list that trusts make would destroy the trusts. I do not agree with this statement as it is made so broadly. I believe that the high tariff has been the means of extortion, and that it has aided trusts to collect more than they otherwise could collect. But I do not believe you could destroy all trusts by putting all trust-made articles on the free list. Why? Because, if an article can be produced in this country as cheaply as it can be produced abroad, the trust could exist without the aid of any tariff, although it could not extort so much as it could with the tariff. While some relief may come from modifications of the tariff, we can not destroy monopoly until we lay the ax at the root of the tree and make monopoly impossible by law.

It has been suggested that discrimination by railroads has aided the trusts. No question about it. If one man can secure from a railroad better rates than another man, he will be able to run the other man out of business. And there is no question that discrimination and favoritism secured by one corporation against a rival have been largely instrumental in enabling the favored corporation to secure practically a complete monopoly. Now, that can be remedied by laws that will prevent this discrimination; but when we prevent the discrimination, when we place every producer upon the same footing and absolutely prevent favoritism, monopoly may still exist. The remedy must go further. It must be complete enough to prevent the organization of a monopoly.

Now, what can be done to prevent the organization of a monopoly? I think we differ more in remedy than we do in our opinion of the trust. I venture the opinion that few people will defend monopoly as a principle, or a trust organization as a good thing, but I imagine our great difference will be as to remedy, and I want, for a moment, to discuss the remedy.

We have a dual form of government. We have a State government and a Federal Government; and while this dual form of government has its advantages, and to my mind, advantages which can hardly be overestimated, yet it also has its disadvantages. When you prosecute a trust in the United States court it hides behind State sovereignty; and when you prosecute it in the State court it rushes to cover under Federal jurisdiction—and we have had some difficulty in prosecuting a remedy.

I believe that we ought to have remedies in both State and nation, and that they should be concurrent remedies. In the first place, every State has, or should have, the right to create any private corporation which, in the judgment of the people of the State, is conducive to the welfare of the people of that State. I believe we can safely intrust to the people of a State the settlement of a question which concerns them. If they create a corporation, and it becomes destructive of their best interests, they can destroy that corporation, and we can safely trust them both to create and annihilate, if conditions make annihilation necessary. In the second place, the State has, or should have, the right to prohibit any foreign corporation from doing business in the State, and it has, or should have, the right to impose such restrictions and limitations as the people of the State may think necessary upon foreign corporations doing business in the State. In other words, the people of the State not only should have a right to create the corporations they want, but they should be permitted to protect themselves against any outside corporation.

But I do not think this is sufficient. I believe, in addition to a State remedy, there must be a Federal remedy, and I believe Congress has, or should have, the power to place restrictions and limitations, even to the point of prohibition, upon any corporation organized in any State that wants to do business outside of the State. I say that Congress has, or should have, power to place upon the corporation such limitations and restrictions, even to the point of prohibition, as may to Congress seem necessary for the protection of the public.

Now, I believe that these concurrent remedies will prove effective. To repeat: The people of every State shall first decide whether they want to create a corporation. They shall also decide whether they want any outside corporation to do business in the State, and if so, upon what conditions; and then Congress shall exercise the right to place upon every corporation doing business outside of the State in which it is organized such limitations and restrictions as may be necessary for the protection of the public.

I do not believe that the people of one State can rely upon the people of another State in the management of corporations. And I will give you a reason: I have here a letter that was sent out by a Delaware corporation, with an office in New York. It is a most remarkable document—the most remarkable document on this subject that has ever fallen under my observation. We have talked about New Jersey having a law favorable to trusts. I have a letter here which shows that in Delaware they adopted a law for the purpose of making Delaware more friendly to the trusts than New Jersey. Let me read the letter. It is a little long, but it will repay reading.

The State of Delaware has just adopted the most favorable of existing general corporation laws—one marking a forward step in the evolution of corporations. It does not encourage reckless incorporation, nor permit the existence of wild-cat companies; but it furnishes at the least expense ample rights to stockholders, and reduces restrictions upon corporate action to the minimum. The enactment is not the result, as in the case of most States, of hesitating, halting, enacting, amending, and repealing, but it is a logical and systematic measure, framed by a committee of able lawyers appointed by the legislature to examine the various statutes of the various States, and prepare a bill which should embody the good and eliminate the bad points of existing law. The law is based broadly upon that of the State of New Jersey, and embraces all the beneficial provisions and safeguards found in the laws of that State. It has, however, in many respects, advanced far beyond New Jersey, and makes Delaware a much more attractive home for business corporations.

In the following salient provisions the Delaware and New Jersey laws are substantially identical, namely: Any three persons may organize a corporation; second, it may engage in any lawful business excepting banking; third, its existence may be perpetual or limited; fourth, it may purchase and deal in real or personal property wherever situated and to any desired amount; fifth, it may be a mortgagee or mortgagor; sixth, it may conduct business anywhere in the world; seventh, stock may be issued for property purchased (and in Delaware for services rendered), and in the absence of fraud the judgment of the directors as to the value of such property or services is conclusive; eighth, it may easily wind up its affairs and dissolve itself; ninth, its capital stock may not be more than $2,000, and only $1,000 of this need be subscribed for; tenth, the amount of capital stock which it may issue is unlimited; eleventh, it may file its certificate of incorporation and even commence business before any sum whatever is paid in; twelfth, it may have different classes of stock, with different privileges or restrictions; thirteenth, the charter may be easily amended; fourteenth, only one director need be a resident of Delaware; fifteenth, the capital stock may be easily diminished or increased; sixteenth, the corporation may be readily merged or consolidated into other corporations; seventeenth, it may own and vote upon the stock of other corporations; eighteenth, the incorporators may or may not limit the authority of the directors as to the liabilities.

"The Delaware law possesses the following decided advantages: First, the original fee to be paid for incorporation is small—about three-fourths of that in New Jersey, for instance; second, the annual tax is very small—one-half that in New Jersey. Delaware is a small State and does not need a very large revenue. Third, stockholders and directors may hold their meetings wherever they please and need never meet in the State of Delaware. (New Jersey stockholders must meet in that State.)" You see it is a decided advantage over the New Jersey law in that respect. "Fourth, the original stock and transfer books (which in a New Jersey corporation must be kept in the State) may be kept in or out of Delaware, in the discretion of the company; fifth, the examination of the books by intermeddlers is much more difficult under the Delaware law than under the laws of any other State; sixth, the liability of the stockholders is absolutely limited when the stock has once been issued for cash, property, or services; seventh, stock may be issued in compensation for services rendered, and in the absence of fraud in the transaction, the judgment of the directors as to the value of such services is conclusive. (In New Jersey authority is given to issue stock for property, but not for service.) Eighth, for certain important classes of corporations—as, for instance, railroads, railway, telegraph, cable, electric light, steam heating, power, gas-piping lines, and sleeping-car companies, the advantage is still more marked."

I wish we had some way of knowing what the additional advantages are, after having read the ordinary advantages.

"Ninth, the annual report of a Delaware corporation is required to give no secret or confidential information.

"Tenth, the certificate need not show, nor need public record be in any way made of, the amount of stock subscribed by any incorporator."

And then the letter adds: "This company is authorized to act as the agent and trustee of corporations organized under the Delaware law. It will maintain the principal office of the company in Delaware and keep an agent in charge within the State. It is formed for the purpose of facilitating the incorporation of companies in Delaware and of aiding them to comply, at a minimum expense, with the requirements of the Delaware law. We are ready to aid and give full information to incorporators or their counsel. We do not interfere between attorney and client. We do not conduct a law business. Copies of the Delaware law, and blank forms of information concerning Delaware corporations, furnished on application.

"All communications to us are confidential."

A VOICE FROM THE GALLERY. Colonel, Delaware and New Jersey are both Democratic States, are they not?

Mr. BRYAN. They were not in 1896.

ANOTHER VOICE FROM THE GALLERY. Has the gentleman any more questions to ask?

Mr. BRYAN. I am very glad to have questions asked, because we are seeking the truth.

I have read you this letter in order to show you that where a State can gain an advantage from the incorporation of these great aggregations of wealth it is not safe to place the people of other States at the tender mercies of the people of such a State as may desire to collect its running expenses from the taxation of corporations organized to prey upon people outside.

I read the letter to show how impossible it is for the people in one State to depend for protection upon the people in another State; and while, as I say, I believe the people of every State should have the power to create corporations and to restrain, to limit, and, if necessary, to annihilate, yet I believe that no complete remedy will be found for the trust until the Federal Government, with a power sufficiently comprehensive to reach into every nook and corner of the country, lays its hands upon these trusts and declares that they shall no longer exist.

I am here to hear, to receive information, and to adopt any method that anybody can propose that looks to the annihilation of the trusts.

One method has occurred to me, and it seems to me a complete method. It may not commend itself to you. If you have something better, I shall accept it in the place of this which I am about to suggest. But the method which occurs to me is this: That Congress should pass a law providing that no corporation organized in any State should do business outside of the State in which it is organized until it receives from some power created by Congress a license authorizing it to do business outside of its own State. Now, if the corporation must come to this body created by Congress to secure permission to do business outside of the State, then the license can be granted upon conditions which will, in the first place, prevent the watering of stock; in the second place, prevent monopoly in any branch of business; and, third, provide for publicity as to all of the transactions and business of the corporation.

A VOICE. Colonel, would such a law be constitutional?

Mr. BRYAN. I was going to come to that. I am glad you mentioned it. *What I mean to say is that Congress ought to pass such a law. If it is unconstitutional, and so declared by the Supreme Court, I am in favor of an amendment to the Constitution that will give Congress power to destroy every trust in the country.* The first condition which I suggest is that no water should be allowed in the stock. I do not agree with those who say it is a matter entirely immaterial whether a corporation has water in its stock or not. It may be true that, in the long run, if you are able to run as long as the corporation can, the stock will fall to its natural level; but during all that time the harm goes on; during all that time the trust demands the right to collect dividends upon capital represented by no money whatever. I do not believe that any State should permit the organization of a corporation with a single drop of water in the stock of that corporation. The farmer can not inflate the value of his land by watering the value of that land. The merchant in the store can not inflate the value of the goods upon his shelves. Why should the corporation be permitted to put out stock that represents no real value?

Why, there are instances where there are $4 of water for $1 of money.

A VOICE. Seven.

Mr. BRYAN. Yes, a man suggests seven. Do I hear a higher bid? I have known it to be twelve; but I am a conservative man, and I must maintain my reputation. No man can defend stock that does not represent money invested, and only in the case of a monopoly can you secure dividends upon stock that does not represent money invested.

We had a law in Nebraska that was intended to regulate railroad rates. One railroad in our State was capitalized and bonded for more than five times what it would cost to duplicate the road, and yet the judge held that in fixing rates and in determining what was fair compensation for the railroad we had to consider the watered stock as well as the actual value of that road, and when the case went to the Supreme Court the Supreme Court rendered a decision which, while I can not quote its exact language, was in substance this: That in determining what was a reasonable rate we had to take into consideration a number of things besides the present value of that road, measured by the cost of reproduction.

If the watering of the stock is permitted, then the cry of the innocent purchaser is raised, and you will be told that you must protect the man who bought this stock. No man ought to stand in the position of an innocent purchaser who buys stock in a corporation if that stock does not represent actual money invested, because he can find out what the stock stands for if he will only investigate; but, as a matter of fact, the holders of watered stock are able to collect dividends. Now, if this license is granted, then the first condition can be that any corporation desiring to do business outside of the State in which it is organized shall bring to that board or body proof that that stock is bona fide and that there is no water in it. In my judgment, when you take from monopoly the power to issue stock not represented by money you will go more than half the way toward destroying monopoly in the United States.

The law should provide for publicity. As has been well said by men who have spoken here, corporations can not claim that they have a right, or that it is necessary, to cover their transactions with secrecy; and when you provide for publicity, so that the public can know just what there is in the corporation, just what it is doing, and just what it is making, you will take another long step toward the destruction of monopoly.

But I am not willing to stop there. I do not want to go one or two steps; I want to go all the way, and make a monopoly absolutely impossible. And therefore, as a third condition, I suggest that this license shall not be granted until the corporation shows that it has not had a monopoly and is not attempting a monopoly of any branch of industry or of any article of merchandise—and then provide that, if the law is violated, the license can be revoked. I do not believe in the Government giving privileges to be exercised by a corporation without reserving the right to withdraw them when those privileges have become hurtful to the people.

Now, I may be mistaken, but as I have studied the subject it has seemed to me that this method of dealing with the trusts would prove an effective method; but if you once establish the system and require the license, then Congress can from year to year add such new conditions as may be necessary for the protection of the public from the greed and avarice of great aggregations of wealth. I do not go so far as some do, and say that there shall be no private corporations, but I say this: That a corporation is created by law; that it is created for the public good, and that it should never be permitted to do a thing that is injurious to the public, and that if any corporation enjoys any privileges to-day which are hurtful to the public, those privileges ought to be withdrawn from it. In other words, I am willing that we should first see whether we can preserve the benefits of the corporation and take from it its possibilities for harm.

A DELEGATE. Would you apply that to rich individuals also? Suppose Rockefeller did it on his own account?

Mr. BRYAN. We have not reached a point yet where an individual has been able to do harm, and, in my judgment, if we would abolish those laws that grant special privileges and make some men the favorites of the Government, no man, by his own brain and muscle, could ever earn enough money to be harmful to the people.

A DELEGATE. What will you say to the banks reporting five hundred millions of money in the vaults and four billions of loans?

Mr. BRYAN. Well, I would say it would not be safe to have all the loans collected at once.

Following out the suggestion the gentleman has made, I want to add to what I have said to this extent; My contention is that we have been placing the dollar above the man; that we have been picking out favorites and bestowing upon them special privileges, and every advantage we have given them has been given them to the detriment of other people. My contention is that there is a vicious principle running through the various policies which we have been pursuing; that in our taxation we have been imposing upon the great struggling masses the burden of government, while we have been voting the privileges to a few people who will not pay their share of the expenses of the Government.

Every unjust tax law is an indirect form of larceny. If, for instance, a man who ought to pay $10 only pays $5, and one who ought to pay only $5 pays $10, the law that compels this contribution from these two men virtually takes $5 from one man's pocket and puts that $5 into the other man's pocket, and I have claimed that when we collected our taxes we were making the poor people pay not only their share, but the share of the men whom they have no chance to meet at the summer resorts. I have been gratified to note the progress that you have been making in Illinois toward more equitable distribution of the burdens of government. I heard it stated that there was a time only a few years ago when the agricultural implements owned by the farmers living within the city limits of Chicago were assessed for more than all the money in Chicago returned for taxation by private citizens. I do not know whether it was true or not, but I saw it stated as a fact. There are some people who have visible property, others who have invisible property, and the visible property is always taxed.

The invisible property has too often escaped, and as a result the people owning visible property have not only paid their own taxes, but the taxes that should have been paid by the owners of invisible property. I have advocated an income tax because I believe it the most just tax. I do not mention it to argue the question here, because I want to avoid the discussion of any question that might be considered partisan. If the Government will quit picking out favorites, and follow the doctrine of equal rights to all and special privileges to no man, I have no fear that any man, by his own brain or his own muscle, will be able to secure a fortune so great as to be a menace to the welfare of his fellow-men. If we secure a government whose foundations are laid in justice and laws exemplifying the doctrine of equality before the law—if we can secure such a government and such laws—and wealth is then accumulated to a point where it becomes dangerous, we can meet that question when it arises, and I am willing to trust the wisdom of society to meet every question that arises and remedy every wrong.

SIGMUND ZEISLER. What will you do, Colonel, with the multimfillionaires that already exist? Suppose they should hold and acquire all the industries—all the factories—and particularly industries?

Mr. BRYAN. Do you mean before our laws go into operation?

Mr. ZEISLER. The multimillionaires that already exist.

Mr. BRYAN. In the first place, private individuals have not been able to secure monopolies, and are not likely to do so. As to the multimillionaires now in existence, I would wait and see whether they would die off soon enough to relieve the country of danger. Life is short. If, however, their accumulations should become a menace, I would then consider what measures would be necessary for the protection of society. And this brings me to what I regard as a very important branch of this subject. I am glad the question was asked; it calls attention to the difference between an individual and a corporation. Every trust rests upon a corporation—at least, that rule is so nearly universal that I think we can accept it as a basis for legislation. Every trust rests upon a corporation, and every corporation is a creature of law. The corporation is a man-made man.

When God made man as the climax of creation, He looked upon His work and said that it was good, and yet when God finished his work the tallest man was not much taller than the shortest, and the strongest man was not much stronger than the weakest. That was God's plan. We looked upon His work and said that it was not quite as good as it might be, and so we made a fictitious person, called a corporation, that is in some instances a hundred times, a thousand times, a million times stronger than the God-made man. Then we started this man-made giant out among the God-made men. When God made man He placed a limit to his existence, so that if he was a bad man he could not do harm long; but when we made our man-made man we raised the limit as to age. In some States a corporation is given perpetual life.

When God made man He breathed into him a soul, and warned him that in the next world he would be held accountable for the deeds done in the flesh; but when we made our man-made man we did not give him a soul, and if he can avoid punishment in this world he need not worry about the hereafter.

My contention is that the government that created must retain control, and that the man-made man must be admonished: "Remember now thy Creator in the days of thy youth," and throughout thy entire life.

Let me call your attention again to this distinction. We are not dealing with the natural man; we are not dealing with natural rights. We are dealing with the man-made man and artificial privileges.

What government gives the government can take away. What the government creates it can control, and I insist that both the State government and the Federal Government must protect the God-made man from the man-made man.

I have faith that these questions will be settled, and settled right, but I want to protest against this doctrine that the trust is a natural outgrowth of natural laws. It is not true. The trust is the natural outgrowth of unnatural conditions created by man-made laws. There are some who would defend everything, good or bad, on the ground that it is destiny, and that you can not inquire into it. The fact that it is proves that it is right; the fact that it is proves that it has come to stay, and the argument most frequently made in defense of a vicious system is, not that it is right and ought to stay, but that it has come to stay whether you like it or not. I say that that is the argument that is usually advanced in behalf of an error—it is here, it has come to stay—what are you going to do about it?

I believe that, in a civilized society, the question is not what is, but what ought to be, and that every proposition must be arranged at the bar of reason. If you can prove that a thing is good, let it stay; but if you can not prove that it is good, you can not hide behind the assertion that it is here and that you can not get rid of it. I believe that the American people can get rid of anything that they do not want—and that they ought to get rid of everything that is not good. I believe that it is the duty of every citizen to give to his countrymen the benefit of his conscience and his judgment, and cast his influence, be it small or great, upon the right side of every question that arises. In the determination of questions we should find out what will make our people great and good and strong rather than what will make them rich. "A good name is rather to be chosen than great riches." Shall we decide the ethics of larceny by discussing how much the man is going to steal or the chances of his getting caught? No, my friends, we must decide questions upon a higher ground, and if you were to prove to me that a monopoly would reduce the price of the articles that we have to purchase, I would still be opposed to it for a reason which, to my mind, overshadows all pecuniary arguments. The reason is this: Put the industrial system of this

nation in the hands of a few men, and let them determine the price of raw material, the price of the finished product, and the wages paid to labor, and you will have an industrial aristocracy beside which a landed aristocracy would be an innocent thing.

I may be in error, but, in my judgment, a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, will be impossible when a few men control all the sources of production and dole out daily bread to all the rest on such terms as the few may prescribe. I believe that this nation is the hope of the world. I believe that the Declaration of Independence was the grandest document ever penned by human hands. The truths of that declaration are condensed into four great propositions: That all men are created equal; that they are endowed with inalienable rights; that governments are instituted among men to preserve those rights, and that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. Such a government is impossible under an industrial aristocracy. Place the food and clothing, all that we eat and wear and use, in the hands of a few people, and instead of being a government of the people it will be a government of the syndicates, by the syndicates, and for the syndicates. Establish such a government and the people will soon be powerless to secure a legislative remedy for any abuse.

Establish such a system, and on the night before election the employees will be notified not to come back on the day after election unless the trusts' candidate is successful. Establish such a government, and instead of giving the right of suffrage to the people you will virtually give the right of suffrage to the heads of monopolies, with each man empowered to vote as many times as he has employees. I am not willing to place the laboring men of this country absolutely at the mercy of the heads of monopolies. I am not willing to place the men who produce the raw material absolutely in the hands of the monopolies, because when you control the price that a man is to receive for what he produces you control the price that he is to receive for his labor in the production of that thing.

The farmer has no wages, except as wages are measured by the price of his product, and when you place it in the power of the trust to fix the price of what the farmer sells you place it in the power of the trust to lower the wages that the farmer receives for his work, and when you place it in the power of the trust to raise the price of what he buys you do the farmer a double injury, because he burns the candle at both ends, and suffers when he sells to the trust and again when he buys of the trust.

Some people have tried to separate the laboring man who works in the factory from the laboring man who works on the farm. I want to warn the laboring men in the factories that they can not separate themselves from those who toil on the farm without inviting their own destruction. I beg the laboring men in the factories not to join the monopolies to crush the farmer, for as soon as the farmer is crushed the laboring man will be crushed, and in a test of endurance the farmer will stand it longer than the laboring man.

I come from an agricultural State—one of the great agricultural States of this nation—and I want to say to you that while our people are, I believe, a unit against the trusts, we can stand the trusts longer than the laboring man can; we can stand all the vicious policies of government longer than the laboring man can. The farmer was the first man on the scene when civilization began, and he will be the last one to disappear. The farmer wants to own his home; he ought to own it. I think that this nation is safer the larger the proportion of home owners. I want every man with a family to own his home; the farmer wants to own his home, but if you will not allow him to own his home, he can rent. He will have to be employed to work the farm.

Take his farm from him by mortgage if you like, but the man who forecloses the mortgage and buys the property will not work the farm. He will need the farmer to work for him, and he will have to give the farmer enough to live on or the farmer can not work. When prices fall so low that the farmer can not buy coal he can burn corn. But when prices fall so low that the coal miner can not buy corn, he can not eat coal. You can drive the farmer down so that he can not buy factory-made goods; but his wife can do like the wife of old—make the clothing for the family off of the farm; but when you close your factories it will take all of the accumulated wealth of the cities to feed the people brought to the point of starvation by vicious, greedy, avaricious legislation.

But, my friends, why should we try to see who can hold out the longest in suffering? Why try to see who can endure the most hardships and yet live? Why not try to see who can contribute most to the greatness and to the glory and to the prosperity of this nation? Why not vie with each other to see who can contribute most to make this Government what the fathers intended it to be? For one hundred years this nation has been the light of the world. For one hundred years the struggling people of all nations have looked to this nation for hope and inspiration. Let us settle these great questions; let us teach the world the blessing of a government that comes from the people; let us show them how happy and how prosperous people can be. God made all men, and He did not make some to crawl on hands and knees and others to ride upon their backs. Let us show what can be done when we put into actual practice the great principles of human equality and of equal rights. Then this nation will fulfill its holy mission, and lead the other nations step by step in the progress of the human race toward a higher civilization.

SECOND SPEECH.

I would not occupy the time again, but for the fact that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Foulke] has referred to a plan which I suggested, and I am afraid that he does not fully understand it.

Just a word in regard to the plan: I want to repeat that it was not presented as the only plan, nor is it necessarily the best plan. It is simply a plan. I was sorry that, when the gentleman got through destroying this plan, he did not suggest a better one. Political agnosticism is of no great value to the public. Not to know what to do is often a convenient position to occupy, but it contributes very little to the settlement of a question.

My plan is this: First, that the State has, or should have, the right to create whatever private corporations the people of the State desire.

Second, that the State has, or should have, the right to impose such limitations upon an outside corporation as the people of the State may think necessary for their own protection. That protects the rights of the people of the State to say, first, what corporations they shall organize in their State, and, second, what corporations they shall permit to come from other States to do business in their State.

Third, that the Federal Government has, or should have, the right to impose such restrictions as Congress may think necessary upon any corporation which does business outside of the State in which it is organized.

In other words, I would preserve to the people of the State all the rights that they now have, and at the same time have Congress exercise a concurrent remedy to supplement the State remedy. When the Federal Government licenses a corporation to do business outside of the State in which it was organized, it merely permits it to do business in any State, under the conditions imposed by that State, in addition to the conditions imposed by the Federal Government. I would not take away from the people of the State any right now existing, but I would have the Federal Government and the State government exercise the powers that may be necessary to annihilate every monopoly.

I do not agree with the gentleman that you can not annihilate a monopoly. I believe it is possible to do so. While the gentleman was speaking I could not help thinking of the lines of a song. While he was destroying every remedy suggested, and yet presenting no other, I thought of the lines:

"Plunged in a gulf of deep despair,
Ye wretched sinners lie."

Now, it is a great deal easier to find fault with a remedy proposed than to propose a remedy which is faultless. Macaulay—I think he is the author of the remark—has said that if any money was to be made by disputing the law of gravitation, able men could be found to write articles against the truth of that law. I have no doubt that any remedy that is proposed will be assaulted. But those who believe that the trusts must go will accept the best remedy they can find, try it, and then accept a better one, if a better one is proposed, and keep on trying until the people are protected.

Now, this is a conference. We have not met here to destroy the trusts. Every law for the annihilation of the trusts must be secured through political action. We are here to discuss the questions. We are here to contribute what we can and to hear what others have to say. We are here to consider the various remedies proposed. I am not sure the remedy which I propose is unconstitutional. I am not sure that the Constitution would prohibit such an act of Congress as I suggest. Suppose that Congress should say that whenever a corporation wants to do business outside of the State it must apply to and receive from some body, created by Congress for the purpose, a license to do business. Suppose the law should provide three conditions upon which the license could be issued:

1. That the evidence should show that there was no water in the stock.
2. That the evidence should show that the corporation has not attempted in the past, and is not now attempting, to monopolize any branch of industry or any article of merchandise; and
3. Providing for that publicity which everybody has spoken of and about which everybody agrees.

Suppose that is done. Who is here to say that such a law would be unconstitutional? The Supreme Court, in deciding the Knight case, did not say that a broader law than the present one would be unconstitutional. It is true that there are things in the decision which suggest that, but until that question is presented to the court you can not say that the court has passed upon it. It is also true that Justice Harlan, in his dissenting opinion, assumed that a broader law would be held unconstitutional, but no one has a right to say that if such a law as I suggest were passed and reviewed by the Supreme Court it would be held unconstitutional. But suppose the law is passed and held unconstitutional; then we can amend the Constitution.

The gentleman suggests that it is a difficult thing to get two-thirds of both Houses and three-fourths of the States to favor such an amendment. That is true. It is a difficult thing; but if the people want to destroy the trusts, they can control two-thirds of both Houses and three-fourths of the States. But what is the alternative? Sit down and do nothing? Allow them to trample upon you, ride rough-shod over you, and then thank God that you still have some left? The people are told to be contented; but I think contentment may be carried too far.

I heard of a man once who had been taught to be contented with his lot, and finally became very poor, and traded off his coat for a loaf of bread. Before he had a chance to eat the bread a dog came along and snatched it away from him. He felt a little indignant at first, but finally that feeling of contentment came back to him, and as he watched the dog turn around a corner in the road carrying the bread away, he said: "Well, thank God, I still have my appetite left."

Now, there are people who seem to think we ought to be satisfied with anything. My friends, the American people are entitled to the best that there is. The American people are entitled to the best system on every subject. I believe when these questions are presented to the American people they will select and secure the best system. I do not believe it necessary for us to sit down quietly and permit a great aggregation of wealth to strangle every competitor. I do not believe that it is in accordance with our dignity as a people, or in accordance with the rights of the people, to say that because a great corporation is organized, therefore, it should be permitted to go into the field of a rival, undersell it until it bankrupts it, raising the money by higher prices somewhere else. I don't think it necessary for us to do that.

I have only suggested a plan. It may not be the best plan. If you have anything better, propose it. If there is any amendment that you can think of that will improve it, suggest it. I am anxious to apply a remedy.

Let me suggest one other thing that I believe will be a step in the right direction. The great trouble has been that, while our platforms denounce corporations, corporations control the elections and place the men who are elected to enforce the law under obligations to them.

Let me propose a remedy—not a remedy, but a step in the right direction. Let the laws, State and national, make it a penal offense for any corporation to contribute to the campaign fund of any political party. Nebraska has such a law, passed two years ago. Tennessee has such a law, passed two years ago. Such a measure was introduced in the State of New York, but so far it has not become a law.

You remember the testimony taken before a Senate committee a few years ago, when the head of the sugar trust testified that the sugar trust made it its business to contribute to campaign funds, and when asked to which one it contributed replied that it depended upon circumstances.

"To which fund do you contribute in Massachusetts?" was asked. "To the Republican fund." "To which fund in New York?" "To the Democratic fund." "To which fund in New Jersey?" and the man replied: "Well, I will have to look at the books; that is a doubtful State."

Now, that is almost a literal reproduction of the testimony of one great corporation on the subject of campaign contribution. I don't mean to say that that remedy will be a complete one, but I believe that when you prevent a corporation from contributing to campaign funds you will make it easier to secure remedial legislation, because some corporations are compelled to contribute; they are blackmailed into contribution, and such a law would protect a corporation that did not want to contribute, and also prevent a corporation from contributing that did want to contribute.

If the people are in earnest they can destroy monopoly, and you never can do anything in this until the people are in earnest. When the American people understand what the monopoly question means, I believe there will be no power, political, financial, or otherwise, to prevent the people from taking possession of every branch of Government, from President to the Supreme Court, and making the Government responsive to the people's will.

Such, Mr. Speaker, are the words of William J. Bryan, as annotated by himself. I submit that they completely refute the charge that he has favored this constitutional amendment or anything in any way resembling it.

Trusts.

SPEECH

OF

HON. THEODORE F. KLUTTZ,

OF NORTH CAROLINA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, June 1, 1900.

The House having under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 138) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States—

Mr. KLUTTZ said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I regard the proposal of this amendment by the majority at this time as one of the most remarkable of all the phenomena of legislation.

For six long months the Republican majority, with absolute control of this House, with a stalwart in the chair, with carefully constituted committees, with iron-clad rules, has sat here stolid, indifferent alike to appeal and abuse; deaf to the remonstrances of the minority, and to the demands of the people for legislation for the extirpation, or at least the repression, of trusts.

Deaf, dumb, and blind for six long months, that majority, in the very closing hours of the session, just six days before the time fixed for adjournment, has at last awakened to the fact that the demands of an outraged and indignant public must, in show at least, be heard. The smitings of guilty conscience, the realization that something must be done, coupled with the fear that something might be done to curb the trusts, has found hypocritical and fraudulent expression in both the matter and the manner of this proposed constitutional amendment.

Let me quote it in full:

ARTICLE XVI.

SECTION 1. All powers conferred by this article shall extend to the several States and Territories, the District of Columbia, and all territory under the sovereignty and subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

SEC. 2. Congress shall have power to define, regulate, prohibit, or dissolve trusts, monopolies, or combinations, whether existing in the form of a corporation or otherwise.

The several States may continue to exercise such power in any manner not in conflict with the laws of the United States.

SEC. 3. Congress shall have power to enforce the provisions of this article by appropriate legislation.

Section 1 seeks to write into the Constitution the false and imperialistic theory, which in the recent Porto Rican discussion was so ably combatted not only by the Democratic minority, but also by such able lawyers on the Republican side as MCCALL, LITTLEFIELD, CRUMPACKER, SMITH, LORIMER, and others, that the Constitution does not ex proprio vigore extend over all territory under the sovereignty and subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

No constitutional amendment has ever contained such language or admission, and none ever will, so long as the American people are mindful of the teachings of the fathers and the traditions of liberty. To enact this section into law would be to admit that territory may be acquired, held, and governed by the United States outside of and without regard to the Constitution, unless that instrument shall be expressly extended to such territory by Congress or by constitutional amendment. It would admit all the claims of the imperialists, and make the President imperator indeed.

Even a cursory reading of section 2 will expose its true character and intent. It strikes down the power of the States, does away with the last fragment of the doctrine of States' rights, and lodges in Congress the sole power—

to define, regulate, prohibit, or dissolve trusts, monopolies, or combinations, whether existing in the form of a corporation or otherwise.

Mark the language! If this amendment be adopted, the Congress has this awful, exclusive, controlling power, and has it absolutely. With a Congress controlled and dominated by the trusts, as this Congress is, can any sensible man doubt how that power would be exercised? Corrupt combinations of capital for the oppression of labor would go unscathed, while combinations of labor for protection against such corrupt combinations would be "defined" as unlawful with a vengeance.

The tobacco trust would have nothing to fear, while the tobacco growers and manufacturers who dared combine to resent its rapacity would soon find themselves "defined" into the penitentiary. But why multiply illustrations?

Under this amendment the trusts would need but to buy and control one house of Congress to effectually prevent any legislation whatever against them.

And how transparently deceitful and fraudulent is the second paragraph of this section:

The several States may continue to exercise such power in any manner not in conflict with the laws of the United States.

The merest tyro in the law can not be deceived by false pretense like this.

Congress will have the power not only to regulate the interstate operations of the trusts—and it has this power now—but it will have the right to invade the States and to "define" and crush any corporation or combination in any State, whether engaged in interstate or foreign commerce or not, regardless of the laws of such State.

When Congress legislates it makes "the laws of the United States," and under this amendment no State may make any law in conflict therewith. Thus, supreme power is sought to be conferred upon Congress, and the States stripped of all power over their own corporations or those of other States doing business within their borders. Trust-ridden, trust-controlled, trust-supported, trust-loving as the Republican party is, do you expect any sane man to believe that you intend, expect, or desire this amendment to become a part of the organic law of the land?

Delude not yourselves thus. If you had intended or desired to secure its passage why did you hold this amendment back to the closing days of the session? Why did you refuse the Democratic minority of the committee the poor privilege of even seeing it until it was ready for introduction into the House? Why did you bring it in under a cast-iron rule, which permitted no opportunity of amendment and which allowed time for only the most meager discussion? Why did you, purposely, so objectionably frame it as to render its acceptance by the Democratic minority impossible?

The poor explanation of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] that it is the plan of the majority, that the majority must take the responsibility, and that therefore the minority must have no voice in framing it, but be content to vote for or against it without power of amendment, is so weak as to demonstrate the absence of all possible excuse or explanation for this remarkable course of the majority.

True, the majority must take the responsibility for legislation, but here a two-thirds majority is required. You have no such majority, and can therefore have no hope of passing this amendment without large help from the minority; yet you deny that minority all help in framing or considering it, and deliberately frame it so as to render their support impossible.

Out upon such humbug.

Then again, you can not but know that even if the gantlet of this House was run, your amendment could not possibly pass the Senate at this session, and would hang up for service in the next Presidential election; after which, if you again succeed in deluding the people and buying the Presidency, you could easily have it defeated in the Senate, and the farce would be over. Besides, you might use it as a threat to fry more fat out of the trusts. You know, too, and the country knows, that even if this amendment should pass both House and Senate, there can be no hope of its ratification by three-fourths of all the States, without which it can never become a part of the Constitution.

Unless I am greatly mistaken in the temper and patriotism of this House, your proposed measure will be ignominiously defeated here and that defeat will have the approval of the people of this great Republic.

You are indulging in a cheap "play to the grandstand," but, ostrich-like, you are befooling only yourselves. As evidence of this I call attention to but two of the many unmistakable utterances of the press on this question.

First, I commend this extract from the Washington Post, a great independent paper, which supports the Administration whenever it can do so without stultification.

DEMOCRATIC POSITION ON TRUSTS.

Our Democratic friends in Congress are to be congratulated upon the attitude they have assumed toward the constitutional amendment proposed by the House Committee on the Judiciary, of which Hon. GEORGE W. RAY, of New York, is the chairman. Mr. RAY'S proposition is obviously impracticable, and, as many believe, was intended to be so. By supporting it the Democrats would have deliberately connived at a virtually permanent retirement of the trust issue; withdrawn it from the campaign, and thereby robbed their party of one of its most powerful engines of war. They express their utter disbelief in the sincerity of any representative Republican effort to curtail the power of the trusts. It would have been, therefore, suicidal on their part to commit themselves to an arrangement most palpably calculated to serve the alleged purposes of their antagonists.

There was still another serious objection, which is set forth in clause 3 of the resolution adopted by the Democratic caucus on Tuesday night:

"3. We oppose and urge Democrats in Congress to vote against the constitutional amendment proposed by the Republican majority of the Judiciary Committee unless amended by striking out section 1 thereof and adding thereto in section 2, in lieu of these words, 'The several States may continue to exercise such power in any manner not in conflict with the laws of the United States,' the following: 'Nothing in this article, nor any act of Congress in pursuance thereof, shall operate to abridge or impair any of the rights or powers held by any of the States prior to its adoption.'"

It seems to be the case, therefore, that the Democrats regarded the Ray proposition not only as a scheme to postpone, perhaps indefinitely, all governmental action against the trusts, and incidentally to entrap the Democrats into withdrawing the issue of the campaign of 1900, but also, in case the amendment should be finally adopted, as an abridgment of the rights and powers of the States. Certainly, holding such opinions, they could not have taken any course other than that referred to. Their present position, in this matter at least, seems to be unassailable.

I further beg to commend to your prayerful consideration the following from the Washington Times, and particularly to the extract therein contained from the rabid, radical Administration organ, the New York Sun:

THE SIXTEENTH AMENDMENT.

The agents of the Administration in the House of Representatives will be welcome to whatever satisfaction is coming to them on account of their cheap political trick in taking up a proposed constitutional amendment ostensibly aimed at their masters, the trusts, six days before the date set for adjournment.

Some of the majority leaders in the House are hugging themselves over the achievement, believing it to be a monster of ingenuity which will "put the Democrats in a hole;" but it will do nothing of the kind. Its hypocrisy is so barefaced and its object so clear that it will serve to bring the richly deserved contempt of the country upon its authors and supporters. This view of the matter is held by eminent Republican as well as Democratic authorities. The leading organ of the party in the country, the New York Sun, yesterday editorially referred to the Jenkins joint resolution in these terms:

"When we say plainly that this is the most dishonest and therefore the most discreditable piece of work achieved during the present session by the leaders of Republican policy in the House, we are not speaking of the merits of the proposed amendment. Its revolutionary character, the sweeping change it would effect in the entire system of our institutions, the bestowal upon Congress of an unlimited and arbitrary power over all private business in all the States and without regard to State lines or State rights, need not even be discussed. There is no more prospect of its adoption by a two-thirds vote of both House and Senate, and of its ratification by the legislatures of three-fourths of the forty-five States than there is of the adoption of a constitutional amendment vesting in the Federal Government the direct management of all the myriad industries of this land.

"The dishonesty of the performance lies in the fact that there was no expectation on the part of the author of this resolution, or of the Republicans on the Judiciary Committee who favorably reported it, or of the Republicans in the House who were willing to vote for it, that the proposed sixteenth amendment will ever amount to more than a campaign trick of the cheapest and unworthiest description."

When one of its chiefest exponents denounces its action, as the Sun does, the Republican party need not indulge in any celebration over its blank-cartridge shot at the monopolistic elements which own and control it and furnish the money with which it expects to carry the next Presidential election. A more doddering piece of campaign idiocy than the sixteenth pretendment proposed against the trusts, by the men who are in Congress only by the grace and money of the trusts, is not to be found in all the pages of a not overclean American political history.

No, gentlemen of the majority, your little piece of peanut politics will only bring down upon you the deserved contempt of an outraged and long-suffering people. They know that your party is, and has been, the promoter, the friend, the shield and buckler of the trusts. They know that your Attorney-General, purposely selected, with ample power in the laws already on the statute book, has utterly failed to proceed against or prosecute a single one of the trusts. They know that it was with the money contributed by the trusts that you debauched election officers, bribed and intimidated voters, bought States, and stole the Presidency and the Congress; and they know you are playing to do it again.

They have suffered under the insolence and arrogance, the heartlessness and grinding cruelty of these corrupt and criminal aggregations of ill-gotten capital; they have traced the evil to its source, and know whence comes this brood of hell. They wage no war on capital as such; they welcome and would foster productive industry and enterprise, but they have determined in their righteous wrath that the trust must go. They have listened to their sorrow to the siren song of Republican promise, and they know that the only hope of relief from the domination of the trusts, the only hope of the salvation of the plain people of this country from industrial slavery, lies in the rout and defeat of the Republican party and the election of a Democratic President and Congress.

Well may you trim and dissemble; well may you try to deceive yet once again, by feigning to legislate against your makers and masters. The people are aroused to the importance of this mighty contest, and though the odds are great, right will prevail against might, truth against falsehood, the people against the trusts.

Nor is this the only count in the mighty indictment which you will have to answer at the ballot box in November.

Your frequent and flagrant infractions of the Constitution; your disregard of solemn promises to the Porto Ricans; your murder of our brave soldiers in the Philippines by incompetent generalship; your determination to crush out liberty in these islands; your anglomania, which has committed you to the obsolete Hay-Pauncefote treaty and renounced our right to build, fortify, and protect an American isthmian canal; your utter denial of even an expression of American sympathy for the suffering South African Republics; the reign of loot and plunder in which your officials have reveled in Cuba and the Philippines; your ill-smelling scandal of Gage and the City National Bank; your absolute refusal to lighten any part of the burdens of the war taxes; all these, and many others of like ilk, are the sins for which you will be called to answer at the bar of enlightened and outraged public opinion. Your record is such as no party can successfully face. If your eyes were not holden, you would even now see, what all the world sees, the handwriting on the wall, the "Mene, mene, tekel, upharsin" of the Republican party.

Twelve Years of National Administration, 1888 to 1900—The Fallacies of W. J. Bryan Exposed.

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES N. FOWLER,

OF NEW JERSEY,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, June 2, 1900.

The House having under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 138) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States—

Mr. FOWLER said:

Mr. SPEAKER: This Government being one of, by, and for the people, is in effect a great corporation, in which every voter is a stockholder.

Every four years the stockholders have a meeting to select a manager of its affairs. It is a simple, plain, business proposition. On the 6th of November every voter will have an opportunity to express his opinion as to the honesty and capacity of the two great parties. No one will have the hardihood to say that either of the great parties, if intrusted with power, would proceed to steal money out of the Treasury.

Nor will any sane man have the audacity to say that either Mr. McKinley or Mr. Bryan is personally dishonest, however widely he may differ from the one or the other upon political questions. Capacity alone, then, of leaders and parties is left for comparison, discussion, and decision. *It is not sufficient that a national Administration, through its policies, shall keep some of the people employed some of the time or some of the people employed all of the time or all of the people employed some of the time. But a truly wise, patriotic, and American Administration should keep all of the people employed all of the time, and that, too, at the highest wages paid to man.*

To every intelligent, fair-minded man, who is a patriot before he is a partisan, the experience of the past twelve years must be suggestive at least, if indeed not conclusively convincing upon his judgment, absolutely binding upon his political conscience, and all-controlling upon his action on election day.

Do you candidly, honestly, and earnestly seek to know the truth? Go to the exchanges of the clearing houses of the country, where the products of labor upon the farm and in the factory are so well and accurately reflected. No broader generalization of the activities and prosperity of our people, in every trade and occupation, in every nook and corner of our Republic, can be found.

Amount of the exchanges of the clearing houses of the United States from 1888 to September, 1900.

1888	$48,750,886,813
1889	53,501,411,510
1890	58,845,867,995
1891	57,298,737,938
1892	60,883,572,428
1893	58,860,682,455
1894	45,028,490,716
1895	50,975,155,046
1896	51,935,651,733
1897	54,170,545,659
1898	68,900,661,776
1900 (seven months)	53,689,443,478
1900 (estimated five months)	38,347,745,340
Total for 1900	92,037,588,818

From 1888, during the four years of Republican Administration, exchanges of our clearing houses steadily increased from $48,750,886,813 in 1888 to the magnificent total of $60,883,572,438 in 1892.

But from 1892, during four years of Democratic rule, our clearings fell from $60,883,572,438 to $51,935,651,733 in 1896, running as low as $45,000,000,000 in 1894.

Mark this, and how great the contrast: From 1896, during Mr. McKinley's Administration, we have gained on an average more than ten billions each year, the exchanges having gone up from $51,935,651,733 in 1896 to the surprising sum of $92,037,588,818 in 1900.

Do we hope to keep American labor employed, with our vast mechanism of production, two-thirds or even one-half of the time, to supply our own needs, we must capture the markets of the world. We must send out our manufactured goods as well as our raw materials. The mechanic and the farmer are alike equally and mutually interested in this conquest of the fields of consumption. Therefore your interest, indeed the interest of every man under the flag, is obviously with that party which has achieved this much desired, indeed necessary, result. Again, let us supply the fatal comparison of policies.

Exports of the United States from 1889 to April, 1900.

Year.	Amount.	Per cent of manufactures.
1888	$695,954,507	19
1889	730,242,609	18
1890	845,293,828	17
1891	872,270,283	19
1892	1,015,732,011	15
1893	831,030,785	19
1894	869,204,937	21
1895	793,392,599	23
1896	863,200,487	26
1897	1,032,007,603	27
1898	1,210,291,913	28
1899	1,203,931,222	28
For ten months up to May, 1900, they were	1,172,749,430	
Estimated for two months	234,549,886	
Total for 1900	1,407,299,316	30
Manufactures exported this year	442,189,794	

From 1888 to 1892, during a Republican Administration, we increased our exports $319,787,505, reaching the then gratifying figure of $1,015,732,011.

From 1892 to 1896, during a Democratic Administration, our exports decreased by $152,531,524, falling from $1,015,732,011 to $863,200,487.

From 1896 down to June 30, 1900, with two months estimated, during McKinley's Administration, our exports have gone up from $863,200,487 in 1896 to $1,400,000,000, gaining $537,000,000, or nearly doubling; and of this vast export of $1,400,000,000 more than $400,000,000 are manufactured goods, and would require in their production more than a million of American mechanics.

Nor need we limit the comparison of the exports of the last four years to those of the preceding four years nor any four years in our nation's history, but boldly challenge a comparison of these matchless years with the whole previous life of the nation. Mark this: The excess of exports over imports during President McKinley's Administration is nearly four times as great as it was for the one hundred and six years before he became President of the United States.

To attest this fact I submit the following letter received by me on June 1 from the Bureau of Statistics:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF STATISTICS,
Washington, D. C., June 1, 1900.

SIR: In reply to your verbal inquiry of to-day, I have to inform you that the excess of exports of merchandise over imports from 1790 to March 1, 1897, was $383,028,497, and the excess of exports of merchandise over imports from March 1, 1897 to March 1, 1900 was $1,483,537,094.

Very respectfully,

J. D. WHITNEY, *Acting Chief of Bureau.*

Hon. CHAS. N. FOWLER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

"The poor ye have always with you" is as true to-day as when the morning stars sang together, and no one need go far to find poverty and suffering in the most prosperous days of the most prosperous years of the most prosperous nation of the world's history, because incompetency, shiftlessness, mistakes, and misfortunes always have produced and always will produce want and woe. But when the great mass of the people, as the decades come and go, get higher and higher wages, and live in better and better homes, and constantly increase their holdings in the building-loan associations, life-insurance companies, and savings banks of the country, you may depend upon it that we are moving grandly on to a higher and better civilization, and that the party whose policies render these improved conditions possible is indeed the true party of the people, rather than that political organization which sings a tale of woe and feeds upon ignorance, prejudice, discontent, and every ism that springs from shortcomings and mental disorder.

Actions speak louder than words. Let the facts show which of the great parties is the true benefactor and real party of the people.

The comparative resources of the savings banks from 1888 to 1900.

1888-89	$1,622,612,215
1889-90	1,742,617,001
1890-91	1,854,517,069
1891-92	1,964,044,861
1892-93	2,013,775,147
1893-94	1,980,744,189
1894-95	2,053,761,328
1895-96	2,143,307,163
1896-97	2,198,824,474
1897-98	2,241,344,991
1898-99	2,400,831,472
1899-1900 (partly estimated)	2,550,000,000

It will be readily observed that the savings increased during President Harrison's Administration from $1,622,612,215 to $2,013,775,147, or $391,162,434; and that during President McKinley's Administration they increased from $2,143,307,168 to $2,550,000,000 or more than $400,000,000, while they only a little more than held their own during Mr. Cleveland's Administration. Hence, it would seem to be very plain where the real interest of the honest, frugal, American laborer lies.

It is well known that during those frightful, those distressing, those horrifying years of Democratic rule many business men placed their capital with savings banks to get some interest temporarily while awaiting the return of Republican days of hope and prosperity, and that if this amount were known and could be deducted there would have been a great falling off from 1893 to 1897.

What is so apparent in this table can be demonstrated in a hundred other ways; but nowhere more authoritatively, plainly, and significantly than here. American toilers, do you wish to continue to thrive and save, or again to swear because you "did not think" or "did not know that it was loaded?"

Does the country need any additional proof of this overwhelming contrast? Look upon the scenes around you, and then think of the days, the weeks, the months, aye, the years, when employer and employee alike sweat blood because of anxiety that ruin would overtake the one while want and starvation faced the family of the other.

Let no man venture to assert that the unparalleled activity of all our productive energies, human and mechanical, marks a temporary outburst peculiar to the last year of the expiring century, for a review of the commercial banking institutions of the country speaks more loudly for the policies of the Republican party than any facts yet submitted. Through them flows the blood of commerce, and in them will be found at any given time the commercial power of the nation to employ labor and distribute its product.

Resources of national banks for years 1888 to 1900.

1888	$2,815,700,000
1889	2,998,300,000
1890	3,141,500,000
1891	3,213,100,000
1892	3,510,100,000
1893	3,109,500,000
1894	3,473,900,000
1895	3,423,600,000
1896	3,263,600,000
1897	3,705,100,000
1898	4,003,500,000
1899	4,650,300,000
1900	4,811,956,000

From the fall of 1888 to the fall of 1892, during a Republican Administration, national banks gained in resources $694,400,000, going from $2,815,700,000 to $3,510,100,000.

From the fall of 1892 to the fall of 1896, during a Democratic Administration, the national banks lost in resources $256,500,000, going down from $3,510,100,000 to $3,263,600,000.

From the fall of 1896 to April 26, 1900, during McKinley's Administration, the national banks have gained in resources $1,548,356,000, going up from $3,263,600 to $4,811,956,000. It will be observed that the increase in both Republican periods was constant and gradual throughout, demonstrating the influence and power of far-reaching policies which alone can bring about uniform and universal prosperity worthy the genius of the American people.

The Democratic party came into power in 1892, and had complete control of the legislative department, the House of Representatives and the Senate, as well as the Executive, and left behind a wreckage of business and a slaughter of enterprise, a destruction of values, and a period of suffering without parallel in American history.

President Cleveland denounced the tariff bill then passed as one of perfidy and dishonor, and refused to father it. But it is not too much to say, in the light of subsequent events, that had he had his way hardly one stone of American industry would have been left upon another.

The ostensible object of the Wilson bill was to secure cheap raw materials and, with constant labor at low wages, capture the markets of the world. The actual result was that we lost our own markets, the exports fell off more than two hundred millions, our labor was thrown out of employment, and the only promise realized was low wages, but our people had very little of those.

The Republican party came into power in 1896 upon two distinct pledges: The maintenance of the gold standard and a tariff for the protection of our labor, which should at the same time produce a sufficient revenue to support the Government. The very day the decision of the people was known capital sought the channels of trade, and then was ushered in a period of prosperity without a parallel in the records of mankind. This favoring circumstance was supplemented in the spring of 1897 by the passage of the Dingley law, wisely adjusting our tariff to our conditions and our needs.

Other important events, materially affecting the operations of the Treasury, followed in quick succession. In December, 1897, the Pacific Railway debt was adjusted, and within ten days $58,448,228.75, in equal installments, was paid to the Government.

In January, 1898, $29,904,952 of matured bonds were paid off, and in September, 1898, $14,004,560 more were paid. The Spanish-American war soon brought in its train large appropriations, which of necessity became significant factors in the operations of the Treasury.

The fifty millions defense fund was at once placed at the disposal of the President. In June the war loan of two hundred millions was effected. Upon the ratification of the Paris treaty in April, 1899, the sum of $20,000,000 was paid to Spain.

In November, 1899, because of our irresponsive system of currency, the commercial conditions of the country became so disturbed that the Secretary of the Treasury came to its rescue and wisely relieved the situation by purchasing twenty millions of Government bonds.

As a result of the war three hundred and seventy-two millions have already been paid out.

Finally, in perfect accord with Republican policy, the Secretary has begun the reduction of the public debt by calling in twenty-five millions of Government bonds now subject to redemption.

To all these vast movements of money in and out of the Treasury another stupendous transaction has been superadded by the fulfillment of the remaining pledge of the Republican party at St. Louis when it declared in favor of the maintenance of the gold standard. The very hour it became known that the control of the United States Senate had passed to the Republican party this pledge was started on its road to redemption; and now, thank God, our standard of values is no longer subject to the caprices of a President or Secretary of the Treasury, and our Government credit has been raised above that of any other nation, Great Britain paying 2¾ per cent upon her debt, while nearly one-third of our Government obligations has been refunded at 2 per cent, the amount reaching $290,000,000, and the saving in interest being more than $8,000,000.

All these gigantic transactions have been crowded into the short period of three years, and yet, notwithstanding the fact that every movement of money or currency to or from the Treasury must necessarily correspondingly affect the quantity of money and currency in the hands of the people, Mr. Gage, perfectly familiar with banking, thoroughly informed upon all economic questions involved, and with a broad and statesmanlike grasp of the situation, has kept the money of the Treasury and that used in commerce in constant equilibrium, so that through no act or word even of his has the slightest shock been given to trade, commerce, or the finances of the country.

In strict accordance with the law of June 3, 1864, and the well-established practice of the Government—notably, in 1879, upon the resumption of specie payment, when John Sherman deposited $279,544,615 with the banks to prevent contraction, and again in 1888, when Mr. Fairchild, a Democratic Secretary of the Treasury, for the same reason deposited with the banks $61,546,000—Mr. Gage, carefully avoiding all favoritism or local advantage, expansion or contraction at any point, distributed the Government deposits, which at no time reached one hundred millions, among 260 banks located in 43 different States.

With what masterly skill he kept our money and currency, which is the very lifeblood of commerce, running a natural course, and prevented the vast transactions of the Treasury from producing any adverse influence upon trade, the amount of cash in the Treasury at the following dates clearly demonstrates:

July, 1898	$222,601,730.13
October, 1898	304,550,685.89
January, 1899	282,086,984.43
April, 1899	275,986,434.22
July, 1899	273,859,780.70
October, 1899	283,497,897.49
January, 1900	273,159,422.86

When the administration of the Treasury from 1897 to 1901 and the achievements of these four years are viewed by the historian, the name of Lyman J. Gage will be written with those of Robert Morris, Alexander Hamilton, Albert Gallatin, Hugh McCulloch, and John Sherman; and, with passing time, will shine more and more as this galaxy of names brightens.

The Dingley bill, the war-revenue measure, the establishment of the gold standard, and the funding of the debt into 2 per cent gold coin bonds, with the currency privileges, have had a most marvelous and salutary effect upon the balances of the Treasury and the monetary condition of the country.

In the light of coming events we should not fail here and now to compare and observe the effect of Republican policies upon the circulation of the country, more especially because of the unwise and unfortunate relation of the United States Treasury to the business of the country growing out of our demand obligations. Under present conditions it is of the utmost importance that the business of the Treasury should be wisely and profitably managed and that our revenues should always exceed our expenditures. Conscious of this fact, let us see to which of the parties should the business affairs of the country be committed.

Excess or deficit of revenues over expenditures from 1889 to June 1, 1900.

Year.	Surplus.	Deficit.
1889	$87,761,080.50	
1890	85,040,271.97	
1891	26,838,541.96	
1892	9,914,453.60	
Total	209,554,348.18	
1893	2,341,074.29	
1894		$69,803,280.58
1895		42,805,223.18
1896		25,203,245.70
1897		18,052,454.41
1898		38,047,247.60
1899		89,111,559.67
1900 (11 months)	63,334,217.37	

Although the Democratic party was in power and in charge of the Government for four years in time of peace, it increased the bonded debt $262,335,800, and yet had an aggregate deficit of $135,470,055.17.

The Republican party had a surplus for the four years 1889–1892 of $209,554,348.18, and for the four years 1897–1900, within which time a Republican Administration carried on the Spanish-American war and so adjusted the revenues to the needs of the country as to produce a surplus in excess of expenditures of more than $63,000,000 the present year, and yet the increase of the debt was not so great by sixty-two millions as during the four years of Democratic rule.

The Republican party turned over the Government to the Democrats in March, 1893, with a bonded debt of only $585,029,330, and this was increased to $847,365,130 in times of peace.

For the purpose of prosecuting the war the debt was increased in 1898 by $200,000,000, and now stands at $1,046,048,750, less such an amount of the twenty-five millions of 2 per cent bonds as the Secretary of the Treasury may have already redeemed.

Confronted by these facts, must not every fair-minded man who appreciates the absolute importance of the successful operations of the Treasury to every business enterprise, to the employee as well as to the employer, confess the unwisdom, the risk, the danger of again turning over the affairs of this country to the Democratic party, which has had no business experience for more than fifty years which has not resulted in dire disaster, not only to the Government but to all the people as well?

Do you need further evidence to completely overwhelm you and remove the last vestige of doubt, turn to the gold movement for the past seven years:

Gold imports and exports.

Year.	Imports.	Exports.
1893		$87,506,463
1894		4,528,942
1895		90,063,721
1896		78,884,882
1897	$44,633,200	
1898	104,985,517	
1899	51,452,517	
Total	201,071,234	201,003,808

During the four years Mr. Carlisle was Secretary of the Treasury $201,003,808 of gold was exported; while during the first three years of the recent Administration, or down to June 30, 1899, we imported $201,071,000, making a difference in favor of Republican policies of $402,076,808.

Nor is this all. When the people voted to turn over this Government to the Democratic party in 1892, there was in circulation among the people $24.44 per capita; but when the people elected William McKinley in 1896 there was but $21.10 per capita in circulation.

After a little more than three years of Republican rule there was, on the 1st day of June, 1900, $26.77 per capita in circulation.

Money in circulation.

	March 1, 1897.	June 1, 1900.
Gold coin (including bullion in Treasury)	$516,315,696	$618,535,530
Gold certificates	37,544,819	204,049,299
Standard silver dollars	55,378,762	67,645,528
Silver certificates	363,709,501	408,477,649
Subsidiary silver	60,709,595	75,658,587
Treasury notes of 1890	85,546,621	78,636,759
United States notes	200,734,616	322,752,949
Currency certificates, act of June 8, 1872	76,525,000	4,785,000
National-bank notes	219,230,343	294,057,570
Total	1,675,694,953	2,074,087,871

Population of the United States March 1, 1897, estimated at 72,807,000; circulation per capita, $22.97.

Population of the United States June 1, 1900, estimated at 77,676,700; circulation per capita, $26.71.

Nor is this table, showing the actual amount of money of various kinds in circulation, more interesting or important than the following, which discloses the general stock of money in the United States March 1, 1897, and June 1, 1900:

General stock of money in the United States.

	Mar. 1, 1897.	June 1, 1900.
Gold coin (including bullion in Treasury)	$702,521,724	$1,041,531,374
Gold certificates		
Standard silver dollars	436,868,343	487,497,976
Silver certificates		
Subsidiary silver	76,514,618	81,672,075
Treasury notes of 1890	117,550,280	79,440,000
United States notes	346,681,016	346,681,016
Currency certificates, act of June 8, 1872		
National-bank notes	234,236,327	300,569,759
Total	1,914,372,308	2,337,392,200

However, it should be observed before leaving these tables that there is scarcely anything which is more likely to mislead the public mind than the statement so often made by the Democratic party as now organized, that the amount of money in any country bears any relation to the prices of that country or in any way reflects the commercial condition of that country. Local conditions, under the operation of economic law, will invariably control the per capita circulation.

In support of this statement I desire to call your attention to the following facts:

Per capita circulation in the United States.

1808	$5.00
1845	9.00
1873	15.85
1892	21.40
1900	26.77

Per capita circulation in different States in 1899.

New York	$37.00
Rhode Island	26.00
Washington	23.00
South Dakota	8.00
Mississippi	2.00
Arkansas	3.00

Per capita circulation in different nations in 1899.

Straits Settlements	$53.82
Hawaii	50.00
Siam	42.68
France	36.15
South American States	33.18
Australasia	31.68
Holland	26.76
Germany	19.84
England	17.05
Spain	15.22
Canada	12.13
Sweden	9.80
Mexico	9.12
Norway	7.6
Russia	6.3
Turkey	3.7
Bulgaria	2.3
Japan	1.75

Certainly no one will contend that Great Britain, with only $17.05 per capita, is not a far more progressive and prosperous country than the Straits Settlements, with its $53; Hawaii, with its $50; Siam, with its $42; France, with its $36.15, or the South American States, with their $33. Nor will anyone think of comparing the prosperity of Siam, with its $42 per capita, with that of Japan, with but $1.75 per capita.

Anyone who cares to investigate at length the question of per capita circulation and prices will find that there is no more relation between them than there is between the Chicago platform and the eighth commandment.

Mr. Speaker, so many of the specious statements, unsupported declarations, and fallacious arguments made by Mr. Bryan in 1896 have been exposed, controverted, and utterly destroyed by the experience of the past four years that I can not refrain from calling the attention of the House and the country to a few of them.

At Newton, Iowa, on August 10, 1896, he used the following language:

> The law upon which we base our fight is as sure as the law of gravitation. If we have a gold standard, prices are as certain to fall as the stone which is thrown into the air.

In the following November the people voted to maintain the gold standard and elected McKinley; and prices have been rising ever since. Just the reverse of what he prophesied.

At the notification meeting, held at the Madison Square Garden, New York City, in his speech of acceptance he used this language:

> A gold standard encourages the hoarding of money, because money is rising; it also discourages enterprise and paralyzes industry.

The people established the gold standard by their votes, and every dollar of every kind has come from its hiding, enterprise has been encouraged beyond the dreams of any man, and industry has called for more men than the country could supply. Just the reverse in every particular to his dire prediction.

At New Haven, Conn., he said:

> No party ever declared in its platform that it was in favor of hard times, and yet the party that declares for a gold standard in substance declares for a continuation of hard times.

The very hour that the result of the election was known, times began to grow better.

At Minneapolis, Minn., he said:

> The gold standard means dearer money; dearer money means cheaper property; cheaper property means harder times; harder times means more people out of work; more people out of work means more people destitute; more people destitute means more people desperate; more people desperate means more crime.

Every month since the national election money has been growing easier, lower, and cheaper; property of every description has been gradually but constantly rising; fewer and fewer people are out of work; fewer people are destitute and crime has constantly decreased. These statements, with the various changes rung on them, constitute all that Mr. Bryan said in those unnumbered speeches in 1896, and there is hardly a shred of fact or truth left in any one of them.

Mr. Speaker, to demonstrate how little Mr. Bryan knows or comprehends of economic principles and the experiences of our country, or how much he must suppress, if he does know, I desire to call the attention of the House to Bulletin No. 27 of the Department of Labor, now under the supervision of that greatest and most reliable of our statisticians, Carroll D. Wright. On page 263 Mr. Wright gives a tabulated statement of prices from July 1, 1890, to July 1, 1899, which I now include in these remarks:

Wholesale prices of commodities, January, 1890, to July, 1899—Relative prices.

SUMMARY BY GROUPS.

Date.	Food.	Cloths and clothing.	Fuel and lighting.	Metals and implements.	Lumber and building materials.	Drugs and chemicals.	House-furnishing goods.	Miscellaneous.	All articles.
January, 1890	99.2	101.9	99.0	106.8	104.1	104.5	100.0	94.1	102.0
April, 1890	97.8	102.2	99.5	103.5	104.2	112.1	100.0	97.6	101.9
July, 1890	95.5	102.1	100.7	105.3	98.8	104.5	100.0	103.8	100.4
October, 1890	103.3	102.4	100.6	105.7	101.1	105.4	100.0	104.5	103.1
January, 1891	103.0	100.3	100.6	98.1	100.5	97.4	102.2	100.4	100.6
April, 1891	104.8	98.5	99.7	97.5	99.3	100.1	100.0	104.0	100.7
July, 1891	99.6	97.9	100.7	95.1	97.1	92.0	100.0	101.5	97.7
October, 1891	101.5	97.6	99.8	94.0	97.7	92.2	100.0	97.5	97.9
January, 1892	98.1	97.0	99.6	94.1	97.1	91.2	98.3	96.8	96.5
April, 1892	93.3	96.0	97.9	92.3	96.9	85.7	96.8	99.3	94.2
July, 1892	94.8	96.2	98.9	92.3	95.0	88.3	96.5	95.9	94.5
October, 1892	97.7	98.3	99.3	90.7	94.6	87.6	95.9	90.9	94.7
January, 1893	103.8	98.9	104.1	88.9	97.7	88.3	92.7	89.8	97.2
April, 1893	102.6	98.3	106.3	89.4	94.5	91.4	90.7	92.7	96.6
July, 1893	96.1	95.6	105.2	87.6	92.6	87.0	88.9	86.9	93.1
October, 1893	101.0	93.0	105.2	84.4	93.1	81.9	87.9	87.1	93.0
January, 1894	94.2	90.0	105.8	80.6	91.2	83.1	84.2	87.0	89.6
April, 1894	87.8	87.8	100.8	79.0	88.7	86.8	83.0	85.1	86.7
July, 1894	87.5	86.2	102.0	79.4	87.4	83.6	83.3	86.2	86.0
October, 1894	93.3	85.4	101.6	78.2	86.9	82.1	82.7	84.5	86.9
January, 1895	90.3	80.0	100.8	76.1	87.8	83.7	78.5	84.3	84.7
April, 1895	91.5	79.4	98.4	75.9	88.4	82.0	79.5	83.3	84.7
July, 1895	87.9	83.6	98.4	84.7	86.4	78.9	76.2	83.1	85.2
October, 1895	85.8	88.3	98.6	89.1	85.4	75.7	81.8	83.9	86.3
January, 1896	84.4	87.2	97.5	83.7	85.6	81.9	79.2	84.2	85.2
April, 1896	80.2	83.3	97.7	85.6	83.1	82.0	77.8	82.3	83.0
July, 1896	75.8	81.4	100.1	85.4	81.8	82.4	78.1	88.5	81.5
October, 1896	78.9	82.8	100.9	83.7	82.4	80.1	79.2	88.5	82.4
January, 1897	79.6	82.3	99.3	80.1	83.1	81.9	76.7	88.4	82.0
April, 1897	78.2	81.4	97.8	78.8	83.0	77.9	78.7	89.2	80.9
July, 1897	76.0	81.4	97.8	77.4	82.6	77.0	78.4	89.6	79.9
October, 1897	83.1	83.0	97.8	80.6	85.7	81.5	76.4	91.6	83.6
January, 1898	83.4	80.8	98.1	79.4	86.5	86.3	74.1	90.5	83.3
April, 1898	82.9	80.9	94.4	79.7	86.7	85.4	74.9	94.1	83.3
July, 1898	83.2	80.9	95.5	81.4	86.0	92.1	73.8	94.6	84.2
October, 1898	84.2	80.3	93.6	81.6	88.3	88.9	74.9	93.6	84.4
January, 1899	86.6	80.7	90.8	83.2	94.1	90.7	79.5	94.3	86.5
April, 1899	87.1	82.5	91.2	96.1	97.1	97.8	86.5	96.6	90.6
July, 1899	85.9	84.5	89.8	107.9	99.9	95.9	92.1	95.7	92.9

From this table one may learn that practically all that Mr. Bryan has ever said on the money question and prices is not so. Taking 100 as the price level, from 1890 to 1893 prices gradually fell, until they reached 81.5 on July 1, 1896. On October 1, six months after Mr. McKinley became President, the price level had risen to 83.6. In July, 1899, the price level had risen to 92.9 per cent, or 15 per cent; and, after a somewhat careful and quite general investigation, I am convinced that the price level, July 1, 1900, will be approximately what it was in 1890, or at 100, or show a rise of 25 per cent in four years.

In October, 1890, when the price level was the highest, standing at 103, the per capita circulation was $22.82; and in July, 1897, when the price level was at the lowest point, 80, the per capita circulation was just the same, or $22.49; and now, though our per

capita circulation is $26.77, we have not yet reached the price level of 1890.

That the opinion of Mr. Bryan upon the gold and silver question and upon money and prices has been proved utterly worthless, I believe all students of economics will agree.

Mr. Bryan, believing that there are more people in the United States who have nothing than who have something, has laid down his platform in the first sentence of his article in the North American Review for June, 1900, when he asserts that "the issue is between plutocracy and democracy." Again he is to bear the torch of unrest, discontent, and disorder, bringing forward the walking delegate, and again is he to try to array class against class, when there is not and can not be any such thing as a class war in this country. Only an enemy to the nation and the people would seek to engender it for his own personal, ambitious, and selfish ends, caring not what havoc might be wrought. He knows and everyone knows that nearly every brilliant star in the firmament of success has won its way through a bitter struggle, steadied always by hard necessity.

On page 757 of this article, he makes an attack upon the protective tariff in these words:

> High duties were placed upon the necessities of life on the ground that infant industries required assistance, with the result that the owners of the aided industries grew rich, while home owning decreased and tenancy increased among the consumers.

If he has taken pains to investigate this question, he knows that just the reverse of his statement is true; but he is bent on making a large portion of our people believe that they are about to be eaten alive, and therefore they should proceed to fight their supposed destroyers.

One page 759 he uses these words:

> After six thousand years of search and saving, the total volume of gold and silver money is about eight billions, nearly equally divided between the two metals.
>
> Upon this basis of metallic money rests a large volume of paper money, and upon the various forms of money rests the world's indebtedness.

Think of this supposed economist saying that the debt of the United States rests upon the money in the Treasury of the United States; for all outside of the Treasury is owned by whomsoever may at any time happen to have possession of it. Did our debt of nearly three billions at the end of the civil war rest upon the few greenbacks that happened to be in the Treasury, or did it rest upon the property, credit, and honor of the nation?

Does the enormous debt of the city of Chicago rest upon the few hundred thousand dollars there may be in the coffers of the city at any given time, or upon the property, credit, and honor of that great municipality?

Does the mortgage of $500 upon a farm rest upon the $5 in the pocket of the farmer, or on his land, credit, and honor?

He sells his wheat crop in the fall to the grain buyer and receives a check for each load, and from day to day deposits the checks in a bank, and at the end of the season gives his own check for $500 to the man who holds the mortgage, which is then canceled, and a part of the world's indebtedness is paid; and that night the evidence of a part of the world's indebtedness is burned up in the kitchen stove, with the happy wife and children standing by. Not a dollar, not a 5-cent piece, has ever figured in the transaction.

The production of gold last year was $315,000,000. It will exceed that this year, and I am informed by the very best authority that it will in all probability reach $400,000,000 in 1901, an amount equal to both the gold and silver produced in 1892, or in the next twenty years the world will produce as much gold alone as the world has collected of both gold and silver in all its history.

In the same article can be found these remarkable words on page 761:

> A currency issued and controlled by banks and secured by government bonds creates a paper-money trust.

Mr. Speaker, it is very doubtful whether the writer of these words knows what a bank is or what a bank does.

If what the gentleman says is true, then there has been a bank trust since the national-bank system was established in 1863. There are 3,583 national banks, but there are 9,732 other banks of various kinds in the United States, any one of which could become a national bank if good enough and it desired to do so. A bank is nothing more nor less than a merchant, precisely as the groceryman who sells vegetables and canned goods is a merchant.

The banker deals in credits, selling his own, which are well-known, and buying those around him, which are little known; and if he can use his credit profitably in the form of a bank note, he will proceed to take out circulation; and if it proves unprofitable, as it often does, he will retire the circulation, precisely as the grocery merchant quits dealing in canned tomatoes or any other commodity if it proves unprofitable. The national-bank circulation was $352,000,000 in 1882 and only $122,000,000 in 1890, showing that credit in the form of bank notes was unprofitable.

Mr. Bryan has detected a prejudice against national banks in some quarters, and desiring to avail himself of it as a political asset, he considered that a sufficient reason for an attack upon them, and his false and senseless remark just quoted.

If one believed what the Democratic candidate says in this article about monopoly and trusts, he would be compelled to think that more than half of the American people were in favor of both, when no intelligent person is in favor of either.

In the light of the decisions of the Supreme Court, interpreting the constitutional provisions with regard to interstate and foreign commerce, Mr. Bryan's suggestion that a license be granted must appear to every intelligent business man or lawyer whose opinion is worth having as most superficial and trivial.

Again, attacking the tariff, he observes:

> The tariff has been a bulwark to the trusts.

If the democratic free-trade country of Great Britain did not contain more trusts and great aggregations of capital than any other country in the world, we might be called upon to seriously consider his assertion. Again, the greatest and most conspicuous trusts in the United States are not protected to the millionth part of a cent, viz, the Democratic ice trust of Tammany Hall and the Standard Oil Company.

Again, in his article in the North American Review he vaporized as follows on page 765:

> The Democratic party is better able to undertake this work now than it was a few years ago, because all the trust magnates have left the party. The Republican party is less able than ever before to make a successful war against trusts, because it numbers among its membership all the trust magnates it ever had, and in addition to them it has all the Democratic party formerly had.

Does Mr. Bryan believe one single word of that paragraph? If so, let him read this list and, rising, like an honest man, retract.

The following is taken from a published list of Democratic stockholders in the ice trust:

New York City officials.

Robert A. Van Wyck, mayor.
J. Sergeant Cram, dock commissioner.
Charles F. Murphy, dock commissioner.
H. S. Kearny, commissioner, public buildings, etc.
M. P. Breslin, dock department.
John Whalen, corporation counsel.
Randolph Guggenheimer, president of council.
E. R. Carroll, clerk, general sessions.
G. V. Brower, Brooklyn park commissioner.

Democratic judges.

Martin McMahon, general sessions.
E. L. Fursman, supreme court.
H. A. Gildersleeve, supreme court.
G. C. Barrett, supreme court.
G. L. Ingraham, supreme court.
James Fitzgerald, supreme court.
Miles Beach, supreme court.
J. E. Newberger, general sessions.
Edward Patterson, supreme court.

Democratic leaders.

Richard Croker.
Augustus Van Wyck.
Eugene D. Wood.
A. N. Brady.
Thomas F. Gilroy.
John F. Carroll.
Hugh J. Grant.
Hugh McLaughlin.
Arthur Sewell, of Maine.
John D. Crimmins.
Maurice Untermeyer.
Theodore W. Myers & Son.

Does not Mr. Bryan know that practically all the wealthy Democrats who have ever been identified with the Democratic party are still within its fold, and that of those men now conspicuously identified with the great aggregations of capital quite as many are Democrats as Republicans? Then why, if he is an honest man, does he attempt, under this cloak of false pretenses, to steal what ever prejudice there may be against these aggregations of capital!

Falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus.

Practically the whole civilized world has now gone to the gold standard, Japan and India being the more recent and important countries. Commenting upon the effect of its adoption by Japan, the Financial Chronicle of New York of June 5 said:

> Steadiness in exchange, resulting from Japan's abandonment of a fluctuating standard had one immediate and natural consequence: It greatly stimulated the country's aggregate foreign commerce. Total volume of outward and inward trade rose from 177,970,087 yen in 1896 to 443,225,900 yen in 1898.

The government of India, in its financial statement for the year ended March 31 last, sums up its achievement in monetary reform in this sentence:

> India has at length emerged from the period of transition in her currency, has reached the goal to which she has been struggling for years, has established a gold standard and a gold currency, has attained that practical fixity

in exchange which has brought relief alike to the private individual and to the government finances.

And the minister of finance for India, in his report for March 31 last, says:

I do not venture to claim for one moment that government foresaw the enormous inrush of gold which has been brought about by the withdrawals of silver upcountry on account of famine relief, by unusual movements of grain, and by the requirements of an exceptionally large rice crop in Burmah, and also by capital coming out of India. But it is not unfair to claim that the reasons which decided government to take instant action have proved sound, and that, independently of the abnormal causes to which I have referred, the operation of other causes on which government relied has not disappointed us.

As I have said, we have been nearly swamped (temporarily) by gold. The amount in our currency reserve on April 1, 1899, was £2,000,000 ($10,150,000). It stood on March 7, 1900, at £7,069,800 ($35,849,000); the amount accumulated in London under Act II of 1898 stood at £1,500,000, making an aggregate of £8,569,800 ($42,845,000). The difficulty has been that of meeting the demand for rupees in exchange for the gold tendered to us.

In the face of these figurse; in the face of the result of our own decisive action in 1896; in the face of the fact that our foreign commerce, in and out, now approaches twenty-five hundred millions; in the face of the fact that the rank and file of the Democratic party, as you meet and talk with them privately, declare that sixteen-to-oneism is deader than Hector, will not every intelligent man, when he reads these words in Mr. Bryan's North American Review article, page 761:

The contest upon this question must be between those who believe in the gold standard on the one side and, on the other side, those who believe in a financial policy made by the American people for themselves—

I say, will not every intelligent man doubt either the good faith or the good sense of Mr. Bryan?

Are the American people so bereft of reason, so completely hoodooed, that they will not question anything and everything he may say hereafter? Let us be frank with each other. Let us be honest with ourselves. Is not William Jennings Bryan the veriest, the humbuggiest humbug that has ever played in the rôle of a Presidential candidate?

The whole campaign of the Democratic party in 1892 was waged against high prices as a result of the protective tariff.

The whole campaign of the Democratic party in 1896 was waged against low prices as the result of the gold standard.

The whole campaign of the Democratic party in 1900 is likely to be waged against high prices as a result of combinations.

Oh, consistency, thou art indeed a jewel, but thy name is not Democracy.

Mr. Speaker, every American citizen who has a day's work to sell, every man who has a dollar to make, every man who has a dollar to save, is deeply interested in the result of the coming election. Like wise, patriotic business men, let us review the achievements of the last three years. Let us consider what they mean to us as a people, to us as individuals, and hold ourselves personally responsible for the result of our action.

When was our condition worse than during those four Democratic years of 1892–1896? When was it better than during the past three years? When have there ever been, not only in our own history but in that of every other country, such mighty strides in clearings, in foreign exchanges, in gold accretions, in bank resources, in savings deposits, and in universal prosperity as since Mr. McKinley became President of these United States? What naval achievements of the world's history can shadow the valor and glory of Manila Bay and Santiago Harbor? When was so vast an army mobilized and sent to the field of action with equal dispatch? When, in commercial diplomacy, was Hay's "open door" to the Orient matched?

Will a too kind and generous act of the President toward a hot-headed but tried and true old soldier, who had often bared his breast to death's messenger; will a delayed baggage train, a box of spoiled meat; will a dishonest public official, quickly removed and looking through an iron grate; will a constitutional quibble; will any or all of these nothings weigh against the stupendous achievements and eternal glory of the last four years of the century?

The American people stand for fair play and love justice. They symbolize those immortal sentiments and saving virtues of the human race:

Love, not hate.
Concord, not discord.
Reason, not prejudice.
Wisdom, not passion.
Truth, not error.
Facts, not fiction.
Experience, not experiment.
Construction, not destruction.
Law and order, not anarchy.
Honor, not dishonor.

On November 6 we will move grandly onward and upward, not backward and downward, and this nation will be saved through the intelligence, justice, and patriotism of the American people.

Military Academy Appropriation Bill.

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM SULZER,
OF NEW YORK,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, June 5, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 11538) making appropriations for the Military Academy—

Mr. SULZER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: As no gentleman on this side of the House desires to occupy further time, I have no objection to taking up the bill under the five-minute rule. However, before that is done I desire to submit some remarks in regard to this bill and other matters. The bill under consideration has been carefully considered by the Committee on Military Affairs and is unanimously reported. I do not believe there is a single item in it that can possibly be objectionable to any member of this House.

In this connection I want to say that I am, always have been, and always expect to be a friend of the Military Academy at West Point. I should like to see the Military Academy made a great national university to which any poor boy would be eligible, if he possessed the necessary mental and physical qualifications, where he might receive at the hands of the Government not alone a splendid technical education, but also a splendid military education. I believe it would be for the best interests of the Government and all concerned if the Academy were enlarged and made a great university of learning.

THE BONDHOLERS' PROFIT.

Already we witness the first evils of this culminating atrocity of class legislation. United States bonds are advancing in price as a matter of course. When the refunding begins under the Republican financial scheme the premium paid by the Government for the old bonds will amount to so enormous a sum that, added to the extension of time, the national debt will be increased by several hundred millions, all of which goes into the pockets of the bankers and money lenders and comes out of the pockets of the people. This mortgage on posterity is easily figured. The interest-bearing debt amounts to $850,000,000, and has nine years to run at 4 per cent; increased to thirty years, to run at 2 per cent, with premium on old bonds now quoted at 134 and advancing. Let any elementary arithmetician make the calculation. Who gets this profit, and who pays it? The bondholders, foreign and domestic, get the profit, and the producers of our country pay it.

HANNA'S BARGAIN WITH WALL STREET.

In my opinion, one of the worst features of this act is the part which consummates the bargain made by MARK HANNA with the national bankers of Wall street during the campaign of 1896. They aided the Republicans then, and now they receive their share of the spoils. For three years the Republicans have waited and hesitated to pass this abomination, fearing the wrath of an outraged and indignant people. But another national campaign is near at hand. They need help again, and in order to get it have unconditionally turned the finances of a great Government over to the national banks.

The powers this act gives the national banks are far-reaching and most dangerous. It turns over to them the finances of the people—the lifeblood of trade and commerce—and gives them the right to contract or expand the currency at will. This right should never be surrendered by the Government. I say, and time will demonstrate it, that if you give the control of the money supply to the national banks, they will soon absorb the wealth of the people and own the Government. It is an enormous power; a power that can create panic or prosperity, happiness or misery, to thousands and millions of people. I say it is too great a power to be given to any corporation, and if once given and set in motion for selfish ends and for sordid purposes, will be a fruitful source of woe and misery to hundreds and to thousands of our fellow-citizens.

NATIONAL BANK MONOPOLY.

It gives the monopoly of issuing money to the national banks, and hence the right to expand or contract the currency of the people whenever it suits their convenience. No corporation should have this power to make or destroy. It deprives the Government of one of its greatest attributes of sovereignty and gives to the national banks the right to paralyze at their will every industry in the country. It is the most daring attempt the banks have ever made by law to seize one of the greatest weapons for good or evil known to civilized man. For the Government to surrender this prerogative and delegate away this power is a

crime against every citizen in this land and will work woe and misery to millions yet unborn. I am opposed to the Government delegating away its powers to the national banks. The Democratic party should vigorously oppose conferring any additional powers on or granting any greater privileges to the national banks. In my judgment they already possess entirely too much power. They are doing to-day, only to a greater extent, what the United States Bank did in the days of Andrew Jackson. The right to coin and issue money is one of the greatest prerogatives of the Republic and one of the highest attributes of its sovereignty. It should not be delegated, transferred, assigned, or set over to any national bank, to any trust, or to any monopoly.

THE TRUSTS MUST GO.

The Democratic party is unalterably opposed to trusts. This is a paramount issue, and we must keep it to the front in the coming campaign. I want to see the Democratic party take an advanced position against the evils of the trusts and the sordid greed of monopolies.

To-day the great trusts of the country are practically supreme. Many of them are so intrenched in power that they are to all intents and purposes above the law and no longer amenable to legislative action. The crying evil of the times is the power and the sway of the trusts. They endanger not only our free institutions, but our free men. The battle cry of the Democratic party should be, "The trusts must go!"

THE OLD FIGHT OVER AGAIN.

Mr. Chairman, the great campaign of 1900—a campaign that will determine the future of the Republic—has practically begun and is now on. We know who the standard bearers of both parties will be. We know Mr. McKinley will be renominated by the Republicans, and we know about what the Republican platform will be. We know William J. Bryan will be renominated by the Democrats just as sure as the sun will rise to-morrow morning, and we know what his platform is. It will be the old fight over again, with none of the issues of 1896 eliminated, but some new ones added. I want to speak briefly about some of the imperative issues in the coming campaign—a campaign as momentous as any ever held in this country and which will determine whether the people shall rule, the Republic live, and our free institutions survive. These issues are now made, inexorable events and the people have made them. They can not be ignored and they must be discussed and settled by the people in the coming campaign.

STANDS SQUARELY ON THE CHICAGO PLATFORM.

The creed of the Democratic party to-day is the Chicago platform. The Democracy will take no step backward in regard to its principles. We have tested them in the loyalty of American manhood, and vindicated them in the crucial fire of 6,500,000 of honest, incorruptible, and intelligent voters, and in our next national convention we will not apologize for our righteous convictions or surrender our fundamental principles. The people know we are right, and they will sustain us if we are true to ourselves and go forward without faltering. We have struggled too long to give up now. On the morning of victory we will not haul down our flag.

I believe in the fundamental principles of the Democratic party. I believe in sticking to our party. I am not a bolter. I stand squarely on the Chicago platform, and I have no apologies to offer for my support of William J. Bryan or for my loyalty to the principles enunciated in that magnificent document. In my judgment, it is the best platform the Democratic party ever adopted, and notwithstanding all that has been said against it, I believe the day is not far distant when every principle enunciated in it will be enacted into law. In the next national Democratic convention the question will be not what shall we take from it, but what shall we add to it.

FOR THE MONEY OF THE CONSTITUTION.

Mr. Chairman, the money question is still an issue and will be an issue until the money of the Constitution is restored and the rapacious and sordid greed of the national banks is checked and curtailed by law. By the signature of the President the iniquitous Republican gold standard bank currency and bond bill is now a law, and the people will ere long have an opportunity of feeling and observing its disastrous and oppressive operation. The Republican party has made this law a party question, and it can not be eliminated from discussion as a leading issue in the coming campaign.

A VICIOUS POLITICAL MEASURE.

It is one of the most vicious political measures ever passed through Congress. It commits the Government unalterably by law to the single gold standard and makes all obligations, public and private, payable in gold. It strikes out the word "coin," which means gold or silver, in all Government bonds, inserts in its place the word "gold," and in addition thereto it authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bonds without limit whenever he pleases, and makes the bonds payable in gold. It refunds the national debt and turns the finances of a mighty people over to the money lenders. It violates the obligations of the contract between the Government and the bondholder, in the interest of the bondholder, and provides that the currency of the people shall be issued by the national banks, and gives them the right at will to expand or contract the currency. It is the most startling and the most daring departure from time-honored and well-fixed financial principles ever made in our history, and the result will be as disastrous as it is far-reaching. It reverses our financial system, repudiates the platforms of both parties, and revolutionizes the monetary methods of a century.

The money power, the bondholders, the trusts, the syndicates, and the plutocrats secured the passage of this law, and the Republican party to-day is their lackey, and in every department of the Government carries out their wishes and registers and records their decrees.

BIMETALLISM A LIVING ISSUE.

Make no mistake. The enactment of this law will not settle the controversy. No great question is ever settled until it is settled right. Bimetallism is a living issue, and will be of paramount importance to mankind as long as civilization uses money for trade and commerce. Gold never was the friend of liberty. It never fought a battle for humanity. No people in a great crisis ever found it a faithful ally. It has been the agent of panic, the minister of despair, the advocate of calamity, and the high priest of cruelty. I am against the gold standard. In time it will have to go.

THE EVIL OF THE TRUSTS.

These gigantic combinations constitute, in my judgment, the greatest menace at the present time to our democratic institutions. They control the supply, monopolize the product, and dictate the price of every necessary of life. They force out of legitimate employment thousands and thousands of honest toilers. They enhance prices, reduce wages, and write the terms of their own contracts. They destroy competition, paralyze opportunity, assassinate labor, and hold the consumers of our country in their monopolistic grasp. They levy tribute on every man, woman, and child in the Republic. They blight the poor man's home, darken the hearthside of his children, and cloud the star of legitimate hope. They control legislation, escape taxation, and evade the just burdens of government, while their agents construct and maintain tariffs to suit their selfish ends and greedy purposes. They imperil trade, stagnate industry, regulate foreign and interstate commerce, declare quarterly dividends on watered stocks, and make fortunes every year out of the people. Their tyrannical power, rapid growth, and centralization of wealth is the marvel of recent times and the saddest commentary on our legislative history.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY STANDS FOR THE TRUSTS.

The people who oppose and condemn trusts will receive no encouragement from this trust-ridden and trust-owned Administration. The Republican Attorney-General is the mere creature of the trusts and will take no action against them.

The Republican party in all its power stands fearlessly for trusts and is openly and boldly supported by trusts. Every trust in the country was for William McKinley for President in 1896, and every trust will zealously and loyally aid him in 1900. If you ask what for, I answer for value received, for the blessing of a pliable Secretary of the Treasury and a derelict Attorney-General, for a lively sense of favors yet to come, and above all and beyond all for MARK HANNA, who runs the Republican machine for the benefit of the trusts and who turned down in Ohio an honest and fearless attorney-general who was brave enough to do his duty and courageous enough to make an attempt to enforce the law against the Standard Oil trust, the greatest, the most relentless, and the most cold-blooded monopoly of them all.

The Republican party is the party of plutocracy. It stands to-day for economic errors that rob the many for the benefit of the few, for financial heresies that centralize wealth and paralyze industrial freedom, for political policies that enslave the masses.

To sum it all up, the Republican party stands for HANNA and the Republican party is HANNA. What a difference between the party of Lincoln and the party of HANNA.

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY OPPOSED TO TRUSTS.

The Democratic party is the party of the plain people. It is opposed to trusts and monopolies, to special privileges. It stands for the supremacy of the law. It believes in freedom of thought, freedom of speech, freedom of action, freedom of trade, and free institutions. It believes in the Constitution, in fostering commerce, unfettering trade, establishing industry, aiding enterprise, maintaining equal opportunity, defending liberty, unshackling the mind and the conscience, and handing down unimpaired to future generations the blessings of our free institutions.

While the Republican party is in power the trusts will flourish like a green bay tree.

When the Democratic party comes into power a Democratic President will appoint a Democratic Attorney-General who will

enforce the law against the trusts, and they will dissolve and disappear like mist before the rising morning sun and be gone forever.

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY FAVORS AN INCOME TAX.

The Democracy will strenuously struggle for the adoption by law of a graduated income tax. This is the fairest, the most just, and the most equitable tax, and makes the accumulated wealth of the land bear its just share of the burdens of Government. This is an imperative issue and we must relax no effort to bring about its final consummation. The unjust, the vexatious, and the burdensome war tax must go and the income tax must take its place. We must not lose sight of this.

THE NICARAGUA CANAL.

The Democracy favors the building and the owning of the Nicaragua Canal by the Government of the United States, in our own way, and with our own money without the aid or consent of Great Britain.

ELECTION OF UNITED STATES SENATORS BY THE PEOPLE.

Mr. Chairman, I favor electing Senators in Congress by a direct vote of the people.

The right to elect United States Senators by a direct vote of the people is a step in advance, and progress in the right direction.

In my judgment the people can and ought to be trusted. If the people can not be trusted, then free government is a failure and our institutions are doomed.

United States Senators should be elected directly by the people. The Senate is rapidly becoming a plutocratic club for multimillionaires, and the people demand a change in their mode of selection.

There can be no doubt that the sentiment in favor of this change is increasing every year, that a great majority of the people now demand the right to vote directly for United States Senators, and this sentiment will continue to increase and the just demand of the people will continue to grow until the will of the people is complied with.

I am an old-fashioned Democrat. I belong to the Jefferson school. I trust the people, and I believe in the people. I believe with him that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. I want to restore to the people the right now delegated to the legislatures, so that the Senate as well as the House of Representatives will be directly responsible to the people, and the Government become more and more a pure democracy, where brains, fitness, honesty, ability, experience, and capacity, and not wealth alone, shall be the qualifications for the upper branch of the Federal Legislature. Let us demand this reform in our next national platform and make it an issue in the coming campaign.

THE DEMOCRACY IS FOR THE TOILER.

The Democracy is now and always has been the party of the plain people, and is and always will be the friend of the toiler. Only through its agency can the masses hope for relief. The Republican party has never been the friend of the toilers and the wage-earners. Nearly every law now on the statute books in the interest of honest workmen was put there by Democratic votes, and in the future, as in the past, the masses of the people must look to the Democratic party for help.

FAVORS AN EIGHT-HOUR LAW.

In the name of Democracy I make an earnest plea for an eight-hour law in the nation and in every State. The laborer demands this law, and the Democratic party is irrevocably committed to its passage.

In my judgment, no man ought to be compelled to work more than eight hours a day. That is long enough. Labor organizations all over the country are asking for the enactment of an eight-hour law. It is fair and it is just to the employer and to the employed.

I want to say that I am, and always have been, a friend of the wage-earners. I want to see, and I hope the day is not far distant when we shall see, the eight-hour law the law all over the land, and rigidly enforced in every State, every city, every town, and every village in the country. I believe it will be beneficial to the laborer, advantageous to the community in which he lives, and for the best interests of the Government. Too long hours make the wage-earner a poor workman. Shorter hours, in my opinion, will produce better results all around and for all interests concerned. Every writer on political economy confirms this conclusion, and as great an authority as John Stuart Mill lays it down as a fundamental principle that any scheme for the amelioration of the social condition of the wage-earner which does not proceed on this proposition as its foundation is for all permanent purposes a delusion and a snare.

I am and always have been an advocate of shorter hours for a legal working day. The history of the past teaches us that every reduction in the hours constituting a day's work has resulted beneficially. These reductions in the hours of labor have decreased intemperance, increased knowledge, made better homes, happier and better-clothed wives and children, brighter and more prosperous firesides, and in every way benefited the social relations, promoted the moral, economical, and financial condition of the producing masses of our land.

The record will show that the Republicans in the United States Senate defeated the eight-hour bill, and every workman in the country should vote against the party responsible for this outrage.

IS THERE A SECRET ANGLO-AMERICAN ALLIANCE?

Another issue that is destined, in my judgment, to play a leading part in the coming campaign, is our true relations with the British Empire. Have we a secret understanding with the British Lion, or does official America simply sneeze when Downing street takes snuff? Is there a tacit agreement, or is it simply an abject and humiliating surrender of American rights to British interests? This will be talked about. It can not be kept out of the campaign.

THE DEMOCRACY IS AGAINST AN ALLIANCE.

I think it can be safely asserted that the party we belong to is against an alliance, expressed or implied, with Great Britain, especially when the representative of the British Government is Joseph Chamberlain, the Benedict Arnold of the cause of Irish home rule, and the instigator of the war against the struggling patriots in South Africa.

We need no alliance with Great Britain. All we need now, as in the past, is a firm reliance on our own greatness, our own ability, our own integrity, our own power to defend our rights, protect our citizens, and legislate for ourselves on every proposition regarding our own welfare, our own happiness, and our own well-being. The spirit of 1776 and 1812 still lives. The Republican party is in favor of this alliance; the Democratic party should be strenuously opposed to it. Its consummation means national disintegration.

I am opposed to an Anglo-American alliance, expressed or implied, especially when its object is the advancement of imperialism, the march of armies, the downfall of republics, the destruction of free institutions, the enslavement of man, and the perpetuity of the power of kings.

The American people should cry out against this sacrifice of principle, this surrender of rights, before it is too late. England never was and never will be our true and lasting friend. You can not make monarchy harmonize with democracy. Their principles are antagonistic and their associations incompatible.

"England will never be our friend," said Jefferson, "until we are her master."

APING ENGLAND.

Sometimes when a representative of the people goes to one of the Departments in Washington he feels that he is trespassing on John Bull's territory. In our own capital city this aping of England is going from bad to worse. I often wonder what the spirits of the patriot fathers think about it.

The White House seems to be enveloped in an English fog, the Administration seems to be more English than American, the Constitution is kicked from pillar to post, the Emancipation Proclamation trampled under foot, the Declaration of Independence sneeringly referred to as a glittering generality—not up to the times of force and grab—and the Cabinet officers industriously turn up the bottom of their trousers when it rains in London. What a spectacle we witness at the capital of the nation!

My friends, it is too bad the Declaration of Independence is not as popular at home as it used to be. I know it is no more popular now with kings and queens than when it was written, but I am American enough to believe that it is just as true to-day as it was in 1776, when it sounded the deathknell of the divine right of kings and proclaimed to all the world a government based on the consent of the governed. But it seems to be in such disfavor in Washington at the present time that the pro-English Secretary of State has locked it up in a safe, and the Anglo-American ambassador to the gilded court of St. James takes delight in making after-dinner speeches to tipsy lords and dukes about the beauties of imperialism and the ironclad friendship of England and America.

"Beware of perfidious England," said Napoleon. And I say she never had a friend she did not deceive, and she never had an ally she did not betray.

THE WAR IN SOUTH AFRICA.

Why, things have gone so far in this regard that a Republican Congress refused to pass a resolution of sympathy for the heroic Boers, and the Administration seems to be secretly conspiring with Great Britain for the destruction of our two sister Republics in South Africa. Can we forget our glorious past? Shall we forget our own struggles and our own prayers for help in the trying days when we were fighting England for our liberty and our freedom? Where is the spirit of liberty that animated the patriotic fathers at Lexington and Bunker Hill, at Saratoga and Valley Forge, at Monmouth and Yorktown? Do the eloquent words of Patrick Henry and James Otis, of George Washington and Thomas Jefferson, of Benjamin Franklin and Gouverneur Morris no longer inspire resistance to tyranny and hatred of oppression?

Is American patriotism dead? Has the spirit that animated the people in 1776 and 1812 been forgotten? Is the Declaration of Independence no longer potent for the upbuilding of republics and the perpetuity of free institutions? Is our form of government a farce?

Shall we tear down our monuments, trample in the dust the Constitution, send back to France the statue of Liberty, and turn to the wall the picture of the Great Emancipator?

If democracy and free institutions find no answer here, then indeed is government of the people and by the people and for the people doomed—republics a thing of the past—and the message of the future an imperialistic cry of destruction, of oppression, and of tyranny.

THIS IS THE GREAT REPUBLIC.

This is the great Republic—for a century it has been the beacon light of the world. Shall the light now go out? Why should we secretly aid Great Britain? Should we not rather be true to our traditions and openly sympathize with the Boers? Look about you, my friends, and answer. It seems the very altars of our liberty are being betrayed by men in high places who are sworn to guard them.

England must not be permitted to crush the Boers and steal their homes. Her criminal march of devastation must be checked. God bless the embattled farmers of South Africa! is my fervent prayer, and from the ashes of the conflict may there arise a greater and a grander republic—the glorious United States of South Africa.

If I mistake not the signs of the times, the friends of liberty in this country will make this an issue in the coming campaign.

NO MILITARISM—NO IMPERIALISM.

The Democratic party is opposed to militarism and to imperialism. They go hand in hand, and one can not stand without the other. They are twin brothers—relics of brute force and mediæval barbarism. They have no place in a republic. We realize what they mean when we witness the horrors and the tyranny of the "bull pen" of Idaho, and the cruel injustice to and criminal aggression against our fellow-citizens in Porto Rico. United States soldiers in Idaho acting as policemen for the trusts and treating honest and innocent citizens worse than Siberian convicts, and United States soldiers in Porto Rico acting as a guard for the Ohio syndicate while it plunders the hurricane-stricken inhabitants of the little the Spaniards left them. It is enough to bring the blush of shame to the cheek of every honest and patriotic citizen in the Republic. These issues are imperative. They will not down. They will be discussed on every occasion in the coming campaign.

NO NEED OF A VAST REGULAR ARMY.

As Democrats we should do all in our power to defeat the now avowed policy of the Republican party to increase the Regular Army of our country to 100,000 soldiers. We do not need this vast army in time of peace. We should favor a great navy to protect our coast and our commerce, but we should, if we are true to the people and to our principles, vigorously oppose this enormous increase in the Regular Army. A large standing army in a republic is a menace to civil liberty.

We have no need of an immense standing army in time of peace. The Regular Army is the most undemocratic institution we have. In time of trouble, in case of war, the Republic should rely on its citizen-soldiery and its volunteer forces. It is contrary to the true principles of the Democratic party to permit the military power to become supreme and paramount to the civil authority. A desperate effort will be made by the Republicans to pass the act to creat a great standing army, and if it succeeds it will burden the taxpayers of the country for its maintenance $150,000,000 a year. Every Democrat and every wage-earner in the land should be alive to the dangers of this Republican movement and do all in his power to frustrate it.

THE TREND OF IMPERIALISM.

Since the ratification of the treaty of peace between Spain and the United States the island of Porto Rico has been and is now a part of the territory of this country, and the Constitution applies to it, and should apply to it, just as much as it applies to the District of Columbia or the Territory of Arizona. To contend otherwise is preposterous.

The people of Porto Rico are citizens of the United States and entitled to the same privileges, the same rights, and the same immunities under the Constitution that the people of any other Territory are entitled to in the Federal Union. The law compelling the citizens of Porto Rico to pay a tariff tax on their goods, wares, and merchandise to and from this country is unwarranted, unjustifiable, unprecedented, un-American, and, in my judgment, unconstitutional. In all our past history no political party ever dared to attempt to pass such a law—a law as inhuman as it is unfair.

The Constitution regarding this matter is clear and plain. Section 8 of Article I says in language that can not be misunderstood:

Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises; * * * but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

PORTO RICANS DEPRIVED OF SELF-GOVERNMENT.

The Republican party has deprived the Porto Ricans of self-government and given them a military government. They have no representation in Congress. Under Spanish rule they were represented by twelve representatives and four senators in the Spanish Cortes. They had their own local legislature and absolute home rule. Why, under the circumstances, I ask, in the name of all that is fair and just and decent, should we now tax them and rob them?

Have we liberated them from monarchical tyranny only to enslave them in industrial oppression? The poor people of Porto Rico will speak, and the great heart of the Republic will answer and respond in the coming campaign. The American people will never repeat in the dying year of the nineteenth century the crimes and the blunders of George III in the closing years of the eighteenth century. In the sisterhood of States there must be no stepdaughters. The flag we all love must not be used as a cloak to rob and oppress our fellow-citizens at the dictation of the trusts and to bolster up the falling Republican protective-tariff fallacy.

My sympathy is with the struggling citizens of Porto Rico. I want to extend to them the right hand of fellowship, and under the folds of the American flag and by virtue of the law of the land welcome them into the Federal Union. I want to help them, and not injure them. I want to save them, and not destroy them. I want them to love the Union, not hate us and despise our institutions.

I want to keep faith with them, and do unto them as we would that others should do unto us. I protest against this mad march toward imperialism with all the emphasis I can command, and I solemnly warn my countrymen that the day is not far distant when the Republic will be destroyed if the wrongs and the usurpations of the Republican party are allowed to go unheeded, unchecked, and unrebuked.

The manhood of this country must speak out, the great conscience of America must find voice, the citizenship of the Republic must assert itself ere it be too late and all is lost!

REPUBLIC OR EMPIRE.

Now, my friends, a few words in conclusion. We are entering a most momentous political campaign to determine the question whether the trusts or the Government shall survive; whether the Republic shall live or the empire shall come and the man on horseback govern; whether the people or the plutocrats shall rule—whether this land shall continue to be a government of the many for the many or an oligarchy of the privileged and for the favored few. You ask me what will the outcome be. I can not tell; but I believe history repeats itself; that God in His infinite wisdom raises up a man from the plain people for every crisis, and in the pending crisis we have such a man, a born leader of men, whom we can all trust and whom we can all follow, and who will lead us to victory and rescue the people from the money lenders and the money changers.

A hundred years ago the Democratic party—the party of the plain people—after a most momentous campaign, came into power under the matchless leadership of its famous founder, Thomas Jefferson, and the impetus his Administration gave to popular government carried forward free institutions unimpaired for a century.

We are beginning another momentous campaign under the leadership of a second Thomas Jefferson—the stalwart, the fearless, the gallant, and the intrepid young leader, of Nebraska, William J. Bryan—to test the perpetuity of popular government and of our free institutions, and by the grace of God and the power of the freemen of America he will win, and the impetus his administration will give the Government of Jefferson, of Jackson, and of Lincoln will carry it forward unimpaired for another century, and generations yet unborn will sing the gladsome song that the government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, in this connection I wish to print in the RECORD some data regarding pension matters.

Think of having for Commissioner of Pensions a man who regards every veteran as a greedy, cunning impostor and every veteran's widow as an immoral adventuress.

The foregoing is from the editorial column of the issue of August 24, 1899, of the National Tribune, of Washington, D. C., the best and most widely circulated journal devoted to the interest of Union veterans. In the Presidential campaign of 1896 this paper gave the Republican candidates cordial, hearty, and loyal support, contributing perhaps more to their success at the polls than any other newspaper then circulated. Every issue of the Tribune during the last campaign vigorously lashed and venomously abused Mr. Bryan and his supporters, ascribing to him and them the basest, most unpatriotic motives and intentions. Upon Mr. McKinley and the seraphic band in his train it lavished all the eulogistic platitudes available, and his inauguration as President, it prophesied, would mark the deliverance of the "old soldier ele-

ment" from the arbitrary rulings, the cruel delays, and other harassments which marked the last régime of Grover Cleveland.

A recent issue of the National Tribune contains the following:

AN OPEN LETTER.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

GENTLEMEN: With his usual fecundity of falsehood, the Commissioner of Pensions has deluged you with a freshet of misinformation as to the manner in which he is managing the Pension Bureau and executing the laws passed by previous Congresses for the benefit of the soldiers, and which it is your duty to see are properly carried out.

Let us dissipate the fog and mist with which he has persistently deceived you by the clear sunlight of a few facts, as well known to you as to us, if you will stir your remembrance.

The management of the Pension Bureau under Lochren was so intensely obnoxious as to arouse the strongest condemnation from all sections of the country and classes of the people. Even Cleveland had to yield to it, and in the last year of his administration he removed Lochren by promotion to another place, and replaced him by Dominic I. Murphy, with instructions to greater liberality.

As the Presidential election of 1896 approached it was felt that no party could go before the country with any hope of success without repudiating and denouncing the management of the Pension Bureau. Even the Democratic party put this denunciation of Lochrenism and indorsement of Murphy, who had at the eleventh hour succeeded him and reversed his policy, in its platform:

"Recognizing the just claims of deserving Union soldiers, we heartily indorse the rule of the Commissioner of Pensions that no name shall be arbitrarily dropped from the pension roll, and the fact of enlistment and service should be deemed conclusive evidence against disease and disability before enlistment."

The People's Party placed among its "demands:"

"7. We favor just pensions for our disabled Union soldiers."

The National Party said:

"11. Ex-soldiers and sailors of the United States Army and Navy, their widows and minor children, should receive liberal pensions, graded on disability and term of service, not merely as a debt of gratitude, but for service rendered in the preservation of the Union."

The Gold Democrats said:

"We favor a liberal policy of pensions to deserving soldiers and sailors of the United States."

But the declarations of the Republican party were of the utmost importance, since it was intrusted with power, and thereby firmly pledged to do what it had promised. It said:

"The veterans of the Union armies deserve and should receive fair treatment and generous recognition. Whenever practicable they should be given the preference in the matter of employment, and they are entitled to the enactment of such laws as are best calculated to secure the fulfillment of the pledges made to them in the dark days of the country's peril. We denounce the practice in the Pension Bureau, so recklessly and unjustly carried on by the present Administration, of reducing pensions and arbitrarily dropping names from the rolls, as deserving of the severest condemnation of the American people."

Now, in spite of all these declarations;

In spite of the most specific one made by the Republican convention;

In spite of the tremendous feeling throughout the country which led to these utterances;

In spite of the mandate of the people, clearly expressed at the polls in 1896, when the pension question was a leading issue;

In spite of the solemn promise of the Republican party that if intrusted with power it would remedy these grievances, Henry Clay Evans has revived and continued every odious practice of William Lochren, and has intensified and harshened many of them.

No matter what Mr. Evans or any of his apologists may say, we challenge him to point out—with one exception—one instance in which he has abrogated or in the least mitigated a single harsh feature of Lochren's rule.

The one exception was rule 228, relating to the preparation of affidavits. This is a most comprehensive challenge, it is easily understood, its terms are definite, and it covers the whole question. It is a test that Mr. Evans can not object to. If he has mitigated Lochren's practice anywhere, or in any degree, let him point it out.

Now, we submit that this is a bad record with which to go before the country.

* * * * * * *

"AN OLD SOLDIERS' ADMINISTRATION."

This was the tempting bait held out by the Republican managers to the veteran voters in the campaign of 1896. In his selection of a Commissioner of Pensions President McKinley ignored the applications for the position of many gallant and worthy comrades and nominated for the position H. Clay Evans, whose military record is given in the National Tribune, issue of July 13, 1899, in an article entitled "When? Where? How?"

In an editorial defense of Commissioner Evans the Wilkesbarre (Pa.) Record says:

General Evans lives in Tennessee, but he is a native of Pennsylvania, served throughout the civil war in the Union Army, and was thrice severely wounded in battle. He settled in Tennessee after the war, but has never had anything in common with the irreconcilable sectionalists of the South in a political way.

This is highly important, and comes in the nature of an astounding revelation to those who have thought themselves pretty familiar with "General" Evans's record as a quartermaster's clerk in the Forty-first Wisconsin, a one-hundred-day regiment, which was organized June 8, 1864, at Milwaukee, and mustered out September 24, 1864, "by reason of expiration of term of service."

* * * * * * *

The Forty-first Wisconsin—Mr. Evans's regiment—took out 578 men, lost 6 by disease, 2 deserted, and 570 were mustered out at the end of one hundred days.

That the Pension Bureau is not manned as largely by Union veterans as many suppose is apparent from the following statement contained in the number of The National Tribune dated August 28, 1899:

EMPLOYEES IN THE PENSION BUREAU.

Mr. Evans makes a great trumpeting over the fact that there are 506 veterans and 32 widows of veterans employed in the Pension Bureau. This is another one of his half facts, which are worse than downright lies. If there is any branch of the Government which should literally overflow with veterans and their widows, it is the Pension Bureau. In fact, there ought to be nobody else employed there. Now, what do we find? There is a total of 1,741 employees in the Pension Bureau. Of these but 506 are veterans and 32 veterans' widows. That is, less than one-third are veterans and veterans' widows. Everywhere the men and women appointed by Hoke Smith and William Lochren are in the ascendant. Civilians really control the Pension Bureau, in spite of all that Evans says. The chief man in the Commissioner's room is a civilian, and there is no veteran in his room. The medical referee is a veteran, but the two men who really run that division are civilians, and it is doubtful if one of them, who was the chief executioner under Lochren, is even an American citizen.

The law clerk is a civilian.

Veterans have been removed from the board of review to promote civilians.

The chief of the special examination division is a civilian, and his room is being filled up with civilians.

The chief of the middle division is a civilian, and so are both of his assistants.

The chief of the mail division is a civilian, and so are both his assistants.

The superintendent of the building is a civilian.

Five of the most important of the sixteen divisions are under the direct control of the civilians, and constantly civilians are advanced over the heads of better clerks who are veterans.

THE CHARGES IN DETAIL.

In its issue of July 13, 1899, The National Tribune says:

THE INDICTMENT AGAINST EVANS.

Mr. Evans is so industrious in trying to befog the public mind and distract attention from his misdoings by senseless clamor about wicked pension attorneys and fraudulent claims that it is very necessary to repeat from time to time the causes of complaint which the veterans have against him and which can not be met by shrieks against pension attorneys and more or less mythical frauds.

It was the will of the people, expressed in the most decisive manner at the polls in 1896, that the methods of Cleveland and Lochren in the Pension Bureau were wrong—cruelly unjust—and should be promptly reversed. Mr. Evans was put into office to do this work and render justice to the veterans and their dependent ones. If he had no intention of doing this, he sought and accepted the office with a willful purpose of deceiving. No man in the country knew better what the people wanted and what they expected. He took as much part as other campaigners in denouncing William Lochren's outrages and promising the veterans just reforms. Yet he has not removed a single cause of complaint against his predecessor; he has not righted a single one of his wrongs; he has not ameliorated a solitary injustice.

This puts the whole case against him in a nutshell. This disposes effectually of his wearisome clatter about pension attorneys and frauds. It sweeps away the fog of misstatement and juggling chicanery of facts with which he seeks to obscure the real issue.

If William Lochren was deserving of the severest censure in 1893, 1894, 1895, and 1896, Henry Clay Evans deserves the same in 1897, 1898, and 1899.

If Lochren's methods were indefensible outrages, Henry Clay Evans's must be branded by the same term.

If Lochren was the bitter enemy of the veterans, and maliciously perverted the laws in order to persecute and defraud them, Henry Clay Evans is just as blamable, for he has followed Lochren's footsteps with servile fidelity. Lochren's words are his words; Lochren's rules are his rules, and Lochren's sins are his sins.

He is in reality much more guilty, for Lochren entered office with the avowed intention of cutting down the pension roll and narrowing the scope of the pension laws. Evans, on the other hand, sought and received the office with the implied pledge to the people of the United States that he would undo Lochren's baleful work, and restore to the Pension Bureau the rightful interpretation of the laws which had obtained under President Harrison.

In the same issue (July 27, 1899) the National Tribune prints the following:

LINCOLN POST'S INDICTMENT.

The most crushing indictment yet presented by any Grand Army post against Pension Commissioner Evans is that drawn by Lincoln Post, No. 1, of Topeka, Kans., the largest and most influential post in the Department of Kansas. It is a model document of its kind, which we earnestly wish could be imitated by every post in the United States. It is the work of a committee of three able comrades of the post—J. K. Hudson, J. G. Wood, and J. W. Sidwell. They are all men of the highest standing in the community, and the chairman is the only man in Kansas who received a brigadier-general's commission at the outbreak of the Spanish war. Very creditably, he has not, like too many other comrades, allowed official favors to bias his judgment when the interests of his comrades were concerned. The document is thoroughly dignified in tone, but intensely in earnest, and its recital of facts is overwhelming. It begins by detailing the assaults upon the comrades by the newspapers, and how successfully they were repelled. It then goes on:

But a more insidious and despicable enemy to the veteran and his pension still lurked behind the Presidential warrant as Commissioner of Pensions.

His first effort against the pension claimants was covert and avowedly in their behalf. If the pension attorneys could be disbarred by the Pension Bureau a great point would be gained. So he began a systematic effort to abuse, until many resented the treatment and began to criticise the Pension Bureau and its Commissioner. This was meant to him. The attorneys out of the way, the claimants would be utterly powerless. Like a ship at sea without a rudder, driven hither and yon by wind and wave, claimants would have been helpless, and in the end would have been compelled to yield. It must be conceded that nine-tenths of the claimants can not properly draw a petition, much less comply with the technical requirements of the rules and regulations of the Pension Bureau. So that men who make a business of booking up on the acts of Congress, decisions of the Interior Department relating to pensions and kindred claims, the rules and regulations of the Pension Bureau, and have a ready command of good English at pen's point are alone competent to prosecute such claims. Comparatively few claims would have ever been allowed had the claimants been unaided. Knowing the weakness and inability of the great majority of claimants, instead of insisting upon lending a helping hand and affording every facility for the establishment of just claims, for unjust and fraudulent claims are not in issue, he has thrown every obstacle in the way, and was willing to sponge from the slate the roll of attorneys if he had dared.

The indictment then proceeds to arraign Evans for his determined insistence that every pension claim is a fraud, with the burden of proof that it is not being put upon the claimant and every obstacle thrown in his way in demonstrating its truth.

The indictment supports its counts by specific instances drawn from a host with which the Post is perfectly familiar. Only a limited number of these can be given without unduly swelling the document, but they are all very pertinent.

First is the case of Louisa Kratzer, a poor, hard-working widow of an ex-

cellent soldier who left her a meager little farm to support herself and family of children. The testimony shows that the utmost value of the proceeds of the farm never exceeded $62 a year, and this was only wrung from it by the hardest kind of toil. Her claim for a pension was "rejected because she is not without other means of daily support than her daily labor."

Adel Rainer, another poor old widow, who makes a living by house cleaning and washing, had her claim rejected on account of a charge of unchastity, preferred by some unknown accuser. Yet all of Mrs. Rainer's neighbors, who have known her as an irreproachable wife and mother for a long period of years, scout the charge and are willing to testify to her good character. But the Pension Bureau will not hear the evidence in her favor, nor will it give the name of the creature who slandered the poor old washerwoman.

D. L. McElfresh, insane, himself and family are denied a pension because it has been discovered by the Pension Bureau that he was kicked on the head by a mule when he was 12 years old. There is not an atom of testimony connecting that kick with his present condition, but evidently the Bureau construes the kick into "vicious habits."

David C. Whitner has proved total inability for labor, caused by progressive disease of the brain, resulting from a sunstroke. His condition constantly grows worse with advancing age. The proof of the incurrence of his disability and its effects is beyond doubt, but because it has been pending for a long time, and carries a large amount of arrears, Evans refuses to allow it.

I. I. Wagner received injuries in the raid on the Weldon Railroad and at Hatchers Run, which have resulted in heart disease and paralysis, from which he is dying. He has thoroughly proved up his case, but Evans refuses to allow it, to the great indignation of all Wagner's neighbors, who are familiar with him and his history.

Ray Richards is the child of an old soldier, and absolutely helpless on account of "Pott's disease," which set in when he was 4 years old. The Pension Bureau refuses to grant a pension because it claims that the law specifies he must likewise be "insane or idiotic."

Thomas H. Haskell, a member of the post, was allowed by the examining board "fifteen-eighteenths" which would give him $50 a month. He was allowed but $8, and this not till after his death, and his widow has been unable to get anything.

Harriet Neiswander, a widow of excellent reputation, married at first a man who left her, and from whom she never heard again. After a number of years she remarried, this time to a veteran, who died and left her a farm, from which she receives a rental of $300 a year, but from this sum must be deducted taxes, insurance, repairs, and interest on a mortgage, so that she has never had more than $52 a year. The Pension Bureau rejects her claim on the double ground that she has not proved her first husband's death and that she has an income.

These are a few of the many cases within the knowledge of the Post that could be cited supporting the committee's conclusions that—

"Henry Clay Evans, Pension Commissioner, has made arbitrary rules governing attorneys in the prosecution of claims in the Pension Bureau which have worked detrimentally to claimants; that he has locked up and refused adjudication of 15,000 soldiers' orphans' and 5,000 dependent mothers' claims; that he has rejected claims for reasons wholly unwarranted by law or equity; that he has demanded testimony of claimants touching transactions which had nothing whatever to do with the merits of the claims; that he has erroneously interpreted plain provisions of law for the evident purpose of defeating claims; that he has "held up" claims for the purpose of delaying the payment of the large amount they would draw if allowed; that he has accepted ex parte reports against the character of female pensioners and when petitioned for a hearing, for the purpose of vindication of life and reputation against foul and false aspersions, refused. He has submitted to interviews and written articles for publication which reflect upon the pension roll as a whole."

The report of the committee concludes:

"The retention of Henry Clay Evans, Pension Commissioner, after a two and a third years' trial, are sources of profound regret to all veteran soldiers.

"Your committee, believing that the maintenance of law, the judicial application of wholesome rules in its enforcement, to the end that honor may be given to whom honor is due, is the highest and best form of civilization, offer the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That we hereby request President McKinley to remove Henry Clay Evans, Pension Commissioner, at once, and then select a man of legal attainments, with broad, generous impulses and sympathies, with fine executive ability, and withal a man who knows from personal experience what it is to be with the boys on the firing line."

The report and resolutions were unanimously adopted.

On August 31, 1899, the National Tribune presented the following:

THE INDICTMENT AGAINST EVANS.

As this is our last issue before the meeting of the national encampment, we recapitulate in succinct form the indictment that the veterans of the country and their widows have against Commissioner Evans. Every "count" in this indictment is supported by positive and unbreakable evidence that would infallibly convict him before any jury and in any court in the country. We cite with each "count" the evidence in support of it, which the reader can examine and verify for himself. "P. D." refers to Pension Decisions made by Assistant Secretary of the Interior Webster Davis, and which can be found in many lawyers' offices or obtained by application at the Interior Department. It is an official publication, and therefore public information.

Henry Clay Evans became Commissioner of Pensions at the close of an administration which was notorious for the narrowness, unfairness, injustice, not to say illegality, of its construction and administration of the pension laws. On him devolved the duty of formulating and putting into effect the policy of the new Administration, which there were the best of reasons for believing would be fair and just to the beneficiaries of the pension laws. But we found him soon devising means to obstruct and delay the ends of justice—to create new obstacles to the speedy adjudication and payment of claims.

First count.—Among his first official acts of importance was one which in effect required that all completed increase claims under the general law, based on disability not covered by the pension certificate, be sent to the special examination division for investigation, a course which was equivalent to burying these claims for from one to three or more years. (Instructions to Chiefs of Adjudicating Divisions, 1897.)

Second count.—He instituted a practice of refusing to consider any claim for increase of pension until a year had elapsed since the previous adjudication. (Order No. 862, dated December 24, 1897.) This he did without consultation with his superior officers of the Interior Department, and by a decision rendered March 30, 1898, he was required to abrogate this practice and reinstate the former practice dating from 1882. (P. D., 9, page 285).

Third count.—In disregard of the law and taking upon himself the right to administer the laws or not as he saw fit, he refused to consider lawful pension claims because the applicants were apparently residing beyond the limits of the United States. (Act of March 2, 1895; order dated November 23, 1897.) He was required to abandon this practice and subordinate himself to law. (P. D., 9, page 437.)

Fourth count.—He prohibited any evidence obtained on special examination being made known to and permitted to be examined by claimant or attorney after the receipt of same in the Pension Bureau, alleging that the claimant had the right to follow the special examination in person or by attorney, but knowing that it is the exception rather than the rule where a claimant is able to himself follow or employ another to follow a special examination, often extending over several States. This he did in disregard of a rule and the settled practice of the Interior Department (December 19, 1891), and was required to return to the former practice. (P. D., 9, page 471.)

Fifth count.—He adopted measures to defeat the act of July 18, 1894, relative to the right of claimant or attorney to inspect reports of examining surgeons. The enactment was in consequence of the action of the Lochren administration taking away the privilege of inspection of such reports, and though Mr. Evans professed to believe that his action was strictly in accordance with the law, it was clear that he desired to restore so far as possible the Lochren practice, with the evident incidental purpose of "getting even" with attorneys whom he claims were instrumental in the passage of the law. (Order dated October 21, 1897.)

He was required to abrogate this practice and restore that in full accordance with the spirit of the law. (P. D., 9, page 478.)

Sixth count.—To retard and obstruct the settlement of claims which he does not wish to allow, save at his pleasure, he adopted rules making it a disbarring offense for any attorney to seek, or to even suggest to a claimant to seek, information through a member of Congress as to the official status of a pension claim; and through evidently misleading representations as to the status of the work of the Bureau and the character of claims in which inquiry is made through members of Congress, he secured formal approval of said rules. (Rules 22 and 23, approved March 10, 1898.)

Seventh count.—In disregard of a decision construing the law relative to the pension title of remarried dependent mothers under the act of June 27, 1890 (P. D., 6, page 30), he instituted a practice of rejecting the claims of all such, having covertly secured the formal approval of such practice by embodying the rule therefor in an alleged codification of existing practice in April, 1898. He was required to amend his self-instituted rule and regard the law and the decision of the Department. (P. D., 10, dated June 21, 1899.)

However, it is the truth that none of the claims rejected under his infamous ruling set aside by the decision (P. D., 10, dated June 21, 1899), have ever been reopened and allowed, he claiming that the decision is not "res adjudicata." Yet common sense, or a desire to be reasonably honest in his endeavor to do right, should have readily pointed his plain duty to recall from the rejected files all such claims and adjudicate them in accordance with the construction of the law promulgated by his immediate superior.

Eighth count.—He continues to reject the just claims under the act of June 27, 1890, of those denied by the last Administration, and to cut off from the pension roll those who escaped the merciless "revision" perpetrated by his immediate predecessors; and the city of Chicago and elsewhere has inaugurated experimentally an iniquitous and unwarranted inquisition to discover possible fraud and to complete the work of Lochren and Hoke Smith and cut off those pensioners held entitled under the Harrison Administration and who have heretofore by some chance escaped the blights of the Hoke Smithism and Lochrenism. No one desires to shield the malefactor, but there is no warrant in law for the indiscriminate and insulting investigation put upon the innocent many by the present Commissioner to seek out the possible guilty few, that he may win anew the plaudits of the press that finds special satisfaction in all that puts upon the pensioners the stigma of dishonor and dishonesty.

Ninth count.—He continues to nullify the act of March 6, 1896, passed by Congress to correct an abuse and misinterpretation of the act of June 27, 1890, by the Cleveland Administration; and until required by the direction of his superior officer, refused to apply the law, even to the extent permissible under the interpretation of the former administration, unless specifically requested by claimants. (P. D., 10, dated December 21, 1898.)

Tenth count.—Contrary to the law and the rights of claimants to choose, he has rejected thousands of claims on the alleged ground of "no benefit," whereas the claims should have been granted and the claimants permitted to elect which of two pensions they would prefer to receive. He was required to discontinue this practice. (P. D., 10, dated December 7, 1898.)

Eleventh count.—For nearly two years he has unlawfully withheld from settlement all general law claims of children over 16 years of age, in disregard of the law and decision of the Department (P. D., 7, page 435); meanwhile using every effort to secure such a construction of the law as will enable him to reject and deny these lawful claims, the matter being now pending on his renewed request for reconsideration of the questions of law.

Twelfth count.—He has for the past year unlawfully withheld from official consideration in ordinary course of business the just claims of soldiers and sailors of the Spanish war, many of them sons and other relatives of soldiers and sailors of the rebellion, on the misrepresentation that the War Department has been unprepared or unwilling or unable to furnish required information from the official military records, whereas the War Department has been ready and willing to furnish desired reports on twenty-four hours' notice. (National Tribune, June 29, 1899.) The unlawful and unjustifiable action of the Commissioner of Pensions in this class of claims furnishes striking evidence of his personal feelings and disposition toward all beneficiaries of the pension laws, there being with respect to this class of claims no room for the slanderous objection or suggestion that the claimants have for many years slept on their alleged rights and the claims are therefore presumably of doubtful or fraudulent character.

Thirteenth count.—It is notorious that claims filed under the general law before July 1, 1880, and therefore involving arrears to date of discharge, are rejected by his direction unless supported by record evidence, and if supported by record evidence are buried in the special examination division, the evident purpose being to reject if not to delay indefinately all claims requiring a large first payment.

Fourteenth count.—He has rejected thousands of claims for invalid pensions under the act of June 27, 1890, the applicants in which are 62 years of age and over, notwithstanding that under the Mexican war pension act of January 29, 1887, claimants 62 years of age are regarded as pensionably disabled and entitled to the rating of $8 per month, and notwithstanding that 62 years is the compulsory retirement age of the Regular Army, Navy, and Marine Corps.

Fifteenth count.—Upon manifestly misleading representations as to the status of the official business of the Pension Bureau he procured the reduction of the office force of the Pension Bureau by 100 (July 1, 1898), notwithstanding that the delays in action and settlement were then great, and have continued notoriously so to the present time, being as great as if not greater than for many years past, thousands of claimants being unable to secure any action on their claims, or learn what, if any, additional evidence is necessary, weeks and months growing into years without any information of any character being elicited as to the official status of the claim. It is worthy of note that a discrimination appears to be made against claims on file many years, and therefore involving considerable sums as arrears, the official reports as to the average amounts of first payments bearing out what has become noticeable in this regard. (Annual Report, 1898, page 23.)

Sixteenth count.—Notwithstanding the great number of just and valid claims awaiting settlement for many years, he has diligently avoided their consideration in order that he may be able to turn back unexpended into the Treasury large amounts of the appropriations for pensions. (Annual Reports, 1897, 1898, 1899.)

Seventeenth count.—He has sought to deprive claimants of the benefit of advice of counsel by forwarding to them direct the orders for medical examination, expecting and desiring that claimants, without knowledge of their rights and privileges and without due regard for their interests, will place themselves at a disadvantage and afford a greater opportunity for the rejection or delay of their claims. (Order 361, dated April 14, 1898.)

Eighteenth count.—While criticising, both in the public press and in official reports, the work of the examining surgeons appointed and retained by him on grounds of fitness, and showing the fallibility of the examinations made by them under his direction, he nevertheless habitually regards their reports as absolutely correct when unfavorable to the claimants, and, as the personal knowledge and experience of thousands of claimants attest, wholly disregards favorable reports on slight pretext or no pretext whatever. (See Associated Press reports and annual report for 1898.)

Nineteenth count.—Before he had been in office a year he entered upon a course of tirade against alleged pension frauds, his pratings in the public press in the form of inspired articles and statements purporting to be "interviews" rivaling and eclipsing in misrepresentation and maliciousness anything of similar character published during the preceding Administration. (Associated Press reports.)

Twentieth count.—He has studiously invited and obtained the approval, to a large degree, of the same portion of the public press that applauded the "revision" and alleged "reforms" instituted by Lochren and Hoke Smith, and has claimed personal credit for the detection and suppression of alleged frauds and for reducing the pension roll or permitting a minimum increase. The same press that acclaimed Lochren and Hoke Smith as wise and just finds joy and satisfaction in Henry Clay Evans. At the same time he has cunningly sought and obtained credit with the press friendly to the Union survivors of the war of the rebellion and their interests, by an apparently considerable number of allowances, a large percentage of which, however, have represented little or nothing of substantial benefit to the alleged beneficiaries, being reissues, duplicates, renewals, supplementals, and the like.

Twenty-first count.—He has vilified the wives of survivors of the war of the rebellion, wickedly attributing to them unworthy, mercenary motives in their marriages, not only in the public press but in official reports (Annual Report, 1898), and has sought in Congress to obtain legislation to cut off the helpmates of the declining years of invalid pensioners.

Twenty-second count.—He has vilified in the public press the claimants whose just claims have been unjustly rejected by him, insinuating that they are rejected because fraudulent, and that every honest, lawful claim is granted promptly and freely by him. (Associated Press reports.)

Twenty-third count.—He has vilified in the public press all survivors of the war and others acting as the authorized representatives of pension claimants, characterizing them as "buzzards," and alleging that they are regularly engaged in the prosecution of known fraudulent claims, and that through his thwarting of such attempted frauds he has incurred the ill will of the attorneys and thereby of the order of the Grand Army. This he has done notwithstanding that attorneys admitted to practice before the Department are obliged by law and the official regulations to furnish satisfactory evidence that they are of "good moral character and in good repute" (act of July 4, 1884, section 5), and are subject to disbarment for offenses far less grave than wittingly prosecuting fraudulent claims. After broadly characterizing the attorneys admitted and continued in good standing by his official superiors of the Department, he proposes no reform or remedy for the alleged corruption and disregard of law but the absolute prohibiting of the employment or recognition of attorneys, agents, or counsel whatever in behalf of pension claimants and the vesting of the prosecution as well as the adjudication of pension claims in the Commissioner of Pensions. (P. D., 10, dated December 7, 1898.)

Twenty-fourth count.—Instead of desiring and suggesting, as was his privilege and right, the abrogation of rules and practice instituted under the late Administration, and working great wrong and injustice and disregard of the letter and spirit of the law, especially with regard to the act of June 27, 1890, he prefers and seeks the continuance of odious measures and practice, particularly Order 225, of June 9, 1898. The alleged Treatise on the Practice of the Pension Bureau, prepared and published under his direction in April, 1898, instead of being the vehicle, or even the means of suggestion, of the obviation of harsh measures and a liberalizing of the practice, was used as a means to covertly introduce new obstructions and limitations with regard to increase claims (page 117) and dependent mothers' claims (page 116), as already shown, the whole codification being approved en bloc upon his evident misrepresentation as to the character of the publication.

Twenty-fifth count.—He resolves all doubts against the claimant, as the experience and observation of thousands attest, and has not originated nor instituted a single practice looking to a greater liberality in dealing with claimants.

Twenty-sixth count.—His every official recommendation has been looking to restriction and limitation upon existing rights under the pension laws (Annual Reports, 1897, 1898), in glaring contrast with those of most of his predecessors. (Annual Reports, 1887, 1891, 1892, 1893, 1896, and others.)

In the number dated November 9, 1899, the National Tribune felt forced to make this rejoinder to the press bureau of the Ohio Republican political machine:

A WILLFUL FALSEHOOD.

During the campaign in Ohio just ended, the Democrats, for their own purposes, and entirely without our knowledge and consent, took up the "Indictment against Mr. Evans," which the National Tribune had published prior to the meeting of the national encampment, and prefacing it with some remarks of their own, gave it a very wide circulation. A number of Republican papers replied to this in an article first appearing in the Ohio State Journal, in which it was said:

"There is not an old soldier in Ohio who does not know that the National Tribune is published by a firm of pension attorneys, and that it is the official organ of that firm and not of the old soldiers."

This is absolutely and unqualifiedly false, and known to be so by the men who wrote the article and caused its publication.

They know very well, as does every other man who is at all familiar with the National Tribune, that it has not the slightest connection of any kind with any pension attorney or firm of attorneys. No man engaged in the prosecution of claims has a cent's worth of interest in the National Tribune except as a subscriber. Not one of the proprietors of the paper receives a pension, is an applicant for a pension, nor will probably ever be.

The veterans of Ohio are all pretty well acquainted with the men who edit and publish the National Tribune. They have been intimately acquainted with them for many long years and known where they have stood unwaveringly through all political perturbations on all questions connected with the interests of veterans.

With the Ohio veterans such an egregious falsehood as this is likely to prove a damaging boomerang to its utterers.

PENSIONERS OLDER—PENSIONS SMALLER.

In its issue of August 31, 1899, the National Tribune prints the following:

CONCLUSIVE FIGURES.

It is impossible for any thinking man to examine the reports of the Commissioner of Pensions without finding the most conclusive demonstrations of Mr. Evans's cruelly harsh policy toward the veterans. Plain figures everywhere, and all the time, give the lie to Evans's industrious and plausible sophistications about his fair treatment of the veterans. For example, let us examine the number of those on the roll under the act of June 27, 1890, and find what proportion of them are receiving the highest rating allowed by law—$12 a month.

Let us premise that this rating was intended by the framers of the law to be granted to every man who was disabled in any considerable degree. And it must inevitably follow that, with the premature aging of the veterans, every year must greatly increase the proportion of those who are legally entitled to the highest rating.

At the time President Harrison retired from office, in 1893, there were 377,203 veterans on the roll under the act of June 27, 1890. Of these 204,909, or 54 per cent, received $12 a month. When under Commissioner Lochren there were 392,440 on the rolls, of whom only 165,783, or 43 per cent, received $12 per month. Evans cut down the ratio still further. In 1898 there were 413,909 on the roll, of whom but 163,367, or only 39½ per cent, received $12 a month.

That is, carrying out the rightful intent and purport of the law, Commissioner Raum gave 5½ men out of every 10 the maximum rating. Commissioner Lochren cut down this proportion to a little over 4 men in every 10, and Commissioner Evans—though the veterans are six years older than when General Raum was in office, much more broken down, and consequently legitimately entitled to a higher rate—reduces it even below that established by the much-denounced Lochren.

These figures are convincing as to Evans's animus.

The foregoing, in connection with the following brief editorial from the issue of the Tribune, dated August 24, 1899, would seem to indicate that even the Cleveland-Lochren "reign of terror" was more bearable than the McKinley-Evans crusade:

It is a very significant feature that in spite of the advancing age and increasing disabilities of the veterans, the average annual value of the pensions is being steadily reduced. Under General Harrison's Administration the annual average value of the pensions under the act of June 27, 1890, was $116.30. Lochren reduced it to $109.29. Last year Evans got it down to $108.11. Remember that, with fewer pensions on the roll, this means a general reduction of allowance to every pensioner.

GET THE FACTS.

That the money power in the campaign of 1900 will stop at nothing to mislead Union veterans and distort the facts as to their base betrayal by the McKinley-Evans combination there can be no doubt. Statistics will be artfully juggled or willfully falsified to this end. That Commissioner Evans has already been caught in some glaring misstatements of fact is apparent from the following article printed in the issue of the National Tribune dated September 7, 1899:

THE COMMISSIONER'S AMENDED REPORT.

The Commissioner has favored the press with another and more extended abstract of his report, evidently for effect on the national encampment. It shows several changes from the first abstract, which was evidently put out as a feeler and to draw the fire of his opponents. We give the essential part of the abstract elsewhere.

Taking it up seriatim, the first notable thing is that there are 9,204 survivors and 8,175 widows of the Mexican war on the rolls. This is a larger proportion to the actual fighting force in that struggle than the veterans and widows on the pension roll bear to the actual fighting force in the field during the rebellion. It makes an aggregate of 17,379, or more than the entire strength that we had on Mexican soil at any time during the two years' struggle.

It is another illustration of how much more liberally the Mexican war pension law is construed than those relating to the war of the rebellion.

He shows that the total number of pensioners has been cut down from 993,714 in 1893 to 991,519 in 1899, a decrease of 2,195. He does not—dares not—attempt to reconcile this showing with his statement further on that the number of claims pending June 30 was 477,239, among which were 69,468 from veterans who have not yet received any pension whatever. What possible pretext can he give for cutting down the pension roll 2,195, while he confesses that there are 69,468 veterans, to say nothing of their widows, who have been waiting for years to have their claims allowed, and while he has a force of 1,741 clerks ostensibly engaged in the work of adjudicating claims? The mere statement is sufficient.

He has cut down his first statement of the amount he returned to the Treasury by about $212,240, and now places it at $1,644,948. This would have put about 17,000 of those long-waiting 69,468 on the rolls at $8 a month.

He says that the total "allowances" for the year was 89,054. Here comes in his crafty juggling, for the total additions to the roll were but 40,991, leaving the enormous number of 48,063, or much more than half the entire number issued for the sole and obvious purpose of "padding," and making a pretense of doing work, where little or none of any real benefit to veterans was done. He will claim that this enormous number represents increases, yet the average annual value of all pensions under the act of June 27, 1890, is but $108.99, or $3.16 less than the point at which Lochren left them. (Report of June 30, 1895.) The average annual value of all pensions on the roll is but $132.74, a decrease of $1.25 from the point where Lochren left them (Report of June 30, 1895), and a decrease of $2.36 from the point where Raum left them.

The whole payment under the general law was but $71,115,703, where it was $72,052,143 nine years ago, and was $85,292,931 when General Raum left office.

The whole payment under the act of June 27, 1890, was $64,321,400, where it was $68,259,537 the year that General Raum left office and $61,686,732 when Murphy went out.

The Bureau's greatest industry during the year was directed toward rejections and making "allowances" which did not allow. There was an astounding total of 107,919 rejections to 37,077 actual allowances, or nearly 3 for 1. The actual allowances averaged about 700 a week, the rejections over 2,000. And what is equally startling is that of the total of 107,919 rejections 89,421 were on "medical grounds." "No benefit" was alleged in 5,000 cases and "legal grounds" in 13,498 cases. That is, nearly 9 out of every 11 claimants had proved up their cases beyond a doubt and had to be defrauded of their rights by injecting some medical quibble. Think of the flagrant cruelty and

injustice of paltering and juggling about their physical condition with men every one of whom is past 50 and prematurely aged by reason of the hardships and strains they endured in the service of their country.

He says, "The Commissioner has given the right of way to original claims in which no pension has ever been granted," etc.

In his report for 1896 he estimated that there were 75,000 of these. This year he says there are 69,468. That is, he has given the "right of way" to 5,532, or about 1 in 15. These are probably those that he has been compelled to grant by Congressional or other pressure.

He has allowed but 333 of the 17,560 Spanish war claims filed. A few months ago he made as an excuse that he could not get the necessary data in regard to these from the War Department. General Ainsworth at once nailed this by saying that every call from the Pension Bureau had been, and could always be, answered inside of twenty-four hours.

The Commissioner admits that Lochren's Order 225, which was the subject of general denunciation in 1896, and which was condemned by the national encampment at Cincinnati, is still in force, and says that no change has been made from his predecessor's course under it.

His recommendation in regard to admitting to the pension list men who previously served in the rebel army is intended to benefit him politically in Tennessee.

His concluding paragraph about the liberalization of the laws and practices is given a direct, flat contradiction by instances of bitter injustice furnished by every community in the country where veterans and their widows reside.

FACTS THAT WILL NOT DOWN.

The annual reports of the various Commissioners of Pensions are interesting, especially to persons who are concerned in the subject to which they relate. The accompanying table, covering a period of eight years, has been compiled from such official documents, and furnishes some rather painful contrasts:

Pension statistics.

Fiscal year ending June 30—	Original allowances (new pensions).				Increases, etc.	Restorations to roll.	Total allowances.	Rejections, all classes.	Dropped from roll.
	General law.	Act of June 27, 1890.	Miscellaneous.	Total original.					
Harrison-Raum:									
1892	25,163	198,760	1,014	222,937	79,009	2,227	304,167	102,928	25,306
1893	17,813	99,408	4,409	121,630	56,705	2,004	180,339	115,221	33,630
Cleveland-Lochren and Murphy:									
1894	10,491	24,846	3,748	39,085	26,235	2,398	67,718	132,873	37,531
1895	9,126	28,442	1,617	39,185	76,447	4,206	119,638	103,355	42,411
1896	7,827	31,361	1,186	40,374	33,311	3,873	77,558	97,280	44,093
1897*	†8,302	†40,709	910	‡56,953	‡25,762	‡4,433	‡94,535	76,234	41,222
McKinley-Evans:									
1898*	§8,117	§43,647	884	45,796	§26,760	‖3,327	‖68,826	85,629	46,651
1899	6,451	30,625	1,001	37,077	32,148	3,914	73,139	107,919	43,186

*During over ten months of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, D. I. Murphy, a Democrat, served as Commissioner of Pensions, and during the remaining two months of that fiscal year there was no material change in the practice. Certificates had been prepared in 6,852 original, 762 restoration, and 7,057 increase and miscellaneous claims during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, which rightfully should be credited in the statistics for that year, but Commissioner Evans held them up until after July 1, 1897, as he admits in his report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1898, and uses them to pad out his showing for 1898. In the figures given for the years 1897 and 1898, the allowances mentioned have been, as they should be, added to the figures as to 1897 and deducted from those of 1898.

†As incorrectly given in Commissioner's report for 1897.

‡Increased by allowances which should have been credited. See note above.

§As erroneously set forth in Commissioner's report for 1898.

‖Decreased by allowances erroneously claimed for 1898. See note above.

AN APOLOGY IS IN ORDER.

Previous to January 7, 1893, the basis of the adjudication of veterans' claims, under the act of June 27, 1890, was Pension Bureau Order 164, issued in 1890, as follows:

That all claimants under act of June 27, 1890, showing a mental or physical disability or disabilities of a permanent character, not the result of their own vicious habits, and which incapacitate them for the performance of manual labor, rendering them unable to earn a support in such a degree as would be rated under former laws at or above $6 and less than $12 per month, shall be rated the same as like disabilities of service origin; and that all cases showing a pensionable disability which, if of service origin, would be rated at or above $12 per month, shall be rated at $12 per month.

Approved.

GREEN B. RAUM, *Commissioner.*

CYRUS BUSSEY, *Assistant Secretary.*

BUSSEY ASSAILS OLD SOLDIERS.

After the election of Cleveland in 1892, Cyrus Bussey made the following savage assault upon the old soldiers, which will be found in his published decision on the pension appeal of Henry Weike, dated January 7, 1893:

The foregoing order (164, see above) has governed the practice of your Bureau in the matter of rates, under the act of June 27, 1890, since the date of its issue. It appears, however, that said order as understood by the Department when approving it, may have been misconstrued by your Bureau, so far as it has been your practice to add the separate nominal and schedule rates allowed for several disabilities in making a rating under this act. This has resulted by reason of the fact that it has been your practice under the old law to combine these rates where the total does not exceed seventeen-eighteenths. The question as to the correctness of that practice is not now before the Department for decision. It is deemed proper to state that the Department in approving said Order No. 164 did not intend that small rates should be added together, as, for example, three or more rates of two-eighteenths in order to make a rate under the provisions of said act. A man may have two or more separate afflictions, either one of which considered singly entitles him to a two-dollar rate under the old law, and yet in the aggregate they may not disable him for the performance of manual labor to a much greater degree than either of them existing alone. Or he may have one serious disability and one or more slight disabilities, the latter of which do not have any appreciable effect upon the degree of incapacity for manual labor occasioned by the former.

* * * * * * *

It is directed that the views herein expressed be observed in the future adjudications of claims under the act of June 27, 1890.

It has been charged that the motive of this attack by Secretary Bussey on his former comrades was to avenge the defeat of Mr. Harrison by giving the old soldiers an effective object lesson; others have charged that his action of January 7, 1893, was an effort to square himself with the incoming mugwump Administration, hoping thereby to hold his job, which paid $3,500 a year. Whatever the facts on this point are, it is certain that the Harrison Administration and General Bussey were careful to wait until after the election of 1892 before they promulgated the repeal of Order 164.

When the Cleveland-Lochren Administration came into power, with its gold-standard, money-power prejudices against Union veterans, it was not slow to avail itself of the weapon provided for it by General Bussey in his Weike decision. On May 27, 1893, it promulgated Order 225, which indorsed Bussey's emasculation of Order 164, and Lochren's much abused revision of the pension roll followed, the statistics of which, as appears from Lochren's report of 1895, were as follows:

Whole number of claims revised	104,100
Pensions dropped	4,149
Pensions reduced in rate	22,638
Number of adverse actions taken	77,373

It was to this harrying of old soldiers that the Republican platform of 1896 referred in these terms:

We denounce the practice in the Pension Bureau, so recklessly and unjustly carried on by the present (Cleveland) Administration, of reducing pensions and arbitrarily dropping names from the rolls as deserving the severest condemnation of the American people.

The absolute insincerity and colossal perfidy of the McKinley-Evans Administration in its relations with Union veterans, before and ever since the election of 1896, is made clearly manifest by the report of Evans for the fiscal year of 1899, which was approved by Secretary Hitchcock and President McKinley, and is one of the executive documents transmitted with the last annual Presidential message. In attempting to excuse the appalling number of his rejections (107,000) in a single year, the Commissioner says, on pages 28 and 29 of his report:

A very large percentage of rejections is made in claims for increase, for restoration, for rerating, and for arrears of pension under the act of March 6, 1896.

This is largely the result of the adjudication of claims under the provisions of Order No. 164, from October 15, 1890, to January 7, 1893, when the said order was revoked by the Department in a decision handed down in the case of Henry H. Weike. During this period pensions under the act of June 27, 1890, were granted so generously, the greater number at the maximum rate or total disability. Following this, under Order No. 225, of May 27, 1893, a large number of claims were readjudicated in 1893, 1894, and 1895, many having their pensions stopped and many others reduced. During the first-mentioned period claimants were pensioned for all disabilities incurred since their service at the same rate, up to $12 per month, as for like disabilities (or even with greater liberality) of service origin. For the first three years after the passage of the act of June 27, 1890, there were added to the roll, under this most liberal construction of the law, 313,798 invalids and 85,667 widows.

A great many of these pensioners were granted a higher rate than their disabilities warranted under a proper construction of the law, and while their ability for self-support by manual labor may have increased since the date of the allowance of their claims, their capacity for earning such support is not impaired in a degree warranting a higher rate under the provisions of Order No. 225, which superseded Order 164. These claims for increase must therefore be rejected on the ground that the rates of pension are fully commensurate with the degree of disability now shown.

* * * * * * *

A large percentage of rejections arises from claims filed under the act of March 6, 1896, for arrears of pension from date of filing the first application. When claims are adjudicated under the act of June 27, 1890, the date of commencement of pension is fixed after careful consideration of the evidence, and if a rate is warranted from the date of the first application the pension is made to commence at that date. If a ratable disability is not shown from date of first application, the commencement of pension is fixed from the date of filing the application under which a ratable disability is shown. This action results in the filing of a large number of applications asking for a prior date of commencement, and many of them must be necessarily rejected.

Many applications have been filed for restoration of rates under the act of June 27, 1890, that were reduced under the provisions of Order No. 225. When the medical examinations held under these applications and the evidence on file fail to show a disability warranting restoration to former rate of pension, the claim must be rejected.

If the Cleveland-Lochren administration deserved "the severest condemnation of the American people" for "reducing pensions and arbitrarily dropping names from the roll," what treatment should the McKinley-Evans administration receive from their outraged countrymen for obtaining office under false pretenses and then continuing and openly indorsing the very abuses so unscathingly denounced by the Republican convention of 1896?

The Republican party should make proper amends to Mr. Cleveland, for it has not only stolen his imported gold standard but has absconded with his pension policy as well.

OLD-LAW CLAIMANTS THE WORST SUFFERERS.

The National Tribune, issue of September 9, 1898, editorially asserts:

It is not only the claimants under the act of June 27, 1890, that have a heavy grievance against Henry Clay Evans's cruelly illiberal administration of the Pension Bureau. These have been made most prominent because they are the most numerous and because the bitter injustice to them could be easiest explained. But every class of claimants are treated the same way, and all suffer alike. If there is any difference, the claimants under the old laws, who are suffering from disabilities traceable to their service, are treated the worst. Their cases are postponed from year to year, and when brought to adjudication all the chances are against them. There were 992 old-law claims adjudicated during last July, of which but 98 were allowed and 834 rejected—that is, 89 out of every 100 were rejected and only 11 allowed. A very large proportion of those allowed were Regular Army and Navy claims for disabilities ncurred since the rebellion.

In a previous issue, that of June 22, 1899, the National Tribune explains how claims under the general or old law have been delayed and defeated in an article entitled:

WHERE HE MAKES THE LAW.

Mr. Evans is now loudly proclaiming that the "law" prevents him from doing this and that that he should do, but in every instance that he cites it is not the law, but his narrow and unjustifiable interpretation of the law. Rather, it is Lochren's perversion of the law, which Evans has inherited, continued, and made in many instances harsher.

Nearly all claims under the old law are rejected on service origin, unless there is a record of existence in service of the alleged disability, or testimony of an Army surgeon. It makes no difference how many officers or first sergeants or comrades testify to the existence and origin in service, or how strong they testify, the board of review simply refuses to believe the evidence, and rejects on the convenient ground that origin in service is not satisfactorily established.

Occasionally one of these claims is appealed to the Secretary and allowed by him if there is strong Congressional influence behind it.

When Commissioner Evans first came into the office, he issued instructions that all such claims should be sent to the field. The board did not quite catch the cue, and referred them to S. E. "per Commissioner's order." The chief clerk then instructed the reviewers that they should not say that, but refer for reasons, stating them. Thereafter the claims were generally rejected without referring to the special examiner; but, if not, the rejection was and is still made on return from the field. No claim of that class can be found allowed in the Bureau for eighteen months last past.

This sly practice overturns standing decisions and all rules on legal weight of evidence and goes further than ever before under existing laws. During Cleveland's first Administration the rule was applied to new disabilities; but not to original disabilities (Laura Wright, 2 P. D., 253.) This estoppel was expressly overruled and removed by the Harrison Administration (Laura Wright, 3. P. D., 191; Gillespie and Eddings, 6 P. D., 54); and the Harrison practice was followed with protests by Cleveland's last Administration (7 P. D., 36, Strange case; Jones, 8 P. D., 304.) The McKinley Administration holds the same as the last Cleveland Administration (Lee, 9 P. D., 214.) But this does not make any difference to an adverse Commissioner. He goes right ahead with his unlawful rejections, trusting that but few cases will be appealed in his day, and that Congress will never send an investigating committee to weigh the evidence in 15,000 or 20,000 of such claims as a sample. It would take as large a lot as 20,000 of these rejected claims to give a just idea of the enormity of his offending.

What we want is a Commissioner who will execute the laws as Congress makes them—not defeat them by his juggling rulings and technicalities.

Evans must go.

SPANISH-WAR VETERANS ALSO VICTIMS.

During the period between June 30, 1898, and July 1, 1899, although 17,560 claims for pensions on account of the war with Spain were filed, only 303 of such claims had been allowed. To this cruel neglect of the brave boys who were wounded at El Caney and San Juan Hill, and contracted permanent diseases in the fever camp of Chickamauga and in other unsanitary rendezvous, is directed the twelfth count of "The indictment against Evans," contained in the issue of August 31, 1899, of the National Tribune, which reads as follows:

Twelfth count.—He has for the past year unlawfully withheld from official consideration in ordinary course of business the just claims of soldiers and sailors of the Spanish war, many of them sons and other relatives of soldiers and sailors of the rebellion, on the misrepresentation that the War Department has been unprepared or unwilling or unable to furnish required information from the official military records, whereas the War Department has been ready and willing to furnish desired reports on twenty-four hours' notice. (National Tribune, June 29, 1899.) The unlawful and unjustifiable action of the Commissioner of Pensions in this class of claims furnishes striking evidence of his personal feelings and disposition toward all beneficiaries of the pension laws, there being with respect to this class of claims no room for the slanderous objection or suggestion that the claimants have for many years slept on their alleged rights and the claims therefore presumably of doubtful or fraudulent character.

OUR NEW PENSIONERS.

Under this title, in what purports to be a personally written article printed in the issue of the Los Angeles Times of May 13, 1900, Commissioner Evans flippantly discusses the pension status of our brave boys who have followed the flag in Cuba and the Philippines and have received wounds or incurred other disabilities in the line of duty. At the outset he says:

Uncle Sam owes much to the small-caliber bullet. The missile that maims makes pensioners; the one that causes a clean wound without disabling saves the exchequer of the country the expense of maintaining a man whose devotion to duty has cut him out of the ranks of the workers. The new pension list strikingly illustrates the immense difference between the bullet wound of the civil war and that of the late struggle in Cuba and the present one in the Philippines.

There have been, all told, almost 28,500 claims filed on account of the Spanish war and the Philippine insurrection. A good many of these will never be allowed. Numbers of applications for pensions, however, will be made later, as after the civil war, when few claims were filed immediately peace was declared, but numbers when the ills directly traceable to the hardships of campaigning began to make their presence felt. It is certain that when these later claims are filed the number of claims arising out of the late war with Spain will be proportionately greater than those filed after the civil war.

Note the genuine money-power prejudice which crops out in his first two sentences. The saving of life in the use of a modern bullet by our enemies does not appear to gratify the Commissioner half so much as his contemplation that "a clean wound saves the exchequer of the country." To the money power and its minions the saving of pension money is the great consideration, and "the expense of maintaining a man whose devotion to duty has cut him out of the ranks of the workers" has ever been resented and begrudged. This and the plutocratic mania of regarding a pension claimant as a fraud, and a disabled veteran who does not apply for a pension as ipso facto a hero, is apparent from the following paragraph of the Commissioner's creed:

Many will go on the list who have no right there. Numbers will not be there who have a perfect right to be. We can not examine every case, and frauds will occasionally victimize the Pension Office. As a set-off against these there are many patriotic Americans, especially among the regulars, who bore their sufferings without a murmur, went back to duty when discharged from the hospital, and are to-day serving in the ranks, when a few affidavits and a bold front would have carried their pension application through and given them perhaps that which they deserved far better than some whose names now figure on the list. All honor to these patriots who refuse to take advantage of the natural hesitancy of the Pension Bureau to turn down cases that have any claim on the national money box.

THE SPY SYSTEM.

One of the chief causes of complaint against the Cleveland-Lochren Administration of the Pension Bureau was that veterans and veterans' widows were constantly annoyed and harassed by a swarm of detectives, technically known as "special pension examiners."

That this system has continued and flourished under the McKinley-Evans régime is demonstrated in an article published in the issue of the National Tribune of November 9, 1899, entitled:

THE SPECIAL EXAMINATION FARCE.

Mr. Evans is spending every year $400,000 on special examinations. Under General Raum and his predecessors the special examiners were sent into the field to help claimants complete their claims; that is, the examiner acted with judicial impartiality. His purpose was to get at the actual facts of any case, and if he discovered any facts which would help the claimant, he gave him the benefit of them, as well as the adverse effect of facts that were against him.

Mr. Lochren changed all that. He made the special examiners a corps of spies to find reasons for refusing or taking away pensions, and Mr. Evans has continued this system and aggravated it. He has made all hopes of promotion to the corps of special examiners, or of retaining the place when once there, rest on servile sleuthness in scenting pretexts for denying or dropping pensions. See what sums have been expended on this disreputable work by Lochren and Evans:

LOCHREN.

1893	$225,000
1894	400,000
1895	500,000
1896	500,000
Total Lochren	1,625,000

EVANS.

1897	$500,000
1898	450,000
1899	403,000
Total Evans	1,353,000
Grand total	2,975,000

That is, nearly $3,000,000, or enough to put 30,000 claimants on the rolls at $8 a month, has been spent in the disgraceful work of spying around, gathering up neighborhood gossip as to whether this old pensioner is able to hoe in his garden or that old widow has had a lapse from virtue.

In the issue of the National Tribune of November 16, 1899, appears the following manly and indignant protest against the McKinley-Evans practice of causing special pension examiners to propound vile and insulting questions to soldiers' widows:

SPECIAL EXAMINERS.

Editor National Tribune:

The Globe-Democrat says that Mr. Evans, Pension Commissioner, denies that insulting questions are asked widows of soldiers, except in cases where charges were made. Mr. Evans evidently does not know what is going on in his office, and has never seen the book of instructions that special examiners in the field carry around with them.

At the request of a soldier's widow I was present when the special examiner was taking her statement and that of witnesses in her case, as to the income from a piece of property and valuation. This property had been bought for her and her children for a home by two rich relations, and was in trust. There was n o charge of immorality. I saw and read the letter from the Commissioner as to the nature of the inquiry. The examiner, after asking quite a number of questions as to her financial condition, and she explaining how her relations had bought this property for a home, said: "Madam, I am about to ask you a very impudent question, but I have no discretion in the matter, as I must follow my instructions," picking up the book from the table. "Well, what is it?" said the lady. The examiner then said: "Madam, have you, since the death of your husband, cohabited with anyone?" The widow answered "No," and began to cry. I then denounced such questions as an insult to a soldier's widow.

This widow is as fine a lady and as well connected as any in this city, and the only trouble in her case was that she had been left without a dollar, and herself and her four children to provide for and educate; and because friends had seen proper to assist her her case must be investigated and she insulted. If it were not for the great publicity and mortification it would cause the lady, I would send on her and my affidavits as to the facts as stated.

JAS. M. WILSON, *St. Louis, Mo.*

THE CHICAGO VICTIMS.

Under this heading the National Tribune, in its issue of August 10, 1899, savagely denounces the McKinley-Evans attempt to besmirch the good names of the widows and mothers of Union veterans of the State of Illinois, as follows:

According to the Commissioner of Pensions' report for 1898, there were the following numbers and classes of pensions paid from the Chicago agency, now suffering from a raid of Henry Clay Evans's special examiners:

General law:	
Army invalids	27,785
Army widows	7,574
Army nurses	64
Navy invalids	1,038
Navy widows	349
Act of June 27, 1890:	
Invalids	25,416
Widows	7,030
Navy invalids	2,359
Navy widows	836
War of 1812—widows	107
War with Mexico:	
Survivors	629
Widows	636
Indian wars:	
Survivors	81
Widows	263
Total	76,067

Every one of these is being subjected to a mean, vicious espionage, that eagerly snaps up every scrap of malicious neighborhood gossip as a chicken would a fly. There are 17,695 widows and 64 nurses among them. Nearly all of these are quite elderly women, who married their husbands at the close of the war, and have lived irreproachable lives as wives and mothers. Now, every one of these has to undergo this degrading inquisition. No matter how old and infirm they may be, how blameless the lives they have lived, how high the esteem in which they are held by their neighbors and brethren and sisters in their churches, the special examiners act on the presumption that they have been guilty of disreputable conduct, and nose around for every scent that will confirm this theory. And Henry Clay Evans, as grand inquisitor, decides in his star chamber in Washington whether these suspicious, these malignant whisperings, are true. He allows his victim no chance to defend herself. He pronounces sentence, and there is no appeal for the poor old woman, who loses not only her little pension, but in the closing years of her life her reputation, carefully maintained through blameless girlhood, wifehood, and motherhood, is wickedly snatched away.

A Chicago comrade of high standing in the Grand Army of the Republic writes us:

"The gang has been enlarged on the pensioners of Chicago. They go from house to house, and are more persistent than the cheekiest of lightning-rod agents. They are simply insulting in their way of cross-examining the man who draws $6 and the widow who is in receipt of $8. This is the worst deal that has ever been given our people. It is an accusation that strikes an old soldier more deeply than all the abuse they have ever had heaped upon them, boiled down, and you can not treat the matter too harshly. Mr. Evans is spending over $100 a day here in his infamous inquisition. How is that for 'economy?'"

A MICHIGAN VICTIM.

Another instance of the McKinley-Evans persecution of a soldier's widow is narrated in a communication printed in The National Tribune, August 3, 1899, under this caption:

"SAVING MONEY" BY RUINING THE REPUTATION OF A MOST WORTHY AND BLAMELESS OLD WOMAN.

Editor National Tribune:

As the recognized champion for right and justice to the veterans of our civil war, will you be so kind as to insert the following in your valuable paper:

Mrs. Mary M. Elliott, of Roscommon, Mich., widow of the late Daniel Elliott, a volunteer soldier of our civil war, had been granted a widow's pension of $8 per month. Being old and decrepit, she was hired as a servant by one William C. Carpenter, also a veteran and a pensioner, to do his housework, etc., Carpenter being a widower. Everything went on smoothly for a number of years, Mrs. Elliott being respected and loved in this community as a chaste, law-abiding woman, and not the least suspicion was thrown upon her character by reason of being employed by the said Carpenter. About a year ago Mrs. Elliott received a communication from the Pension Bureau at Washington that her name was struck from the pension rolls, charges having been made against her that she was living in open, notorious, and unlawful cohabitation with one W. C. Carpenter.

She at once set to work to refute the charges, and at least 40 affidavits made by our best citizens, among them being our sheriff, prosecuting attorney, president of the village, judge of probate, county treasurer, ministers, doctors, and merchants of this village, were forwarded to Washington, bearing testimony, under oath, that the charges preferred against Mrs. Elliott were untrue and without any foundation whatever.

A special examiner was finally sent to Roscommon. After taking testimony under oath and gathering in all possible evidence, pro and con, for two or three days, this special examiner stated to me that there would be no trouble for Mrs. Elliott to have her pension restored; that he was fully satisfied that the charges were not proven, and that his (the examiner's) report to the Pension Bureau would fully vindicate Mrs. Elliott.

What was her astonishment when she received a letter a few days ago apprising her that her application for restoration of pension had been rejected upon the report of the special examiner.

The people of Roscommon have been grossly and wantonly insulted by the Commissioner of Pensions; he has branded them as liars, unworthy of belief, and as perjurers; he has given preference to anonymous letters, and rejected the sworn testimony of at least 40 good citizens of this community.

A poor old woman, nearly blind, unable to sustain herself, is now thrown upon this cold world without any cause, either to starve, to live on charity, or to go to the poorhouse, and the widow of one of the fallen heroes of our great civil war.

Verily, the reward she receives from this our great and good Government as the widow of a soldier is to be recorded in history as an everlasting shame and stain upon the heads of those who must shoulder the responsibility of one of the greatest injustices ever perpetrated.

CHAS. L. DE WAELE.
Prosecuting Attorney, Roscommon, Mich.

Commenting on the shocking disclosures as to the cowardly, insulting, and outrageous espionage on and interrogations of the widows and mothers of Union veterans, which is and has been part and parcel of the McKinley-Evans pension policy, The National Tribune says editorially in its issue of August 10, 1899:

AN IGNOBLE INQUISITION.

Actuated by his monomania as to frauds on the pension roll—almost desperate to substantiate his slanders upon the veterans and their widows—frenetic to advertise his shrewdness and cunning to the public, Henry Clay Evans has revived another of the obnoxious devices of William Lochren. He has sent to Chicago a band of thirteen special examiners, chosen with great care as to their aptitude for the work, on an extraordinary fraud hunt. Not that there have been any developments to call for this unusual inquisition. There has been nothing to indicate the existence of frauds there. They are sent thither with drag-net instructions, in the hope that they may find something that will bolster up their falling chief.

They are instructed to take the whole list of 76,000 pensioners paid by the Chicago agency and make a house-to-house investigation of every one of them, listening to and encouraging all manner of neighborhood gossip concerning each one of them and following up every clew that may be obtained which promises to furnish a pretext for dropping from the roll. If the pensioner is a man, every tittle-tattle about his present or previous habits of life is to be carefully listened to and inquired into. His ability to work is to be discussed with his neighbors and preponderance given to the statements of those who are, for any reason, unfriendly to him. If the claimant is a widow, her income must be made a matter of rigid inquiry, that she may not have more than the $96 a year, which, by the grace of Henry Clay Evans, she is allowed. And particular attention must be paid to any whispers against her character.

This inquisition would not be so atrocious if its victims were given any chance to meet those who bear witness against them and to learn what accusations spite, jealousy, or neighborhood enmities may have led them to make. But they are not allowed this natural right of every American. Their enemies furtively whisper innuendoes and calumnies to the examiner in some dark corner, and the first the victim hears is that the Commissioner has exercised his summary power of dropping him or her from the roll. We recently published two flagrant instances of how this worked in the cases of poor old women of unimpeachable character. In one the prosecuting attorney of Roscommon County, Mich., testified over his own name how a poor old half-blind widow of his city, who worked as a servant for her living, had been reported by some anonymous miscreant for unchastity, and though the charge was on the face of it absurd, though the special examiner who investigated the case confessed as much, and though 40 of the leading citizens of Roscommon joined in a certificate of the poor woman's good character and an indignant protest against her vilifier, Commissioner Evans refused to restore her to the roll or give the name of the vicious slanderer. Lincoln Post, of Topeka, Kans., certified to another similarly aggravated case.

The special examiners who are doing this odious work are only human. No matter what may be their likes or dislikes as to the duty upon which they are sent, they know that their standing in the office, their retention of their positions, and their chances for promotion all depend upon the activity and zeal that they show in attacking the character of every man and woman on the pension roll. The more to the discredit of any pensioner that they can find and send in the better will the Commissioner be pleased, the better their standing in the office, the greater their chances for promotion.

If the results obtained in Chicago justify it, other agencies will be visited in like manner.

How much longer must the veterans stand these persecutions?

Illustrative of the tendency to a clash between the interests of the money power, which is behind the imperialistic policy of the present Administration, and the pensioned and pension claiming of our citizens, the following able articles from recent issues of the National Tribune, the most prominent organ of the Grand Army of the Republic and of veterans generally, are worthy of thoughtful perusal and consideration.

The following is from its issue of September 21, 1899:

A FIGHT TO A FINISH.

The selfish, sordid, greedy, ungrateful money power, mostly concentrated in New York, Philadelphia, and Boston, and largely represented and controlled by men who have come into the country since the close of the rebellion, has entered upon an organized campaign to reduce pension expenditures. It can not bear to see $140,000,000 a year taken from its control and distributed among the common people all over the country. This makes money more plentiful everywhere and easier to get. It reduces the rate of interest and cuts down the profits of the great lending corporations. It puts a great sum of money completely out of the control of the financiers, and so they hate pensions with the consuming hatred of men whose "pocket nerves" are irritated.

On the other hand, the small merchant, the dealers of all kinds, the great mass of common people everywhere, to whom this money is immediately paid by the pensioners, should be actively in favor of pensions. They are their great relief from the money monopolists. There can be no better machinery for preventing money stagnation and congestion than this of quarterly disbursements to the common people in every town and village of the great sum which the Government pays in satisfaction of the just claims of the men who saved its very existence.

The money power controls the papers of the metropolitan cities and is using them mercilessly against pensions. It is now a fight to a finish. If they can prevail, pensions will continue to be cut down, and the vast number of veterans and their widows who go to their graves every year defrauded of rights bought with their dearest blood will be greatly augmented. The question now is sharply presented as to which is the stronger, the men who own money or the men who have made and are making the nation the greatest on earth.

The National Tribune is on the side of the men who fought and saved the nation and who have built up its farms, its factories, and its varied industries. It is not against the men who merely own money except when and where they are antagonistic to the higher rights of those to whom the country owes everything.

The National Tribune of September 21, 1899, says:

THE OTHER SIDE OF THE ACCOUNT.

Commissioner Evans, in his annual report for 1899, parades the fact that there "have been $2,389,910,974.74 paid out since 1860 for pensions." These figures are strongly at variance with those usually given in books of reference, which make the total amount paid since 1861 $2,289,425,128, or over $100,000,000 less than Mr. Evans's figures and for four years longer time. But let that go, and accept Mr. Evans's figures. The object of Mr. Evans in publishing these figures is, of course, and in accordance with his usual practice, to prejudice public opinion against the veterans, by showing that they have

dipped inordinately into the Treasury and made themselves a heavy burden on the taxpayers.

Now, facts and figures out of their places and out of their relations are worse than lies, and the dangerous falsehood of this statement is that it is cunningly unaccompanied by any sort of comparison with the payments to the other class of the nation's creditors—the men who lent it money, instead of offering it themselves.

The Government urgently needed two things during the war—money and men. It wanted to borrow the first and have the other given it. It wanted those who had money to risk a portion of it at big interest on the Government's being able to maintain itself, and it wanted the men by millions to risk limbs, health, and life itself to maintain its existence. The money lenders were more reluctant to lend their dollars than the men were to enlist, and more than once, at critical times, they actually "struck" against lending any more.

Altogether they lent the Government $2,381,530,294. This was in paper dollars worth all the way from par down to 38.7 cents in gold. Much the greater part was lent at a time when the greenback was worth in the neighborhood of 50 cents. If we assume that the average gold value of the dollars which they lent the Government was 66¾ cents, which is far above the actuality, it would make the total gold value of their loans $1,587,686,862. For this loan they have received back in principal, interest, premiums, etc.—all in gold—and inclusive of the bonds they still hold, the incredible sum of $5,353,569,900!

That is, they have gotten back nearly $4 for every dollar that they lent the Government.

They have gotten more than twice as much as has been paid in the way of pensions to the survivors and widows of the 2,320,272 men who gave an average of three years' service to the Government.

They have been paid an equivalent of about $70 in gold for every man, woman, and child in the country to-day!

This, too, was paid them when the country was not half so rich as it is to-day, and taxation sat more than twice as heavily.

Remember that the money lenders have received $5,353,569,900!

This is an inconceivable amount of money. It approximates the total valuation of the country and everything in it, according to the census of 1850, only eleven years before the war. Then the assessed valuation of every acre of land, every house and lot, every factory, every mile of railroad, all the crops and live stock, including slaves, was only $6,024,666,900, or but $671,097,000 more than has been paid the money lenders since 1861 for their lendings to the Government during the war.

There is still another important feature. All this vast amount was raised by the most drastic taxation at a time when the wealth of the country was only a fraction of what it is now. A very large proportion was paid by the ex-volunteers, who on their return became the great body of wealth producers of the loyal portion of the country, which bore the whole burden of taxation for many years. The veterans cheerfully endured all this in order to pay the money lenders the last cent that they could possibly claim under their contracts. Now the money lenders, with base ingratitude, turn around and fight giving the veterans even scant justice in their age and need.

Still another feature: Every man who enlisted in the Union Army made a financial sacrifice. Taking everything at full cash value, the Government gave him $1,036 for three years' service. Every man capable of being a soldier could have earned at least twice that by remaining at home; therefore each man made an average donation of at least $1,000 for the privilege of serving the Government three years. Multiplying this by 2,320,000, the number of men who gave the Government an average of three years' service, we have the astounding amount of $2,320,000,000, or about as much freely given the Government as the bondholders lent it.

The Government has paid in pensions to those who were disabled and to the widows and orphans, according to Mr. Evans's figures, $2,389,910,974.74. It has therefore scarcely paid back to those who were wrecked in its service as much as those who enlisted freely donated to it, in addition to risking their lives and all that life could give in order to rescue it from destruction.

The nation has not been generous to the men who saved its existence.

It has not paid its plain money debt to them.

It has not begun to treat them with that scrupulous recognition of their claims that it displayed toward the bondholder.

The National Tribune of September 28, 1899, says:

INGRATITUDE OF THE GREEDY MONEY POWER.

One single illustration will well show the graceless ingratitude of the money power, which is now fighting pensions to the men who gave their blood and lives to place that power where it is to-day.

All through the rebellion the greedy cormorants of Wall street fattened on the needs and misfortunes of the country. While the patriotic youth of the land were striving even unto death to save the country—while they were enduring the strains of fateful campaigns, the tense anxieties of months and years of wavering fortunes, the anguish of defeat, the exultation of victory—while the inmates of every home in the North woke each morning with apprehensions as to what news the day would bring of the fate of the loved ones—these men were cunningly plotting to make gain out of every event—defeat or victory, fruitless marches or repulsed assaults. A defeat, or even the failure of the Union Army to win a decided success, merely meant to them that the Government would need more money; that they could drive a harder bargain with it, and that what they had already lent was not so desirable an investment. They kept steadily to their determination not to lend a dollar more than the loyal portion of the country would be likely able to pay if the Southern States succeeded in establishing their independence.

The gold value of the greenback dollar—the Government's promise to pay—was their measure of belief in the Government's ability to sustain itself.

July 11, 1864, saw them in a condition of mind when they wanted to abandon the sinking hulk. Their purely selfish view saw all the chances against the Government. The mighty armies which had been raised during the winter had, after three months of the bloodiest fighting in human annals, apparently been fought to a standstill. They saw Grant's maimed and decimated army bloodily repulsed from the impregnable intrenchments around Petersburg. Sherman's magnificent force of 100,000 men, with which he had started from Chattanooga in May, had been unable to score a single complete success over the rebels, and was lying before the intrenchments around Atlanta, seemingly unable to advance, and sure of destruction if it attempted to retreat. The force which Banks had led up the Red River had been driven in humiliating rout. Two separate armies had been chased out of the Shenandoah Valley, and the confident rebels were even then at the gates of Washington. The cowardly money changers felt that all they could hope for was some salvage out of the wreck, and this feeling was represented by the fact that on July 11, 1864, they demanded and got $285 in greenbacks for $100 in gold—that is, they would only pay a fraction over 35 cents for a greenback dollar. They estimated that the chances were nearly two to one against the Government's being able to sustain itself and pay anything.

Up to that time they had lent the Government $1,359,980,768 in paper dollars, and held its bonds for this amount. According to their own figures this was then worth but $475,975,767. There was then outstanding $833,718,984 in paper money, which was, by the same figures, only worth $291,801,615. This was only the beginning of the story. There were hundreds of millions of dollars more of bank, railway, mining, and manufacturing bonds and stocks, of other bonds, notes, bank deposits, trusts, legacies, contracts, etc., all depending upon the gold value of the greenback dollar.

If the men who were fighting the battles of the Union had been as cowardly and unpatriotic as the money lenders; if the men who emerged from the bloody hell of the Wilderness and Cold Harbor, only to undergo renewed slaughter on the Appomattox; if those who had fought their way for 100 miles through the mountain fastnesses of Georgia, had been as faint-hearted and reckless of the country's future as the Wall street cormorants, and said, as they might well have said, "We are tired and discouraged by this ceaseless slaughter; we will fight no more," then the value of the greenback, and all of the wealth depending on it, would have gone no one knows whither. Billions of dollars of valuation would have simply disappeared. They would have been crossed off the account books, as the Confederate bonds, money, and all values depending on them were at the close of the war.

But the soldiers—the men and their representatives who are drawing pensions to-day—did nothing of the kind. They were determined that the country should be preserved, no matter what might be the cost to themselves in life and limb. They went on and took Atlanta, they drove the rebels out of the Shenandoah Valley, and they hammered away at Petersburg with renewed zeal. Their brethren on the sea took Mobile, and by the end of October they had put such a different face on matters that the money changers were willing to pay 48.3 cents for the Government's promise to pay a dollar. That is, in about ten weeks they had, by reckless expenditure of their blood and lives, increased the value of the greenback dollar over 13 cents—more than one-third its price on July 11—and correspondingly enhanced the price of every bond, share of stock, mortgage, note, trust, etc., in the whole country.

In May, 1865, after these same soldiers had forced the surrender of Lee and Johnston, ten months after the greenback had been selling for 35 cents, it was selling for 73.7 cents.

That is, inside of ten months these men who are now the objects of the abuse of all the papers controlled by the money power, by their unflinching determination and regardlessness of self, more than doubled the value of every bond, share of stock, paper dollar, and paper evidence of value in the whole country, and added billions to the actual wealth of the money power.

Yet this same power, with Henry Clay Evans as its venal tool, is now engaged in a campaign of defamation against these men and their widows, and striving to deprive them of their pitiful little pensions in their old age.

The National Tribune of October 5, 1899, says:

THE SELFISH AND UNPATRIOTIC COWARDICE OF THE MONEY POWER.

In previous articles we have shown how the greedy money power of New York and other Eastern cities was ready to abandon the country in July, 1864, and struck at it viciously in its most vulnerable part, by depreciating its money until the greenback dollar was worth but a little over 35 cents in gold. It was the time of all others when they should have patriotically rallied to its assistance, and offered it their wealth as freely as the volunteers in the field were offering it their blood, to rescue it from destruction. While the soldiers in the field, who had stained with their blood every step in the long miles from the Rappahannock to the James, and from Chattanooga to Atlanta, felt that they would rather die than see the Southern Confederacy succeed, the selfish and cowardly money power refused to risk another dollar—even those despised greenback dollars—to help the Government maintain itself.

The Secretary of the Treasury, William Pitt Fessenden, in his report dated December 6, 1864, tells pathetically of the Treasury's struggles with these cormorants:

"The prospect of negotiating a loan in the ordinary way was by no means flattering, as the notice for a loan of $33,000,000 advertised on the 25th day of June had been withdrawn on the 2d of July, the Secretary having reason to believe that such a loan would not be taken on terms which it would be for the interest of the Government to accept."

That is, in the seven days they convinced the Secretary that they would not give him even so small a loan as $33,000,000, no matter what the straits of the Government. This, too, at a time when money was unprecedentedly plenty, and the amount asked for represented but $11,550,000 in gold, upon which the Government offered to pay over 12 per cent.

Then the hardly pressed Secretary called a meeting in New York of the managers of the New York, Boston, and Philadelphia banks, and other financial corporations, and tried to get them to lend him $50,000,000 upon bonds and other securities of the United States. He was terribly in need of $130,000,000 for supplies and ammunition for Grant's and Sherman's hard-fighting armies, and which the contractors prudently refused to furnish until they got the money. Again the bank managers refused to help, and the Secretary came back to Washington entirely empty handed. Then, July 25, he appealed to the people with an advertisement of a national loan. This did not meet a satisfactory response, and in his despair the Secretary turned to the men who were fighting the battles of the country—the men who were then under the fire of the enemy in the trenches around Petersburg and Atlanta. Out of their meager little $16 a month they lent the Treasury $20,000,000.

The grateful Secretary says:

"The Secretary * * * was gratified to find that these notes were readily taken in payment to a large amount by our gallant soldiers, in many instances not only receiving them with alacrity, but expressing their satisfaction at being able to aid their country by loaning money to the Government. The whole amount of notes thus disposed of exceeded $20,000,000, and the Secretary has great satisfaction in stating that the disposal thus made was not only a relief to the Treasury, but proved a benefit to the recipients, in affording them a safe and valuable investment and an easy mode of transmitting funds to their families."

Of course the $20,000,000 which the volunteers loaned the Government became a "safe and valuable investment," because the soldiers stuck to their work for eight or nine months longer, and by "sending Early whirling up the valley," by clinging to the throat of Lee's army around Richmond, by running him down through the mud and rain to Appomattox, by marching to the sea and through the Carolinas, and by crushing Hood's army at Franklin and Nashville, made not only their loan gilt-edged, but put many billions of dollars into the pockets of holders of greenbacks, notes, stocks, shares, and bonds of every description.

What a contrast is presented between the glorious, all-conquering faith and self-sacrifice of the soldiers and the paltering selfishness of the money power at the moment when the nation's fate hung trembling in the balance.

Yet to-day, when the money power has reaped unknown billions of dollars from this steadfastness of the soldiers, it wages a war of cruel calumny to rob them of their meager pensions in their needy old age.

It is heartless and shameful.

The National Tribune of October 12, 1899, says:

PENSIONERS VERSUS BONDHOLDERS.

Altogether the bondholders lent the Government $2,381,530,294.

These were greenback dollars, varying in value all the way from par down to 35 cents.

Very much of this was lent when the greenback was worth in the neigh-

borhood of 50 cents or less, as the following table, showing the aggregate debt for the year and the average value of the greenback, will show:

Year.	Total debt.	Average value of greenback.
1861	$90,580,874	Par to 88.3
1862	365,304,826	88.3
1863	707,531,634	68.9
1864	1,359,930,763	49.2
1865	2,381,530,294	63.6

The increase of the debt from year to year indicates the amount of the lendings that year, and the price of the greenback indicates the real gold value of the same. For example, in the fiscal year ending August 31, 1865, the debt increased $1,021,599,531, or almost half the total amount, and the gold value of the greenbacks lent varied from 39.4 cents to 73.7 cents. The earlier part of the year it was far under 50 cents, going as low as 35 cents July 11, 1864.

If we assume, therefore, that the average value of all the dollars lent was as much as 66⅔ cents, we are making a very strong assumption in favor of the bondholders. Yet this will make the total value of their lendings only $1,587,686,862. For this they have been paid back—counting in the market value of the bonds they still hold—the enormous sum of $5,353,569,900, or nearly four times the value of their original lendings! To show this at a glance, we restate it in the form of an account:

MONEY LENDERS IN ACCOUNT WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Dr.		Cr.	
To amount of debt repaid to date	$1,796,496,034	By paper dollars loaned up to August 31, 1865, $2,381,530,294. Gold value of same at 66⅔ cents	$1,587,686,862
To bonds yet outstanding, $585,024,200. To market value of same at $125	731,292,825		
To interest to date	2,705,917,633		
To premiums	119,863,408		
Total	5,353,569,900	Total	1,587,686,862

Now, let us take the other side of the account—that of the men who gave years of their lives, their health, their strength, and even their lives, where the bondholders only lent a portion of their wealth.

The War Department statistics show that there were an average of 2,320,272 men who gave three years' service to the Government. These men received for this, counting everything at current money values, as follows:

Two years' pay, at $13	$312
One year's pay, at $10	102
Three years' clothing, at $42	126
Three years' rations, at $9 a month	324
Bounty	100
Additional bounty	100
Total	1,154

Average pay per annum, $384.66⅔.

Now, every one of those strong, able-bodied young men was capable of earning from double to quadruple that amount, and would have gotten it if he had stayed at home and received the high wages then ruling. Skilled mechanics received from $3 to $6 and $8 per day. Farmers got as high as $3 a bushel for wheat, $1.50 for corn, $1 a pound for wool, etc. We shall not be overstating it when we estimate the average wage-earning capacity of the men from the Union Army at $1,200 a year. Therefore each of them made an average donation to the Government for the privilege of serving it of about $2,000.

If we multiply this by the aggregate, 2,320,272 three-years men, we shall have the astonishing total of $4,640,544,000. That is, the men who fought the battles of the country actually donated to the Government about twice as much as the bondholders lent it. We can reduce all our estimates very much and still show that the soldiers gave outright to the Government more than the money power lent it.

The payment of pensions is not an offset to this. Pensions are given in compensation for injuries and disabilities received in the war. They are in satisfaction for an actual debt incurred by the Government when it sent the men on the march and into battle, and have no relation to the sacrifice made by men to enter the Army. But they are associated in the public mind with rewards to the soldiers, and therefore they can be put in opposition to the rewards given the men who lent the money.

The total amount paid out for pensions since 1861 foots up $2,289,420,128, or much less than half the amount paid the bondholders. To be exact, the money lenders have received $3,034,149,772 more than the soldiers, and the present rate of about $140,000,000 could be continued for over twenty-one years before the aggregate paid the pensioners would reach the present aggregate paid the bondholders.

The soldiers of the Union were resolute in their belief that the bondholders should be paid, as they have been. They held it to be right and just that the Government should pay the last cent that could be justly claimed by those who lent it money in its hour of need. They taxed themselves mercilessly to do this, and presented a solid front against all schemes of repudiation, no matter how artful and seductive.

Now, it is the basest ingratitude for the money power to be arrayed solidly against justice to the men to whom it owes so much.

On December 14, 1899, the National Tribune said:

THE UNIVERSAL BENEFIT OF PENSION EXPENDITURES.

Few who read and are influenced by the constant tirade against the "burden of pension expenditures" stop to reflect that there is a much greater fact to be offset against this. That is, the incalculable, incomputable, but nevertheless direct and positive, dollars-and-cents value of the periodical disbursements for pensions to the merchants, retail dealers of all kinds, physicians, and professional men, the mechanics and artisans of the whole country. It is they who, in the end, receive the most benefit from pension expenditures. In a very little while every dollar of the $140,000,000 annually paid out for pensions finds its way into the pockets of men who have stores and shops, large or small, who sell dry goods, clothing, shoes, hats, groceries, meat, family supplies, drugs and medicines, who practice medicine or dentistry, who run blacksmith, carpenter, or other shops, or who are, in short, doing anything useful for the community in which the pensioners live.

Entirely differing from any other class of Government creditors, the pensioners immediately spend every dollar that is paid them directly among their neighbors in the village where they reside. They are the very opposite of the bondholder, who takes his interest to pay the expenses of himself and family in Europe; or the contractor who locks his gold and greenbacks up in the vaults of a safety deposit company, or some other man who may expend his check on the subtreasury in silks and diamonds and French wines. The pensioner's dollars are all for the prime necessaries of life, such as his neighbors around him make their living by supplying.

The direct benefit of this to the business men and artisans of every village and town in the country is simply beyond computation or expressing. It is a mighty power to keep money in healthful circulation and promote general prosperity. Capitalists may get frightened, clutch all the money in reach and lock it up in vaults; bankers may put the screws on "accommodations;" operators may plot to tighten the money market; strikes may occur to stop work and wages; mills may shut down; crops may fail; grasshoppers devour; floods waste and hurricanes devastate, but so long as pensions are paid there will be some ready money coming into town every three months, upon which business can be done. There will be money in circulation which will be independent alike of the manipulations of selfish financiers and the misfortunes to trades and agriculture.

Take, for example, the State of Ohio. There are 105,627 pensioners in the State, who receive every year $15,456,006.90. As there are 88 counties in the State, this would make an average of 1,200 pensioners to each county and an average payment to each county of $175,630. That is, the Treasury distributes among the people of each county in Ohio an average of $43,900 every three months.

Can there be any overestimation of the benefits which flow to every merchant, every shopkeeper, every retail dealer, every mechanic, every artisan, of the quarterly payment of this great sum directly to the people of the county? There is not a man in the whole county, no matter what he does or what business he is engaged in, but within a very short time after pension day gets some of this money in his pocket. Even if he is only a day laborer he finds some one more ready to hire him and pay him good wages than he would be were it not for this.

And the certainty that this money will come—that it can not be prevented by Wall street panics, or bankers' schemes, or trade disturbances, or crop failures—enables men of all kinds to go ahead and make their arrangements with a degree of confidence which they otherwise would not have. From the quickness with which this money passes into circulation and from hand to hand among all classes it does more good than millions would if doled out through the timid and stringent methods of the banks.

Then there is the question "of the burden on the taxpayer." No matter what he may say for the purposes of argument, every decently informed man knows that the fund from which pensions are paid is not the slightest burden on any taxpayer. As a rule, the customs duties and internal-revenue duties were imposed and are maintained more for the protection of American industry, and the regulation of certain traffics, than to secure the revenue. Take, for example, oleomargarine, from which the Government receives about $2,000,000 a year. This tax was levied to restrain the production and sale of bogus butter and cheese, and the revenue part was a mere fiction. Before the war with Spain called for extraordinary expenditures, the Government had to find a way to return to the people the money it was obliged to collect to protect American manufacturers and to regulate the whisky, beer, and tobacco trades. The people demanded that certain duties be imposed on imported goods and on the distillation and sale of whisky, the brewing and sale of beer, and the manufacture and sale of bogus butter and cheese. What was done with the proceeds of those duties was a secondary question. The imposition of the duties was the main thing and in this they were resolute. The expenses of the Spanish war are now being rapidly met, and we shall soon return to the same condition. "The burden on the taxpayer" is the most absurd of partisan fictions.

In paying pensions the Government is not only meeting its just obligations to those whom it is overwhelmingly indebted, but incidentally it has hit upon the most effective way in which to return to the whole people, without partiality or favoritism, the money it is compelled by a mandate of the people to collect for economic and moral purposes.

SAVING MONEY.

The money power controls the McKinley-Evans administration of pensions affairs just as it did during the Cleveland-Lochren régime, and it gloats with satisfaction as it contemplated the millions of dollars appropriated by Congress for the payment of pensions has been filched from the pockets of deserving, infirm, and needy veterans, their widows and other dependents, through the refusal of the McKinley-Evans combination to carry out the pledges to "the old-soldier element" made in the campaign of 1896. Upon this subject the National Tribune, in its issue of November 9, 1899, has this to say:

NO "LOOTING THE TREASURY."

It suits Mr. Evans and his literary bureau to keep up a great pretense that the veterans and their widows are ravenously eager to "loot the Treasury" and riot in the hundreds of millions of dollars hoarded there, and that the only thing which prevents this dire robbery is Mr. Evans's superhuman shrewdness and unparalleled integrity.

As we have frequently said before, we have not the slightest objection to any public man trumpeting his own ability and honesty to any extent that he can impose upon newspaper space so long as he does not attempt to build himself up at some one else's expense.

But nothing can be more aggravatingly untrue than this brazen claim. The difference between Evans's policy of niggardly injustice and one of fair and honest interpretation of the pension laws represents in the aggregate an astonishingly small sum, instead of the tens of millions which Evans would make out.

When it is remembered that $8 a month is only $96 a year, it will be seen that he has to deprive an immense number of people, poor old men and women, of their rights in order to save even so much as $1,000,000 a year.

For example, since Mr. Evans has been Commissioner he has turned back into the Treasury, of money that Congress gave him to pay the just claims against the Government—

In 1898	$3,166,000
In 1899	1,746,000
Total	4,912,000

Congress certainly had no idea that the Treasury was being "looted" when it freely and willingly appropriated that money, and Congress is not noted for its liberality toward public creditors. Its sins are on the side of grudging parsimony rather than on that of generosity. Yet it took the view that at least that much was due the poor, old, long-waiting men and women, and that they should be paid. The sum that Evans turned back would have actually put 50,000 of them on the roll at $8 a month, and as Mr. Evans reported that there were probably 65,000 only original applications on file from parties who have not heretofore received any pensions, this would have, in connection with the year's mortality, virtually cleared up the pension docket.

If this had been done, it would have gone far to satisfy all reasonable expectations as to this Administration's management of the Pension Bureau.

DELAYS SAVE MONEY.

That the downright rejection of pension claims is not the only way to curtail pension payments has been fully demonstrated by the McKinley-Evans combination.

During the discussion of the pension appropriation bill for the year ending June 30, 1898, Commissioner Evans appeared before the committees of Congress, and although at that time in his Bureau there were then pending over 600,000 pension claims, of which over 200,000 were those of persons who had never drawn pensions, he had the effrontery to ask that his force of clerks be reduced. The money power was then, as now, in full swing, both Houses of Congress had Republican majorities, and it quickly saw the cold-blooded purpose of its faithful servant. A Republican Congress enacted, and a Republican President approved, the law cutting down the clerical force of the Pension Bureau by 110 clerks. This saved the Treasury over $100,000 a year in clerk hire; and, coincident with this reduction of the clerical force of the Pension Bureau, the number of pension claims allowed during the ensuing fiscal year (1899) was reduced by over 14,000; the annual value of the pensions allowed during that period was reduced by $1,200,000, and nearly $2,000,000 of the money appropriated by Congress to pay pensions during the year 1899 was turned back into the Treasury.

Another McKinley-Evans scheme to delay claims, especially those of dependent relatives of Union veterans, is capitally exposed by the National Tribune in its issue of July 6, 1899, under the title of—

EVANS'S TACTICS.

Some of the tactics to which Commissioner Evans has resorted in order to save up millions of dollars from pensions to return to the United States Treasury for this year are very wonderful.

Early in February, 1898, Evans had prepared a little book, signed by him as the author, and published April 9, 1898, instructing the office force what to do, entitled "Practice of the Pension Bureau."

In this book, tucked away nicely in two lines in an out-of-the-way place near the bottom of page 116, is one of his sly tricks which overruled the settled practice and law of eight years' standing in mothers' claims under the act of June 27, 1890, and caused the unlawful rejection of 1,000 of these old mothers' claims.

These are the only words he used to do the hostile work:

"The remarriage of a mother after the death of the soldier is a bar to pension under this act."

This same question had been fully considered by both the Harrison and the Cleveland Administrations on the special requests of Commissioners Raum and Lochren, and decided exactly the other way, both Administrations holding that a mother's remarriage before applying for pension under the June law did not bar her claim if she was still in a destitute or pensionable condition as to property and income. (See decision of August 6, 1890, published in 4 P. D., 240; 6 P. D., page 30; 7 P. D., page 543; 7 P. D., 550, and Ruling 243, of April, 1891.)

* * * * * * * *

On June 25, 1899 (one year and three months after the work of rejecting these mothers' claims began), the first appeal was reached by the Secretary, and Evans's action reversed. But he had accomplished his purpose. The saving had been made for his June, 1899, report.

It will be five years, if these mothers live so long, before all these rejected claims will be reached for reopening. At least half of the mothers will be then dead and the saving made permanent.

Evans is doing a similar wrong to a class of minors' claims under the old law. He is placing them on the "hold-up files," refusing to consider them, although the question has been decided against him and Lochren dozens of times by the Secretary and the Attorney-General. Lochren was simple enough to begin rejecting these minors' claims; and, just as Evans has done with the mothers' claims, rejected some 5,000 before an appeal could be reached to stop him. Evans is profiting by Lochren's experience, and has learned a better way, one that will not give them a chance to appeal. He refuses to act, and as fast as they reach the board of review, he piles them away, if ready for allowance. During the last two years he has piled up 15,000 of these minors' claims that have been submitted for allowance, or for the field, as prima facie complete. He allows the adjudicating division to complete them before he holds them up. These are many of the same claims that have been ready for four and five years, which Lochren rejected on same ground that Evans now holds them up in the board of review. Had he (E.) taken this course with the mothers' claims, he could have worked it for two more years; for only a mandamus can compel him to take them off the hold-up files.

PLEDGES AND PERFORMANCES CONTRASTED.

There were four great corps in the Republican army of 1896—the manufacturers, the money changers, and the trust managers. These three classes furnished the money to corrupt and the influence to coerce thousands of voters. The fourth corps was the "old-soldier element," over 2,000,000 voters strong. To the manufacturing contingent a higher tariff was promised, and the Dingley bill, in its interest, was forced through Congress and became a law within six months after President McKinley was inaugurated. The money power was promised more bonds and straight-out legislation in favor of the gold standard, and those promises have been duly performed. The commercial and industrial trusts were pledged immunity from prosecution under existing laws, and full faith has been kept with them. The Republican party is therefore assured of the moral support and financial contributions of the capitalistic classes, and certain to have a vast corruption fund for use in the campaign of 1900. Having the sinews of war in abundance, the promoters of McKinleyism feel that they are in no danger, even if they have perfidiously and ungratefully ignored their pledges to give their allies of the veteran corps "fair treatment and generous recognition."

WHY FAITH HAS NOT BEEN KEPT WITH VETERANS.

One reason is because the purse-proud adherents of plutocracy feel that they are always sure of the vote of "the soldier element," no matter how recreant they may be to solemn promises made to it. They confidently count on the soldiers' votes in the coming election, because of their successful efforts in the past to appeal to the patriotism and play on the prejudices of the veterans. The Republican managers chuckle as they contemplate the existing excitement in old-soldier circles, and dismiss the threatened mutiny with the reflections: "The old 'Vets' are so accustomed to voting the Republican ticket that, while they may make wild threats of desertion, when it comes right down to voting as they talk rather than as they shot, they can not help being 'loyal.' A real, live President in a G. A. R. parade and a judicious ante-election waving of the 'old flag' will cause the old fellows to forget all our broken promises and forgive even Commissioner Evans's dubious management of the Pension Bureau."

But the chief reason why the Administration has not kept faith with Union veterans is because it is hopelessly committed to the expensive policy of

IMPERIALISM.

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, our national expenditures were $365,000,000, of which $141,000,000 were for pensions. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1899, we expended $605,000,000, of which only $139,000,000 went to pensioners. Of this tremendous increase in our expenditures, amounting to over $280,000,000, or twice the amount of money expended for pensions, at least $150,000,000 were spent last year in attempting to carry out the vicious policy of imperialism.

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1899, over $112,000,000 in war taxes were wrung from our people, of which over $8,000,000 was produced by the tax on tea.

Contemplate the fact that money by the scores of millions is being annually squandered and hundreds of brave young lives are being yearly sacrificed in a chimerical scheme to force our political ideas, our so-called civilization, on an alien people.

Then realize that, as shown by the report of the Pension Bureau for 1899, 144,397 veterans of our Army and Navy, their widows and dependents, are pensioned at less than 40 cents a day, while thousands of other needy and deserving veterans, their widows and orphans, have no pensions at all. Yet pensioned and unpensioned veterans must contribute from their meager hoards toward defraying the expenses of our military missionizing and the maintenance of our colonial satrapies. At less than one-fourth of the annual financial cost of imperialism a service or a per diem pension bill could be enacted and carried into effect, and enough funds would be left over to give a proper increase of pension to every deserving veteran now pensioned under the general law.

The interest of those who profit by imperialism and the interests of the Union's veterans are, therefore, necessarily hostile and irreconcilable. Already the people, and especially the moneyed classes, are restive under the burdens of the Dingley tariff and the war-revenue law. A reduction in taxation must occur in the near future. This will mean greater rigidity in pension practice or a radical change in our policy as to our insular acquisitions.

Having in mind the contrast between recent Republican promises and performances, the discerning veteran is bound to conclude that the pensioner, not the colonial parisite, will be the sufferer.

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE?

Who is responsible for the complete failure of the Republican party to carry out the pledges and promises made to the veterans in its platform of 1896? For over three years H. Clay Evans has been the most abused man in America. Posts of the Grand Army of the Republic have fulminated against him; the organs of the various organizations of veterans have belabored him with vigor and virulence; whenever and wherever an old soldier has a grievance—and thousands of them have been treated unfairly and unjustly—he places the blame upon Evans. In short, H. Clay Evans, in old-soldier circles, is held up and hooted at as the sum total of official deviltry and political perfidy. The truth is, however,

EVANS IS THE OFFICIAL SCAPEGOAT

for the sins and hypocrisies of the McKinley pension policy. President McKinley appointed Evans Commissioner of Pensions, and could have removed him at any time the Commissoner's course was unsatisfactory. Corporal Tanner was summarily dismissed from the Commissionership because his administration of the Pension Bureau displeased President Harrison. No one will question the power of the President to remove Mr. Evans. The question naturally arises, "Does President McKinley know that his Commissioner of Pensions is and has been for three years abrogating and ignoring the law, unfairly and arbitrarily rejecting just pension claims, insulting and spying upon soldier's widows, and in every way possible giving the lie to the solemn pledge of the platform on which Major McKinley was elected—to give the veterans of the Union armies "fair treatment and generous recognition?"

PRESIDENT M'KINLEY KNOWS ALL THIS.

It has been iterated and reiterated to him, and he can not plead ignorance to any of the charges of Pension Bureau mismanagement. Knowing, as he must know, all of the damning truth in failing to cause his party's pledges to Union veterans to be kept, and in permitting his Commissioner of Pensions to revive and continue "every odious practice of William Lochren," President McKinley can not escape the charge that he and not his understrapper, Evans, is responsible for the breach of his party's solemn pledges and for the indignities and outrages which have been heaped upon the heads of Union veterans, their widows and orphans, during his Administration.

EVANS HAS BEEN BUFFER

long enough. He has acted well his part, but veterans will be no longer deceived. It is an insult to their intelligence to assume that the removal of the Commissioner now, or later in the campaign, would acquit the President of knowledge of and complicity in the monstrous conspiracy to hold up and pare down the allowance of pension claims which has been going on during the past three years. The Administration purposes to use Commissioner Evans as a shield and cloak to this shocking confidence game until assured that it no longer conceals the real conspirators; then we may expect the usual political trick. The President will rise in indignant majesty, theatrically denounce Commissioner Evans as a betrayer of the Presidential confidence, and summarily remove the offender. This scenic effect will be followed by the appointment of a new Commissioner, who, during the closing weeks of the campaign, will "work the soldier racket for all it is worth" in the doubtful States, and the gentlemen who have enacted the little comedy will fraternally don the blue and sally forth to the Philadelphia encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic to try once again to persuade their comrades to "vote as they shot."

Fortunately, however, Union veterans know that ever since September, 1899, the President has been directly, personally, and completely estopped from denying knowledge of and responsibility for Commissioner Evans's official acts for reasons clearly set forth in the following article, which appeared in the National Tribune under date of September 14, 1899:

EVANS'S CONDEMNATION.

Several times in the history of the Grand Army of the Republic the national encampment has found it necessary to criticise the Commissioner of Pensions, but never to visit upon anyone the unstinted condemnation it has unanimously passed upon Commissioner Evans.

Even Lochren did not move it to so stinging a rebuke. Then we were in the hands of a declared and open enemy, from whom we had no reason to hope for anything. Now it is a professed friend, who adds hypocrisy to injustice and aggravates cruelty by tireless slander.

With all the force that can be given language the encampment denies absolutely the view of the law which Evans inherited from his predecessor and has still further harshened by his own animus. It points out that the opposite view had the support of such peerless lawyers as Benjamin Harrison and John W. Noble, while his has not the sanction of a single lawyer of reputation.

It convicts him of going even beyond the worst phases of Lochrenism in his eagerness to withhold from the veterans and their widows that which the laws granted them, and of having converted his office into a spouting geyser of defamation which has constantly filled the papers of the country with slanders against the men and women to whom the nation owes boundless gratitude. It points out that this unintermittent flow of disparagement is never relieved by a single word of appreciation of the gallantry, heroism, and self-sacrifice of those men and women, though his Bureau must teem with multitudinous testimonials which could not fail to move a heart less icily cold.

It shows that he has as little justification for his slanders as for his pretended law, and then, stating its hopelessness of relief from him, lays the whole matter before the President, citing the law which specially charges the Chief Magistrate with the oversight and control of the Commissioner of Pensions.

The whole matter is therefore appealed directly to President McKinley. With the utmost respect, with impressive dignity, in carefully measured words, all the more forceful for their thoughtful circumspection, the President is informed that his Commissioner of Pensions has utterly failed to carry out the spirit and intent of the laws, and that he has done this with a persistent zeal which seems to imply a perverse animus. The encampment is a jury which presents a unanimous finding of facts to the President. It does not embarrass him with so much as a recommendation as to his action upon them. The encampment, which must always maintain the most exalted and American view of the Chief Magistrate, took the proper attitude that it was only necessary to present the facts to the President. He could not fail to act properly upon them.

So the matter stands at the present writing.

That the veterans feel keenly President McKinley's treatment of them is evident. After all that was said and done prior to, during, and after the Philadelphia encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, they hoped that the President in his last annual message would manfully come to the front and at least say something good of them. The state paper in question was cold, formal, and noncommittal on the subject of pensions. So much so that the National Tribune of December 14, 1899, mournfully observed:

WHY IT WAS DISAPPOINTING.

In the hurry of going to press last week we could only say of the reference to pensions in the President's message that it "was distinctly disappointing."

Now we shall say why it was so.

The bitter discontent of the veterans and their friends with the maladministration of the Pension Bureau is now more than six years old. It began in 1893 when Cleveland, Hoke Smith, and William Lochren began their cruel work of disemboweling the pension laws, and particularly the act of June 27, 1890. The bitterness increased as these men perfected their work, and by 1896 became an overwhelming sentiment, which expressed itself most vigorously at the polls. President McKinley, and all those who were candidates with him that year, sympathized with the discontent, and promised sweeping reforms if intrusted with power. They were successful at the polls, and Henry Clay Evans was made Commissioner of Pensions, presumably to carry out the preelection promises, "obliterate every vestige of Clevelandism, Hoke-Smithism, and Lochrenism," and restore the administration of the pension laws to what it had been under President Harrison, Secretary Noble, and Commissioner Raum. Instead of doing this Mr. Evans has continued virtually every obnoxious rule, regulation, and practice of Lochren, and in many instances intensified and harshened them. It has been made even harder to get justice under Evans than it was under Lochren, though the veterans and their widows are now six years older, and therefore incomparably more deserving of speedy action on their claims.

Naturally, therefore, the bitterness of discontent has gone on increasing, and been sharpened by the feeling that the veterans and their widows have been the victims of ingratitude and deceit.

WHAT HAS THE GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC DONE?

When the national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, sometimes referred to in old soldiers' circles as the "House of Lords," assembled in the city of Philadelphia last year, its membership was in a serious dilemma. Their constituents, as individuals, posts, and, in many cases, departments, were clamorous for the removal of Commissioner Evans and a complete return to the liberal pension procedure that prevailed during the Administration of President Harrison.

Gleefully commenting upon what it apparently then regarded as a victory for Union veterans in their fight to force the Administration to make good its ante-election pension pledges, the National Tribune of September 28, 1899, said editorially:

The newspapers of the country are beginning to realize that Evans badly deceived them when he proclaimed that he had won a decisive victory in the national encampment. They are beginning to understand the fullness of the condemnation passed upon him, and the more radical of the soldier haters are turning around and abusing the national encampment. Evans finds himself caught in a severe pinch. After his proclamation in advance that the Administration was going to stand by him and send a number of prominent officials to control the encampment, he is estopped from using his favorite excuse that that body was "controlled by pension attorneys." Everybody knows that there were never so many district attorneys, marshals, postmasters, revenue officers, and minor officials in the national encampment. Almost everybody else than pension attorneys was in evidence at Philadelphia.

It will be hardly presumed that these Federal officeholders were numbered among those officers and delegates of the encampment who were urging the organization to declare open war on Commissioner Evans and make formal demand on the President for his removal and for a complete about-face in his pension policy. No; these district attorneys, marshals, postmasters, and other occupants of remunerative offices were there playing partisan politics instead of demanding that faith be kept and justice done to their less fortunate and more needy comrades of the rank and file of the Grand Army of the Republic. These Republican officeholders and others of the same stripe who were yet "outside the breastworks" realized it would be "bad politics" and would "hurt Comrade McKinley in 1900" to have the encampment go on record as squarely denouncing the perfidy of the Administration in its relations with Union veterans.

By dint of hard work and many promises, President McKinley's political henchmen convinced the encampment that all grievances would be righted if a committee would call on the President and make known its complaints and wishes. The commander in chief designated the committee. It came to Washington; it saw the President; it returned whence it came, leaving Commissioner Evans's scalp still in its normal position and the situation absolutely unchanged. Then the commander in chief appointed a committee on pensions, with instructions to investigate pension conditions and to suggest remedies for existing causes of complaint and dissatisfaction. This committee basked in Administration circles for some weeks and made a report which, with its recommendations as to legislation, would do credit to any political "whitewash" committee that was ever selected, the net results of its labors being the enactment of a bill containing sundry amendments to the act of June 27, 1890, which was signed by the President on May 9, 1900, and is thus characterized by the American Tribune, of Indianapolis, Ind., in its issue of May 17, 1900:

CONGRESS CHANGING THE PENSION LAWS TO SUIT COMMISSIONER EVANS—THE GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC PENSION COMMITTEE'S BREACH OF TRUST.

After our article was in type last week, the House of Representatives changed the Senate bill (fraudulently called the Grand Army of the Republic bill) so that it represented all that Evans, through his Grand Army of the Republic pension committee, desired; and then passed the bill under suspension of the rules. It will now go back to the Senate to be rushed through and become a law. By it all of Evans's contentions and practices are approved by Congress, just as we warned the veterans was the object.

The veterans should immediately write their Congressmen—Senators and Representatives—to vote and work against the bill. Send them the American Tribune, with a protest against their course. Demand on your rights that Order 164, of Commissioner Raum's time, be restored for rating new-law invalid disabilities with the same rate as the same disability under the old law is rated. Demand that the proposed increase of widows' exemption of income shall explicitly state that "this income of $250 shall be held to relate only to income from property, and shall not include any part of her labor earnings or income from her labor or the labor of her children." This is the present holding of the Interior Department, and should apply to this new amendment;

but it is the trick to include her earnings. (See Davis, 9 P. D., pages 2, 3, and 4.)

We showed conclusively in our issue of May 10 (last week) that the invalid bill does not change the elements of the law; and that these two bills as now under way are not Grand Army of the Republic bills, but Evans bills; and are being passed under the false pretenses of benefiting pensions while in truth and fact they will cause the rejection of ten pensions to each claim which they will benefit.

Notwithstanding the last Grand Army of the Republic encampment was in the grip of the political bosses in President McKinley's Cabinet, which demanded a traitorous report from that discredited Grand Army of the Republic investigating committee, that encampment did get through and adopted one explicit resolution which required two specific changes in the pension laws, and only two changes. The present Grand Army of the Republic pension committee has wholly ignored and disobeyed each of those two requirements, has committed a breach of trust, turned tails, and gone into the enemy's camp. This is the first part of the resolution:

"*Resolved*, That this encampment respectfully represents to the President its earnest conviction that rule 225, now in practical effect in the adjudication of claims for pensions, under section 2 of this act of June 27, 1890, in the Pension Bureau, works grave injustice to the worthy ex-soldier and ex-sailor, and we express the hope that you will not find it inconsistent with your duties as an officer to abrogate this rule and reestablish the principle as defined in rule 164. Under the operation of rule 164, formulated and put into effect soon after the passage of this act, unquestionably responsive to public sentiment and based upon sound legal propositions—in a word, the simple expression of the letter and spirit of the law—400,000 names were added to the pension roll of the Republic, and to which no objection was heard for years after its promulgation."

The other point in the resolution required that the exemption of widows' net income from property be raised to $250, amount allowed by Commissioner Raum under President Harrison. Then followed an address to President McKinley, requesting him to order Evans to comply with the above. Then came the following:

"*Resolved*, That this committee is hereby authorized and directed, in the event that it is determined that relief may not be accorded by the administrative officers of the Government, to present to Congress a request for the amendment of the law in such form as to make certain the true intent of the statute, as we believe it can be constructed as herein presented."

Any Congressman would, on request, have introduced the above bills. But Commander in Chief Shaw and his Grand Army of the Republic committee did not ask it. They took two bills suggested to confirm and approve, against the veterans, Evans's present practice on rating, and to further narrow widows' exemption, and introduced them in the Senate, through Senator GALLINGER. This bill on rating veterans simply added to the word "disability," the plural "disabilities." The present law contains the stronger term "disability," and requires the whole inability to be rated. The whole includes and covers all its parts. The Pension Bureau cares no more for a pension law than a breachy animal cares for a rail fence. This charge against McKinley and Evans has been proved in the American Tribune time and time again, and it stands admitted the country over, and was admitted in the arguments in Congress on this bill. They pretended to be trying to tie the Commissioner down to the law, but they confirmed his Order 225 by passing this amendment without changing the law. That was the whole object, to approve Evans and down the Cincinnati resolutions.

Congressman GARDNER of Michigan said:

"This bill remedies the law as to widows' claims, but I fear that in so far as it is designed to aid in the construction of the law of 1890, by making its operation more liberal toward the veterans, it will be a failure. If you will amend it so that the disabilities shall be rated 'as of service origin,' you will have made the intent of Congress so plain that no Commissioner of Pensions nor board of medical referees can misconstrue it." [Applause.]

Congressman CALDERHEAD said:

"The truth about it is that if the law as it now exists was administered in the spirit in which it was made, was construed by the law department of the Pension Bureau in the spirit in which it was enacted, or was construed by the medical department of that Bureau in the spirit in which it was made, this bill would not be necessary. The truth about it is that if the same rules of evidence applied before that department that apply in any civil court in any civil suit or in any suit in equity, this bill would not be necessary."

It would have been a simple matter to have tried the votes of Congress on Order 164, but that was to be avoided by all means, or Evans would not have been confirmed. They are preparing to get hold of the machinery of next August encampment at Chicago. It is a necessity in a political year, as well as to confirm Evans. Evans is now howling through "editorials," written by him in the Pension Office and published in all the cuckoo and pension-hating newspapers, pretending to denounce the great increase of pension expenditures which these two bills will make. Congressmen are aiding him in his deception. The following was got off in the debate:

"Mr. MADDOX. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

"Mr. DRIGGS. Certainly.

"Mr. MADDOX. I understand you to say that this will increase the appropriation about a million dollars?

"Mr. DRIGGS. I am taking my own estimate; I have nothing to go upon or to base my estimate upon. I am assuming that it will increase it a million dollars. It has been stated by one gentleman before our committee, who appeared before us on behalf of this bill, that it would not increase the pension expenditure one dollar."

There is a frank admission inadvertently made in debate. This amendment on rates will not increase pensions one dollar, because it makes no change in point of law. President McKinley may order Evans to increase just before the elections; but he has now the same law for it, and has had for over three years, or all the time.

Another very important point, and adverse point against veterans in this sham tinkering with the law, is that the amendment is not retroactive and contains no clause saving pending claims. It strikes every claim from the files, and compels claimants to lose all the past time and to file a new claim, which will begin from only the new filing. That is the express language of this section 2 as amended: "Such pension shall commence from the date of filing the application after the passage of this act." The amendment preserves only one of the old dates, and that is the date of widow's marriage, "Shall have married soldier after the passage of the act of June 27, 1890." There is no better settled principle of statutory construction. There can not be two sections 2 and two 3's unless the amendment provides that pending suits or claims shall be adjudicated under the law as it was, and for that purpose continues the law. (86 Tenn., 523; 85 Tenn., 495; 86 Ky., 170; 73 Iowa, 616; 20 Oreg., 394; 82 Ky., 256; 12 Mass., 537; 6 B. Monr. (Ky.), 146; 121 N. Y., 234.) This nonretroactive character of these amendments was admitted by Congressmen in debate. These speeches can not change the amendment from what it is written; but they show the admission, and also a false pretense in connection with it, to cover up what they too late saw was a dangerous admission.

"Mr. BURLESON. How many rejected claimants will this amendment affect?

"Mr. DRIGGS. These cases would not come under this act because they have been turned down. The gentleman will notice that in the wording of the act it says that it does not include pending cases. It is very clear about that. These cases rejected would not come in here.

"I want to say another thing, that under this act there is absolutely no chance whatever for any arrearages—that is, any extensive arrearages. There has been some complaint made in the daily press that a bill of this character would provide for the granting of arrearages. I will leave it to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAFF] if it is not true that under this bill there will be no arrearages?

"Mr. GRAFF. Practically none.

"Mr. DRIGGS. Of course in pending cases I concede there may be some."

Now, the false pretense in the above lies in pretending that there might be a little increase in the pending claims. Why a little? There are 94,017 invalid claims pending under this section 2; some of them are many years old. If it carries a little increase to them, how does it carry a big increase to new claims? And how far back on pending claims does it take the increase? Who is to judge? Is Evans? Why not let him write the law in each claim to suit his notion? The admission, to its full extent, was correct. It not only cuts off increase on pending claims, but renders them null and void and leaves them without any law to support them. The clauses are the same in the original act as to pending claims under other laws; and it was held that such pending claimants must file a new claim to commence from date of filing, not from date of prior pending claim.

The real issue is well stated in an article which appeared in the National Tribune under date of October 12, 1899, entitled:

IT GOES MUCH DEEPER.

The fight against the maladministration of the Pension Bureau is not all, by any means, of the present struggle. The pension question is simply the most salient feature of the issue as to whether the veterans of the war of the rebellion are back numbers, to receive no further consideration as a factor in public life. If they can be treated with impunity as they are being treated with regard to pensions, if they can not properly resent the wholesale defamation and depreciation poured out on them by the Commissioner of Pensions, their personality has lost its power and their hands their cunning. They need not be considered any longer for public office or employment, and they can take themselves to their dusty shelves and be forgotten.

But inasmuch as there are something like 800,000 veterans alive, and most of them have sons and sons-in-law, we think that the politicians who are calculating that they have "at last got through with the old soldiers" are liable to awake to their mistake with a shock.

To conclude, attention is invited to the information and suggestions, expressed and implied, contained in an article in the National Tribune under date of November 16, 1899.

NOT TO BE SHELVED JUST YET.

We invite the earnest attention of aspiring politicians who are fondly cherishing the delusion that the "old soldier business is at last played out," to the following table of the number of probable survivors of the war of the rebellion, prepared for the years named by Gen. F. C. Ainsworth, the Chief of the Record and Pension Division of the War Department:

1899	1,032,418	1909	665,832
1900	999,339	1910	636,231
1901	965,313	1915	429,727
1902	930,380	1920	251,727
1903	894,585	1925	116,073
1904	858,002	1930	37,033
1905	820,687	1935	6,296
1906	782,722	1940	340
1907	744,196	1945	0
1908	705,197		

This is exclusive of all deserters and men dishonorably discharged, and is as nearly an accurate and official report of the number of surviving ex-soldiers as anything short of a formal census enumeration can be.

Therefore, next year, as far as anybody can tell, there will be nearly 1,000,000 veterans still alive. They not only control their own votes, but each one of them can strongly influence that of one or more sons and sons-in-law.

In brief, then, the veterans are still the strongest political element in the country, and if they stand together upon matters affecting their interests, they can control the elections of Representatives in Congress and even of President of the United States.

This is a matter for comrades to think over and discuss among themselves. Let them measure up quietly their own strength in each community, and do a little figuring on the basis of the returns of the recent elections as to how a solid soldier vote would have changed things. They can do this in a non-partisan way, for the younger politicians of all parties are alike anxious to shelve the veterans and get rid of their claims to office, employment, and pensions.

Self-preservation is the first law of nature, and veterans can not be blamed for resisting the efforts of greedy politicians to crowd them off the earth.

Trusts.

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS M. JETT,

OF ILLINOIS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, June 2, 1900.

The House having under consideration the bill (H. R. 10539) to amend an act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890—

Mr. JETT said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I am going to support the pending bill, the title of which is "A bill to amend an act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that I am going to support this bill. I mean by that, I will support it provided I can not get anything better.

These amendments to the original anti-trust act of July 2, 1890, are perhaps a little more stringent than the original act itself. I would much prefer the amendments to this act of July 2, 1890, that have been offered by my friend Judge TERRY.

In my judgment, the House will make a great mistake if it refuses to accept the amendments that have been offered by the minority of the Judiciary Committee. If the majority party in this House are desirous of enacting legislation for the purpose of protecting the rights and interests of the people against the unlawful and illegal monopolies, then they should be willing to accept the pending amendments offered on the part of the minority of the Judiciary Committee by Judge TERRY.

From our experience and observation of what the trusts have done and are doing, it seems to me that it should be considered a great pleasure to each and every member of this House to have an opportunity to strike a blow at these deadly foes of human liberty and despoilers of the happiness of mankind.

Mr. Speaker, it is no longer a question in the minds of the people as to whether or not there are trusts and monopolies abroad in the land. There are many who can rise up and bear witness to the great evils they have done and oppression they have brought. Their presence is known and their direful effects have been severely felt and experienced during the last few years throughout the length and breadth of every State in this Union. They exist under different names and have different titles, but yet have a common purpose—the monopoly of manufacture, the monopoly of production, and the destruction of competition as well as the control of the cost to the consumer and user of articles of necessity and of common use.

Mr. Speaker, if I will be permitted, as I did not have an opportunity on yesterday to address myself to the joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States ostensibly for the purpose to amend the Federal Constitution that more stringent legislation might be had by which the trusts could be regulated, I will for a brief time during this debate make some remarks concerning that joint resolution then under discussion.

In the first place, Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that from the action of our Republican friends it seems to me, and I believe will be so understood by the American people, that they are only trifling with this question as well as with the people who are and have been suffering by the hands of the great monopolies. Now, in support of what I have said and to prove that I am correct, it is only necessary to refer to the action of our Republican brethren in relation to this matter. It will be remembered that the Committee on Rules, a committee of which the Speaker is one, and who usually controls those on the committee that are of his same political faith, never brought in a rule for the consideration of the joint resolution until after they had first brought in a resolution and passed it through this House to adjourn.

You gentlemen on that side are not acting in good faith about this matter, judging you from your actions. You first fix a day to adjourn and then bring in a rule to consider a constitutional amendment. I am sorry to see you trifling so with the proud and patriotic people of our country, who are hoping and praying for relief from the soulless corporations and monopolies. By first fixing the time for adjournment, before giving the people's representatives an opportunity to legislate upon this important question, you knew it could not pass both branches of Congress. You are playing into the hands of the trusts. These acts of yours indicate very strongly that you are the agents of the monopolies.

Mr. Speaker, if the majority party of this House were wanting to legislate in opposition to the trusts, why did you wait until you had fixed upon an hour of adjournment before you would take up the constitutional amendment for consideration? This act of our Republican friends is in keeping with what they have been doing for the trusts during the last three years.

Mr. Speaker, when the people are being robbed of the fruits of their toil, I rise above party interest and party prejudice to defend and protect their interests. I represent a constituency of honest and patriotic people. I protect their rights alike, Democrats and Republicans and Populists and all parties. I would not so far forget myself and become so narrow-minded and partisan as to want to legislate only for those that are of my political way of believing. I want relief against these great combinations, formed for private gain, for all my people, regardless of their political affiliations.

Now, further, Mr. Speaker, no one who is in favor of legislation to suppress the power of the trusts would dare think of supporting the joint resolution for an amendment to the Constitution that you brought in here yesterday. It appears that it was drawn with the view of making it so bad that no one who was anxious for anti-trust legislation would support it. By this resolution you propose that power should absolutely be taken away from the States to legislate in opposition to the trusts. No one who is anxious for legislation that the people may be relieved from this octopus would ever sanction any measure that would absolutely destroy the right and power of the State to legislate upon the subject of trusts and monopolies.

We all know that what enforcement of anti-trust laws has been had was under State legislation. There are one or two States in the Union that have enacted drastic laws upon this subject to such an extent that they have been able to largely control the action of the trusts, and one of these States is the great State of Texas, whose anti-trust law was held to be constitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Why, then, do you seek to authorize a constitutional amendment that will take away from the State the right to legislate in opposition to trusts? This is in effect what your constitutional amendment amounts to. Again, Mr. Speaker, has the Attorney-General of the United States undertaken to use the power that is given in the act of June 2, 1890, to suppress these great evils? The answer comes from every source in the negative. If the Attorney-General had taken hold of this matter when he should, in my humble judgment, the people would not be bearing the burdens that have become more burdensome daily.

Who has tried to enforce the law during the present Administration in opposition to these trusts? Whose duty is it to see that the Federal laws are administered? It is the duty of the Attorney-General, under and by the direction of the Chief Executive of the United States, to see that the laws are duly administered and enforced. And I ask the gentlemen on the floor of this House to name any one instance in which the Attorney-General of the United States has filed a complaint in opposition to the trusts and with a view of suppressing them.

Nay, gentlemen, you may search the records of all of the courts of the entire country, and in no one case will you find that upon the docket. This is the reputation of the Republican party in relation to trusts. This is where the party stands that have brought in a resolution for a constitutional amendment that is so vicious in its provisions that anyone who desires to relieve the people of their burdens could not support.

Nor is this all, Mr. Speaker. We find that the Committee on Rules have brought in a rule, and it has been adopted by the majority party of this House, in which it is provided that there shall be no amendments to this joint resolution. You gentlemen who are responsible for this resolution being before this House bring in a rule with it for its protection in this, that you refuse to permit any amendment even being offered to it. It seems that you gentlemen on that side of the House are determined to stand up for the trusts. Your determination is so strong that when you bring in a resolution for a constitutional amendment you bring in also a rule to prohibit the offering of any amendments. Do you think you are going to fool anybody? Do you think that the people of this country can be hoodwinked in such a manner as you are attempting at this time? You must have very little confidence in the ability of the people to discern right from wrong.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the American people know what it means to have stalking abroad in this land such enemies to them. I can say, answering for my people, that they are in opposition to such false and vicious legislation that is being attempted here. I can say for the people whom I have the honor of representing upon this floor that they are not only with me in opposition to such a vicious matter, that is calculated to protect the trusts and illegal combinations, as this resolution for amendment to the Federal Constitution, but that they will stand by me in my fight for legislation that will curb the power of all these unlawful combinations that are sapping the very substance from the life of our people.

Mr. JOHNSTON. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. JETT. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Is there any probability of the bill under consideration, in your judgment, passing both Houses of Congress?

Mr. JETT. No; it is not intended by our Republican brethren that this bill now under consideration shall become a law. If it had been intended to have any effective anti-trust legislation, the leaders of the Republican party would not have waited until the hour of adjournment had been fixed before they would have brought in a rule to consider this measure.

Mr. LITTLE. If the Republican party had desired the passage of anti-trust legislation, would it not have been considered earlier in the session?

Mr. JETT. Certainly; the time for consideration is put off until they fix a time to adjourn, showing there can be no legislation in opposition to trusts.

Mr. Speaker, I have said all I desire to say concerning the joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States. I now desire to refer again to the present bill under consideration for a few moments. What has been the history of the trusts with reference to the rapidity of their organization within the last three years? Never in the history of any country has there been an annual production of legalized monopolies equal to the last year's crop—that is, for the year 1899. It is charged,

and reliably so, that 2,000 corporations were chartered and authorized to issue capital stock to the amount of three and one-half billions. This will be substantiated by an examination of the records of the department of state of New Jersey.

As I am informed by reliable sources, 200 of these corporations are each capitalized at two millions and upward. One hundred of the charters granted for the year were given to absolute trusts. Fifteen thousand trusts, combinations, and other corporations in every section of America are being operated under the liberal laws for the organization of such concerns, of New Jersey. Upward of 200 of these are, in the language of the New York Journal, "simon-pure trusts, organized for the purpose of controlling absolutely various products and enterprises." Of course there have been incorporated under the laws of New Jersey several other concerns of which I will not here speak.

Mr. Speaker, the following list shows the concerns having an authorized capital of $2,000,000 or more, each chartered during the fiscal year from November, 1898, to November, 1899, and a large percentage of which number are entitled to be placed in the category of trusts:

Federal Steel Company	$200,000,000
Distilling Company of America	125,000,000
Standard Oil Company	110,000,000
American Steel and Wire Company	90,000,000
American Bicycle Company	80,000,000
National Tube Company	80,000,000
Continental Tobacco Company	75,000,000
Amalgamated Copper Company	75,000,000
American Hide and Leather Company	70,000,000
United States Worsted Company	70,000,000
American Smelting and Refining Company	65,000,000
American Woolen Company	65,000,000
American Ice Company	60,000,000
American Foundry Company	60,000,000
National Steel Company	59,000,000
Republic Iron and Steel Company	55,000,000
Rubber Goods Manufacturing Company	50,000,000
American Tin Plate Company	50,000,000
American Cereal Company	33,000,000
American Linseed Company	33,500,000
American Plumbing Supply and Lead Company	35,000,000
American Steel Hoop Company	33,000,000
National Enameling and Stamping Company	30,000,000
United States Cast Iron Pipe and Foundry Company	30,000,000
American Shipbuilding Company	30,000,000
Kentucky Distilleries Company	32,000,000
American Alkali Company	30,000,000
Scott-Janney Electric Company	30,000,000
Asphalt Company of America	30,000,000
New York Vehicle and Transportation Company	25,000,000
Pressed Steel Car Company	25,000,000
Union Bag and Paper Company	27,000,000
International Steam Pump Company	27,500,000
New England Electric Vehicle Company	25,000,000
Electric Company of America	25,000,000
American Railways Company	25,000,000
United States Flour Milling Company	25,000,000
National Electric Company	25,000,000
Illinois Electric Vehicle Transportation Company	25,000,000
American Writing Paper Company	25,000,000
Electric Axle Light and Power Company	25,000,000
United States Shoe Company	25,000,000
National Tin Plate and Stamped Ware Company	20,000,000
Federal Printing Ink Company	20,000,000
Sloss-Sheffield Steel and Iron Company	20,000,000
General Carriage Company	20,000,000
Havana Construction Company	20,000,000
International Silver Company	20,000,000
Royal Baking Powder Company	20,000,000
United Electric Company of America	20,000,000
American Beet Sugar Company	20,000,000
United Fruit Company	20,000,000
Havana Commercial Company	20,000,000
Consolidated Street Car Company	18,000,000
Indo-Egyptian Compress Company	15,000,000
Compressed Gas Capsule Company	15,000,000
National Light and Power Company	15,000,000
Sedatine Chemical Company	15,000,000
Continental Compressed Air Company	15,000,000
International Car Wheel Company	15,000,000
United States and Havana Cigar Company	15,000,000
Central Foundry Company	15,000,000
National Salt Company	12,000,000
American Power and Transportation Company	12,500,000
Kern Incandescent Gas Light Company	12,000,000
United Lighting and Heating Company	12,000,000
Edison Portland Cement Company	11,000,000
Otis Elevator Company	11,000,000
New England Cotton Yarn Company	11,500,000
American Switch Company	11,000,000
American Radiator Company	10,000,000
Park Steel Company	10,000,000
American Brick Company	10,000,000
Continental Cement Company	10,000,000
American School Furniture Company	10,000,000
Electric Boat Company	10,000,000
Havana Electric Railway Company	10,000,000
Union Match Company	10,000,000
Woods Motor Vehicle Company	10,000,000
Consolidated Rubber Tire Company	10,000,000
International Smokeless Powder Company	10,000,000
Spanish-American Mining Company	10,000,000
Railways General Company	10,000,000
Century Development Company	10,000,000
New York Auto-Truck Company	10,000,000
National Carbon Company	10,000,000
People Realty and Finance Company	10,000,000
American Chicle Company (chewing-gum trust)	$9,000,000
Boston Breweries Company	9,750,000
Niles-Bement-Pond Company	8,000,000
Pennsylvania Sugar Refining Company	8,000,000
Bevery Process Company	7,500,000
Essex and Hudson Gas Company	6,500,000
International Air Power Company	7,000,000
United Zinc and Lead Company	6,000,000
Continental Cotton Oil Company	6,000,000
Manufactured Rubber Company	6,000,000
Washington Electric Vehicle Transportation Company	6,000,000
United Starch Company	6,000,000
United Electric Vehicle Company	7,000,000
Guggenheimer Exploration Company	6,000,000
Mexican Land Company	6,000,000
Delaware River and Atlantic Railroad Company	6,000,000
Newark Consolidated Gas Company	6,000,000
Passaic Gas and Electric Company	5,000,000
Xelton Manufacturing Company	5,000,000
Mexican Coal and Coke Company	5,000,000
United Asphalt Company	5,000,000
Great Lakes Towing Company	5,000,000
Alabama Consolidated Coal and Iron Company	5,000,000
American Sterilized Air Company	6,000,000
Reynolds Tobacco Company	5,000,000
Lewis Motor Vehicle Company	5,000,000
North Star Mines Company	5,000,000
Montana Coal and Coke Company	5,000,000
Pacific American Fisheries Company	5,000,000
Helvetia Copper Company	5,000,000
Empire Steel and Iron Company	5,000,000
American Felt Company	5,000,000
Chicago Warehouse Company	4,000,000
Crystal Lake Ice Company	4,000,000
National Cash Register Company	3,750,000
Arcadian Copper Company	3,750,000
Isle Royal Copper Company	3,750,000
Columbia Refrigerating Company	3,000,000
Maritime Improvement Company	3,000,000
Columbia Automobile Company	3,000,000
Acker Process Company	3,000,000
International Automobile Tire Company	3,000,000
American Ginning Company	5,000,000
Goodson Graphotype Company	5,000,000
United States Glucose Company	5,000,000
Columbia Electric Vehicle Company	5,000,000
Pacific Coast Biscuit Company	4,000,000
White Line Traction Company	4,000,000
American Pastry Company	3,000,000
Cotton Oil and Fiber Company	3,000,000
Atlantic Clay Company	3,000,000
Cuban Steel Ore Company	3,000,000
Paterson Brewing and Malting Company	3,000,000
United States Finishing Company	3,000,000
New York and Hoboken Ferry Company	3,500,000
Werner Printing Company	3,500,000
Union Copper Mining Company	3,000,000
Birdsboro Iron and Steel Company	3,000,000
National Nutrient Company	3,000,000
Tacoma Railway and Power Company	2,000,000
Trenton Gas and Electric Company	2,000,000
Bill Posting Sign Company	2,000,000
Umbrella Hardware Company	2,000,000
Southern Light and Traction Company	2,500,000
Baltimore Brick Company	2,100,000
National Fuel Saving Company	2,000,000
Fireproof Matting and Rug Company	2,000,000
Atlas Mining Company	2,000,000
Tractor-Truck Automobile Company	2,500,000
United States Ship and Pile Coppering Company	2,000,000
Cumberland Coal and Coke Company	2,000,000
General Power Company	2,000,000
Lee Tweedy Company	2,000,000
United States Bobbin and Shuttle Company	2,000,000
American Cement Company	2,160,000
Interstate Oil Company	2,200,000
Oxide Copper Company	5,000,000
Acker Process Patent Company	2,000,000
Mutual Mercantile Agency	2,000,000
American Incandescent Light Company	2,000,000
Fire-Proofine Company	2,000,000
American Linen Fiber Company	2,000,000
Metropolitan Water Filter Company	2,000,000
Empire Chemical Company	2,000,000
Minneapolis General Electric Company	2,100,000

Mr. Speaker, from an examination of the above all will necessarily be compelled to admit that there exists within the United States a great many combines formed for the purpose of private gain and which are exceedingly dangerous to the well-being of the people and of the free institutions of the United States. It will further be admitted that when these unlawful combinations are permitted to carry out their purposes, as they have been doing recently, they become oppressive and interfere with labor and legitimate enterprises. Here are some of the effects experienced by the people of these illegal combinations.

I desire to show to the members of this House the increase of many articles, which increase has been brought about by the influences of the trusts. We find since the trusts have been in operation, within the last three years, that builders' hardware has increased from 45 to 70 per cent; iron beds, from 35 to 65 per cent; brass castings, 33⅓ per cent; barbed wire, 88 per cent, and in this connection I desire to say that the farmers of this country who use barbed wire for fencing are compelled to pay 88 per cent more than foreigners are compelled to pay for the same class of wire.

This is a direct result experienced by our people daily of the trusts. Brooms have increased within the last six months from 40 to 50 cents a dozen; rubber belting has increased within the

last year 33⅓ per cent; brass wire, from 75 to 85 per cent; carpets, 16 to 20 per cent; flannels, 10 per cent; glassware, 40 per cent; window glass, 50 per cent; hardware, 45 per cent; wrought iron, 100 per cent; iron for horseshoes, 40 per cent; cotton linings, 12 to 15 per cent; oil, 20 to 80 per cent; lumber, other than oak, 25 per cent; oak lumber, 33⅓ per cent; nails, 115 per cent; water buckets, 50 per cent; steel for horseshoes, 100 per cent; tin plates, 75 per cent; tinware, from 20 to 500 per cent; wooden tubs, 50 per cent; t n, 95 to 100 per cent; wall paper, 50 to 80 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, these are a few of the numerous articles that have been increased in cost to the consumers and users of such articles, brought about by the formation of monopolies. Every man engaged in the tilling of the soil, or in one of the various pursuits in life, when he goes to purchase these things he feels directly the effects of these unlawful institutions. These illustrations come home to our people daily, and when they understand the situation, as I believe they will, they will loudly condemn these illegal concerns.

It has, Mr. Speaker, come to this, that the farmer and the laborer have got to strike a blow in their own necessary self-defense unless the cost price on the various articles which they are necessarily compelled to have will become so burdensome that they can not afford the necessaries and conveniences of life. It is these people whom I have in mind and for whom I desire redress. It is these people that I am more directly representing upon this floor, and I hope to secure that character of legislation that will be for the benefit of them, so that they will be better enabled to provide for themselves and for those that depend upon them.

Mr. Speaker, every time an article is purchased by one of our people, especially those things that are more generally used and which we are all compelled to have, the effect of these illegal organizations is felt, and this, in my judgment, is an argument against the policy of the present Administration for its failure to even undertake the enforcement of what is known as the "Sherman anti-trust law." I know it is claimed by some that this is prosperity, but this character of prosperity that builds up and amasses great fortunes at the expense and to the detriment of what the lamented Lincoln called the common people is unjust and I say outrageous.

And along this line, Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that the amendment that has been offered and is now pending, which provides that nothing in this act can be construed so as to apply to trades unions and other labor organizations organized for the purpose of regulating wages, hours of labor, etc., should meet with the approval of this House, and the failure of our Republican friends to provide the proper safeguards for these organizations is in keeping with their past history in dealing with these industrial questions. It may be insisted, of course, that no one would think of saying that this act would be held to include them; but, judging the future by the past, it would be exceedingly unsafe for the interests of the farmer and the laborer to have this bill adopted without this provision.

My distinguished friend Judge TERRY has requested me to investigate the RECORD during the consideration of the Sherman Act and to see what was said by the then advocates of that bill. I will say for the information of the House that I found that when the Sherman Act was up for consideration that Senator George, of Mississippi, and Senator TELLER, of Colorado, raised the question that the provisions of that bill would affect the Farmers' Alliance, Knights of Labor, and kindred organizations organized for the purpose of raising the price of products and increasing the wages for labor.

It was claimed by Senator Sherman that no one would think of making the provisions of that bill apply to these organizations. He said that the bill did not interfere in the slightest degree with voluntary associations made to affect public opinion to advance the interests of a particular trade or occupation, but we all know that the "Sherman law," notwithstanding what the Senator had said, was invoked for the very purpose that Senator Sherman had disclaimed that it would be. In this act similar provisions are found on this point as in the act of 1890.

This is the reason why this side of the House are in favor of the amendment in question. Now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I wish I could speak with that confidence that I could if I knew it was the intention of the party in power to adopt this legislation before the adjournment of Congress. There is too much vagueness surrounding this entire matter. I am afraid that this bill will not be passed through the Senate and receive the sanction of the President at this session. My desire for the relief of my people, whom I know are bearing these burdens, is such that I feel that legislation of this character should not be attempted or be had for political purposes, but that it should be considered as a serious matter, which it is, and be enacted without division.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the amendments may be adopted and this bill passed.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to append a letter sent by the Anti-Trust League, reading as follows; also editorial in Verdict of August 7, 1899, and constitution of Anti-Trust League:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 2, 1900.*

Hon. T. M. JETT,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR SIR: In view of the discussion of proposed anti-trust legislation now going on in the House, I beg leave to suggest to you three or four points that should be included in any legislation enacted upon this subject, as follows:

First. That the President of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to offer a reward of not less than $10,000 or more than $200,000 to any person or persons who shall furnish evidence that will lead to the arrest or conviction of any person or persons guilty of a violation of the Federal anti-trust law or of the interstate-commerce law, and whatever moneys are required for the execution of these statutes are hereby appropriated from any funds available in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated.

Second. That any individual or combination of individuals, corporation or combination of corporations who shall be engaged in an effort to establish or who shall have established a partial or complete monopoly in the control of any line of business or industry in the United States shall be and are hereby prohibited the use of the United States mail.

Third. That any person or combination of persons, corporation or combination of corporations who shall engage in destructive competition, upon conviction thereof shall be liable to a fine of not less than $10,000 for each offense and imprisonment of not less than one year. The words "in destructive competition" in this act shall be construed to mean the offering for sale of any articles or article of commerce at a price below the cost of production or manufacture for the purpose of destroying competition and establishing a monopoly.

Fourth. Inasmuch as equality of rates in transportation charges of all shippers is an absolute necessity for the securing of freedom of trade and commerce among the people of the United States and various States, and as the private monopoly of the public highways, such as railways, telephones, telegraphs, and pipe lines, inevitably lead to criminal discrimination in favor of those individuals or corporations which control great wealth, and against the interests of the masses of the people, therefore immediate steps shall be taken by the Government of the United States to secure the Government ownership and operation of all railways, telegraphs, telephones, and pipe lines.

Fifth. Upon the complaint of any citizen or citizens the Attorney-General of the United States and all district attorneys of the United States are hereby directed to institute proceedings against any person or combination of persons, corporation or combination of corporations, who are charged with a violation of the Federal statutes against the organization or operation of trusts.

H. B. MARTIN,
National Secretary, American Anti-Trust League.

THE BANK TRUST—THE NEWEST AND GREATEST—TO OVERLORD ALL OTHER TRUSTS.

[Alfred Henry Lewis's editorial in the Verdict, August 7, 1899.]

Here be true news. This is a grave story. It is one of even, near concern to small and great. Let it come unshod of simile, unbusked of imagery or rhetoric, unclouded of any mists of metaphor. In Wall street as this is read the giant trust of all is forming. It is to collect within itself the banks of New York City. Its core is to be Standard Oil. Its moving spirits are John Rockefeller and Pierpont Morgan.

With them in full and close association are the Rothschilds and their American agents. It was to link the Rothschilds to the scheme that of late took Morgan Europeward and brought him back again. This trust, at its consummation, which is close, will pull the reins of guidance and crack the whip of domination over $2,000,000,000. It will, as stated, be a muster of the New York City banks. They are to be made into one force—unified and brought under one word and one command. Thereafter they are to say "No" together or "Yes" together, or together stand motionless and mute. This trust of the banks is to be the dictator trust; to overlord all other trusts. The greatest among these latter will be dwarfed as they stand beside it. We, the people, are to become the subjects of bank conquest and suffer the feudalism of money. This bank trust is to be our William of Normandy. New York City is to be its Hastings without a blow. It will have, as it were, a Doomsday book, and the country is to be parceled among its followers.

This is a true tale. There is neither guess nor fancy in its telling. Naught but the bald facts are set forth. This trust expects to hold the nation in the hollow of its hand. Their plan is to be the grand bank of the United States; issue at the last its money and have custody of its credit. In a cruder day Jackson defeated a parallel conspiracy; crushed beneath his stern heel the head of a similar serpent.

With this difference: That was a python of seven and one-half millions, a baby and plaything to the one in hand. Now are we to confront a serpent of two billions, or one two hundred and fifty times as large. At a time, too, when the Jacksons seem gone from our midst. For a century and a quarter there has been liberty in this land. For a century and a quarter Europe, pointing to America, whether in hate or love, was driven to say with Job: "There the wicked cease from troubling; there the weary be at rest! There the prisoners rest together; they hear not the voice of the oppressor! The small and the great are there, and the servant is free from his master!"

Once this trust of the banks, and Europe will say this no more. There will none to give tongue to it. The fact of freedom will have departed, the song would be a lie. In that day of gilded, narrow fetters, the spirit of true Americanism will be crippled, bent, and broken. A sightless Samson, it will grind in the mills of the Philistines. It will long for destruction, and dig for death as for treasures that lie hid.

Standard Oil is to be the heart of this bank trust. There is one known thing of Standard Oil. Its minimum profits are at least forty millions yearly. How much more they be is the jealous secret of Standard Oil, and none may pierce it. As stated, as captain constructors of this bank trust are Rockefeller, Morgan, and the Rothschilds. They will go to New Jersey for organization. That State has grown the Morocco of America. Its statutes are the merest shipyards to build and launch and outfit these trust pirates of commerce. New Jersey, to be consistent, should adopt the black flag as its banner. It should float the Jolly Roger, with skull and crossbones, from the dome staff of its capitol. Once this trust of the banks is afloat, it will have beneath its pennant every bank in New York. They must join or be destroyed. The old killing Standard Oil method will suffice for this. Then it will extend itself. Every bank in the country will become its gillie. There will be no limit to its sway. Its powers will find their last extension in the frontiers of the possible. It will loose and unloose credit. It will fix the price of money and censor the markets to the last item of value. It will pick up the national debt and hold the country between its thumb and finger. It will demand bonds and get them, or it will force payment for them. It will stand at the spigot of loans. It will flow money on or off at its selfish

interest or caprice. All other businesses will sit like beggars at its gates. It will be the Dives of trade, and commerce will become its Lazarus. If it likes you, you may have money; if it hates you, your ruin is within its reach.

In short, controlling, as it will, the tides of credit in their ebb or flow, this bank trust will rule the mart. An autocrat, it will respond to nothing but itself. There will be none greater, none stronger. Congresses will exist by its consent and Presidents wait, hat in hand, for its orders. It will have power of life and death in business; to lift up or strike down, to plant or uproot. Between the upper and nether millstones of its operations all men are to be ground, and all will be grist to its hopper. Elections will be at its mercy. It will produce in office its own paid, sworn follower. It will draw within the train of its control every element of government. You may change your White House every four years, your Congress every two; yet once this trust of the banks be rooted you will never change your ruler. You will bow eternally before this never-dying, changeless dynasty of money.

CONSTITUTION.

NAME.

SECTION 1. The name of this organization shall be The American Anti-Trust League.

MEMBERSHIP.

SEC. 2. Any American citizen of character and qualifications satisfactory to a majority of the members of the local league, who subscribes to and pledges his support to the principles of this organization, is eligible to membership.

LOCAL LEAGUES.

SEC. 3. Local leagues may be formed in any town, township, or city, and shall be composed of not less than five members.

COUNTY LEAGUES.

SEC. 4. County leagues may be formed of delegates from five or more local leagues.

STATE LEAGUES.

SEC. 5. The local leagues in any State may form a State league on such a basis of representation as will best suit the convenience of the members within the State.

NATIONAL LEAGUE.

SEC. 6. Until the first national convention is held the national league shall consist of the national committee, the national executive committee, and the national officers. Thereafter the national league shall be composed of delegates elected by popular vote of the members in each State.

SEC. 7. Each State shall be entitled to one delegate to the national league, and one additional delegate for each 500 members or major fraction thereof.

SEC. 8. The election for delegates to the national league shall be held at such times, places, and in such manner as may be prescribed by the national committee.

OFFICERS.

SEC. 9. The officers of the national league shall consist of a national president, one national vice-president from each State and Territory and the District of Columbia, a national treasurer, a national secretary, a national recording and corresponding secretary, a national financial secretary, a national committee of three members from each State and Territory and the District of Columbia, and a national executive committee, to be appointed by the president, consisting of 15, of which the president, secretary, and financial secretary and treasurer shall be members, 5 of whom shall constitute a quorum. Said committee shall appoint a ways and means committee of 7, whose duty it shall be to raise funds to carry on the work of the league.

All vacancies in national offices shall be filled by the executive committee.

MEETINGS.

SEC. 10. The local leagues shall hold at least one meeting in each month, and oftener if necessary or convenient. The county and State leagues shall hold at least one meeting in each year. The national league shall meet at least once every two years.

SEC. 11. Special meetings may be called by the president of local leagues upon a written request of 25 per cent of its members, by the president of county leagues upon the written request of 25 per cent of the local leagues in his county, by the president of State leagues upon the written request of 25 per cent of the county leagues of the State, and by the national president upon the written request of 25 per cent of the State leagues.

CERTIFICATES OF AFFILIATION.

SEC. 12. Certificates of affiliation with the American Anti-Trust League will be issued by the national league to the local, county, and State leagues, whenever the organization of such league is effected, upon written application to the national league.

DUES.

SEC. 13. The membership fee in this league shall be $1—50 cents to the local league and 50 cents to the national league; not less than 25 cents to be paid at admission and balance quarterly: *Provided*, That local leagues shall have power to remit payment of the fee by any applicants for membership. The local, county, and State leagues may charge such membership dues as will suit the convenience of their body. Aside from its one-half of the admission fee, the national league will depend upon voluntary contributions for such necessary expenses as are connected with the spreading of the principles of the organization.

BY-LAWS.

SEC. 14. Local, county, and State leagues may adopt such by-laws, not inconsistent with this constitution, as will facilitate the work of the organization in their respective jurisdictions.

DUTIES OF OFFICERS.

SEC. 15. The duties of the national officers shall be as follows: The president of the national league shall preside at all meetings of the league, act as executive head of the organization, appoint all national organizers, with power to remove with consent of the executive committee. In case of his absence or disability, one of the vice-presidents shall be selected by the executive committee to act in his place.

SEC. 16. The national vice-presidents shall act as chief organizers of the State leagues, and shall appoint a chief organizer for each county, and the county organizer shall appoint such organizers for the subdivisions of his county as will be required to further the work of the league.

SEC. 17. The duties of the secretaries, treasurer, and executive committee will be such as usually devolve upon similar officers in all organized bodies.

SEC. 18. The executive committee shall require of the treasurer and financial secretary bonds, to be approved by said committee, for the faithful performance of their duties, in such sums as shall make secure the handling of all funds of the organization.

SEC. 19. The local, county, and State officers shall have similar duties to perform in their respective leagues.

REPORTS.

SEC. 20. The local, county, and State leagues, through their presidents and secretaries shall, on the 1st day of each month, report to the national president and secretary the names and total number of members added to or dropped from the organization during the preceding month; also reports of the state of the warfare between the people and the trusts in their locality; full reports of the organization of new trusts and of the operations of those already in existence, together with copies of existing anti-trust laws and any new legislation proposed against them; as full reports as possible of court decisions and trials or labor troubles involving a conflict between the people and any of the trusts. These reports shall also include a record of the official conduct of all national, State, and municipal officers, both legislative, executive, and judicial. The national league will report to the people a correct and carefully prepared summary of these records as rapidly as they are accumulated.

SEC. 21. This constitution may be amended by a majority of the votes cast in a referendum vote of the membership; an amendment proposed by at least five State leagues must be submitted for such a vote.

The executive committee shall temporarily appoint the vice-presidents and the national committeemen, and the delegates in the conference assembled shall make recommendations to the committee for this purpose; and the vice-presidents so appointed shall, as soon as advisable, call a State league for the purpose of electing their successors and perfecting the State organization. The vice-presidents so appointed shall hold their places until their offices are filled by the State league and the national officers until the national league fills their places.

Indian Appropriation Bill—Conference Report.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN J. FITZGERALD,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, May 24, 1900.

The House having under consideration the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7433) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes—

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York said:

Mr. SPEAKER: The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. LITTLE] has submitted to the House a letter from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, W. A. Jones. It is addressed to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. LITTLE] and is dated "Washington, March 14, 1900." The letter has the caption in the following words:

Memorandum with reference to the speech of Hon. JOHN J. FITZGERALD, of New York, as it appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 1, 1900.

I have examined this letter, Mr. Speaker, with much care and with greater indignation. Such a paper emanating from another source would not, perhaps, require other comment than an expression of contempt for its author. Coming from an official of this Government—the head of the Indian Bureau—I can not permit its statements to go unchallenged, nor its author to escape just rebuke.

This letter is one of the most remarkable documents that, in my opinion, has ever been issued by a public official in this country. It is teeming with misstatements. Evidently it is intended to mislead. Did the Commissioner merely distort the remarks submitted by me when this bill was under consideration in this House I might easily be content to permit just and fair-minded men to judge and to properly characterize his action by the record as it would then be. But this Commissioner has not merely done that. In an apparent delirium of recklessness for truth and decency, he has done much more. The speech to which his letter refers was an honest and unbiased discussion of the Government's ability to accommodate during the coming fiscal year the pupils in the contract schools. It may have appealed to him as neither sound nor conclusive; but it was addressed to the reasons and not to the passions of men. Unable to make an effective answer to it, however, the Commissioner, in a vain effort to justify his position, has attempted to place in hostile array men of different religions, which, if successful, would have aroused the most bitter, most dangerous, and the most destructive passions of men. This letter is a covert, contemptible, and despicable attack and slur upon the missionary work so long done by the people of a particular faith. It is a scandalous, although indirect, reflection on the Catholic missions of this country, unjustifiable, unworthy, and constituting a disgraceful abuse of official power. Not daring to reflect directly upon these missions, this Commissioner, in what apparently seemed a safe and diplomatic manner, has given expression to his bitterness against them.

When an official occupying a responsible position in this Government so abuses his official power as to do manifest injustice to

the memories of men whose fame is entwined with the glory of this country and to grossly insult 12,000,000 of its most devoted citizens, as this Commissioner has done, it is not only proper, but every consideration of decency and justice demands that his slanderous charges be refuted and that he be confounded with the proof that his statements are both inaccurate and unjust.

The Commissioner opens his statement in these words:

Mr. FITZGERALD introduced an amendment to reestablish the contract-school system.

This statement is absolutely false. The Commissioner knew it to be false when he made it. Stated in similar words by another unfamiliar with the facts it might be taken as a careless or inaccurate use of language. Contrasted with other statements made by the Commissioner in this letter, it only permits the conclusion that it is made for the purpose of deceiving those unfamiliar with the system and the legislation affecting it during the past few years.

Since its inception, the contract school system has never been abolished. It is in existence to-day. It will cease, it is true, with the termination of the present fiscal year; but that does not justify the language of the commissioner, which was evidently deliberately used to convey an erroneous impression.

When the Indian appropriation bill was under consideration in this House I submitted an amendment, the text of which follows:

After the word "Alaska," in line 14, page 45, insert the following:

"*Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior may make contracts with present contract schools for the education of Indian pupils during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, but shall only make such contracts at places where the Government has not provided school facilities for all the children of school age residing thereat, and to an extent not exceeding the number of children in attendance at such contract schools at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900."

This amendment did not in any sense reestablish the contract-school system. It merely continued, or proposed to continue, a practice of Congress to provide for children in contract schools until the Government would have adequate facilities of its own. The only issue raised by this amendment was, Has the Government ample school accommodation for the pupils in the contract schools?

The policy of discontinuing contract school appropriations originated, officially, in the following provision of the Indian appropriation act, approved August 15, 1894, and making provision for the fiscal year 1895. The act provided:

That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby directed to inquire into and investigate the propriety of discontinuing contract schools, and whether, in his judgment, the same can be done without detriment to the education of Indian children; and that he submit to Congress at its next session the result of such investigation, including an estimate of the cost, if any, of substituting Government schools for contract schools, together with such recommendations as to him may seem proper.

As I have heretofore shown in discussing this question, the Secretary of the Interior, in his annual report for 1894, evidently with this action of Congress in mind, said:

The contract schools are now the subject of general discussion. I agree fully with those who oppose the use of public money for the support of sectarian schools. But this question should be considered practically. The schools have grown up. Money has been invested in their construction at a time when they were recognized as wise instrumentalities for the accomplishment of good. I do not think it proper to allow the intense feeling of opposition to sectarian education, which is showing itself all over the land, to induce the Department to disregard existing conditions. We need the schools now, or else we need a large appropriation to build schools to take their place.

It would be scarcely just to abolish them entirely; to abandon instantly a policy so long established. My own suggestion is that they should be decreased at the rate of not less than 20 per cent a year. Thus, in a few years more they would cease to exist, and during that time the Bureau (of Indian Affairs) would gradually be prepared to do without them, while they might gather strength to continue without Government aid.

The Secretary's theory at that time was to reduce the contract school allowances at the rate of 20 per cent a year; but upon further investigation he apparently concluded that it was neither feasible nor practicable to make the large annual reduction at first contemplated, for in a report to Congress, dated December 13, 1894, he said:

It is possible that the plan of annual reduction can not be carried out to the full extent proposed, namely, 20 per cent each year. But in any event within a few years, unless unforeseen obstacles arise, the substitution of Government for contract schools should take place.

In the third session of the Fifty-third Congress the House of Representatives endeavored to carry out the Secretary's first proposition by placing the following provision in the Indian appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1896:

The Secretary of the Interior may make contracts for the education of Indian pupils during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, to an extent not exceeding 80 per cent of the amount so used for the fiscal year 1895, and each succeeding year he shall proportionately so reduce the amount thus used that at the end of five years from the date on which this act goes into effect all contracts for such education shall cease.

Had this provision been enacted into law, it would have established a policy requiring annual reductions of 20 per cent and the abolition of the contract school system on the 30th of June 1900; but this did not become the law. The Senate substituted the following provision:

That the Secretary of the Interior shall make contracts, but only with present contract schools, for the education of Indian pupils during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, to an extent not exceeding 80 per cent of the amount so used for the fiscal year 1895, and the Government shall, as early as practicable, make provision for the education of Indian children in Government schools.

This provision was finally accepted by the House and enacted as a part of the Indian appropriation act for the fiscal year 1896.

It is apparent that originally neither Congress nor the Department definitely decided to limit the continuance of the contract school system, after having decided to abolish it, to five years, nor contemplated an absolute annual reduction of 20 per cent of the appropriation. It was determined, however, that the Government should place in Government schools, at as early a day as practicable, the Indian pupils then in contract schools; and until this was possible it was intended that necessary contracts should be continued. In other words, it was contemplated that hand in hand with the reduction in the number of pupils in contract schools there should be provided accommodations in Government schools for the pupils dismissed from the contract schools. That the Secretary of the Interior had this in view is clearly shown by his statement in the extract above quoted, that during the time that would elapse before the contract schools went out of existence, "the Bureau of Indian Affairs would gradually be prepared to do without them;" and by his further declaration in the same extract: "We need a large appropriation to build schools to take their place." It is still further shown by the following extract from the report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to the Secretary of the Interior, dated November 19, 1894:

By gradually reducing the contracts year by year and placing the pupils in Government schools, or better still, in public schools, the contract schools can be entirely done away with in the course of five or six years, and this without doing any great injury to the parties who have their money invested in contract schools, and at the same time provide adequate facilities for the Indian pupils.

That this was also the intention of Congress is evident from the concluding clause of the provision above quoted.

It is true that ever since 1895 Congress has made a reduction of the contract school appropriations, and that in the Indian appropriation act for the fiscal year 1900 it declared that the appropriation therein made for contract schools should be "the final appropriation for sectarian schools." These annual reductions and this declaration, however, were made upon the theory and in the belief that the Indian Department, from year to year, had made provision in the Government schools for the contract pupils for whom appropriations were discontinued, and that at the end of the current fiscal year the Department would be able to care for all the pupils then in contract schools. This belief was based upon the statement of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, made every year for the past three years, that he could provide facilities for all the contract school pupils.

Early in the session, as a member of the Committee on Indian Affairs, my attention was called to this question. After a thorough and careful study of it I became, and I am still, convinced that Congress has been misinformed, and has acted upon statements misleading in character and now, in my opinion, evidently prepared and made for the purpose of misleading, and of influencing the action of Congress. Despite the assertions of the commissioner to the contrary, it is a fact easy of demonstration, that at no time since 1895 has the Indian Bureau been able to provide accommodations in the Government schools for the contract school pupils. In 1895 there were 3,500 pupils in such schools, and at no time since then have there been less than 2,000.

The following figures, taken from the annual reports of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, show the capacity and enrollment of the Government schools for each year since 1895:

	1895.	1896.	1897.	1898.	1899.
Capacity	16,950	17,806	18,610	19,874	20,126
Enrollment	16,584	17,789	18,603	19,899	20,712
Difference	366	17	7	25	586

While these figures disclose that the capacity slightly exceeded the enrollment in the years 1895, 1896, and 1897, yet for 1898 and 1899, respectively, the enrollment was 25 and 586 in excess of the capacity.

From an examination of these figures, compiled by the Commissioner himself, it seemed clear to me that more pupils were enrolled in the Government schools during 1899 than the capacity justified. No provision having been made in the bill making appropriations for the coming fiscal year to provide in any way for the pupils carried by contract, the amendment heretofore set forth was offered by me so that some provision might be made for them during the coming year.

The Commissioner in his letter does not deny the accuracy of his own figures, but by an elaborate table he attempts to demonstrate that the Government has accommodations for the contract pupils. He urges that because the Government schools have had an increase in attendance of 7,900 pupils since 1893 that there need be no fear of the Bureau's ability to accommodate all the children in the contract schools. Of course the attendance in the Government schools increased materially since 1893. It would have been most remarkable if it had not. A glance at this table, in which are given the amounts expended for school buildings in the Indian Department from 1893 to 1899, as shown by the annual statements of receipts and expenditures issued by the Treasury Department, will disclose sufficient reason for a large increase in attendance in the Government schools.

1893	$303,187
1894	139,732
1895	85,985
1896	35,716
1897	120,355
1898	198,941
1899	256,912
Total	1,188,808

In the Indian appropriation act for fiscal year 1900 the general appropriation for construction, purchase, repair, etc., of Indian school buildings amounted to $300,000; the specific appropriations to $299,050; total, $599,050.

With this information it is not so very extraordinary that since 1893 there has been an increase in attendance at these schools of 7,900 pupils.

Neither is it strange that in the corresponding period, as the Commissioner points out in his letter, the contract schools lost in attendance 2,898 and in enrollment 3,683 pupils. Rather, the highest encomium that can be paid to those conducting these schools is to point out that the decrease in both attendance and in enrollment has been so small. The $533,241 set aside for contract schools in 1893 had dwindled in 1900 to $59,822.25 (eliminating Hampton and Lincoln as not coming within the description of contract schools), yet the attendance and enrollment, despite the loss of nearly 90 per cent of the appropriation, decreased only about 50 per cent.

But, after all, these questions of increase and decrease in attendance in Government and contract schools since 1893 are not material to the question raised by the amendment, namely, Could the children in contract schools in 1900 be accommodated in the Government schools in 1901 if no appropriation were made for the contract schools?

It is conceded by the Commissioner, as indeed it must be, since his own report proves it, that the number of pupils enrolled in the Government schools during 1899 is in excess of the accommodations. He contends, however, that since all the pupils do not continually attend the schools, and that the reports show that the average attendance is much less than the average enrollment, it is perfectly proper to continue to enroll much beyond the accommodations at hand. Should the 2,000 pupils now in the contract schools be enrolled in the Government schools, or if only the 534 contract pupils were enrolled therein, the loss in attendance, which is now the hope of his office, would immediately become its necessity. If all the pupils enrolled to-day in the Government schools were to apply for admission, it would be denied to some of them. How, then, could the Commissioner find accommodation for 2,000 additional pupils? The assertion that the Indian Office can provide for these children is an idle boast; the public official that makes it deserves pity rather than contempt.

There is still more conclusive proof than that already adduced that the Indian Bureau can not only not provide in the Government schools for the pupils in contract schools, but that it is impossible to place in any schools large numbers of Indian children of school age.

In the Indian appropriation act, just agreed upon in conference, the general appropriation for construction, purchase, repairs, etc., of Indian school buildings amounts to $240,000; specific appropriations for construction, repairs, and improvements, $349,927; total, $589,927.

The Commissioner does not contend that with this appropriation sufficient additional sittings can be provided in the time at the disposal of the Bureau, or, in fact, in any time, for the 534 pupils under contract, much less for the 2,000 pupils in the contract schools. Since 1895 the Government school accommodations, with the expenditures already set forth, have been increased as shown in the statement that follows:

Total capacity for—		
1895	16,780	
1894	16,119	
Increase 1895 over 1894	661, or 4	per cent.
Total capacity for—		
1896	17,866	
1895	16,780	
Increase 1896 over 1895	1,086, or 6	per cent.
Total capacity for—		
1897	18,610	
1896	17,866	
Increase 1897 over 1896	744, or 4	per cent.
Total capacity for—		
1898	19,874	
1897	18,610	
Increase 1898 over 1897	1,264, or 6	per cent.
Total capacity for—		
1899	20,126	
1898	19,874	
Increase 1899 over 1898	252, or 1¼	per cent.

The rate of increase of 1899 over 1898 is 1¼ per cent; while to place the 2,060 pupils in contract schools in Government schools would require an increase for 1901 in the Government facilities of 13 per cent over the facilities of 1899. No such increase has been contemplated during the past year; provision for such increase was not made either during the year just closing, nor will it be made in the year to come.

The Indian school population can not be stated with accuracy. A number of reports of the Commissioners of Indian Affairs prior to 1896 estimate the school population from 34,000 to 39,000. The report of the Indian school superintendent for 1896 places the school population at 38,981. No statement or estimate of this population is given in any report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs since 1896. The Bureau of Indian Affairs estimates it at about one-fifth of the total Indian population. According to the report of the Commissioner for 1899, exclusive of the Five Civilized Tribes and the Indians in Alaska, the Indian population is placed at 187,319. Adopting the practice of the Indian Bureau it is safe to place the school population to-day at 37,484.

The Commissioner concedes, indeed, his report for 1899 shows, that as stated by me in the speech referred to in his letter, the capacity of the Government schools is 20,126. In the contract schools there are 2,060 Indian children. With ample allowance for the number of pupils in other schools of every character—not exceeding at a very liberal estimate 2,000—about 13,000 children of school age are unprovided for in any way whatever.

Such deductions are not confined to me alone. They are not merely matters of opinion. They are facts gathered from official reports. Anyone who will take the trouble to investigate the subject quickly arrives at the same conclusions. It is apparent to the most superficial observer, excepting the blind in the Indian Bureau, that the Government can not accommodate at present all the children of school age. The well-known editor of the Forest and Stream, Mr. George Bird Grinnell, in a work entitled The Indian of To-day, published this very year, speaking of the contract-school system, says that—

> * * * it is to be regretted that Congress has reduced the number of children to be paid for at a time when there are so many requiring education for whom the Government provides no accommodation.

This is the opinion of one with no personal interest. It is the belief of everyone who has in an impartial manner given any attention whatever to the question.

An even more insuperable barrier intervenes, however, to prevent the Commissioner accommodating in Government schools the pupils now in contract schools. No reference is made to this difficulty in the Commissioner's letter. Its perusal might suggest the suspicion that the Commissioner is unaware of this difficulty. The Indian appropriation act for the fiscal year 1896 contains the following provision:

> That hereafter no Indian child shall be sent from any Indian reservation to a school beyond the State or Territory in which said reservation is situated without the voluntary consent of the father or mother of such child, if either of them are living, and if neither of them are living, without the voluntary consent of the next of kin of such child. Such consent shall be made before the agent of the reservation, and he shall send to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs his certificate that such consent has been voluntarily given before such child shall be removed from such reservation. And it shall be unlawful for any Indian agent or other employee of the Government to induce, or seek to induce, by withholding rations, or by other improper means, the parents or next of kin of any Indian to consent to the removal of any Indian child beyond the limits of any reservation. (Act approved March 2, 1895. Public—No. 121.)

With that provision of law in mind it may be possible for the Commissioner to point out in which of the Government schools, located in the same State or Territory, the pupils in the contract schools, as shown in the following statement, can be placed:

Statement showing number of Catholic Indian contract school pupils; Indian school population of States and Territories in which contract schools are located; capacity of Government Indian schools in said States and Territories, and number of Indian children unprovided with Government school accommodations.

State or Territory, and schools.	Contract pupils.			School population.	Capacity of Government schools.	Number of children unprovided with Government school accommodations.
	Under Government support.	Without Government support.	Total.			
CALIFORNIA.						
Mission Agency	51	135	186	1,191	391	
St. Turibius Mission	5	9	14			
Hoopa Valley Agency				102	200	
Round Valley Agency				109	70	
Perris Training School					150	
Greenville Training School					100	
Fort Yuma Training School					175	
Fort Bidwell Training School					100	
Day schools					340	
	56	144	200	1,402	1,454	*52
MICHIGAN.						
Baraga	10	12	22			
Harbor Springs	17	56	83			
Mount Pleasant Training School					300	
Day schools					90	
Not on reservations, but scattered throughout the State				†1,200		
	27	78	105	1,200	390	810
MINNESOTA.						
White Earth Agency	37	110	147	1,909	315	
Morris Training School					100	
Pipestone Training School					100	
	37	110	147	1,909	515	1,394
MONTANA.						
Blackfeet Agency	17	40	57	431	150	
Crow Agency	17	69	86	295	150	
Flathead Agency	80	80	160	387		
Fort Belknap Agency	24	74	98	291	100	
Tongue River Agency	13	62	75	370	40	
Fort Peck Agency				394	200	
Fort Shaw Training School					250	
	151	325	476	2,177	890	1,287
NORTH DAKOTA.						
Turtle Mountain Reservation	35	91	126	728	140	
Devils Lake Agency				227	350	
Fort Berthold Agency				271	120	
Standing Rock Agency				690	535	
	35	91	126	1,916	1,145	771
IDAHO.						
Cœur d'Alène Reservation	20	61	81	134		
Fort Hall Agency				225	150	
Lemhi Agency				117	40	
Nez Perces Agency				321	175	
	20	61	81	797	365	432
NEW MEXICO.						
Pueblo Agency	17	53	70	2,112	658	
Mescalero Agency				105	100	
Albuquerque training					250	
Santa Fe training					250	
	17	53	70	2,217	1,258	959
OREGON.						
Umatilla Agency	12	70	82	253	75	
Grand Ronde Agency				76	100	
Klamath Agency				281	225	
Siletz Agency				90	100	
Warm Springs Agency				233	175	
Salem Training School					350	
	12	70	82	933	1,025	*92
SOUTH DAKOTA.						
Pine Ridge Agency	40	98	138	1,586	1,285	
Rosebud Agency	30	181	211	1,391	717	
Cheyenne River Agency				608	202	
Crow Creek Agency				†210	190	
Springfield (nonreservation) School					60	
Lower Brule Agency				109	140	

Statement showing number of Catholic Indian contract school pupils; Indian school population of States and Territories, etc.—Continued.

State or Territory, and schools.	Contract pupils.			School population.	Capacity of Government schools.	Number of children unprovided with Government school accommodations.
	Under Government support.	Without Government support.	Total.			
SOUTH DAKOTA—continued.						
Sisseton Agency				552	130	
Yankton Agency				429	150	
Pierre Training School					150	
Chamberlain Training School					100	
Flandreau Training School					200	
Rapid City Training School					100	
	70	279	349	4,875	3,424	1,451
WASHINGTON.						
Colville Agency	17	42	59	538	80	
Tulalip Agency	24	52	76	291	110	
Neah Bay Agency				†142	116	
Puyallup Agency				423	375	
Yakima Agency				476	125	
	41	94	135	1,870	806	1,064
WISCONSIN.						
Green Bay Agency	21	94	115	489	200	
La Pointe Agency	27	84	111	1,120	565	*
Oneida Reservation				521	196	
Tomah Training School						
Wittenberg Training School					125	
					100	
	48	178	226	2,130	1,186	944
WYOMING.						
Shoshone Agency	17	49	66	375	150	225
Total	531	1,532	2,063	21,801	12,608	9,193

* Excess in capacity.
† Estimated, on basis of 1 to 5 of entire population; practice of Indian Office.

With much care the Commissioner has set forth the several amounts received by the schools under the control of the Catholic Church and contrasted the total with the aggregate amount received by the combined Protestant schools. It is difficult to understand the relevancy of this contrast to the issue raised; but it does not require much shrewdness to divine the purpose of the Commissioner. It was intended to convey the impression that in some way Catholic schools had improperly obtained an advantage over the schools controlled by the Protestant denominations. The amount received by any particular class of schools can have nothing to do with the ability of the Government to accommodate the contract pupils. It has no place in this discussion at all. It was brought in to ally with the Commissioner certain well-known and bigoted persons, who are unable to consider the question at issue or kindred questions in an impartial manner.

But the Catholic Church needs offer no apology for accepting aid from the Government in the work of Indian education. The solicitation was on the part of the Government. It was the Government, not the church, that proposed such a practice. While some men have been found too narrow to pay just tribute to this work, none have ever had the temerity to disparage it.

The Commissioner states that "from 1889 to 1899, inclusive, the Catholics have drawn for contract schools $3,493,409." It apparently has never occurred to the Commissioner that this has resulted from a monetary standpoint alone in great saving to the Government. The Catholic contract schools educate and care for pupils for one-third less than the Government schools. To be a little more explicit and accurate, the per capita allowance for pupils in contract schools is $108 per annum; the average per capita cost of educating Indian children in Government schools, as estimated by the Indian Bureau, is $142 per annum. The Government schools are eight twenty-sevenths more expensive than the contract schools. The expenditure of the $3,493,409 for pupils in the contract schools conducted by Catholics has effected a saving to the Government of $1,035,084.

This, however, is not all. Since 1896 these schools have carried many more children than the Government paid for under the contracts. These additional children cost the Government nothing.

The number of pupils carried at no expense to the Government during that period are shown in this statement.

Fiscal year.	Contract number.	Average attendance.	Excess attendance.
1896	2,531	2,995	464
1897	1,732	2,205	473
1898	1,672	2,272	600
1899	1,078	1,993	915
1900	931	*2,000	1,469
			3,921

*Estimated, but fully within the number.

Had these children been in Government schools the cost of their board and tuition would have aggregated $548,940. This amount, with the $1,035,084 already shown to have been saved, amounts to $1,554,024, which represents part of the saving to the Government in the education of the Indians that has resulted from its arrangement with Catholic contract schools.

Besides this sum, it must be remembered that large expenditures would have been required for the erection of necessary school buildings, which easily would have amounted to $750,000, while the usual repairs and improvements necessary from time to time would have compelled considerable expenditures.

It is rather to be regretted that the Commissioner did not give just a little of this information when stating the amount that had been received by Catholic schools and contrasting it with the totals received by all other schools, so that men might have judged whether the Government had been improvident in its contracts with these schools.

In his letter the Commissioner says:

In the criticisms and debate on this question no account is taken of the fact that religious bodies do and can take care of Indian pupils. There are a number of mission schools throughout the Indian country maintained and operated by various religious bodies and churches, who furnish teachers, food, clothing, etc., to the pupils attending.

At times I have thought that the Commissioner never read the speech which he attempts to review and answer. If he has, is it not more than passing strange that he should so quickly forget the following language contained therein:

The value of these schools is not at issue. It has never been questioned. In the report of the board of Indian commissioners for 1898 this commendation is found at page 7:

"The contract and mission schools are continued by the various church missionary societies, though with a slight reduction of attendance, since the most of them no longer receive Government aid. We trust that this work may go on and increase, for, as we have often said, our deep and abiding conviction is that what the Indian needs above all things is moral and Christian training."

The Commissioner of Indian Affairs, in his report for 1899, made no comment on contract schools. Unable to speak in derogation, he refuses the tribute of just praise. Upon the question of mission schools, however, which differ from contract schools only in that no pupils are in the former under Government contract, he says:

"The labors which they do in an educational way are of inestimable value for civilizing these people, and while the heavy burden must, as it should, rest upon the shoulders of the Government, yet these little institutions of learning, with their faithful Christain workers, are important adjuncts."

It would be too unkind to make further comment upon this statement of the Commissioner.

The Commissioner says further:

In 1893, prior to the inauguration by Congress of reducing contract schools, these "mission schools" reported an attendance of 75 pupils, and in 1894, 152 pupils. For the year 1895, when the first reduction was made, 754 pupils were reported; 755 in 1896; 813 in 1897; 1,112 in 1898; and 1,261 in 1899. An analysis of the average attendance at the mission schools shows that the Catholic schools had an attendance of 259, the Protestant schools 855. It seems evident from this that the great Protestant organizations in refusing aid of the Government for their schools have maintained them in the true missionary spirit out of their own funds.

A more palpable attempt to deceive this House has seldom been attempted. A more unjustifiable and outrageous effort to bring into reproach, in an underhand manner, the Catholic missions among the Indians of this country has never been made. As I stated in the speech to which the Commissioner's letter refers, "mission schools" differ from contract schools only in that no pupils are in the former under Government contract." As the Commissioner well knows, pupils in contract schools without contract provision are "mission" pupils. Why, then, in the "analysis" that he made were the 1,469 "mission" pupils in Catholic contract schools eliminated? These 1,469 "mission" pupils, with the 259 that the Commissioner admits were in attendance in the Catholic mission schools, make in all 1,728. Contrast this total—1,728—with the 855 pupils in attendance in all the other mission schools, and let the Commissioner answer whether it still—

seems evident from this that the great Protestant organizations in refusing aid of the Government for their schools have maintained them in the true missionary spirit out of their own funds.

It would be interesting to know whether this still applies, in the opinion of the Commissioner, to the Protestant churches alone.

At this time, too, it is proper to call attention to the fact that in addition to the mission schools to be found in the Commissioner's report, and from which this analysis was apparently made, there are two other Catholic mission schools. At Santa Fe, N. Mex., St. Catharine's, a mission school, with 135 pupils; and at Muscogee, Okla., St. Joseph's, with 145 pupils.

I have no quarrel with the school of any denomination. As far as I am informed, they all do good work. This I have never hesitated to say. Members of this House and of the Senate have heard me urge an appropriation for the Hampton school. But when an official of this Government makes such a statement as that just quoted it is very natural that it be resented.

The insinuation that the Catholic Indian schools have not "been conducted in the true missionary spirit" is simply astounding. Who that had ever read a line of the history of this country could have given expression to such a slander? From the discovery of this continent to the present day much of the history of this country must be read in the lives of Catholic missionaries. Perpetuated in countless streams and rivers, towns and cities, mountains and valleys, the glories of their deeds and of their lives will be commemorated throughout the land until the end of time. To detail their marvelous work would be idle, since the history of America will forever stand in refutation and condemnation of the Commissioner's contemptible insinuation.

No fear need be entertained that this work will cease. The history of nineteen centuries can be marshaled to show the fidelity with which that church has gone forth to teach all men. This is the Commissioner's chief reliance against embarrassment. Well does he know that the accommodations that the Government can not offer will be found in these same schools. And let it be hoped that in their operation nothing will be done that will not be in harmony with the Commissioner's idea of "the true missionary spirit."

In this extraordinary letter the Commissioner also says:

It is claimed in the discussion in Congress above referred to that "if contract schools are obnoxious because sectarian, Government schools are certainly much more objectionable." This is a statement which is not substantiated by the facts. Long quotations are given from Archbishop Ryan, Herbert Spencer, and Webster's argument in the celebrated Girard case as bearing upon this subject. The definition of a sectarian school, as adopted and understood in this office with reference to the educational matters, is that of the latest edition of Webster's International Dictionary. He defines sectarian as "a member or adherent of a special school, denomination, or religious or philosophical party;" sectarianism as "excess of partisan or denominational zeal; adherence to a separate church organization."

The statement that "if contract schools are obnoxious because sectarian, Government schools are certainly much more objectionable" was certainly made by me. It was based, too, upon the report of the superintendent of Indian Schools, a Government official, and on an extract from the Commissioner's own report, all of which he conveniently omits to mention in the extract just quoted. Just to make it clear that there was justification for the assertion, even though the Commissioner says that it is "not substantiated by the facts," I give here the authority for the statement, as it appears in my former speech:

The Government schools are supposed to be stripped clean of everything that smacks of sectarianism. The report of Miss Estelle Reel, the superintendent of Indian Schools, for 1899, however, refutes this supposition. At the outset of her report she says:

* * * "Therefore it seems most fitting that I should set forth in my report such matters as have come under my personal observation while in the field."

As a result of her "personal observation," she reports the conditions existing at the many schools visited. Some of her observations follow: She found at the Haskell Institute, Kansas, that "a most happy Christian influence pervades the school;" Chilocco Indian School, Oklahoma, "religious exercises are conducted regularly;" Nambe and Tesuque Pueblo day schools, "religious training is carefully given;" Albuquerque Indian School, New Mexico, "the religious welfare of the children is carefully looked after;" Phœnix Indian School, Arizona, "Christian influences surround the students;" Perris School, California, "Sunday-school exercises are held regularly;" Carson Indian School, Nevada, "religious exercises are held regularly;" Klamath Agency, Oreg., "at each school (there are three) there is a force of faithful, Christian teachers;" Chemawa Indian School, Oregon, "religious exercises are regularly held;" Siletz Boarding School, Oregon, "the religious training of the children is carefully looked after."

These, sir, are all Government schools. Can there be religious training without sectarian teaching? Why, these schools are the most objectionable because the most sectarian of all existing schools among the Indians. Speaking of this phase of the school question, the Commissioner, in his report for 1899, says, at page 29:

"Although sectarian teaching is forbidden in the schools, they are not Godless institutions. The broad principles of the Bible, of religion, and morality are taught, and, so far as it is possible, only strong religious characters are placed in charge of the children. The petty distinctions of creeds are ignored, but all employees are required to lay such a foundation in the hearts and minds of their pupils that the great religious bodies of our country may hereafter build upon it a vigorous and enduring Christian character."

In other words, the Commissioner believes in a "creedless" religious training by lay teachers.

That is the justification for the assertion that the Government schools are as obnoxious from the standpoint of sectarianism as are contract schools.

It was hardly to be expected that the Commissioner could appreciate the force or meaning of any word without recourse to a dictionary, and no one could imagine him exercising any reasoning powers for himself in an effort to comprehend its meaning. The long quotation from Archbishop Ryan to which he refers was adopted by me as a more comprehensive and exact definition or explanation of the word "sectarianism" than any given elsewhere. It was made before the Senate Committee on Appropriations in

February, 1898, by the Most Rev. P. J. Ryan, Archbishop of Philadelphia, and is as follows:

This word sectarianism, gentlemen, is the most thoroughly misunderstood and at present, perhaps, the most mischievous word in the English language. Properly speaking, sectarianism is the religion of sects—that is, of bodies cut away, as the term implies, from the original church. Unsectarian religion is the religion of that original church. But this is not the meaning popularly attached to it. Webster defines as sectarian "one of a party in religion which has separated itself from an established church, or which holds tenets different from those of the prevailing denomination."

Now, as we have no established church, for union of church and state in our circumstances is out of the question, and there is dispute as to which is the "prevailing denomination," a "sectarian" is not easy to find. For a man to preach unsectarianism it is supposed that he must avoid all doctrines in which he may disagree with anyone of his audience. Now, as every doctrine of Christians has been denied by someone, unsectarian preaching is simply impossible, when the audience is representative of all shades of religious opinion. What is called unsectarian teaching is attempted in some of our public institutions by what are known as "moral instructors," but it is sometimes the most sectarian of all teaching, as it represents simply the peculiar religious views not of a body but of the individual who teaches. It has the merit of great variety, as it changes with each moral teacher, and not unfrequently with the same individual at different periods of life.

The Commissioner evidently could not appreciate the logic of that passage. The limits of his vision and reason are defined by Webster's International Dictionary.

The quotation from Webster's argument in the Girard will case was used in the argument to demonstrate that the Government schools were equally as sectarian as contract schools. That the mere fact that individuals uncontrolled by the tenets of a particular church were commissioned to teach, could not obviate the objection that the teaching was sectarian. To repeat Webster's words:

It has been said that there may be lay preachers among them. Lay preachers! This is ridiculous enough in a country of Christianity and religion.

* * * * * * *

Now, are not laymen equally sectarian in their views with clergymen? And would it not be just as easy to prevent sectarian doctrines from being preached by a clergyman as from being taught by a layman? It is idle, therefore, to speak of lay preaching.

Here Webster was interrupted by a statement that it was not lay preaching, but lay teaching, that had been discussed. He continued:

Well, I would just as soon take it that way as the other—teaching as preaching. Is not the teaching of laymen as sectarian as the preaching of clergymen? What is the difference between unlettered laymen and lettered clergymen in this respect? Everyone knows that laymen are as violent controversialists as clergymen, and the less informed the more violent. So this, while it is a little more ridiculous, is equally obnoxious. According to my experience, a layman is just as likely to launch out into sectarian views and to advance clashing doctrines and violent, bigoted prejudices as a professional preacher, and even more so. Every objection to professional religious instruction applies with still greater force to lay teaching. As in other cases, so in this, the greatest degree of candor is usually found accompanying the greatest degree of knowledge. Nothing is more apt to be positive and dogmatical than ignorance.

A passage from Herbert Spencer's Study of Sociology was used to sustain the proposition that the development of the intellect alone did not act as a preventive of vice. I contended then, as I believe now, that religious training and development are essential to all proper education; that without it men are not made either good or desirable citizens—certainly not good Indians. The passage, however, was not relied upon in the discussion of the sectarian nature of the Government schools.

It may be said that this is of no importance. None whatever, except to call attention to the commissioner's omission to state upon what the assertion was made, and the authority to which it is improperly credited. It merely brings out distinctively the careless and unfair manner in which the commissioner has reviewed and answered the speech to which he calls attention.

With much seriousness it is pointed out in this letter that—

In a Catholic contract school every employee, from superintendent to the smallest Indian assistant, is a member of the Catholic Church; no other denomination has any representative; the ritual of the Catholic Church, its catechism, it traditions, its theories, are alone taught; it is emphatically an organization for the purpose of inculcating the peculiar tenets of the Catholic faith to the exclusion of all others. In a Government school the religious or political opinions of an employee are not involved in his selection or retention in the school.

It seems strange that it did not occur to the commissioner that everything in that passage about Catholic contract schools applies with equal force to the contract and mission schools of all the denominations. Why single out with such particularity the Catholic schools? Why did not the commissioner call attention to the fact that the Lincoln School, for which direct appropriations have been made and which will only cease with this year, is by its charter an Episcopalian school? Hampton, until 1893, when apparently it first dawned upon men that contract schools were sectarian, made it clear in its reports that it had a missionary department.

Pupils were there prepared to do mission work. Its report for 1895, found at page 414 of the Report of the Commissioner of Indians Affairs for the same year, shows that of the "returned students" 6 were missionaries and 15 catechists. Religion and religious teaching and instruction is an important part of the school work. Its principal is a Congregational minister, and it has a resident chaplain. I do not say these things in derogation of the school. From personal examination I am convinced that this school does good work, and, as I have already stated, I urged the appropriation for it. But these facts are stated because, as the Commissioner of Indian Affairs is well aware of them, it emphasizes the action of the Commissioner in dragging into the discussion of the Government's ability to accommodate the children in contract schools matters affecting Catholic schools alone when there was no necessity for it.

The Commissioner concludes his letter by saying:

Representative FITZGERALD says truly that the only difference between the Government schools and the contract sectarian schools is that one is supported by the Government and the other by contributions from religious and other associations. This is the point involved in sectarianism. The mission schools, if managed under Presbyterian auspices, teach the peculiar tenets of Presbyterianism to the exclusion of all other tenets; so are the Methodist, Baptist, Episcopalian, and others. In other words, they use their own funds in order to propagate their peculiar and separate creeds.

Of course I never made any such statement. Had I done so the commissioner would have been justified in declaring that I was absolutely ignorant of the school system. No doubt it would have afforded him great pleasure to point out my ignorance on the subject. I did say, however, as it appears before, that mission (not Government) schools differ from contract schools in that no pupils are in the mission schools under Government contracts. It may be said that the commissioner inadvertently used the term Government for mission; but even if this be so, it only further illustrates the careless and thoughtless manner in which the letter was prepared, or else it is an exhibition of ignorance about Indian schools that should not be tolerated in the least responsible of the commissioner's subordinates.

There are some other matters upon which I might with propriety touch at this time. There is no question that Catholic as well as Presbyterian, Episcopalian, Baptist, and Methodist mission schools are supported by the respective churches that maintain them, although the Commissioner omits to name in that statement the Catholic schools. There has never been a desire on my part, however, to discuss this question in the narrow way that the Commissioner has attempted to do. I have no wish to stimulate the bitterness sometimes inherited by men of different religious beliefs. Indeed, there is no necessity of it being done by anyone, not excepting the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

Whenever the question of Indian education is to be discussed, as a member of this House I will shrink from no phase of it. Some other phases of the question the Commissioner will hardly deem it either profitable or advisable, although it certainly would prove instructive, for him to discuss.

So far as this remarkable letter is concerned, I am done. Upon it I have no further comment to make. If the Commissioner can take any satisfaction from it, let him enjoy to the full his delight. It may as well be understood, however, that no such slanderous statements as are contained in this letter can either be uttered in this House or placed in the RECORD without receiving speedy and proper refutation and their author just rebuke.

Trusts.

SPEECH
OF
HON. MARLIN E. OLMSTED,
OF PENNSYLVANIA,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Friday, June 1, 1900.

The House having under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 138) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States—

Mr. OLMSTED said:

Mr. SPEAKER: It was my intention when I spoke before upon this subject to call attention to the influence of Republican administration upon the laboring man. Our Democratic friends are shy about comparing present industrial conditions with those which obtained during the last Democratic Administration. One member upon this floor did faintly insist that the Democratic party had done more to reduce the hours of labor. We concede that. They reduced not only the hours but the days, the weeks, and the months of labor. They even reduced the number of men engaged in and the wages paid for labor.

Pennsylvania is the Keystone State, and what affects the keystone affects the whole arch. In the manufacture of iron, steel, and tin plate alone there were employed in Pennsylvania in 1899, under President McKinley, 24,667 more men than in 1896, the last year of Cleveland's term. Each man had upon an average about thirty-five days more work in the year, and the daily wages were from 10 to 31 per cent higher.

The aggregate of wages paid them was $50,680,394 in 1899, as against $29,859,019 in 1896, a difference of $20,821,275 in favor of a Republican Administration. These figures are from the official reports. The statistics as to workmen in mines, upon railroads, and in other lines can not yet be officially ascertained; but their testimony will be equally convincing as to the advantages of Republican supremacy.

As part of my remarks I submit the following official tables, for which I am indebted to Hon. J. M. Clark, chief of the bureau of statistics:

Employment, wages, yearly and daily earnings, and value of product in the manufactories of pig iron, tin plate, and iron and steel rolled into finished form, in the State of Pennsylvania, in the years 1896 and 1899, respectively, showing the increase in 1899 over 1896.

[Compiled from reports of the bureau of industrial statistics, department of internal affairs, State of Pennsylvania.]

	1896.	1899.	Increase, 1899 over 1896.	Per cent of increase, 1899.
PIG IRON.				
Production ..... gross tons..	4,030,350	$6,455,035	2,428,685	60.3
Workmen employed	11,580	15,350	3,770	31.7
Average days of employment	239	327	88	13.2
Aggregate wages paid to workmen	$4,589,165	$7,505,870	$2,916,705	63.6
Average yearly earnings	$396.30	$488.83	$102.53	25.9
Average daily wage	$1.37	$1.51	$0.14	10.2
IRON AND STEEL, ROLLED.				
Iron and steel rolled into finished form, net tons	3,757,070	6,929,046	3,171,976	84.4
Workmen employed	53,573	69,982	16,409	30.6
Average days of employment	251	287	36	14.3
Aggregate wages paid workmen	$23,332,628	$39,120,129	$15,287,501	64.1
Average yearly earnings	$444.80	$559.00	$114.11	25.6
Average daily wage	$1.77	$1.95	$0.18	10.1
BLOCK PLATE TIN WORKS.				
Total production of block plate for tinning ..... pounds..	158,306,490	368,600,734	210,294,244	132.8
Quantity tinned ..... do....	97,814,762	292,164,734	194,349,972	198.5
Workmen employed	3,194	7,682	4,488	140.5
Average days of employment	250	223	27	10.8
Aggregate wages paid workmen	$1,437,226	$4,054,395	$2,617,169	182.1
Average yearly earnings	$456.55	$527.76	$71.23	15.6
Average daily wage	$1.80	$2.36	$0.56	31.1
Number of plants	13	21	7	53.8
STEEL PRODUCED.				
Bessemer ..... gross tons..	2,292,814	3,971,835	1,679,021	60.1
Open hearth ..... do....	1,098,608	2,398,210	1,299,602	157.1
Crucible ..... do....	43,107	75,356	32,249	74.8

Persons employed, days of employment, and yearly earnings in 303 representative manufacturing establishments in the State of Pennsylvania, in 1894 and 1899, respectively.

[Comparison in 1899 is in all cases made with the same plants considered in 1894.]

Articles.	Average number of persons employed.		Average number of days in operation.		Average yearly earnings.	
	1894.	1899.	1894.	1899.	1894.	1899.
Pig iron	1,751	3,015	301	322	$382.09	$498.24
Rolling mills	30,120	43,536	300	324	482.05	605.72
Steel	9,778	14,578	272	285	459.41	517.24
Architectural ironwork	976	1,735	307	305	500.19	563.34
Iron forgings	409	670	296	295	506.31	557.84
Nuts and bolts	580	995	288	304	372.95	545.22
Pipes and tubes	1,263	1,720	308	279	406.38	483.52
Iron foundries and machine works	2,602	4,091	282	305	504.53	587.35
Stoves, ranges, heaters, etc	1,238	1,304	210	247	425.06	467.28
Hardware	1,464	1,926	205	268	337.79	391.42
Malleable iron	398	746	247	292	442.44	521.83
Saws, edged tools, etc	1,995	3,079	280	301	444.05	514.40
Metal and metallic goods	1,500	1,809	288	324	430.35	495.31
Locomotives and engines	8,441	14,795	267	306	477.72	594.65
Boilers	601	513	320	307	319.23	464.53
Bridges	647	975	305	284	405.31	419.29
Car couplers	416	905	203	303	386.06	498.13
Cars and car wheels	2,830	3,184	261	304	456.65	553.78
Woolen yarns	1,148	1,706	277	274	249.61	307.46
Cotton yarns	270	284	261	306	262.90	329.70
Worsted yarns	722	838	277	290	279.20	285.88
Miscellaneous yarns	418	453	262	275	330.31	378.27
Hosiery	2,589	3,204	273	290	219.16	252.76
Carpets	5,326	6,178	259	299	355.30	373.53
Cotton and woolen goods	1,248	1,252	258	274	290.19	323.03
Cotton goods	3,687	4,295	246	299	317.75	351.08
Woolen goods	4,856	4,350	278	287	286.00	344.42
Worsted goods	461	597	287	296	344.35	405.67
Knit goods	807	1,004	254	282	254.93	287.28
Mixed textiles	1,847	2,431	299	300	287.86	315.05
Window glass, bottle and table goods	5,132	5,979	231	234	430.73	466.02
Pianos and organs	102	120	259	300	285.10	444.19

From Hon. James E. Roderick, chief of the bureau of mines of Pennsylvania, I learn that the production of coal in my State in 1899 was 127,101,167 tons as against 98,347,986 tons in 1896, an increase of 28,753,181 tons. The wages paid are not reported to his department, but assuming that the amount paid per ton for mining remained the same in 1899 as in 1896, the cost of mining the additional 28,753,181 tons was more than $20,000,000, so that in the manufacture of iron and steel and tin plate and in the mining of coal there were paid out in 1899 as wages to laboring men more than $40,000,000 in excess of the wages paid in 1896, the last year of the last Democratic Administration.

Think of the great advantage to every interest and to all the people of having $40,000,000 per annum added to the number of honest dollars in circulation. Think to what proportions this increase will swell when we take into consideration the additional wages paid to men employed upon railroads and in the various other branches of industry not included in the figures I have given. Reflect that this great improvement has been taking place not only in Pennsylvania, but throughout the entire Union, and then you may begin in a small way to realize the inestimable advantages of Republican rule and the importance of maintaining a Republican majority in Congress and continuing in power the Administration of President McKinley, under which such mighty changes have been wrought for the benefit of all our people.

Interference with Navigation.

SPEECH

OF

HON. NICHOLAS MULLER,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, June 7, 1900,

On the bill (H. R. 8777) to confer upon the supervisor of the harbor of New York further power to act in reference to interference with navigation, and to confer jurisdiction upon the United States courts to punish offenders thereof.

Mr. MULLER said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I urge the passage of the bill, which is a measure in behalf of all the owners, managers, masters, and pilots of steam vessels who are in active service. I urge the passage of this bill in the interests of navigation and to protect the lives of navigators and to protect valuable property, by the avoidance of collisions. No legal authority for abating this smoke nuisance can be found in the Federal laws; and in the interests of commerce and navigation Congress is appealed to to remedy this long-existing evil and thus do away with this great menace to navigation.

It has been conclusively shown by preponderance of evidence that these waters under the control of the Federal Government are made absolutely dangerous, and large interests are jeopardized by the creation of these dense smokes and fumes from the factories located on the Jersey side of the Kill von Kull River. This bill, while directly intended to protect navigation, will also give great relief to people of the State of New York, whom I have the honor to represent in part. This bill should receive the favorable sanction of Congress, as recommended by the honorable Secretary of War, honorable Secretary of the Treasury, the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army, and by the United States Government supervisor of the great harbor of New York.

This bill should command the earnest consideration of every member of Congress, and I am convinced, if properly and carefully considered by this body, it will receive favorable action. For years Staten Island has suffered from the prevalence of this smoke nuisance, and as Congress alone can give relief, I earnestly ask for such relief as this bill will afford, and am supported in this contention by thousands of people on Staten Island who have witnessed the depreciation of property values caused by the dense smoke of these factories; and so dense and stifling is this smoke that all forms of vegetation are dwarfed and ruined.

This bill should receive the favorable action of Congress—

First. Because the interests of interstate and foreign commerce demand the protection of the Government against this danger to navigation in the great waterways controlled by the Federal Government.

Second. Because the large appropriations granted by the United States are rendered, to a great extent, useless by the danger to navigation on waterways so improved at the nation's expense. It has been shown by naval officers and expert navigators that these dense clouds of smoke, obscuring the vision, are a far greater hindrance to navigation than the densest fog could be.

This bill in its general character does not apply to any particular case, nor is it advocated by any special interests, and if opposed, as it certainly should not be, it can only be opposed by special interests. It is a strictly business as well as humanitarian measure. Its enactment is demanded by the highest considerations of the public weal, and for a just and proper regard for the increasing dangers that threaten navigation in the great port of New York.

Having at heart the welfare and safety of thousands who demand the passage of this bill, I submit it to the consideration of the House, feeling that a sense of right, humanity, and common justice will satisfy the members of the House that this bill should pass, in the interests of the people concerned as well as the United States Government, whose executive representatives unite in recommending its enactment into law.

Deficiency Appropriation Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. HENRY D GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, May 14, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 11537) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, and for prior years, and for other purposes—

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: At the very beginning of this session of Congress, as far back as December 12, 1899, House bill No. 3717, familiarly called the Grout bill, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

It has remained there ever since, and, for all that I can find out, will remain there until the Fifty-sixth Congress ceases to exist, or at least until it will be too late to have the measure acted upon and enacted into law at this session.

There can be no excuse for this unprecedented and needless delay. Sixty days would have been sufficient time to hear all the arguments for and against the measure. It is apparent that want of time to consider can not be urged as even a plausible excuse. What, then, is the reason for the delay? The bill is a very short one, the provisions are simple, the subject-matter is old, and the legal propositions involved have all been settled by the court of last resort. The people naturally suppose that the men who are appointed as members of the Committee on Agriculture are not only familiar with the subject-matter of the questions coming under its jurisdiction, but are friendly to the passage of fair legislation which will protect and encourage that large portion of our people who are engaged in agricultural pursuits.

To my personal knowledge, many individual members of this House have seen personally the members of this committee and personally urged them to take prompt action on the pending measure. Speaking for myself, I know I have done everything in my power to have the friends of this measure make special efforts to report the bill promptly and favorably.

From all the information I can obtain, the majority of that committee are in favor of reporting the bill favorably. When its friends outside of the committee expostulate and complain of the delay—the dangerous delay—the only answer we receive is in the way of excuses which do not excuse.

Anyone, from the conduct of the committee in not reporting, from the poor excuses offered for the delay, from the assurances given of approval of the measure, is compelled to conclude that the members of the committee are individually for the bill and collectively against it.

Their delay can be explained in but one of the following hypotheses:

First. The enemies of the bill, open or secret, constitute a majority of the committee, despite their personal assurances to the contrary.

Second. The friends of the bill, while they may be a numerical majority, are outmaneuvered by the oleomargarine supporters, and have not and are not managing their fight with skill.

Third. That the friends of the bill are in a majority, yet by party orders or for supposed partisan capital are willing to allow the bill to be delayed so that final action may not be taken on the measure before the expiration of this session and before the question of the Presidency is again settled previous to the convening of Congress.

It looks as though they wished to be able in the next Congressional and Presidential canvass to pose as both the friends of the oleomargarine trusts and the friends of the farming and dairy interests.

Let me say to the Committee on Agriculture as well as to the members of this House that this straddle will not be successful.

The farmers and dairymen of the United States are alive to their interests; they have taken a firm and uncompromising stand in their opposition to any longer delay in stamping out this fraudulent business, which so interferes with them that it threatens the very existence of the manufacture of pure dairy butter.

They are well organized and each day are becoming better organized. They stand shoulder to shoulder in this fight, willing to drop party lines if need be.

They will solve the mystery of this delay. Time will disclose to them the real cause. Even the secrets of the committee room will leak out and become public property. They will be able to separate their friends from their opponents and before the Fifty-seventh Congress is elected they will by their votes at the polls see that their interests are not put in jeopardy by either open enemies, lukewarm friends, or bungling management.

It is said by members of the committee that the bill has been referred to a subcommittee of three, and that two out of the three members are enemies and have held back and continue to hold back the report. Will it not be hard to explain to the dairy interests of this country what necessity there was to have a bill so plain in its provisions and so reaching in its character referred to any subcommittee? Surely this was a blunder. But it is easily corrected. The majority of the committee, which had power to refer to a subcommittee, surely have the power to order a report of that subcommittee, and in case of a refusal they can discharge them from all further consideration of the measure and take action. Nay, they can even take action and report the bill without considering the fact of its submission to the subcommittee. This may not be a very courteous proceeding, but who will deny that the time for courtesy has passed and for action has come? The continuance of this courtesy plea can result in nothing else than the undue delay and ultimate defeat of the measure.

I for one hold and say there is no good reason for delay, and for one representing a constituency in which every farmer keeps cows and produces milk, and is directly or indirectly interested in the manufacture of pure dairy butter, enter my solemn protest against the dilatory action of this committee and demand a report. The very opponents of this measure can assign no good reason for withholding the measure from the consideration of the House. The subject is an important one, one of great interest to the public, and one whose decision affects the business of many thousands of our most industrious and most valued citizens. So it at least has a right to be discussed and passed upon by the House.

If there are any intrinsic objections to this bill, if any of its provisions are unjust, if any can be improved, let these changes be made by the committee and the bill then reported. The members of this House, I believe, are fully able to frame and pass a fair and acceptable measure on the subject-matter. Whatever may be said by the opponents, it is not fair that the legislation be stifled in committee or its enactment into law at this session of Congress be prevented by these dilatory tactics. I again warn the members of this committee and of this House that each one individually and the majority party collectively will have to answer for the defeat of this legislation, whatever be the excuse they may give.

In behalf of my constituents, in behalf of those of your constituents who have for days by letter, petition, and resolution pressed you to have this bill doing away with the illegal and unjust practices used by the manufacturers of oleomargarine in their unfair and criminal competition with the pure dairy product passed, I appeal to you to redouble your efforts to secure a favorable report of the Grout bill and its enactment into a law before Congress closes its doors this session.

Now, let us turn our attention to an examination of the merits of the Grout bill and to a discussion of the arguments urged by its supporters and the statements and criticisms of its antagonists.

Let the position of those who favor this bill be not misunderstood. They do not complain at their product, real dairy butter, being placed on the market in honest competition with oleomargarine, butterine, or any chemical compound of grease, call it by whatever name the manufacturer may; but they do protest against these grease compounds being placed on the market and sold to purchasers and consumers for what it is not—the product of the dairy.

The provisions of the Grout bill should plainly convince any unprejudiced thinking man that this is their only object, for although the Federal tax on oleomargarine and its kindred products is at the present time 2 cents a pound, by this bill this tax will be reduced to one-fourth of 1 cent a pound—merely a nominal amount—one which will enable these compounds to be sold for 1¼ cents cheaper than its present price.

But it does provide that all oleomargarine, the natural color of which is white, if colored to resemble butter shall pay a Federal tax of 10 cents. Why do the dairy interests ask the reduction? Simply because they wish to show in a practical manner that they

do not fear the honest competition of oleomargarine or any other grease so long as it has its natural color and must be sold in the open market for what it really is.

Why do they ask the imposition of a high tax on the colored compound? Simply because if it is sold for butter, which it is not, it can not be sold at a price under which honest butter can be produced.

These imitations, on an estimate based upon the market prices of the products entering into them and adding in labor, cost of production, and a fair profit to the manufacturer, can be produced at from 8 to 10 cents a pound, while, on the contrary, every farmer or every man that has ever examined into the manufacture of dairy butter knows that at 18 and 20 cents the profit is merely nominal and during many seasons of the year it can not be produced at that cost. Now, here let us examine what materials go in the manufacture of these compounds. They are the same, and in order that there may be no mistake about it I insert the answer given by the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States in reply to a resolution of this House asking for the information which under the present law the manufacturers are obliged to file in the Treasury Department, after swearing to the same.

This return also shows the amount of these grease compounds manufactured during the year beginning June 30, 1898, and ending June 30, 1899.

Quantities and kinds of ingredients used in the production of oleomargarine in the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1899; also, the percentage each ingredient bears to the whole quantity.

Materials.	Pounds.	Percentage each ingredient bears to the whole.
Neutral lard	31,297,251	34.27
Oleo oil	24,491,709	26.82
Cotton-seed oil	4,357,514	4.77
Sesame	486,310	.53
Coloring matter	148,970	.16
Sugar	110,164	.12
Glycerin	8,963	.01
Stearin	5,890	.007
Glucose	2,550	.003
Milk	14,200,576	15.55
Salt	6,773,670	7.42
Butter oil	4,342,904	4.76
Butter	1,568,319	1.72
Cream	3,527,410	3.86
Total	91,322,260	100

When you glance over this long list of various articles it has a tendency to make even a stout heart quail. It is claimed that they are all healthy and easily digested. Perhaps they are; I hope they are. To me it looks like a rather nasty mixture, and I may be pardoned for preferring my butter to be made of the natural juice of the cow. But I do not intend to discuss either the healthiness of the compound, its flavor, or its digestibility; others may discuss that part of the subject.

If anyone will take up the list and put market prices on the several ingredients, the statement I have made as to cost of production can be easily verified; and that is the point I wished to make clear. The burden of the complaint of the supporters of this measure is that these products are fraudulently sold as dairy butter. Is this charge true? I have before me a circular letter mailed to me and having the name of G. F. Swift, president of Swift & Co., of Chicago. He states, "It is absolutely impossible to-day, under the internal-revenue laws and regulations, to sell oleomargarine as butter to consumers of ordinary intelligence." Is this true? No thinking, reading citizen will believe this statement. Certainly none living in Pennsylvania who has read the North American and other newspapers, which have daily during the last three months shown up the frauds practiced in the sale of oleomargarine in Pennsylvania alone.

That State has stringent laws against the fraudulent sale of oleomargarine for butter, and severe penalties are attached; but even these laws it has shown—and daily now is conclusively showing—do not prevent or deter the manufacturers of oleomargarine and their agents from carrying on a gigantic system of frauds. Over 11,000,000 pounds of this grease was sold in Pennsylvania alone, nearly one-eighth of the entire output of the United States manufacturers—fully one-eighth when the amount exported is taken into account.

Was this sold as oleomargarine or butter? The answer may be found in the hundreds of indictments brought before the Federal courts against those who sold this trash for butter, and at butter prices. The cases tried conclusively proved that a mighty and extensive conspiracy existed, backed by the millionaire manufacturers, to set the laws at defiance and swindle the consuming public. These men, principals and agents, went so far as to guarantee immunity from punishment to those who carried on this nefarious business and perpetrated unblushingly these gigantic and outrageous frauds.

They went beyond this in their revel of lawlessness. They bribed the State authorities and officers who were supposed to have been appointed and who were paid out of the taxpayers' money for the purpose of detecting and punishing these offenders.

Such a flood of light has been thrown upon this subject that the man who makes the statement that oleomargarine is not largely sold as dairy butter would be stamped as a modern Ananias, and would be admitted without further examination to the order of the knights of that name.

It is hard to believe that the gentleman whose language I quoted above willfully made a false statement, but it is harder still to believe that he has not "ordinary intelligence." The public must explain his statement. In charity I am willing to believe he has been misinformed by the conspirators. Now, if a large part of the 11,000,000 pounds sold in Pennsylvania was sold as dairy butter—and when I fix that amount at 90 per cent I believe I place it within the bounds of truth—how much of the balance was sold in others States as the products of our dairies? Is it any wonder that the sales of these imitations have increased so rapidly?

Let us look at this increase, boasted by the manufacturers.

In the same letter Mr. Swift says—I read a portion of his letter:

Fourth. The annual report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1899 (pages 192 to 199, inclusive), furnishes much interesting and valuable information on this subject. For instance, the average monthly production of oleomargarine in 1888 was 2,880,460 pounds, while the average monthly production in 1899 was 6,928,325 pounds, showing an increase in production in eleven years of nearly 300 per cent. This increased production grew out of the increased market, and the increased market came because the people wanted and used oleomargarine. During the same period the averege quantity withdrawn monthly for exportation to foreign countries increased from 140,516 pounds in 1888 to 258,003 pounds in 1899.

The following table of production from all oleomargarine sources for each fiscal year since November 1, 1886, the date the oleomargarine law took effect, is interesting as showing the extent of operations in the country.

	Produced.	Revenue paid.
	Pounds.	
On hand Nov. 1, 1886	181,090	
During the fiscal year ended June 30—		
1887 (from Nov. 1, 1886)	21,513,537	$723,948.04
1888	34,325,527	864,139.88
1889	35,664,026	894,247.91
1890	32,324,032	786,291.72
1891	44,392,409	1,077,924.14
1892	48,364,155	1,206,329.60
1893	67,224,398	1,670,643.50
1894	69,632,246	1,723,479.80
1895	56,958,105	1,409,211.18
1896	50,853,234	1,219,432.46
1897	45,531,207	1,034,129.60
1898	57,516,136	1,315,708.54
1899	83,130,474	1,956,618.56
Total	647,610,476	15,942,101.43

This table is taken from the report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue above referred to, and is therefore authentic and official. It will be noted that the production has steadily increased until, in the year 1899, it amounted to 83,130,474 pounds.

The Secretary of the Treasury's statement shows that the production of oleomargarine in the United States for the month of December, 1899, was 11,713,743 pounds.

With these startling and unimpeachable figures, does any sane man wonder why the farmers of this country complain and ask the enactment of legislation which will only in a measure protect the dairy interests from utter annihilation in the very near future if the present fraudulent competition is allowed to go on.

Every member, when he casts his vote on this measure, must decide whether he will wipe out the entire dairy interests of his district to allow the millionaire bogus-butter manufacturers of the United States to roll up more millions; for that and nothing else is what a vote against the Grout bill means. To you members of this body who represent Southern constituencies, where the cotton blooms, I ask you whether you are willing by your votes to strike down the great dairy interests of this country in order that you may dispose of a few more gallons of cotton-seed oil than you otherwise would?

Have you no regard for your friends among our people who, like you, are trying under the most adverse circumstances and discriminating laws to wring a livelihood by the hardest labor from the soil of mother earth? There are innumerable legitimate uses for your oil. Daily and hourly you are gaining more extended markets for it among the people of the North and the East and the West. You need not fear for its present and its future—it has far better uses than a component part of bogus butter.

To you I will quote from Mr. Swift:

Cotton-seed oil: This ingredient is not always used; it is used in limited quantities in the medium grades.

The statistics above quoted show you how much, irrespective of

his assertions, is used. We, the friends of honest butter, ask your assistance. We ask you to take a broad and honest view of this subject and not be influenced by selfish and sordid considerations alone, but by your sense of right and justice. Show us what Southern justice and generosity is. Prove to us that it exists, and you can never give us more conclusive proof than by the stand you take on this bill. This is a case of live and let live. What is your answer?

To the Union Dairy Company, manufacturers of choice oleomargarine, I say, as honest men, change your name; oleomargarine is not a product of the dairy, and your name is a fraud, and it suggests fraud to others who handle your product. To the Retail Merchants' Association of Illinois, I say to you that for every dishonest dollar you may put into your pockets by the sale of oleomargarine for butter you pull five honest dollars out of the pockets of the trousers of the honest farmers who sell an honest product from the milk of their cows, and many of them live on the broad, grass-covered prairies of your own State.

To the various trade and labor organizations who have honored me with their protests against the Grout bill I say you have been imposed upon by false statements and designing and unscrupulous men. No one can object to your eating imitation butter from choice. You can even buy it for less money than you do now if this bill is enacted into law. It will not be colored, it is true, yet the color adds neither to its taste, its feel, its odor, or its healthfulness. Surely the difference in price will pay for its looks. And then you must also remember that you and yours are subject to the same impositions that have been inflicted upon your fellow-workmen all over the United States. The workmen in any community do not wish to buy oleomargarine for real butter, they do not want to pay two or three prices for these grease com pounds. Stop a minute and think. Do you?

Your plea that the passage of this bill will close the sixteen oleo factories and throw workmen out of employment is a weak one. It will not bear examination. Do you think these factories will be shut down? I would that this might happen, but it will not. They will surely not produce the quantity they do now, I grant you, and some workmen may lose employment there to find it in the manufacture of some honest product. But to every man that goes elsewhere for employment for this reason a score will find employment and a better living on our farms and in our creameries. Remember they are workingmen earning their living by the hardest kind of manual toil.

You could give the same reason for not interfering with the marketing of soapstone, whose product is mixed with the flour which goes into the bread you and your families eat. So could you give the same reason for not shutting down the manufactories which produce any other adulterated food article which is sold for genuine. You are the sufferers; you are the direct beneficiaries of all pure-food legislation honestly enforced. Ask your wives; they will tell you so, if you do not believe my statements.

This is no time for the workingmen of even Cincinnati, Cleveland, or Chicago to give their assistance to the oleo or any other trust. You speak of butter trusts. Do you not know that such a trust is a practical impossibility? Cattle used for dairy purposes will not flourish in large herds. The actual labor of producing butter is too great for a trust to be even thought of. Thousands of farmers would by adding to their herd of cows break it down in a few short months. Do not strain at a gnat and swallow a camel. Honesty in this case is the best policy; and what is more, it is right. Many of us who are pressing for this measure have for years fought, and hope in the future to actively assist in fighting, your battles. They are many. They are opposed by money and the same kind of arguments as you bring forward against the butter interests.

Had you not better consider before you are used as the tools of the backers of these frauds? When the farmers of this country cease to give you sympathy and assistance you will have a harder fight to maintain your rights than you have ever had in the past. It will not pay to go back on these valuable allies, and I am glad to say your opposition is not general. It is confined to only a very few spots, and you do not talk for the great army of the employed.

You ask me why it should be permissible for the makers of genuine butter to color their product and not the manufacturers of oleomargarine.

Mr. Swift ostentatiously boasts that they have colored oleomargarine a rich yellow color for twenty-five years, as though that gave a prescriptive right to continue the practice despite the disastrous results. The reason I give you for prohibiting the coloring of oleomargarine is that by coloring it you are able to and you actually do deceive the public.

God Almighty gave butter its color—the grass He gave the cows to eat colored it yellow. If any distinction is to be maintained, it must be the natural color when that color is most pronounced. When it bleaches from the want of grass food in color, it could hardly be told from oleomargarine; and it is as much as anything to maintain the true distinction that they are compelled to color it, and they do color it.

Butter, to my recollection, was never colored until it was brought into competition with these imitation competitors. The necessity for the passage of this legislation becomes evident when we call to mind that thirty-two States of the Union have enacted legislation to remedy this crying evil. They have from time to time by amendment made these laws more stringent. All action on this subject has been for greater protection and never for less—for heavier penalties and never for lighter. The people of these States by a large majority must have demanded and kept demanding this legislation, or these laws would never have been passed. Thereby they recognized the existence of the evil and the necessity for action such as this bill contemplates.

The most plausible argument, and one which seems to have done more than any other in convincing some of the labor organizations of the cities named above that this bill is hostile to their interests, is that the enactment of this law will raise butter to an exorbitant price, which they fix as high as 50 or 60 cents a pound. Surely when oleomargarine pays 10 cents tax, and costs not more than 10 cents, it would enter the competition colored at 20 cents a pound. Again, the increased production of butter, which will take place as soon as a small margin of profit appears, will be greatly increased, and this will in itself maintain the price at a point very nearly at the cost of its actual production.

So I say to you your fears are groundless and you will be able to buy and eat genuine butter at a price no greater than or but very little greater than its present price. On principle no one can object to pay for an article its actual cost plus a fair profit, but we can object to profits being made exorbitant by resorting to fraudulent practices.

In conclusion, let me say that the farmer's lot is a hard one; it means incessant toil of the severest kind; it means manual labor under the burning suns of July and August and in the drenching rains of March and April. His wife and every one of his growing family must contribute their share to keep the wolf from the door. He suffers from drawbacks which come to no other occupation. At one time it is too much rain, at another it is too little; at another it is the fly in his wheat, the cholera among his hogs and poultry, or some other disease among his sheep or his cattle

Hardly a season goes by that he must not face a substantial and unlooked-for loss. His taxes are high, and the owner of land and farm stock can not escape them, as does the coupon clipper. Profits never come to him in a great lump, as they do to the manufacturer. Good years are only comparative to him, as his margin of profit is never large, and bad years are often as disastrous as they are to the manufacturer. Ease and luxury he knows little about. He is always the victim of tariff legislation, for he pays a tariff on even the imported grains which he sows. He pays the direct and indirect exactions of all tariff-taxed commodities which he is forced to consume. He is forced to sell in the markets of the world at a price fixed by his foreign competitor, and buy at protection prices.

He suffers most from freight discriminations. He contributes the largest part by far to the profits of all trusts. He has suffered from the fall in the price of lands. He pays the highest rates of interest for the money he is forced to borrow. He asks but little consideration at the hands of Congress; he asks them not favors, but only rights. In this measure he asks just and necessary protection, and he now awaits your answer. He is no slave; he owes no allegiance to trusts or corporations; he is not controlled. He is still a proud freeman, and he has the power and the nerve to punish a public servant who fails to do his honest duty and secure protection to himself and the general public from an undeniable fraud practiced on them. Remember, "You can not fool all the farmers of this country all the time."

Civil Government for Alaska.

SPEECH

OF

HON. S. S. BARNEY,

OF WISCONSIN,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, May 17, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (S. 3419) making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes—

Mr. BARNEY said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I shall not at this time enter into an extended general discussion of the pending bill (Alaska code), as we are all agreed that there is a pressing necessity for proper legislation of this character at this session of Congress. Later on, however, when this measure is taken up under the five-minute rule, I shall have some suggestions to make as to its details.

At this time I desire to take advantage of the rules and practice of the House and make some remarks more particularly applicable to other important measures asking the attention of Congress—one measure at least, which though perhaps not political in its character, is of vital interest to a large portion and perhaps all the people of this country.

The most important industry in America is the farming industry. And while we all know this to be a fact, I sometimes think we pay less attention, in the way of legislation, to its needs than any other. The reason for this perhaps is that the farming industry is so diversified and scattered in its influence that its wrongs and necessities are not often heard from in legislative halls.

It is the one great industry in this country which is not yet organized into great corporations, which always seem to be able to take care of themselves, and, from its very nature, probably always will remain divided and free from concentration.

It has "stock," and, generally, well-watered stock; but not of the kind which is quoted upon Wall street. And I trust the day is far distant when that will be the case.

It is very seldom that the farmers of the country knock at the doors of Congress for relief, and for that reason if for no other when they do come their requests should be heeded. The fact that they are here asking for help is good evidence that they are entitled to our careful consideration. The measure to which I now refer is H. R. 3717, being a bill "to make oleomargarine and other imitative dairy products subject to the laws of the State or Territory into which they are transported, and to change the tax on oleomargarine," introduced by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GROUT], and commonly known as the "Grout bill." While that measure in some of its details may not be entirely above criticism, I regard its object and general scope as most meritorious. It seeks to prevent fraud both upon the honest producers and the honest consumers of this country, and that in relation to a food product which enters into the domestic economy of every household in the land.

For that reason it may truthfully be said to be a measure not alone for the relief of the farmer, but also in the interest of all the people of this country who are not directly connected with this fraud. This bill seeks to insure to the consumer a knowledge of what he is buying and eating, to the end that he may not be imposed upon either in quality or price, and to insure the producer against being compelled to compete against a swindle and a fraud.

Those who have not given the subject careful attention hardly realize the magnitude and importance of the dairy interests of this country. The annual value of the dairy products of the United States is more than $800,000,000, and my own State of Wisconsin produces to the value of more than $35,000,000 every year. Millions of men, women, and children in this country are chiefly dependent upon this industry for their support, and these millions form a class of people who have a right to be heard when they ask for help.

They ask for no subsidy or bounty; they ask for no class legislation; they ask for nothing but protection against a fraud and a counterfeit. They ask for no legislation to assist them in placing their product upon the market, but they do ask—and they have a right to ask—for a law which shall prevent swindlers and counterfeiters from invading that market. This law is simply a proposition to prevent deception of the consumer who wishes to buy butter, and is so palpably just as to hardly need argument. Butter is a product of the cow, and from time immemorial she has had a monopoly of this article, and no man or corporation has any better right to counterfeit butter than he has to counterfeit the current money of the land.

Butterine, oleomargarine, or whatever name it may be called by, has no more or better right to be called butter and sold in the market for butter than a bogus dollar has to pass for a genuine one. The only difference is in the extent of the injury done in the one case or in the other.

It should be remembered that the measure referred to does not seek to take away or limit the right of anyone to either manufacture, buy, or use butterine, oleomargarine, or any other substitute for butter; it only seeks to compel the manufacturers of these substitutes to place them upon the market and sell them for what they really are.

If a manufacturer still wishes to deceive the public and color his product in imitation of butter, he can do so upon the payment of the required tax. If it were possible under the Constitution to do so, I would not have any manufacturer permitted, for any price, to deceive the public in a food product; but this exercise of the taxing power seems to be the only feasible way we have of reaching and preventing this deception and swindling of the public.

It is said that we are thus indirectly taxing an article out of existence. Now, in the first place, let it be understood that we are not attempting to tax oleomargarine or any other substitute for butter out of existence when made and sold for what it really is, but only desire to make it difficult for manufacturers to place on the market and sell an article of food for what it is not. If this can be accomplished in this way, I am glad of it and have no apology to offer. Congress taxed the old State banks out of existence, and thus prevented the public from being imposed upon by a wildcat and unsafe currency, and that was done "with malice aforethought," and the great majority of the people of this country are saying amen to that legislation every day. Many States, by means of high license, tax rum out of the market, or at least limit its sale, which is the same thing in principle. If such legislation is a proper exercise of the taxing power, I see no impropriety in making it burdensome, by taxation, for counterfeiters to deceive the public in an article of food.

It has been claimed that this oleomargarine is a wholesome article of food, better than much of the butter which is sold in the market, and that it is bought and consumed by the poorer classes, and that such a law will deprive them of this privilege. There is no truth whatever to this proposition, and it is only a subterfuge, by the means of which dishonest manufacturers seek to obtain undeserved sympathy and support.

Such a law will not prevent or in any way limit the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine or any other substitute for butter when not placed upon the market in a manner calculated to deceive the public. This law is as much in the interest of the people who buy and consume oleomargarine as of those who produce butter, and will only reduce the dishonest profits of the oleomargarine manufacturer. When the public is deceived as to the kind and quality of the article it is buying, it is always liable to be cheated, and generally is cheated.

Why is oleomargarine made and sold in imitation of butter if not for the purpose of making the consumer think that he is buying butter, and thus fraudulently induce him to pay for it the price of butter? While all may not be thus deceived, some unquestionably are, and in that way the market price of oleomargarine is dishonestly raised above its fair market value. It has been proven that oleomargarine can be made for less than 8 cents per pound, and yet it is often sold for more than three times that sum. Thus it is seen that all classes are cheated by this counterfeit—the farmer, the dealer, and the consumer.

Let some law be enacted which will prevent this deception, at the same time in no way preventing or limiting the honest manufacture and sale of oleomargarine for what it really is, and the consumer of this article, instead of paying 18 or 20 cents a pound for it, will be able to get it for but little more than one-half that sum. The dishonest profit of the manufacturer will be taken away, and the man who can afford it and who buys gilt-edged creamery butter will perhaps pay a little more for it, for he will know what he is getting and will not be deceived.

At the last session of the Fifty-fifth Congress, the Senate, by resolution, authorized and directed its Committee on Manufactures to investigate the pure-food question, and to ascertain if any food products are frauds upon the purchasers. While this committee was in session in the city of Chicago last summer, several witnesses appeared before it with samples of oleomargarine, which had just been purchased for the "best creamery butter," and for which from 18 to 25 cents per pound had been paid. Some of these packages had no marks upon them at all, as required by law, to enable the purchaser to know what he was buying, and all the others were so wrapped that this mark was entirely concealed; and this evidence was not successfully contradicted.

Notwithstanding the fact that this kind of traffic is being carried on all over the country, all the time in violation of law, experience proves that under the present law it is practically impossible to prevent it or to punish the offenders.

It may be stated as a fact almost undisputed that more than four-fifths of the oleomargarine sold and consumed in this country is sold for pure butter; and a large part of that which is honestly sold is fraudulently placed before the consumer for pure butter by dishonest hotel and boarding-house keepers. This dishonest practice can be but for one purpose and can have but one effect, and that is to raise the price of the imitation article approximately to that of pure creamery butter, while its cost of production is less than one-half.

Does it need any argument to prove that if a law is passed and enforced which will prevent this deceit and fraud, this imitation will be reduced in price to a fair profit above the cost of production, and thus save money to the purchasers and consumers of oleomargarine? It is not to be wondered at that the pork packers of Chicago and other large cities are opposed to this measure, because without some such law they are able to sell imitation butter for more than twice the cost of production.

The following report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, in response to the resolution of Congress asking for information as to the ingredients used in the manufacture of oleomargarine, as shown by the returns of the different manufacturers, shows the composition of this article of food and proves beyond a doubt

that it is now being sold in the market for nearly twice what it is honestly worth:

[House Document No. 662, Fifty-sixth Congress, first session.]

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Washington, D. C., May 14, 1900.

SIR: In compliance with your instructions in responding to House resolution of May 8, 1900, I have the honor to submit herewith data therein called for.

The original forms in which this information is submitted to this office are not only very large in bulk, but voluminous in number, and can not very well be transmitted; besides, they are a part of the records of the Internal Revenue Bureau, and should not therefore leave the custody of the Treasury Department.

The data submitted discloses the kinds of material used, the amount of each ingredient, and the per cent that each bears to the total amount of oleomargarine produced in the country for the periods named, and it is believed furnishes all the information intended to be called for in the resolution.

Very respectfully,

G. W. WILSON, *Commissioner.*

The SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

Quantities and kinds of ingredients used in the production of oleomargarine in the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1899; also, the percentage each ingredient bears to the whole quantity.

Materials.	Pounds.	Percentage each ingredient bears to the whole.
Neutral lard	31,297,251	34.27
Oleo oil	24,491,769	26.82
Cotton-seed oil	4,357,514	4.77
Sesame	486,310	.53
Coloring matter	148,970	.16
Sugar	110,164	.12
Glycerin	8,963	.01
Stearin	5,890	.007
Glucose	2,550	.003
Milk	14,200,576	15.55
Salt	6,773,670	7.42
Butter oil	4,342,904	4.76
Butter	1,568,319	1.72
Cream	3,527,410	3.86
Total	91,322,260	100

Quantities and kinds of ingredients used in the production of oleomargarine in the United States for the month of December, 1899; also, the percentage each ingredient bears to the whole quantity.

Materials.	Pounds.	Percentage each ingredient bears to the whole.
Neutral lard	3,735,777	31.88
Oleo oil	3,309,085	28.84
Cotton-seed oil	511,157	4.34
Color	21,753	.18
Sesame	50,500	.43
Sugar	14,111	.12
Stearin	12,705	.10
Glycerin	1,212	.01
Glucose	2,940	.02
Butter	106,130	.90
Salt	800,156	6.83
Milk	1,889,467	16.13
Butter oil	727,062	6.20
Cream	471,688	4.02
Total	11,715,743	100

Without discussing the question as to the healthfulness of the above conglomeration of ingredients, I think I am justified in saying that it is not honestly worth in the market 20 cents per pound and never would sell for that sum if uniformly offered for sale without deception. Oleomargarine has the same rights before the public as any other food product, and it is not sought by this law to take from it one such just right. It has the right to be made of lard, hoof fat, cotton-seed oil, and soap grease. It has the right to come into the market honestly for what it actually is and, under those circumstances, to obtain for itself as high a price as the consumer will pay. But it has no right to sneak into the market disguised as pure butter and thereby obtain an unfair and dishonest advantage over both the butter consumer and the butter producer.

There is no better protection for the public against unjust profits than laws to compel producers to put their goods upon the market and sell them without deceit or fraud, and that is all this measure seeks to do.

We are told that we have no more right to tax the manufacturer of oleomargarine for his colored product than we have to tax the farmer who sometimes does the same thing. I say there is no analogy between the two cases whatever, because the manufacturer of oleomargarine colors his product for the purpose, and the only purpose, of cheating the consumer and making him believe he is buying something which he is not buying, while the producer of butter has no such object in view. Pure butter is colored to suit the fancy of the consumer and not to cheat him. I tell the man who sells me my butter that I do not wish it colored, and he brings it to me uncolored; others who buy of the same man desire their butter colored, and they get it to suit their fancy.

Nearly all wool is white, and everybody knows that to be a fact, and yet most of the garments which are made of wool are colored. This is not done for the purpose of cheating the buyer—and he is in no way deceived by it—but is done to suit the varied fancies of the buyers and wearers of woolen garments. There is no more fraud in the coloring of pure butter than there is in the coloring of wool and woolen goods.

In conclusion, I wish to say that there is a larger and broader principle involved in the measure than the protection of the farmer from the dishonest invasion of his market or the protection of the consumer from this one fraud.

America is the richest and most fertile country on the face of the earth. It has the means and the capacity of producing the greatest variety and the best foods consumed by man. Its people are the most ingenious and skillful people under the sun. For these reasons the food products of America ought to be the best in the world; and yet, if one wishes to purchase an extra article of food, he must buy something either actually imported or marked imported to deceive him.

Is it not a fact, humiliating to every American citizen, that foreign brands are placed upon our best food products to make people believe they were not made in America? And why is this so? Not because we have not the material and the skill to make the best food under the sun, for we have both; but because we have not yet risen to the standard of the Old World in the enactment and enforcing of pure-food laws.

The first step in that direction is to drive out of our markets every fraud and counterfeit. Every State should make and enforce laws which will enable the purchaser to know just what he is buying and eating or drinking, and the Federal Government should lend its aid in that direction, so far as it can, by the exercise of its taxing power.

If one wishes for any reason to buy ground pease instead of coffee, oleomargarine instead of butter, or any other substitute instead of the genuine article, he should have the unlimited right to do so, but he should buy in the market with a full knowledge of what he is getting. He can then buy pure food if he wishes to do so, and whatever he buys he can get it for what it is reasonably worth. This measure will at least help to accomplish that object with reference to one of the most important and delicate articles of food which goes upon the American table, and that is why I am heartily in favor of it.

I sincerely trust that before this session of Congress closes this measure will be reported to the House and considered. If that is done, it will undoubtedly pass, and it is a great wrong to prevent this consummation by parliamentary scheming.

Trusts.

SPEECH
OF
HON. FRANCIS R. LASSITER,
OF VIRGINIA,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Friday, June 1, 1900.

The House having under consideration joint resolution (H. Res. 138) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States,

Mr. LASSITER said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not accustomed to this rough and tumble debate which I have enjoyed for the last few minutes, but I had intended to ask a question of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee of this House, which was answered by his silence when the gentleman from Texas charged him with the fact this morning. It is perfectly patent to my mind, devoted as I have been for my whole life to the interests of the people, that it is not the desire of the majority of this House to pass any legislation which shall restrict the illegal combinations which we call trusts. I had intended to ask the chairman of the Judiciary Committee whether he and his party associates had any arrangement with the leaders of either party in the other branch of this governmental body, looking to the favorable consideration of the pending resolution at this session of Congress? In view of the fact that a resolution has been adopted that Congress adjourn on the 6th of this month, and with the knowledge that several other important measures, including appropriation bills, are yet to be considered by both Houses of Congress, it must be evident to the country that this amendment to the Constitution is not aimed at trusts. It is aimed at the Democratic party.

Trusts will flourish so long as the Republican party is trusted to devise legislation to suppress them. Democrats, and all others who sincerely reprobate the illegal trade combinations known by this name, should reject this fraud—this Grecian horse—whose author could doubtless trace his lineal descent from Sinon. For one, knowing I should traduce my constituents in believing that they could be deceived by the political play of the majority, I shall adhere to the traditional principles of Democracy and with the caucus of that party vote against this snare. I can not do violence to the Constitution of my country, the sovereign rights of a sovereign State which I represent in part, nor hold out false hopes to people of this land who are the prey of these combinations, under Republican legislation and administration, for selfish fear lest my life-time record shall be misconstrued. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Increase of Pay of Surfmen of the Life-Saving Service.

Life, which all creatures love and strive to keep,
Wonderful, dear, and pleasant unto each,
Even to the meanest; yea, a boon to all
Where pity is, for pity makes the world
Soft to the weak and noble for the strong.
Arnold—"Light of Asia."

SPEECH

OF

HON. TOWNSEND SCUDDER,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, May 4, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 11212) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes—

Mr. SCUDDER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This amendment should pass. The surfmen employed in our Life-Saving Service are underpaid. It is because this benignant service is threatened seriously, and because calamity will be the natural result of its crippled condition that we ask commensurate remuneration for those employed in it. Not that money reward can adequately compensate for the saving of precious human life, for life is priceless. Its loss can not be repaid. There are losses for which rewards and gains will afford compensation; not so loss by death, and for this reason legislation for its protection and preservation can not be too generous.

I would pay the life saver so well and make such liberal provision for his loved ones that thought of them or of self would be removed even more from his mind than it is now, if that be possible, at the moment of great danger, when risks seeming hopeless and heroism without bounds are demanded of him. With how much better heart and courage could these brave fellows go to their work if freed from all anxiety for their dear dependents in event of accident to themselves? I will not attempt to answer the question. To me it seems that the annals of the service reveal few cases of anything but the most complete self-abnegation and sacrifice in the hour of need, and for this reason the more would I wipe away that anxiety which must prey upon them in their leisure moments.

Mr. Chairman, the standard of civilization of a people is measured by their regard for the sanctity of human life—the divine gift of our divine Maker—life—equally precious to the lowly and to him of high degree—life, for the preservation of which every instrumentality known to the highest civilization of mankind should be called into requisition.

Our Life-Saving Service has been said to be divinely beautiful; the characterization is apt and deserved, for its benefactions know no boundary; its example has been an incentive to all nations; it rescues the children of all nationalities.

Is it to be marveled that enlightened governments everywhere are following the example we have set? The gallant and heroic services which humanity in distress has received at the hands of our life-saving crews have been recognized by foreign powers on more than one occasion, several of which have bestowed upon these heroes of ours especial tokens of grateful appreciation, among them the Government of Spain, which awarded a crew near Cape Charles medals of honor; the Government of Great Britain; the German Empire, which bestowed money upon the families of surfmen who perished in endeavoring to save the crew of a German vessel below Cape Henry, and awarded valuable tokens to the survivors of our crew, the greater number of whom were lost.

I have no doubt there are other instances, but do not call them to mind. These suffice to prove how general is the recognition our Life-Saving Service has received, after which other nations have organized similar institutions, but to which is awarded, by general consent, the preeminence in this God-like work. Representing a district embracing many miles of coast, along which are scattered over 10 per cent of the life-saving stations of the Government, and a constituency deeply interested and concerned in the work of the Life-Saving Service, I feel justified in calling to the attention of the House the dangers threatening this service by reason of the neglect of Congress to make adequate provision for the compensation of the life savers.

At an early date in this session I had the honor of introducing a bill (H. R. 7436) fixing the compensation of surfmen employed in the Life-Saving Service at the uniform sum of $65 per month. Gladly would I have made it seventy, but I feared to ask too much at this time.

I had previously introduced another bill (H. R. 97) providing for the pensioning, by retirement on half pay, of keepers and surfmen disabled by reason of wound or injury received or disease contracted in the Life-Saving Service in the line of duty so as to unfit them for the performance of duty.

The bill further provides that any person who has been, is now, or at any time hereafter may be a keeper or member of a crew of a life-saving or lifeboat station may, at his own request or at the pleasure of the Secretary of the Treasury, upon the expiration of twenty years' employment in the Life-Saving Service, be retired upon half pay for the remainder of his life.

That if any keeper or member of a crew of a life-saving or lifeboat station shall hereafter die by reason of perilous service or any wound or injury received or disease contracted in the Life-Saving Service in the line of duty, leaving a widow, or child or children under 16 years of age, such widow and child or children shall be entitled to receive, in equal portions, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, one-half of the same amount, payable quarterly as far as practicable, that the husband or father would be entitled to receive as pay if he were living and continued in service.

The portion payable to the widow to cease upon her death or marriage, and the portion payable to any child to cease upon his or her attaining the age of 16 years. Upon the death or remarriage of the widow her portion of said amount to be added to the amount to be paid to the remaining beneficiaries under the provisions of section 8, if there be any; and upon the arrival of any child at the age of 16 years the payment of the portion of such child to thereafter be added to the amount to be paid to the remaining beneficiaries, if there be any. I feel that these provisions should be extended also to the superintendents and assistants in this service.

Both of these bills were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The pension bill I have not succeeded in having reported, not for lack of interest in the subject, but rather, I assume, owing to an indisposition at this time to take up new legislation, particularly that extending the pension system to the civil service. The experience which I have gained on this subject, however, encourages me in the hope that the time is not long distant when the end I have at heart will be accomplished. I feel assured that a bill can be framed which will meet the serious objections of those opposed to the extension of the pension system, of the merits of which legislation, so far as the Life-Saving Service is concerned, I will speak later.

My bill increasing the pay of surfmen (H. R. 7436) has fared better than the pension bill, its passage, with certain amendments in matters of detail, having been recommended by Hon. Sumner I. Kimball, the General Superintendent of the service (H. R. Report 1078, Fifty-sixth Congress, first session), to whom and to Mr. Horace L. Piper, the Assistant General Superintendent, I am gratefully indebted for much valuable information upon the Life-Saving Service. I take the liberty of using Mr. Kimball's language commending my bill, as it expresses the condition confronting the service far better than can words of mine.

To enable the committee to properly consider this bill, it seems proper that they should have information regarding the extent and location of the stations at which surfmen are employed, the number of surfmen, their required qualifications, the nature of their duties, and the hardships and dangers to which they are exposed.

The Life-Saving Service, as at present organized, divides the 10,000 miles of sea and lake coast of the United States into 12 districts embracing 260 stations in commission, distributed as follows: On the Atlantic, 190; on the Great Lakes, 55; on the Pacific, 14; and 1 at the Falls of the Ohio, Louisville, Ky. Each of these stations, excepting 8 on the coast of Florida, is manned by a keeper and a crew of surfmen ranging in number from 6 to 8, according to the requirements of the various localities, making the aggregate number of surfmen employed 1,763 who would be affected by the enactment into law of the bill under consideration.

On the Pacific coast the stations are open and manned throughout the year; on the lake coasts, from the beginning to the close of navigation (say from April 1 to December 15); on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts, from the 1st of August to the 31st of May, following. During the period the several stations are manned each

year the surfmen, under the existing laws, receive a compensation of $60 per month.

Surfmen are employed only after examination and certification by the Civil Service Commission. An applicant must be a citizen of the United States; not under 18 or over 45 years of age; not less than 5 feet 6 inches in height; not less than 135 or more than 205 pounds in weight; must reside in the district in which he seeks employment, and not more than 5 miles from the ocean, bay, or sound shore, or the shore of the Great Lakes (except applicants for the Louisville station); must be able to read and write the English language; must be a good swimmer, and must pass a satisfactory physical examination.

No person, however, can be examined who has not had at least three years' experience as a surfman, sailor, or boatman, unless the number of eligibles shall be found insufficient to fill the vacancies. An applicant, if successful, must, before signing articles of engagement in a crew, pass another physical examination by an officer of the United States Marine-Hospital Service, and be certified as physically sound. Once in the service, at any time during six months after his entry, if his conduct or capacity be not satisfactory, the keeper can, upon his own volition, discharge him from the service.

These restrictions limit the location of surfmen to the coast where they are to be employed, and of those eligibles by location it has been shown that only men in the prime of life and physically sound, accustomed to the handling of boats, and believed to be capable of withstanding the labor and exposures incident to the performance of their duty, are admitted to the service. It may be added that anyone subsequently found deficient is immediately discharged.

During the period of active service every surfman is required by law to reside at the station where employed, which, in most cases, is upon some lonely and exposed point of the coast, thus separating him from his family and preventing all social intercourse. During this time he is entitled by the regulations to be absent a period from sunrise to sunset in pleasant weather, in turn with the other members of the crew, or in lieu of two turns he may be absent twenty-four hours; but in this case he must furnish a substitute, to whom he must pay his entire salary for the period absent. No other absence is permitted except in an exigency, and then only upon loss of pay, a substitute being employed and paid the full salary of the absent man.

Their duties at the stations consist of daily practice and drill of some kind with the boats and apparatus, taking care of the station and the Government property, making such repairs and improvements as may be within the scope of their ability, and at night and during thick weather keeping watch and patrol upon the beach. The night is divided into four watches, each of which is taken, in turn, by two surfmen, proceeding from the station in opposite directions, and patrolling the beach until they meet the patrolmen from the adjacent stations, and exchange checks with them to prove their faithful execution of this duty. Where the stations are located at too great a distance from other stations to admit of this a regular beat of several miles is assigned, the limit of which is marked by a key post, which the patrolman is obliged to reach and there make record of his presence upon the patrol clock which he carries for the purpose. The severity of this duty can hardly be conceived by people accustomed to remain at night within doors.

Some idea may be formed from the fact that men have perished in its discharge, while others have providentially escaped death through timely rescue by their comrades. It is not at all unusual for patrolmen to meet with accidents which cripple them through stumbling in the dark over driftwood and unseen obstacles, and a large proportion of the deaths which have occurred in the service is due to complaints contracted through exposure on patrol. It frequently happens during the prevalence of storms that the men are drenched by overflooding seas, or by having to wade through the beach gullies often waist deep and sometimes deeper. This duty is considered so important that it is never under any circumstances omitted, and its infraction is held to be unpardonable, and is followed by certain dismissal.

In addition to the foregoing regular routine must be added their terrible and daring labors at shipwrecks. This, of course, is their crowning duty, and involves efforts almost superhuman and heroism carried to the very brink of deadly peril and often to death itself. It is unnecessary to enlarge upon this feature, as many examples of their prowess are known to the country at large and have become as familiar as household words. The extent of their success is attested in the annual reports of the Service by statistics showing great numbers of lives saved and vast amounts of property delivered from the sea.

When it is considered that the life-saving crews are thus composed of selected professional experts, as it were—the pick of our hardy beachmen and sailors—that their duties, hardships, and exposures are as above described, and that the results of their labors and achievements have won for the Service the foremost place among all similar institutions in the world, thus adding luster to the national honor, it would seem that their compensation should bear relation rather to the value of their services than to the rate of wages current on the coast. Such, however, is not now and never has been the case.

For ten years previous to 1892 the compensation of surfmen was, under the law, fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury at a rate not to exceed $50 per month for such period as the General Superintendent might find necessary. This pay proved so meager that men best qualified for the service preferred private employment, and Congress, therefore, by an act approved July 22, 1892, provided that surfmen should receive $65 per month each during the time the stations were manned.

By a provision in the act of August 3, 1894, extending the period of active service on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts from eight to ten months in the year, however, the above rate was limited to those surfmen who should serve for a shorter period than 8 months, $60 only being allowed to those serving the full period named for the Atlantic and Gulf coasts. This proviso was offered as an amendment by a minority in the House of Representatives, and was insisted upon at a time in the passage of the bill when, if the point of "no quorum" had been raised, the bill would have failed.

The discrimination thus made in the compensation of surfmen was productive of much complaint among them, and involved difficulties in the administration of the service and the settlement of the accounts which it is not necessary to enumerate here. They are set forth in the annual report of the operations of the service for the year 1894, and were in some measure remedied by an amendment in the appropriation bill of March 2, 1895, extending the period of service for which $65 per month could be paid from eight to eight and one-half months. On account of the discrimination still remaining, however, the administration of the service continued to suffer serious embarrassments which, as the committee having the bill under consideration may wish to understand, are quoted, as set forth in the annual report for 1895:

The act approved July 22, 1892, increasing the compensation of all surfmen from $50 to $65 per month, relieved the service of the difficulty it had for a considerable period experienced in enlisting and retaining competent men for the crews. Although the rate then fixed was smaller than many thought should have been accorded, it sufficed to secure the requisite ability and to restore contentment in the stations.

The act of August 3, 1894, extending the period of active service upon the Atlantic and Gulf coasts two additional months (May and August), however, created a new disturbance, which threatened results scarcely less disastrous to the morale of the service than those which were apprehended and were making themselves apparent in consequence of the insufficient wages provided for the men previous to the increase of 1892.

This discontent sprang from a clause contained in the act which provided that all surfmen serving more than eight months should receive but $60 per month during the period of their service, and thus made a discrimination in the rate of compensation chiefly against those serving in a large proportion of the stations on the lakes, but also against many on the ocean coasts, and gave rise to numerous difficult questions of construction in the administration of the law. The difficulties were set forth to some extent in the last annual report, and attention was called to the necessity for remedial legislation. A provision inserted in the act making appropriations for the maintenance of the service for the current fiscal year, extending the rate of $65 per month to all surfmen serving for a period of eight and one-half months, obviated many of the difficulties; but a serious one yet remains, the discrimination now being chiefly in favor of the lake as against the ocean coasts, and in favor of one man in each of the 154 manned stations on the Atlantic coast against his comrades in the same station and all others employed on both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts.

This happens from the fact that the term of active service upon the lakes, which is from the opening to the close of navigation, rarely or never exceeds eight and one-half months, and from the circumstance that in each of the 154 stations on the Atlantic an extra man is employed from December 1 to May 1—a period of less than eight and one-half months. The surfmen upon the lakes, therefore, and the extra man referred to, their term of service being within eight and one-half months, receive $65 per month, while all the others receive but $60.

The sense of injustice which this inequality excites among the men naturally creates much discontent and ill feeling, besides provoking constant strife on the part of the best surfmen throughout a large extent of the Atlantic coast to obtain the shorter period of service, it being a fact, which the authors of the law in question were apparently unaware of, that upon many portions of the Atlantic coast the services of men expert in surfing, boating, and fishing command much better wages during the late spring, summer, and autumn months than have ever been paid in the Life-Saving Service.

The interests of the service, no less than simple justice, demand that the compensation of surfmen shall be made uniform at what-

ever rate, and it is believed that $65 per month, the rate established by the act of July 22, 1892, is none too large.

It is noted here that no further allowance has ever been made to them, food, clothing, etc., being entirely at their own expense. This is mentioned because the idea is more or less prevalent that, like the enlisted men in the Army and Navy, surfmen are allowed rations, etc.

The embarrassments mentioned were repeatedly made known to the committees on appropriations, and the establishment of a uniform rate was recommended to them. Finally, in appropriating for the sundry civil expenses of the Government for the current fiscal year, the rate of $60 per month was provided for surfmen throughout the service. While $65 per month would have been a more suitable rate, though one by no means adequate to their deserts, the fact that it was the same throughout the service was a source of great relief, and would have proved of such advantage that, if there had not been recently a great increase in the rate of wages for labor and in the cost of the necessaries of life, I should not now urge the increase contemplated by the bill, nor do I think the surfmen would have asked for it.

But the rise in the cost of living and the increase in the wages of laboring men throughout the country—and especially of men competent to handle boats—has so made itself felt in the decrease of the number of men seeking employment as surfmen, as well as in the increase in the number of resignations from the service for entry into better-paying private positions, that serious injury has already been done the service, and still more serious results are threatened. Within a year more than 15 per cent of the entire number of surfmen in the lake districts have resigned to better their condition, and the number of men applying for examination with a view to entering the service has so decreased that in nearly all the districts there have not at times been eligibles enough to fill the vacancies. The condition of the Ninth life-saving district, including the coasts of Lakes Erie and Ontario, is well set forth in the following extract from the quarterly report of the district superintendent, dated September 28, 1899:

"I found throughout the district a considerable feeling of uneasiness and dissatisfaction among the surfmen on account of the reduction in their pay, coming, as it did, when wages ashore and afloat through this section of the country are advancing. Attention is respectfully called to the fact that in nearly all of the changes during the season in this district the reason given by the surfmen for leaving the service has been that they thought they could do better elsewhere. During the trip I endeavored as much as possible, by talking with the men, to stay this current of unrest and desire to seek employment elsewhere; but I fear that some of the best men in the district will not return another season. The cost of living has advanced, and the point is made by the men that if they can do as well at other employment and be with their families it is more advantageous for them to do so.

"This district is in what in prosperous times is a center of industry. The cities of Oswego, Rochester, Buffalo, Dunkirk, Erie, Cleveland, Sandusky, and Toledo, with the many smaller intermediate towns, afford many openings for such men as the service most needs.

"Attention is also called to the dropping off of the applications for examination for the position of surfmen, the reason for which is, without doubt, the many other openings at present, both on the lakes and ashore, together with the reduction in wages in the service. I have sent out many notices to the lake towns, inviting sailors, fishermen, etc., to apply, and have in other ways endeavored to obtain applications, but the work so far is almost barren of results.

"This statement fairly represents the situation in the remaining lake districts, covering the coasts of Lakes Huron, Michigan, and Superior.

"The wages of a common seaman on the lakes during the past summer was $1.75 per day, besides his living, which increased in the fall to $3 per day, with living furnished. It is evident that the service, paying $2 per day without board, which would leave the surfmen about $1.50 net, can not compete with the shipmaster who pays $3 per day with board in addition.

"As an officer of the service has aptly expressed it, 'Heroes on $1.50 a day, especially if they have large families to support, however full of human kindness or prone to daring exploits, will immediately yield to the plump $3 per diem of the lake schooner or steamer with the fleshpots of the cook's galley thrown in by way of garnish.'

"On the Atlantic coast while the relative number of resignations has not quite equaled that on the lakes, the conditions are nearly as unsatisfactory, while in the Gulf district for a year or more the crews have been more or less made up of such men as were available from outside who have not passed—and perhaps could not pass—the required examinations for entry in the service, it being impossible to obtain eligibles.

"It is not difficult to foresee what the inevitable result of this disinclination of the best qualified men to accept permanent employment in the service must be—a result which it is believed neither Congress nor the country desires. There must be some additional inducement to retain the best men already in the service, and to cause that class of men outside to apply for entry thereto. The additional compensation contemplated by the bill under consideration will, it is believed, furnish the inducement desired; and I therefore urgently recommend its passage, amended, however, so that the new rate shall take effect at the beginning of the next fiscal year, and the period of pay be limited, as now, to that part of the year when surfmen are actively employed."

If I may be indulged, Mr. Chairman, I will give a brief sketch of the history of the development of the American Life-Saving Service now covering a period of existence exceeding the century mark by fourteen years.

The initiatory movement was the organization of a few benevolent persons of the Massachusetts Humane Society in 1786. In attempting to alleviate the miseries of shipwreck on the Massachusetts coast, small boats were built; and in 1807 the first lifeboat station was established at Cohasset. The society depended upon voluntary crews, but so much was accomplished of value that some pecuniary aid was received, as time wore on, from both State and National government.

The magnificent work of the Coast Survey begun in earnest in 1832, absorbed the resources of Congress for a decade and a half, during which period nothing was attempted in the way of life-saving except through voluntary societies. A few public vessels were, indeed, authorized in 1837 to cruise near the coast for the assistance of shipping in distress, but it was through the movement in aid of commerce which extended to the light-house system.

In 1847, $5,000 were appropriated by Congress toward furnishing light-houses on the Atlantic with the facilities for aiding shipwrecked mariners. The money, after remaining in the Treasury two years unused, was permitted to be expended by the Massachusetts society upon Cape Cod.

In the summer of 1848 the Hon. William A. Newell, then a member of the House of Representatives from New Jersey, incited by some terrible shipwrecks on the coast of that State, induced Congress, through his eloquence, to appropriate $10,000 for providing surfboats and other appliances "for the protection of life and property from shipwreck on the coast between Sandy Hook and Little Egg Harbor." During the next session a still larger appropriation was obtained. Twenty-two station houses were erected on the coasts of New Jersey and Long Island, and although no persons were paid or authorized to take charge of them, and they were manned by extemporized crews, their value in several cases of shipwreck was so great that Congress made further appropriations from year to year, and stations and lifeboats gradually multiplied.

Through the pressure of a shocking event in 1854—the loss of three hundred human lives off the New Jersey coast—a local superintendent was employed, a keeper assigned to each station, and bonded custodians placed in charge of the lifeboats, which before that time had been repeatedly stolen; but the absence of drilled and disciplined crews, of general regulations, and of energetic central administration rendered the record of the institution unsatisfactory and its benefits checkered by the saddest failures.

In 1871 Sumner I. Kimball succeeded to the head of the Revenue Marine Bureau of the Treasury Department, under charge of which were the life-saving stations. He made it his first duty to ascertain their condition. Capt. John Faunce was detailed to make a tour of inspection, and was accompanied a portion of the way by Mr. Kimball himself. The buildings were found neglected and dilapidated, the apparatus rusty or broken, portable articles had been carried away, the salaried keepers were often living at a distance from their posts, some of them too old for service and others incompetent, and the volunteer crews were in a quarrelsome temper with each other and with the coast population.

Then commenced that vigorous prosecution of reform which has crowned the humane work with unprecedented success. Making the most of slender appropriations, and in the face of perpetual discouragements, this one man, the chief of a bureau, pushed on by philanthropic impulses and guided by unerring judgment, brought a complete and orderly system into effect. It was not the work of a day, nor of a year. It required patience, sagacity, and rare powers of organization and government. He knew no office hours, working day and night at what many were pleased to consider a hopeless task. In his brain originated the idea of guarding the entire coasts of the nation through the planting of a chain of fortresses to be garrisoned by disciplined conquerors of the sea. It is a matter of public record, and generally known to the country, that through his practical devotion to the cause this has been so nearly accomplished.

In reorganizing what there was of the service he prepared a code of regulations for its absolute control. The duties of every man employed were minutely defined. The lazy, the careless, and the unworthy were dismissed, and men chosen to fill their places with sole reference to integrity and professional fitness. Politics was abolished; that is, experts in the surf were regarded as of more consequence to drowning victims than voters of any particular

political ticket. The station houses were repaired and increased in numbers as fast as the means afforded by Congress would allow; the appliances for life-saving were restored and improved from year to year through the best inventions and discoveries in this or any other country, and a rigid system of inspection and of patrol was inaugurated.

The record of the first season on the New York and New Jersey coasts, where the new system first went into actual operation, showed that every person imperiled by shipwreck was saved. Consequently a commission, consisting of Mr. Kimball, Captain Faunce, and Capt. J. H. Merryman, of the Revenue Marine, surveyed in 1873, by order of Congress, the vast and varied coasts of the oceans and lakes, investigating personally the characteristics of the dangerous localities, and holding consultations with underwriters, shipowners, captains of vessels, and veteran surfmen.

The report of this commission placed before Congress a minute account of the disasters to vessels on every mile of coast for the previous ten years; a bill based upon it, prepared by Mr. Kimball, became a law June 20, 1874. It provided for the extension of the field of this great national work of humanity; for the bestowal of medals of honor upon persons risking their lives to save others, and empowered the collection and tabulation of statistics of disaster to shipping which, by reference to the periodicity of marine casualties, aided in determining the points most needing protection, and in various other ways benefited both Government and maritime interests.

No history, be it ever so condensed, of the development of this noble service would be complete without grateful mention of Hon. S. S. Cox, of New York, to whose generous, humane heart and impulse, untiring efforts and energy, and singular abilities and eloquence the service owes its recognition by the Federal Government, its incorporation into our system as a fixed institution, and its introduction into the hearts of a grateful people.

From the little start the service received in 1871, through an appropriation of $10,080 secured by Mr. Cox, what immense results have followed!

We have to-day distributed along our ocean, Gulf, and lake coasts 265 stations, manned by gallant men, whose courage, skill, and humanity have made the service not alone honorable and humane, but have ingratiated it in the hearts of the people, where it is cherished as one of the richest fruits of an enlightened Government. I have before me the annual report of General Superintendent Kimball for the year ending June 30, 1899, and that I may illustrate the beneficence of the service I will quote from its pages.

There were 265 stations embraced in the Life-Saving Establishment at the close of the fiscal year. Of this number, 193 were situated on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts, 56 on the coast of the Great Lakes, 15 on the Pacific coast, and 1 at the falls of the Ohio, Louisville, Ky.

The number of disasters to documented vessels within the field of station orperations during the year was 428. There were on board these vessels 3,903 persons, of whom 56 were lost. The estimated value of the vessels was $6,072,635 and that of their cargoes $2,032,005, making the total value of property imperiled $8,104,640. Of this amount $6,261,900 was saved and $1,842,740 lost. The number of vessels totally lost was 72.

In addition to the foregoing there were also 294 casualties to undocumented craft—sailboats, rowboats, etc.—carrying 671 persons, 7 of whom perished. The value of property involved in these instances is estimated at $138,535, of which $129,285 was saved and $9,250 lost.

Seven hundred and fifty-one persons received succor at the stations, the number of days' relief furnished aggregating 1,460.

From the foregoing it appears that 63 lives were lost within the scope of the service during the year, a larger number, with a single exception, than in any year during the last two decades. Forty-four persons perished in one district, embracing only the coast of Massachusetts, and one-half of this number were on board vessels which were destroyed on islands and outlying rocks in the night when they could not been seen from the mainland, and the first knowledge of which was gained from wreckage coming ashore. In a word, this overwhelming loss of life on a coast long noted for frightful disasters was the result of a single stroke inflicted in the dark, which was so sudden that it could not be parried, and so powerful that its awful effects could not be mitigated. This almost unprecedented tempest wrought its direst effects between Gay Head and Point Allerton. Careful investigation of all the circumstances of each casualty shows that the station crews there were uniformly vigilant, brave, and efficient.

During the following February another extremely severe blizzard prevailed along the Atlantic coast from Texas to Massachusetts, but in marked contrast as to results with that of November, principally because its progress northward covered several days (the 8th to the 15th), and, therefore, afforded shipmasters ample warning and time to seek harbors of refuge. While it prevailed, however, the station crews rendered assistance to 28 vessels carrying 230 persons, of whom none were lost. The exacting and dangerous labors of the surfmen were performed in all cases with skill and daring.

The record of the men on the Lakes is equally worthy of commendation. Disastrous tempests occurred on those waters during October and November, 1898, involving 28 vessels and 162 persons, of whom not one perished. Indeed, during the entire season only 3 persons were lost in 263 disasters on the Lakes, comprising craft of all descriptions.

On the Pacific coast there were lost within the scope of the service only 13 lives during the entire year, and 11 of these were from a small vessel which was capsized more than a mile from land and destroyed within ten minutes.

The results of disasters to vessels of all descriptions within the scope of the service aggregate as follows:

Total number of disasters	722
Total value of property involved	$8,243,175
Total value of property saved	$6,391,185
Total value of property lost	$1,851,990
Total number of persons involved	4,574
Total number of persons lost	63
Total number of shipwrecked persons succored at stations	751
Total number of days' succor afforded	1,460
Number of vessels totally lost	72

From this tabulation it will be seen that, were we to regard the service divested of all sentiment and clothed in a cold business light, the saving of property alone would justify the annual appropriation proposed for the fiscal year, which, including $40,000 for new stations, will amount to $1,611,180, which sum will be increased by $88,330 if this amendment raising the pay of surfmen be passed.

But let us pursue this report further and we will find additional grounds for our commendation.

There were during the year 97 persons rescued from positions of danger otherwise than from vessels, who would probably have perished but for the aid of the surfmen. Of these, 25 had fallen from wharves, piers, landings and the like; 9 were bathers who were in imminent danger of drowning; 39 were rescued from dangerous places from which they were unable to extricate themselves; 10 were on outlying rocks, cribs, or points cut off from land by the rising tide; 3 were overcome by exhaustion or exposure; 5 were adrift on broken ice; 1 had broken through the ice; 1 was recovered from the water apparently drowned, but was resuscitated; 3 were rescued from a building wrecked by an explosion, and 1 was taken from a drifting raft.

Five hundred and ninety-one stranded vessels were floated off, repaired when damaged, piloted out of dangerous situations, and in similar ways assisted by the station crews. Minor assistance was also afforded to 382 vessels and small craft. One hundred and ninety-three vessels running into danger of stranding were warned off by the signals of the patrolmen, the most of them probably having been saved from serious danger or total loss.

The surfboat was used 773 times, making 1,089 trips. The self-righting and self-bailing lifeboat was used 132 times, making 163 trips. The gasoline launches at the City Point Station (Second district) were used 80 times, making 90 trips. Smaller boats were used 432 times, making 526 trips. The river life skiffs at the Louisville station (Ninth district) were used 41 times, making 97 trips. The breeches buoy was used 11 times, making 55 trips. The wreck gun was employed 17 times, firing 29 shots. The heaving stick was used 28 times.

There were landed by the surfboat, 949 persons; by the lifeboat, 111; by the gasoline launches, 184; by the river life skiffs, 162; by other station boats, 151, and by the breeches buoy, 54.

In addition to the foregoing, there were miscellaneous rescues as follows: 11 persons, by wading out into the surf; 6 persons, by a ladder from shore to a stranded vessel; 6 persons, by a line from a sinking vessel to a pier; 2 persons, by means of heaving lines, and 1 person was hauled through the surf on the whip line when the hawser was not set up.

I wish I had the time to enter upon the deeds of heroism and mercy which have distinguished the service during the past year. I earnestly recommend to all the reading of the general superintendent's report. It does one good in these days of commercial activity and absorption to be reminded that there are men in our midst whose lives are devoted to works of humanity, valor, and self-sacrifice, not less disinterested and distinguished than the deeds of the heroes of history. Well has it been said that this service "has no peer in the world for its effective work, and no paragon in the history of nations for its inspiration."

The assertion is made boldly. Departmental records nowhere show such sure and satisfactory progress in all right directions as are exhibited in "the short and simple annals" of the Life-Saving Service. We can pause with profit to ourselves to consider for a moment, in summary form, the statistics of the service from the first little appropriation in 1871 to the close of the last fiscal year, June 30, 1899; and were it given to us to read between the figures chronicling these disasters and values and rescues of human life and property, if our imagination could but carry us to those awful scenes of self-sacrifice and heroism—could we see them even reenacted upon the stage of our fancy, though

divested of the horror of reality—how deep would be our sense of reproach that so worthy an object and so noble a cause had received at our hands such scant consideration. Yet how our hearts would throb and swell with pride, tempered with gratitude, that through governmental foresight such deeds were made possible, and not less would be our joy that we had ever ready men to respond to humanity's call.

These figures speak for themselves:

GENERAL SUMMARY

Of disasters which have occurred within the scope of life-saving operations from November 1, 1871 (date of introduction of present system), to close of fiscal year ending June 30, 1899.

Total number of disasters	11,170
Total value of vessels	$119,540,500
Total value of cargoes	$40,888,099
Total value of property involved	$160,428,599
Total value of property saved	$132,021,447
Total value of property lost	$37,407,152
Total number of persons involved	85,916
Total number of lives lost	1908
Total number of persons succored at stations	14,627
Total number of days' succor afforded	36,659

Mr. Chairman, the saving of human life up to the present time by and through this service doubtless reaches the great total of 40,000; tens are lost to-day where thousands perished before the service was instituted. In view of this magnificent result can we be indifferent to our duty by failing to give more adequate pay to the men employed in it. For one I would go further even now, and place upon the pension list the families of those who have lost father and husband in line of duty in their ceaseless struggle for humanity with storm and sea. I would likewise retire, with a suitable provision for their comfort, those who have become disabled in the service through the service, or who have served faithfully for twenty years, if retirement is then desired.

The amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WANGER] will fix the pay of all surfmen at $65 per month, the amount provided in my bill (H. R. 7436). It seems to me that the amendment is most opportune; that this is the time and place to secure this desired and deserved legislation. Delay may defeat it. My interest lies in the accomplishment of this act of justice. I care not for the hollow honor which for a few short moments may fall to my lot if my bill becomes a law as an independent measure. It is the end and object that absorbs my attention. Cheerfully do I second the amendment, and with joy will I see it enacted into law, that these sturdy men, who year after year are called upon to brave dangers before which the stoutest heart might quail, and brave them calmly and coolly, without the stimulus of excitement which in battle carries men along—oftentimes making fictitious heroes of natural cowards—may be encouraged in their noble work by this act of simple justice on the part of Congress.

There is nothing fictitious in the heroism of the life savers. They are aware of the possible consequences of their every act. They take desperate chances, and they know that they are taking them. They deliberately go forth to save the lives of others, well knowing they are imperiling their own; and this without the hope of adequate reward, whether they succeed or whether they fail and render up their lives in generous heroic endeavor.

It is to these surfmen who patrol our coast by night and day in all weather that we owe the wonderful work our statistics show. They are the men behind the guns.

The poet has sung of the glories of death for country; men rush to conflict and die under the inspiration of martial music; nations vote pensions and decorations to the heroes of battlefield and war. Then, why not pension these heroes of peace, who, seeing or hearing a brother man, though a stranger, in the struggle and despair of death, plunge into the dark and roaring waters to launch a boat upon a sea that threatens to overwhelm, knowing not who clings to that tottering aerie in the rigging of the doomed ship, expecting no reward save the consciousness that duty expected of them by the service has been done, the duty of manhood to itself?

How often have these attempts failed; how often have the brave men rendered up their lives for an unknown brother; how many mothers, widows, and children are crying aloud in their destitution for our help? Does not this Government owe these afflicted ones some consideration? These keepers and crews should be brought under a pension system. Of them Superintendent Kimball says:

"These crews are composed of poor fishermen who live scantily and find their main means of support in the slender pay they receive as surfmen. Grown old or disabled in the service, they sink into penury or dependence, and when they lose their lives in disasters in attempting to save others, or when they die in the course of nature, their death, after all their valuable and heroic service, leaves their families in poverty and want. It should be borne in mind that they are the very flower of their class—hardy and able seamen, dexterous and courageous, matchless in managing boats in heavy seas and in the perilous neighborhood of wrecks, and of such approved integrity that the property of mariners and passengers, and the cargoes of vessels saved by their efforts, suffer no loss at their hands."

The statistics I have referred to show thousands of lives and vast amounts of property saved by their exertions, and these exertions, laborious in themselves, are often made at the peril of their own existence.

It should be conceded that the right of sailor and soldier to pension is equally theirs, and that when age or infirmity has come upon them, or when they surrender life in the line of their duty, what they have done and suffered for others to the nation's honor and glory should be remembered to them and theirs by a grateful nation. The nation's gratitude should likewise be expressed to keepers and crews disabled in the discharge of duty, and to the widows and orphans of those who perish in attempts at rescue, by extending to them the benefits of a pension system.

I have in mind a case which seems to me particularly pathetic. It is but one of many, but will serve to illustrate the point I hope to make. It is that of a man who served some ten years in a volunteer crew of life savers on Long Island before the inauguration of the present system, and who for thirty years last past has been the keeper of the Potunk Station. Old age is now upon him. He was ordered some months ago to present himself for examination as to his physical condition. He did so. The following official note tells the tale:

DIVISION OF APPOINTMENTS, TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., June 2, 1899.

SIR: The certificate of medical inspection in your case having established the fact that by reason of your age you do not possess sufficient activity and physical endurance to properly perform the duties attached to your position, you are informed that your resignation will be accepted if tendered immediately.

Respectfully, yours,

L. J. GAGE,
Secretary.

Mr. FRANKLIN C. JESSUP,
Care of General Superintendent
United States Life-Saving Service.

I supplement this cold, concise, heartless official announcement with a letter received from Mr. Jessup some little time ago:

LIFE-SAVING SERVICE, THIRD DISTRICT.
West Hampton Beach, January 14, 1900.

Hon. TOWNSEND SCUDDER, M. C.

DEAR SIR: Will you kindly let me know what action has been taken regarding a retired list for the Life-Saving Service?

It is five months since I was relieved from said service. I find that my long term—thirty years—as keeper of Potunk life-saving station, to the neglect of all other business, has completely unfitted me for any other business. While I can do many things, I can not find anyone to employ me. I find no business man wants to employ an old man.

Hoping to hear from you soon, I remain, very respectfully,

FRANKLIN C. JESSUP,
Ex-Keeper Potunk Life Saving Station.

P. S.—Please remember me to Mr. Rose.

How does the story told by these two letters impress this House? How does it impress the generous people of this land? Forty years of solitude on a lonely beach, separated from home, family, and friends; forty years of tramping up and down the shores, weary miles in season of storm and dangers; forty years of tension and anxiety, with eye and ear strained for sight or sound of human distress; forty years of faithful service, sacrifice, danger, daring, and heroism; forty years of struggle and fierce combat with wind and wave, to defeat their cruel harvest of death, and then the book is closed—"By reason of your age you do not possess sufficient activity and physical endurance" (for forty years more, perhaps); therefore "your resignation will be accepted if tendered immediately."

Not a month, a week, a day, but immediately! Mr. Chairman, these men render services as taxing and as honorable as ever performed by soldier on field of battle. Their field is ever one of danger and struggle; their battle is ever on, and life itself is given up in the discharge of their duty, yet when age overtakes them, when they fall in harness on their tempestuous battlefield, they are lost and forgotten, without provision or shelter—the discarded, worn-out, faithful servants of an ungrateful people. Let us wipe out this stain, purge ourselves of this ignominy. Let this great nation set an example to her children by suitably providing for those who have added so greatly to her honor and glory, who have been faithful to the trust she reposed in them, faithful to her and to humanity. [Loud applause.]

The Results of Three Years of Republican Supremacy.

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. BABCOCK,
OF WISCONSIN.
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Monday, May 28, 1900,

On the bill (H. R. 9836) to establish a code of laws for the District of Columbia.

Mr. BABCOCK said:

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no brighter page in our national history than that which tells the story of the Administration of William

McKinley. Its achievements at home and abroad have won new laurels for the Republican party. President Lincoln guided the country through four years of civil war to an honorable peace. He gave freedom to 4,000,000 slaves. He led the contending sisterhood of States to a union that nothing can sever. He belongs to the nation as no man but Washington had belonged to it, and it was the Republican party that gave him to the nation.

President McKinley has carried forward the work of the immortal Lincoln. Under him we have fought a successful foreign war; we have added millions of square miles to our territory; we have firmly established the national credit by placing the country upon the gold basis; our bonds command a higher premium and pay a lower rate of interest than those of any European power; our domestic and export trades have expanded so rapidly that production can scarcely keep up with the demand; our mechanics are working overtime, and an era of universal prosperity has followed the bitter years of depression under the last Democratic Administration.

We are approaching the time when the American people must choose their leader for the next four years. The same candidates are before them as in the last Presidential election. Which will they choose? Shall it be William McKinley, whose wise, firm guidance has gained us those victories of peace and war to which I have alluded; or shall it be William Jennings Bryan, who stands for a debased currency, for a cowardly foreign policy, for a surrender of the outlying possessions, won by the skill and prowess of our brave soldiers and sailors, and for principles and policies that would substitute anarchy and ruin for the reign of law and order? I can not doubt the answer that the people will give to these questions next November. They will triumphantly reelect President McKinley by an increased majority; and they will decree the continued Republican control of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I have recited briefly the brilliant achievements of these three years of Republican rule. I purpose now to review, in some little detail, the work of the several departments of administration that has contributed to this result.

Mr. Bryan's chief attacks have always been against the financial policy of the Republican party. His argument has been that its opposition to free coinage of silver would make money scarce, depress prices and wages, stifle industry and enterprise, and make the poor poorer than ever. Let us look at the facts.

At the end of the third year of President Cleveland's last term the money in circulation was, in round numbers, a billion and a half of dollars. At the end of President McKinley's third year it was $2,000,000,000. In the third year of Cleveland the circulation of money was $21.53 per capita of the population. In the third year of McKinley it is $26.12 per capita. This does not look like making money scarce. At the end of President Cleveland's third year the gold circulation was $490,000,000; but at the end of President McKinley's third year it was $786,000,000, an increase of nearly three hundred millions.

Two-thirds of the increase of circulation has been in gold, the metal that Mr. Bryan said would make money scarce and throw the country into poverty and decay. To complete the refuation of Mr. Bryan's prophecies, there was nearly $75,000,000 more of silver circulation at the end of President McKinley's third year that at the end of President Cleveland's third year of his second term.

Let us now turn to Mr. Bryan's prediction of the stagnation of industry if his "16 to 1" policy was not accepted by the people. The figures of our domestic industry as a whole are not accessible. They are not necessary, as every intelligent man knows whether or not labor is plenty, wages good, and agricultural prices away above the quotations of three years ago.

For our foreign trade we have the figures. During the first three years of Cleveland's second Administration our imports amounted to $2,898,000,000; during the first three years of McKinley's Administration our imports amounted to $2,296,000,000, or under the Dingley tariff act, during prosperous times and great activity, our imports were $602,000,000 less than during the same period of the Cleveland Administration, when the country was filled with distress and want.

Now glance for a moment at our exports. During the first three years of the second Cleveland Administration our exports amounted to $3,578,000,000, and during the first three years of the McKinley Administration our exports amounted to $3,828,000,000—a difference of $250,000,000 in our favor in exports, and a difference of $602,000,000 in our favor in imports, which, added together, make a grand total of $852,000,000 in our favor during the three years of Republican rule.

During the first three years of the second Cleveland Administration our excess of exports over imports was $679,000,000; during the first three years of the McKinley Administration our excess of exports over imports was $1,531,000,000, showing the same results, or a net gain of $852,000,000. This condition is the result of a wise tariff law and the pronounced position of the Republican party on the money question, which has given confidence to all of our great manufacturing enterprises.

But I have not yet told the brightest part of the story. That part consists in the figures concerning our export of manufactures. Manufacturing implies skilled labor, skilled labor means high wages, and high wages mean a good demand for all the products of agriculture. In the three years of President Cleveland to which I have so often referred, our exports of manufactures amounted to $568,000,000, but in the three years of President McKinley they amounted to $998,000,000, an average gain of $143,000,000 per year.

A gratifying fact in the increase of our importations is that nearly one-half now consists of materials for use in our domestic manufactures. These crude materials do not compete with our own products; but, on the contrary, give increased employment to labor engaged in producing for the home market, and enable us to send our manufactures out into the markets of the world.

The first act of President McKinley after his inauguration was to assemble Congress in special session to provide revenue for the Government by a tariff that would not pauperize our own working people. The Democratic tariff of 1894 had so cut the revenue that we were in the humiliating and hurtful position of borrowing money to carry on the Government in a time of peace. A treasury that should have been full was empty, and loan after loan was syndicated in Wall street at huge profits to the money lenders.

A bankrupt government makes a bankrupt people, and that was just the condition that the Republican party found existing on its return to power three years ago. The "tariff for revenue only" had driven away the steady, growing revenue that was coming in under the McKinley tariff of 1890, and the promises of abundant employment, good wages, and large export of American manufactures had turned to empty performance.

Just eleven days after his inauguration President McKinley had both Houses of Congress in session, and sixteen days later the House sent to the Senate the Dingley tariff bill. The special message of the President had called for a bill that would supply ample revenues for ordinary expenses; that would pay the interest and reduce the principal of the debt, largely increased under the Democratic Administration, and that would insure the full and prompt payment of liberal pensions to the survivors, widows, and orphans of the civil war.

It called for a bill that would preserve the home market to our own producers; that would revive and increase manufactures, relieve and encourage agriculture, extend domestic and foreign commerce, and "render to labor in every field the useful occupation, the liberal wages, and the adequate rewards to which skill and industry are justly entitled." I quote the very words of Mr. McKinley in order to ask if those very demands have not been most bountifully fulfilled.

By aid of the Dingley tariff, Mr. Speaker, we have supplied ample revenues to the Government; we have paid the interest and provided for the reduction of the national debt; we have paid prompt and liberal pensions without oppression of the taxpayers; we have preserved the home market, revived and enlarged manufactures and commerce, rescued agricultural industry from its depression, and opened to labor of every kind its adequate reward.

When the schedules of the Dingley tariff were in preparation, the revenue experts came with tables and figures showing that a customs revenue of half a million dollars a day would be needed, but they confessed that they could not quite see how it was to be obtained without sacrificing some of our home industries, or fettering our manufacturing export trade by restrictive duties on its imported materials. Well! The Dingley tariff is producing considerably more than its required half a million of revenue a day, and no sacrifice has been made of home industry or of the export trade. The explanation is simple—we Republicans believed that the energy and enterprise of the people would supply the Government with revenue and themselves with home and foreign markets if we removed from their path the obstacles that experience had shown to lie in the Democratic tariff act.

The Wilson tariff of 1894 professed to be, above all things, "a free raw material" tariff for the encouragement of our manufacturing export trade. Yet our largest yearly export of manufactures under it was less than $230,000,000; and now, four years after the high-water mark of the Wilson tariff, our yearly export of manufactures is touching the $400,000,000 mark under the Dingley tariff.

This year, too, we are importing $300,000,000 worth of manufacturers' materials, a large part of which is to be sold abroad, after paying wages to American skilled labor. Mr. Bryan and his party denounced the Dingley tariff as calculated to destroy our foreign trade and to shut our industries in upon our own resources. But our exports to Great Britain and Germany, our largest customers, have increased materially, and so has the whole volume of our trade with them; as also with Canada, Italy, Japan, China, and other countries.

The Dingley tariff and the currency act—I yoke them together as the two great achievements of peace by our Republican Administration—a boundless industry, and a sound currency with which to conduct it. Not only a sound currency, but, as incident to it,

the putting into circulation of many millions of dollars at a time when trade and commerce are active and need money in circulation; the saving of greater millions by a reduction of the rate of interest in the debt; the payment of $25,000,000 of old bonds; the substitution of long-time bonds, at a lower rate of interest, for the short-time bonds, calling for a higher interest rate; the facilities thereby afforded for many years for an increasing bank circulation, and the time gained thereby for eventually providing an equally secure but more flexible bank currency, when the national debt shall all have been paid.

I ask where would now be our finances, our revenues, our domestic industry, and our foreign trade if the Democracy had succeeded in 1896? Where will those great interests, each and all, be three years hence if a Democratic President and a Democratic House of Representatives should be elected next November?

President McKinley took over from his predecessor an unsettled controversy with Spain and did his best, though vainly, to bring it to a peaceful and honorable close.

We began the Spanish war with an army of less than 29,000 officers and men, and ended it four months later with an organized and fully equipped force of nearly ten times that number. This means that more than a quarter of a million of capable men were withdrawn from the farm, the mine, the factory, the store, and office, and the various other haunts of industry and civil life, and converted into marching and fighting units, with no other thought or purpose than to uphold the honor of the flag. It means that our wealth, our credit, our resources in hands and brains, our machinery and material of every sort, were turned with incredible swiftness and profusion from their ordinary uses to the painful but necessary exigencies of war.

I say nothing now of the patriotism, the self-sacrifice, the disinterestedness, the public spirit and generosity, among all ranks and classes of our people, whether individually or collectively, that marked their response to the trumpet call of war. The theme is too large if not too high for the present occasion. For the same reason I say nothing of the spontaneous rushing together of the North and the South, as though they never had been apart; of the Blue and the Gray, as though they never had been antagonistic colors; of the veterans who had worn those colors; and, more than all, of the sons and daughters of those veterans, who, in sight of an aroused and united country, forgot all they had heard about the division of that country before their time.

The war with Spain, Mr. Speaker, was a people's war, and well our people did their part in it. But the vote of the people in November, 1896, had placed upon William McKinley the duty, in 1898, of avoiding that war if it could be honorably averted; of preparing for it when it could no longer be avoided with honor, and of conducting it to that speedy and successful conclusion which the popular feeling and confidence demanded. And William McKinley did not fail, or ever falter, in any point of that duty. Like his great predecessor, Abraham Lincoln, he personally associated himself with every phase of the war, and in less than four months drove from the Western Hemisphere one of the oldest of the world's military powers, that had been intrenched here for more than four hundred years.

In the "war room" at the White House during the four months of hostilities we had an example of the intelligent and thorough way in which he met the grave responsibilities of his place. Into that room came all the information upon which the plans for the shifting phases of the war were based; out from it went the instructions under which those plans were executed. If, before the end came, the President looked aged and worn, as the newspapers of the time tell us, what better proof could we ask of the reality of the strain under which he lived and the fidelity with which he met the exigencies of that strain?

Even in times of peace the constitutional post of Commander in Chief is no sinecure; what it is in war we know from the recorded experiences of Presidents Madison, Polk, and Lincoln. Our system of government is so organized that when the country is at war the President is the one man of the multitude engaged in the direction of the war who is compelled to view and to act within the whole arena of the contest. His political functions, likewise, are more arduous in a time of war than in peace.

Scarcely more than a month after the outbreak of hostilities the Administration was ready with an expedition designed to "capture the garrison at Santiago and assist in capturing the harbor and fleet of the enemy." Up to that time it had looked as if the fixed military problem was to form and land in the late autumn an army large and strong enough to capture the powerful and well-defended garrison at Habana. But it is always the unexpected that happens. Cervera's fleet had gone into the harbor at Santiago, and its capture or destruction there would apparently leave the enemy without means of sustaining the great army at Habana.

That we were ready so soon to take advantage of the sudden opportunity was fortunate, and we owe it to the wisdom and energy of the Administration that we were ready. In two weeks from the time that the preparatory order was given, thirty-three transports, collected and fitted with extraordinary dispatch, left Tampa with 815 officers and 16,000 men, together with their equipage, and eight days afterwards were landed at Daiquiri. They advanced 8 miles to Siboney, to establish a base of supply.

Two days after the landing a cavalry brigade, acting as infantry, stormed and carried the trenches at La Guasima; a fight that brought renown to the white and colored regulars, the rough riders, and some of the gallant commanders, living and dead. Just a week later the strong position of El Caney was carried by assault after a struggle lasting from early morning until afternoon. Then came the crowning victory at San Juan Hill, which gave our forces command of Santiago. Negotiation then took the place of fighting, and on the 14th of July, three weeks after the landing, the campaign ended by the surrender of the Spanish forces, numbering 23,000 officers and men, on terms that comported at once with American interests, the honor of a brave enemy, and the dictates of humanity.

To estimate the importance of this Santiago campaign, we must remember that the Spanish forces in all Cuba numbered 11,000 officers and 215,000 men, including regulars, volunteers and guerrillas. What our forces did in three weeks, with much less than 20,000 officers and men, against an eighth part of the Spanish army, saved us the necessity of sending ten times the number to Cuba, and spending as many months as we spent weeks, in making a decisive impression. What we were spared we can now better appreciate by contrasting our experience with that of the large British army in South Africa, compelled to divide its force, as we should have been, against a multitude of positions, defended by inferior numbers, but favored by the nature of the country and their better knowledge of local conditions.

It was the result of the Santiago campaign that enabled us to spare 11,000 officers and men for the expedition to the far Philippines and to hoist our flag over Manila so early as the 13th day of August—less than four months after the outbreak of war. The same result gave us the means of sending 17,000 officers and men to Porto Rico, garrisoned by an equal number of Spanish troops, and of ending the war there within three weeks of the first landing by a part of the force. That the Spanish war was rushed on our part is true, and the rush caused some confusion and hardship, but never in the history of the world have such great results been achieved in so short a time and with so small a loss of human life. It is to the credit of President McKinley and his Administration that, having carefully studied the prospect, they took the unavoidable risks of an energetic policy.

Immediately after the preliminaries of peace were signed, the discharge of some 30,000 men, temporarily added to the Regular Army, began, as did the muster out of the volunteers. Exclusive of regulars, 64,000 officers and men were brought home from Cuba, Porto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippines, and new garrisons organized and sent to those stations. In Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines the Army has been obliged to administer the civil government. Customs, internal revenue, taxes, navigation, public schools, sanitation, road building, courts of justice, police, and local governments and functions of every sort have been in its charge.

By means of the telegraph, the telephone, and flash and flag signaling, and the building and management of nearly 7,000 miles of new lines, the Army has kept up communication for itself, the people, and the authorities at Washington. Army medicine and surgery have served both the troops and the local population. Among our troops the rate of mortality from disease was less than 26 in the thousand, scarcely more than half the rate of the civil war. Ocean transport service is a new thing to our Army administration, yet 300,000 persons have been transported without loss or serious discomfort, and at this moment our Army transport fleet supplies the model for the world.

At the outbreak of the war our seacoast ordnance consisted of 63 guns and 88 mortars. During the short time that the war lasted these were doubled, and 25 of the principal harbors mined. Seacoast fortification is still going on, and our chief harbors are already fairly secure. The troops in camp and field were armed and accoutered as fast as organized, some 250,000 complete sets of infantry equipments and 26,000 complete sets of horse equipments being turned out within a hundred days.

More surprising was the creation of 30 mounted field batteries of six guns each, with all their equipments, without using more than half the capacity of the public and private ordnance plants for that kind of work. The expeditions that went to Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines took with them a supply of maps and of military, geographical and statistical information that proved remarkably accurate and serviceable, and reminds us, by contrast, of the way in which a British army has been thrown into South Africa, to find out, at its own cost, nearly everything that should have been known beforehand.

The Spanish war and its resultant native revolt in the Philippines have cast upon the military department the work of enlisting and organizing 260,000 volunteers, of whom 225,000 have

been discharged, paid off, and sent home. For the Regular Army 100,000 men have been enlisted, of whom 34,000 have been discharged, paid, and sent home. For each of the 360,000 men enlisted and the nearly 260,000 discharged a written record exists, showing who he was and what he was at the time of enlistment, his physical condition when he entered the service, and his entire military history.

In addition to enlisting and recording him and keeping a record of his Army life, he has been clothed, armed, equipped, fed, lodged, paid, medically attended, and variously transported by land and sea. Multiply this record and service for each one by the whole number enlisted and discharged, and add the record and provisions made for more than 20,000 commissioned officers, and one may form some idea of the work that the military branch of the Administration has been called upon to perform.

Under the present Administration the Navy has shown itself worthy of its best traditions. The great victories of Manila Bay and Santiago, which shed undying fame upon this arm of the national defense, were not accidents, but the results of the thorough preparations of the fleets for the crucial test of war. For this preparation, this readiness to meet the supreme moment for which a navy is constructed and maintained, those who administer the affairs of the Navy should have credit.

The glory goes to our heroes who are in command afloat and to those officers and men who seized the opportunities of war to render conspicuous service; but in remembering them let us not forget those who labor without ceasing to secure the fleet in a condition of high efficiency and to place at the disposal of the commanding officers an abundance of the supplies without which the fleet is powerless.

More than a month before the *Maine* was destroyed in the harbor of Habana the Secretary of the Navy began to mobilize the ships of the Navy and to take such other measures as would place at the disposal of the officers in command the full power of our naval force.

Upon the passage of the bill appropriating $50,000,000 for the national defense, a board was organized for the purchase of auxiliary ships, and, after careful examination, 102 ships of various types were secured at a total cost of nearly $18,000,000. Of these vessels, all but two were merchant ships, pleasure yachts, tugs, colliers, and other craft of the commercial type, which were rapidly overhauled at the different navy-yards, and some of them provided with light-armor protection and suitably armed.

Some of these vessels were ready at the outbreak of the war, and within two months from the declaration of war all were in commission and in active service. Some were used as auxiliary war vessels, and others to supply the fleets with coal and ammunition, fresh water, and provisions. For the care of the sick and wounded the *Solace* was fitted out as a complete hospital, and to make repairs to vessels at sea the *Vulcan* was fitted as a modern machine shop. To meet the increased demands on the navy-yards the force was virtually doubled by the middle of April.

Besides the ships added to the Navy by purchase, 15 revenue cutters and 4 light-house tenders were transferred from the Treasury Department to the Navy, and 4 of the great Atlantic liners and 1 great Pacific liner were chartered. In all, 128 ships were added to the naval establishment. To man these vessels 225 officers were ordered from the retired list to active duty; 856 officers were appointed for temporary service, and the enlisted force was increased from 12,500 to over 24,000 men.

It was an enormous task, Mr. Speaker, to make all these additional ships ready for war service and secure the necessary guns for them, and to keep all the fleets supplied with coal, ammunition, and provisions. Yet this was only a part of the work which the Navy Department had in hand. For the protection of the coasts of the United States an auxiliary naval force had to be created, officered and manned by the naval militia of the United States. A coast signal service was also established, which kept our coast line from Maine to Texas under observation, to give warning of the approach of an enemy's vessel or of suspicious craft of any kind.

The operations of the Asiatic and North Atlantic squadrons are so well known that it is not necessary to speak of them in detail. We all know that their work was so well done that the power of Spain was swept from the sea, and Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines, misgoverned for centuries, taken from under her dominion.

But the claims of the Administration to the approval of the people for its management of the Navy rests not alone on its war record. The upbuilding of the new Navy has gone steadily forward, and Congress has wisely and liberally cooperated in the work of materially increasing our naval strength. The entire history of naval warfare for a thousand years does not furnish any comparison to the two great naval engagements of the late war—one in Manila Bay and the other off the coast of Cuba. In these two engagements the Spanish navy was swept off of the face of the earth, with a loss on our side of only one human life. History records nothing like it, and all honor is due the American Navy.

Since the accession of President McKinley a Republican Congress has authorized the construction of 49 ships, with a total displacement of 155,480 tons. This includes 6 battle ships of the first class, 3 armored cruisers of the first class, 4 monitors, and 6 protected cruisers.

The current naval appropriation bill, as it passed this House, adds to this formidable list 2 battle ships of the first class, 3 armored cruisers of the first class, and 3 protected cruisers, with a total displacement of 90,000 tons. There have been completed and placed in commission in the same time a total of 32 vessels, with an aggregate displacement of 52,681 tons. No preceding Administration approaches this record of naval construction.

The present Administration received as a legacy from its predecessor a pension roll of some 974,000 beneficiaries, and, though death makes great havoc in the ranks of the old soldiers, the roll had grown to over 991,000 at the end of last June, the latest date for which I can find official information. The average loss to the pension roll from natural causes is about 45,000 names a year, so that the net gain of 17,000 in about two and a quarter years means that under this Administration nearly 5,000 new pensions per month have been granted.

Contrast the figures just given with those under the preceding Democratic Administration, which cut the payments by nearly $17,000,000 in its first year. In other words, while $156,000,000 had been disbursed for pensions in the last year of President Harrison, the payments fell to $139,000,000 in the first year of President Cleveland. The present fiscal year will end on the 30th of June, and there will then have been paid for pensions more than $140,000,000 in the twelve months. With 135,000 names gone from the roll since the present Administration has had charge of it, the quarterly payments for pensions equal those of the last Administration.

Including pensions granted directly by Congress, the Pension Office is now issuing new certificates to survivors and widows at the rate of 4,000 per month, and increases and increased ratings at the rate of 4,850 per month. No other country, in any period of the world's history, has had the fairness and courage of our own in doing justice to its defenders and their dependents first, and counting the cost afterwards. It is to the Republican party and Republican Administrations that the people owe the broad, generous pension policy from which we shall never depart and to which every government in Europe in which the masses have an influential voice must eventually come.

President Lincoln declared that the nation would take care of the soldiers and his dependents, and the facts and figures I have given show that the duty he foresaw and pledged the country to perform has fallen to faithful hands.

One achievement of the McKinley Administration, the importance of which is not generally known, deserves mention here. I refer to the collection from the Pacific Railway Companies of their indebtedness to the Government. This indebtedness had extended over a long term of years, and so much indulgence had been shown it that more than one-half of the $130,000,000 due was for unpaid interest. Many plans for its settlement had been before Congress at one time or another, but it was reserved for a Republican Administration, with its capacity for handling great questions, to succeed soon after its Democratic predecessor had failed.

The settlement was arranged by a commission, consisting of the Secretaries of the Treasury and the Interior, and the Attorney-General. So skillful was the management of the Government's case that within six months the sum of $124,421,607 was collected.

The names of the several corporations and the amounts paid by them are as follows:

Union Pacific, cash	$58,448,223.75
Kansas Pacific, cash	6,303,000.00
Central and Western Pacific:	
Cash	11,798,314.14
Notes, amply secured	47,050,172.36
Kansas Pacific, divided; on deficiency due United States, cash	821,897.70
Total	124,421,607.95

Since the notes for $47,050,172.36 were received by the Government, a large proportion of them have been paid.

It was alleged to the present Administration that its predecessor had consented to a proposition, advanced by the reorganization committee of the Union Pacific Railway Company, that the Union Pacific and the Kansas Pacific roads should be sold to new owners for $43,000,000, free of the public claims. This agreement was repudiated by President McKinley. The whole amount due from the Union Pacific and one-half of the amount separately due from the Kansas Pacific were consequently collected, or more than $22,700,000 in excess of the sum for which the last Democratic Administration was represented as being cheerfully willing to settle.

When we remember the enormous material benefits that have

accrued to the country from the construction of these trans-continental lines of communication, and the advantage which the Government has had by way of reduced rates of transportation and service over them, the participation of the Government in the construction and maintenance of these enterprises has been fully justified.

Under President McKinley the best traditions of the State Department have been jealously preserved. Our foreign relations have been marked by vigor and robustness, but tempered always by wise and prudent counsel. The perplexing problems inseparable from a foreign war were skillfully solved, and triumphs no less important have since been won. Our trade relations with the Orient have been preserved from injury in the impending partitioning of China.

By promptly taking up the matter, and handling it with rare skill and delicacy, the Administration obtained assurances from the European countries occupying spheres of influence in China that our exports should continue to reach that market through the "open door" guaranteed to us by treaty. Through the State Department the path is thus blazed for further extension of our foreign markets. That Department is brought less into touch with the people than other departments, but its work is in some respects the most important of all.

Our ambassadors to Great Britain and the Continent have never been surpassed collectively by those representing any previous Administration. Choate at London, Porter at Paris, White at Berlin, Tower at St. Petersburg, Harris at Vienna, Draper at Rome, and Storer at Madrid form a diplomatic corps whose work would reflect credit upon the proudest nation of Europe. The great powers are always represented at Washington by some of their ablest diplomats—men who have made diplomacy a study and who devote their lives to the work. The United States have no school of diplomatic training. Our ambassadors and ministers are relieved at each change of Administration.

In few instances have they received special education for their duties; yet it is doubtful if Great Britain and the continental powers are better represented in the United States than are the United States in Europe. There is something in the American fiber—it may be the American spirit, it may be the character of our institutions, or it may be a combination of fortunate circumstances, I know not which—that makes the American the most adaptable of men. Without special training, he always rises to his opportunity. He has courage, tact, and intelligence. He may lack sometimes the courtly address and shifty methods that are associated with diplomacy, but he usually accomplishes his purpose, and he does this by methods more direct and more in keeping with the spirit of our Government.

Under the present Administration, the consular service has extended its good work in the promotion of trade. Its success has been so great that Great Britain and Germany are paying us the compliment of considering how their consular services can be made to rival our own. There is criticism of consuls and consulates here and there, and the traveling and commercial classes have not been slow to point out defects in the service; but as a whole, it reflects the spirit of the American people. Just as our industries have outstripped those of other countries, so the typical American consul has exhibited practical qualities which compensate for the lack of qualities of a more social character.

On the other hand, foreigners often complain that their consuls are overtrained; that they have been selected with reference rather to their diplomatic functions than to promoting the nterests of commerce. Our consuls are not perfect; but as a class they are keenly alive to every suggestion that may widen American markets abroad. This feature of the consular service has been made very prominent by the McKinley Administration, and there is now scarcely a corner of the world that is not being officially canvassed in behalf of American products.

The growth of manufactures in no way impairs the importance of our agricultural interests. Three years of Republican administration have added untold millions to our agricultural wealth. To bring the resources of the Government nearer to the farmer, the planter, and the stock grower, the methods of the great Department to which our agricultural interests are intrusted have been almost revolutionized under the present Administration. The subject is too large and varied for treatment in detail. I can but glance at what the Department of Agriculture has been doing these last three years.

Foreign markets for our agricultural products have been aggressively sought for and explored; producers here and consumers there have been supplied with information, opportunity, and inducement to come together; domestic consumption has been increased by merciless exposure of adulterations; crop reports, so seriously affecting prices, are now prompt and accurate, and kept from manipulation by speculators; new fruits and plants, likely to flourish and be profitable, have been liberally tested, studied, and distributed; the farmer has been warned and guarded against debased seeds and fertilizers; tobacco and sugar cultivation have received the attention which their importance demands; every part of the country has been classified according to its agricultural possibilities and advantages; the experimental stations in every section have been vitalized, and a real beginning has been made toward an economic use and reproduction of our great forest wealth.

The losses of our farmers from diseases and epidemics among horses, cattle, sheep, and hogs have been greatly reduced. Their losses from injurious affections of fruits, grains, plants, and vegetables have been reduced in a like proportion. A great extension of cattle and meat inspections has preserved and increased the home and foreign markets for live and dead stock, and enhanced the prices obtained on the farm and range. During all of the last three years ceaseless attention has been given to the great subject of the reclamation of arid lands and useless soils, and to the reseeding of those vast cattle ranges that have been eaten bare.

Weather predictions and warnings have been brought within the reach of almost every energetic farmer. He is promptly notified of untimely droughts, rains, and frosts, and the broad-gauge methods of the present Administration are shown in the carrying of these predictions and warnings into remote and sparsely settled regions of the South and West, which had been previously neglected. In these beneficent activities of this great Department of Government our island wards Cuba and Porto Rico have not been overlooked.

In the Post-Office Department rapid strides have been made, and new improvements and added facilities for rapidly handling the mails have been brought into service. The rural free delivery, that great achievement of the McKinley Administration which has brought the agricultural classes closely in touch with the great throbbing business centers of the country, is now an established fact and successful far beyond the expectation of its warmest friends.

I had the honor to advocate the establishment of the rural free-delivery system in its early stages, when the opposition to what was termed this "experiment" was pronounced and large, but to-day it is impossible for the Department to supply the demand for the extension of this system, and I believe that in the near future, nine-tenths of the rural or agricultural sections of the country will have their mail daily delivered at their doors.

This, Mr. Speaker, is only a part of the record of the Republican party. It stood at its birth for human freedom and for the largest liberty of the individual. Its corner stone was opposition to the extension of slavery. Aided by loyal Democrats, it stamped out secession, emancipated 4,000,000 of slaves, and restored the Union. It established the national banking system, it brought about the resumption of specie payments.

Its protective-tariff policy has made us the great manufacturing nation of the world, giving employment at the highest rate of wages to millions of American workingmen. It has carried to a successful conclusion the war with Spain. It has enacted financial legislation that has placed the country upon the gold basis, and firmly established our credit at home and abroad. It is essentially the party of the people. It represents every principle for which Jefferson and Jackson stood, and it is to-day, as it always has been, the party of liberty, progress, and enlightenment.

Contrast with this the record of the Democratic party. When the Republican party was born, in 1856, the Democratic party was the advocate and supporter of slavery. It opposed the national-banking system, it opposed the resumption of specie payments, and it has steadily supported every financial heresy with which the country has been confronted. It favored the payment of the national debt in greenbacks, when paper money was at a discount.

Four years ago it sought to destroy the national credit and to degrade our financial policy. It sought to recognize the so-called revolutionary government of Cuba, knowing that such recognition would embarrass, if not entirely prevent, our expulsion of Spanish rule there. Failing in this it recommended fresh issues of irredeemable paper money to defray the expenses of the Spanish war.

If placed in power it would initiate a foreign policy repugnant to the intelligence and the best interests of the people. It has no capacity for constructive legislation. Its notion of statesmanship is blind opposition to all Republican policies. The Wilson tariff act was largely responsible for the panic of 1893, which was not relieved until the eleciton of Mr. McKinley. It can not construct; it can only destroy. Its greatest strength has been to criticise, obstruct, and oppose the policy of the Republican party since its organization, seeking to defeat measures that all acknowledged wise, simply because they were Republican.

Twice only in forty years have the people placed it in power. Its occasional victories fall like a blight upon the country. They are invariably followed by distrust and confusion in business, and by policies that hamper the great industries to which the workingmen look for support, and the interests of which are inseparably connected one with another.

It is hardly conceivable that, with this record of ignorance and

imbecility, the Democratic party should again be returned to power. The election of Mr. Bryan would at once check the abounding prosperity that surrounds us, and result in four years more of uncertainty, distrust, and paralysis of business. It is for the American people to decide which of the two parties they will place in power. Shall it be the Republican party, with its brilliant achievements of forty years, or the Democratic party, which has not to its credit a single act of legislation that has not been hurtful to the country?

Elections in the South.

SPEECH
OF
HON. C. L. BARTLETT,
OF GEORGIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, February 2, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the Indian appropriation bill—

Mr. BARTLETT said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I undertook the day before yesterday to get an opportunity to answer some remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LINNEY] with reference to my own State, and I intended on yesterday to do so, but I was not able to be present.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina has so established himself as the harlequin of this House that it is not necessary for me, where he is known or where his peculiar characteristics are known, to refute any suggestion he might make with reference to my own State. The other States that he arraigned as guilty of gross violations of the law because of election methods and election laws that exist there may take care of themselves, and are able to do so. His own State, which he maligns on the floor of this House, is ably represented and can take care of herself. The State of Mississippi has already taken care of the assaults made upon it, and the gentleman has been answered most fully.

But, Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman undertakes to call attention here to the fact that there have been unfortunate violations of the law in my own State, and undertakes to give as the reason for them that it is because of what he denounces as wrongful and outrageous election laws and election methods existing in Georgia, the gentleman, as usual, speaks without knowledge of the facts and makes statements that the facts do not warrant or bear out.

Now as to the law of Georgia, Mr. Chairman. Since Georgia got control of her own affairs in 1872, when a governor guilty of wrong and fraud upon the State fled between two suns and turned the government of the State over to her own people and to her own sons, no man has been able to truly charge upon her people a law which was wrong as to elections or to charge us with fraud at the ballot box. I challenge the gentleman from North Carolina in this House, since he has been a member, to point to a case that is sustained by the least proof or a particle of evidence that will refute what I have stated.

The gentleman who charges Georgia with being guilty of violations of law and who attributes the small vote cast in the last election to vicious election laws, which he denounces now as a member of this House, was a member of Elections Committee No. 1, which heard two cases of a contested election from the State of Georgia in the Fifty-fourth Congress. He heard the evidence and he heard the arguments; and after hearing it all he, partisan as he is, giving the utmost weight to every suggestion, to every suspicion, and to every indication that might point to fraud or wrong in elections, in order to turn Democratic members out of the House, with reason if he could, and without reason if he must, knew at the time that he made the statement with reference to the laws of Georgia that both of these cases had been heard in the committee room and that he signed his name to both reports, in which he concurred with every other member of that committee and declared that there was no suspicion of fraud in either.

And with this knowledge, Mr. Chairman, he had the effrontery to disregard the truth and make a statement that assaulted the election laws of Georgia and attempted to allege that unfortunate circumstances and crime that existed there in the past year—that lynchings that have unfortunately occurred, and not only have occurred in Georgia, but everywhere in the United States from New York to California, wherever the cause has existed—I say, when he made that statement, he knew the facts did not authorize him or sustain him in the allegation.

Mr. Chairman, no one knows better than the gentleman who now occupies the chair that these allegations are unfounded, because he was a member of the committee that investigated these cases, and as a fair and honest man, together with every other member of that committee, knows that the election laws of Georgia were fair and honest and that any complaints made against them for twenty years past were unfounded.

Mr. Chairman, we have a constitutional provision which provides the qualifications for voters, one of which provides that there shall be paid a capitation tax in order to qualify people to vote. Are we peculiar in that? I hold in my hand the law of Rhode Island, which not only imposes the tax, but makes it a crime not to pay it; and the supreme court of Rhode Island, no longer ago than November 27, 1899, declared to the legislature, when inquired about it, if such a law as that were constitutional, that it not only did not violate the Constitution of the United States, but it did not violate the constitution of Rhode Island. So the poor white voter in Rhode Island must not only pay his poll tax in order to vote; but if he does not pay it, he must go to jail. And yet the gentleman from North Carolina, with his great wisdom, with his great knowledge that he parades before the House, arraigns the State of Georgia and other States in this Union that lie south of the Potomac River for fraudulent election laws and fraudulent ballot-box methods.

Lawyer that he is, the walking encyclopedia that he claims to be, this Solomon that half knows everything, Mr. Chairman, did not call attention to a single election law or to a single case except in his own State. This apostate to the teaching and doctrines of his own people was satisfied, in order to accomplish his own purpose of reelection, or hope of election, not only to denounce his own people, but to denounce every other State of the South.

Why, Mr. Chairman, your own State is the advance agent in the laws that protect the ballot box and the intelligent people in the right to cast the ballot.

She set the first example in her Australian ballot law. She has required an educational qualification. So does Connecticut and various other States. Georgia has not yet advanced that far. She may or may not do so. But I tell you, sir, that when it comes to the laws of election and the holding of elections, the election laws of Georgia are just as fair and the holding and certification of the results just as true and honest as in the State of Massachusetts, whose honesty in respect to matters of election has not been questioned. Sir, I do not desire to criticise any one harshly, but they are in the State of Pennsylvania engaged in trying a few ballot-box stuffers, many others having fled the realm in order to escape punishment.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me tell you what happened in Georgia on the 22d of December, 1899. There were but two Republican members in the house out of 175. With those exceptions, every man was a Democrat; and every man was a white man. Every man owed his place in that house to the nomination and the votes of the white Democracy of Georgia. No, sir, not altogether; for there were some in that house who owed their election as nominees of the Democratic party to the votes of colored people, who voted for them in preference to the Populist candidate.

There was introduced in that house a constitutional amendment copied after the provision of Louisiana and North Carolina. That proposition was fully debated; and on the roll call (two-thirds being required in order to pass it) there appeared in the house of representatives of the State of Georgia only three men voting to put upon the statute books of the State of Georgia a provision which would disfranchise the negro. That is public history. And on that day ministers of the gospel and other representative negroes in the city of Atlanta met together and offered up thanks to God for the action which their old masters and the sons of their old masters had taken. "We owe it," they said, "to them and to nobody else that the right of the ballot which was given to us by the Constitution of the United States has not been taken away."

Mr. LACEY. Will the gentleman allow me a suggestion?

Mr. BARTLETT. Oh, yes; I am always glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LACEY. I am very much gratified to learn of the action of the State of Georgia to which the gentleman from Georgia refers. Now, does he not believe that if North Carolina, Mississippi, and other Southern States would act as generously as Georgia has done there would be less trouble in those States?

Mr. BARTLETT. Why not apply the question to Massachusetts or Connecticut or Pennsylvania?

Mr. LACEY. It is not a negro question there.

Mr. BARTLETT. Ah, my friend, these various gentlemen must take care of their own States. For myself, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that in the State of Georgia we have got along with a ballot law which works no injustice to anybody. Those who pay the poll tax have the right to vote. And in the battles between the Populists and the Democrats in our State one-half of our colored voters have aligned themselves with the Democrats.

Yet the gentleman from North Carolina, with this fact of public history before him—it having been published in the newspapers of every metropolitan city in the country with conspicuous headlines that Georgia had refused to disfranchise the negro—stands on the floor of this House and denounces us as violators of

the law, because, forsooth, we have, as he says, outrageous election laws.

Now, I want to call the attention of this House to an incident which happened about three years ago. The governor of Georgia was stricken and was thought to be dying. His friends stood around watching with anxious hearts to determine whether he would live or die. He was carried from the executive mansion on a stretcher to a room where a surgical operation was to be performed upon him. His wife and children had bid him good-bye. The physicians held out no hope of his recovery. The great cold waters of the sea of eternity were splashing at his feet. He could almost hear the opening of the great beyond. His surgeons laid him bare upon the table; the surgeon's knife glistened before the sufferer's eye. But at that moment he remembered that in the executive office there lay an application for the reprieve or pardon of a humble negro—a person poor and friendless—so much so that the court was obliged to appoint a lawyer to defend him. While lying there on the surgeon's table the governor called out to his secretary, "Do not forget that negro" (naming him), and he named then a period of reprieve for that old negro; and when God had spared his life that reprieve went into effect, and the sentence of the negro was commuted to a life penalty instead of death. [Applause.]

When that man was nominated again by the Democratic party, and was assailed by men who had formerly been Democrats when the banner of the Democratic party was in his hands, there marched to the polls all over that State men whose skins were black, led by men who went to the Republican convention for the last five to ten years to nominate a Republican candidate for President, men who were the trusted political friends of President McKinley, white and black in Georgia, and cast their ballots for the candidate of the Democratic party, because, Mr. Chairman, when it came to administering the law and meting out justice, the black man, without friend or help, received at the hands of the governor of Georgia consideration equal to that of any other man in the State. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. BARTLETT. I hope I may have ten minutes more. I beg the indulgence of the committee.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia may proceed for ten minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the House and I thank my friend from Ohio.

Mr. GROSVENOR. If the gentleman will allow me, and it is not an interruption, I should like to say that this is a very interesting subject to me.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I confess that I have been in the line of thought with the gentleman, and that Georgia has done wonders for the probable checking of wrong upon this question. Now, if it is consonant with the gentleman's ideas, will he explain why so small a vote is cast in Georgia?

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman for the suggestion. That was the purpose of my addressing the House. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LINNEY] undertook to give it as irrefutable evidence that the vote in Georgia was suppressed, and that our infamous election law, as he calls it, made the vote small, and that, therefore, people being roused to indignation because they could not vote, committed crimes, or people who could vote committed inexcusable and unnamable crimes, as he charged, upon people who could not vote. Gentlemen, I will tell you the reason for the small vote.

I had the honor of aiding in enacting as a statute of Georgia what is known as the primary election law of that State, by which the different parties hold primaries to nominate candidates. Every man of Georgia upon the floor of this House and every man who holds an office in Georgia by the election of the Democratic party does not receive that office as the nominee of any clique or county convention or court-house call. He receives that office as the choice of the majority of the Democratic party in its Democratic primaries, and every election held under the primary law is guarded by men who have to be appointed and sworn, and it is made as much a crime to vote twice or to vote illegally or doing any wrongful act at a primary election in Georgia as to do the same thing at the subsequent regular election.

Now, we have these primaries all over the State of Georgia to choose candidates from governor and Congressman down to justices of the peace and bailiffs, and the contest is in the Democratic party between the candidates for office, who go out amongst the people, discuss the questions involved, and the voters come out in the primary election and cast their ballots; and when the nominations are declared and the elections come in October or November, in an off year or a Presidential year, if you please, the people being satisfied, there being no opposition in nine cases out of ten in the counties or in the Congressional districts of the State, in those districts where there is no opposition the people do not get out to vote.

Pardon me for referring to my own case. Mr. Chairman, in 1894 I was nominated by my people in the various primaries in my district. Nearly every vote was polled, there being three candidates for the nomination. Each one of the three got out his friends, and the ballot was full, honest, and square.

Mr. LACEY. I should like to ask my friend one further question. How extensive was the colored vote in that primary?

Mr. BARTLETT. Well, I will answer that question, speaking only for my own district. I could name the counties. In two counties in my district colored men who acknowledged that they were Democrats, or wanted to vote in the Democratic primary, and thereby declared their allegiance to the party and to support its nominees, did vote and were allowed to vote; and those we knew to be Democratic colored men, who not only supported us in the primary, but when the election came in 1894 and 1896, with nobody but the Populist candidate running against us, they voted for me as the Democratic nominee. And I have a letter which I wish I had here, that I could read, from one of the white Republicans, amongst many in my district. He not only supported me, but wrote to every county, and, though his business was a hundred miles away from the place where he was to vote, on the election day he left his business and came back to the polling place, and said to me, as he walked to the polls, "I am here to vote for you, as I promised."

So, Mr. Chairman, when the elections came in my own district, the first time, having nobody but the Populist candidate against me, the negroes did not vote, or the vote was divided. The next time we had again the Populist candidate, a man who went out amongst the negroes and undertook to array them against the whites; but the representative colored men in my district, through their executive committee, through the men who go to the national conventions, stumped that district for me with their colored friends and colored supporters and they voted for me. When 1898 came I did not have any opposition, either in my own party, the Populist party, or the Republican party, and every vote in that district that was cast, amounting to but about 3,500, it is true, was cast for me except three. So I give my own case as an answer to the gentleman's question.

My people have honored me by giving me every office I have asked for since the day I was 24 years old. I have never sought anything at their hands without receiving it, and sometimes they have been generous enough to force upon me offices that I did not seek.

They have honored me by giving me every office that I have applied for and some that I did not.

I know the importance of a full vote. My own county possesses a Democratic white registered vote of 4,500. I sat down and wrote to every registered Democratic voter on that list and begged him to come out and cast his ballot, stating to him that the smallness of our vote was a matter of criticism by the opposition. I sent a printed appeal with a ticket with my name upon it, begging them to come out and vote. Out of a registered Democratic vote of 4,500 I received 1,000 votes. One thousand men only went to the polls, not because they objected to me, but when I met them on the street and asked "Why did not you vote?" the reply always was: "You have no opposition, and it is not necessary for me to vote."

When I did have opposition, Mr. Chairman, they closed their stores, they shut up their houses, they quit their business, and not a man went back until he had cast his ballot. When I did not have any opposition I could not by the most earnest appeals induce them to come out and vote. The reason the small vote is cast is because a nomination by a white Democratic primary settles the election in every district almost, and opposition has not existed except in rare instances by the Republicans and in some instances by the Populists, and wherever there is opposition by the Populists one-half of the negroes vote with the white Democrats.

Mr. GROSVENOR. That, I suppose, would show that the colored vote is getting to be quite intelligent.

Mr. BARTLETT. Wait a minute.

Mr. GRIGGS. We educate them.

Mr. BARTLETT. Here is something by the smartest and most intelligent negro I know. Here is a statement by Booker Washington about the negro, and here is what he says about the governor of North Carolina. Let us see what he says:

Is there any reason why the negro in the South should oppose the Southern man in politics? Unconsciously we seem to have gotten the idea into our blood and bones that we are only acting in a manly way when we oppose Southern white men with our votes. * * * In some way, by some method, we must bring the race to the point where it will cease to feel that the only way for it to succeed is to oppose everything suggested or put forth by the Southern white men. * * * I believe there are thousands of white Democrats in North Carolina who are 50 per cent better friends to the negro than Governor Russell, and I see no necessity in continuing to follow Governor

Russell, who has no power to protect, or if he has the power, does not exercise it, rather than those other white men who can protect us if we cease to continually and forever oppose them.

[Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I trespass a little more on the time of the committee?

Mr. LITTLE. I hope that the gentleman may be allowed to proceed ten minutes longer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Georgia be extended ten minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BARTLETT. What I have said has been with reference to my own district. I prefer rather to speak of it than those of my colleagues, but it is the same with their districts as it was with mine. In the primary that we had, where there were candidates for all the county offices, I had 12,700 votes cast for me, and that was because there were candidates running for every office.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. BARTLETT. Certainly.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. What was the population of your district?

Mr. BARTLETT. One hundred and sixty-five thousand, I think.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Counting 1 vote to 5 of a family, there were 33,180 voters.

Mr. BARTLETT. And 26,000 registered.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. You received 3,008 votes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. And there were three against you?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Do you know who they were? [Laughter.]

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes. They were Prohibition Populists, extreme upon the subject of the sale of liquor and equally extreme on the subject of Populism in the South. [Laughter.]

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. And they are against you because you are not a Prohibitionist. [Renewed laughter.]

Mr. BARTLETT. Now, Mr. Chairman, permit me to say in answer to some of these things that have been said with reference to lynchings in the South and in Georgia, I shall not refer to the conditions generally. I have taken pains to investigate the matter, and I do not want to offend anybody; I do not want to be understood as criticising other States. God knows that I would repeat every day that grand prayer that we repeat from the prayer book every Sunday when we go to church: "From all envy and hatred and malice, good Lord deliver us;" and I would commend it to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LINNEY], if he ever has an opportunity to enter the portals of a church, to ask forgiveness for the wrong he has done his own country. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, here we are. In my own town of 40,000 people there was a case where a poor, helpless white woman had been assaulted, not by a negro, but by a white man. He was arrested and put in jail, and in that community a public meeting was held, and nobody could stem their indignation; they broke the jail open and carried him out and lynched him. He was a white man. They might have done that thing, and doubtless would have done it, if his skin had been black. Lynchings not only occur in the South, but in the West, in the North, in New Jersey, in New York, in Pennsylvania, in Ohio, in Michigan, and in many other States.

I have here gathered accounts of lynchings that have occurred in all these States; and whether it occurred in the cold climate of New York or Maine, or whether in the cold climate of Minnesota or Michigan, whether it occurred in that State from which the Presidents have come of late—the State of Ohio—one touch of humanity makes all white men kin. [Applause.] No State or community is free from lynchings or mob violence when the honor of their homes and the virtue of their wives and daughters are assaulted. Their homes, their daughters and wives, the neighbors' daughters and wives and their virtue are to be sacred and not to be subjected to criticism because you can not find a cold law that will bridle and check the hot temper of fathers and brothers, whether they live in Ohio or live in Georgia.

Another instance which occurred since this Congress has been in session. A white lady on her way home was waylaid by a colored brute. We do not know whether he committed any wrong or outrage except murder. Her throat was cut, her head beaten into a jelly, and she was thrown into the river, where her body lay until, in the course of nature, decay made it float to the top. They found the murderer; they traced it to him; they put him in jail in that county, the principal county in the district I have the honor to represent, and in a city in the State of Georgia tried him on the 19th day of December by a white jury. He was defended by my own law partner, appointed by the court, for the man did not have a dollar in the world—defended ably too, so much so as to evoke for the attorneys the thanks of the court and of the law-abiding people; and to-day his case is in the Supreme Court, where they are exhausting every remedy in his behalf.

I give you the two cases, one where a white fiend outraged a white woman and was lynched by my people, in violation of law, if you please, and a negro brute who murdered a white woman ten years afterwards, and was tried and convicted by law. I ask gentlemen on that side of the House to listen not with censure; we ask your sympathy. We know if you had these things existing in your community you would need ours; and you would get it, and not the carping criticism that we received at the hands of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LINNEY]. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have a number of instances of lynchings in States other than the South which I will not quote, because it will do no good or serve no good purpose; but I want to say this: The South has had great trials and tribulations. We helped found, organize, and build up this great country. Our people in every war from the Revolution down have sought with arms, with their treasure, and her sons to uphold the liberty of our people and the banner of our country. It has been declared by the President of the United States, himself a Federal soldier, that the time had come when these animosities, thank God, should be banished forever in the graves of our soldiers who fought together at San Juan and various places where we battled with the foreign foe. But, Mr. Speaker, if all this does not prove to you, if what our representative men state and the facts do not bear out what I have said, if this does not convince you that we are determined to solve this terrible problem which is put upon us in God's own time to suit our judgment, our duty to God and man and our families and to this great Government, we can not help it.

To those who extend to us the sympathy, forbearance, and patience that we may be entitled to by reason of the condition of affairs that places upon us these great problems for our solution, we thank you. To those who believe what the gentleman from North Carolina has said, that we are vicious violators of the law, that we maintain our supremacy of law and order by vicious election methods and by violation of the law, we have to say we leave you, we leave him, to the calm indifference of our contempt. [Applause.]

Mr. LINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has but one minute left.

Mr. LINNEY. I was not present during his criticisms of me, and I want to ask him a question. Will he tell the House why it is that in the State of Texas, a Southern State, where there are probably as many negroes as there are in Georgia, that there are no lynchings, and about 95 per cent of the electors in that State cast their vote every year, when so few cast votes in Georgia? Now, I want that as a matter of information, without getting mad. [Laughter.] Do not get mad as you do in election precincts, but state it philosophically.

Mr. BARTLETT. Oh, the gentleman from North Carolina is putting on the cap and bells again to play before the House. I have here a list of the lynchings in Georgia and Texas. In Georgia there are 11, and Texas has 7.

Imperialism.

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN,

OF NORTH CAROLINA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, May 17, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (S. 3419) making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes—

Mr. KITCHIN said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Trusts in industrial life are what imperialism is in governmental affairs. Trusts bring naturally independent business enterprises under one control, though it may destroy many of those enterprises and ruin their owners. Imperialism often brings widely separated countries under one control, though States may be destroyed and their people deprived of their rights of local government. A man who is a tyrant at heart may gladly favor trusts in business and imperialism in government.

The Republican party was once true to a great principle, but of late it has been true in obedience to the demands of concentrated wealth, and steady in disregard of the rights of the people when in conflict with those demands. Its President once declared—as Democrats still declare—that "forcible annexation"

was "criminal aggression." That sentiment was applauded from sea to sea. His party has violated that sentiment and his declaration, and he has since then, and while blood was flowing in the Philippines, called the policy he then denounced by the sweetened words "benevolent assimilation."

The Republican party once made slaves under our flag free; it has recently raised our flag over slaves and brought the Sultan of Jolo, with his many wives and concubines, under our jurisdiction.

It gave the country the greenbacks, the best of all its acts; it has recently provided for their destruction, against the protests of the Democracy. The great national banks desired their destruction.

The Republican party has, under this Administration, unnecessarily adopted and pursued a policy which in principle is subversive of our theory of government. The great principle which distinguishes a true republic from a tyranny is "that all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed."

The grandest body of patriots that ever assembled on this continent wrote that doctrine in the Declaration of Independence. One community has no right to govern or control another community without its fairly expressed consent. The people of any considerable community have a right to govern themselves; but, in my opinion, the God of nations and peoples never endowed one community or state with the right to govern a different community or state against its consent. The monarchies, tyrannies, and empires of earth have disregarded the natural rights of man and of peoples, usurped the powers of oppression, and inflicted upon unwilling states governments contrary to the consent of the governed.

Such governments have not only resulted in robbery and oppression of their distant territories, but also in robbery and oppression of their home people. Oppression abroad engenders oppression at home. A government can not survive half tyranny and half liberty. A government strong enough to do wrong abroad with impunity is strong enough to do wrong at home with impunity. The authorities who govern distant people without their consent will endeavor to govern their home people without their consent. That government which directly oppresses or suffers oppression of her colonies or territory will by indirection oppress or suffer oppression of its own home people. A people without their own local government never breathe the air of liberty, equality, and justice.

The whole life of our country until the last eighteen months was the noblest protest in the annals of men against the tyrant's creed that one State may govern another State without its consent and participation. When that protest becomes approval, mankind in horror may look forward to its political destiny, for what was common man's dearest hope will prove his direst curse. Sirs, if this country is to pursue a policy of imperialism, so rashly begun by an Administration elected by the trusts, let the praises of our Revolutionary heroes be torn from our histories, and instead of the record of the glorious fight of our ancestors for liberty, let it be written that their descendants destroyed the light of liberty and, for the sake of gain, put forth the sword of oppression instead of the declaration to save. Let Washington and Jefferson be forgotten. Let the monuments of Lexington and Guilford be dynamited. Aye, sirs, snatch from its pedestal the Goddess of Liberty Enlightening the World, send it back to France, and publish to mankind that America has become the enemy of man.

When the virtues that once adorned the consuls of Rome were abandoned for the luxurious vices that characterized her later emperors, her fate was determined. It saddens the heart and shames the spirit of our best citizenship when, after contemplating the simple virtues, rugged honesty, and pure patriotism of the fathers of this Republic, he turns to the consideration of the weakness, the changes of position, the drifting with events, and the vanity of our present Administration. Oh, that we had had as President a man of heroic nature when the flatterers were around, when the temptation came! Oh, for a Washington or a Jackson then!

The great American spirit would not be wounded; our country would not be suspected of indifference to the great rights of man; American soldiers would not be wasting away in the Philippines; the ambition of the individual would have yielded to the wisdom of the patriot. Having liberated Cuba, we would have the glad praise of all the world, and the liberty-lover wherever he is would point his countrymen to glorious America, the land of Washington, the country that makes people free! To-day you will search the wide world over in vain to find a single intelligent man, acquainted with our insular experience, who will call America now the giver of liberty to states.

In this Administration, in my opinion, the demands of capital have prevailed over the rights of man. It has followed a policy that says the people who must pay allegiance to our flag have not the protection of our Constitution. A policy against which every patriot, every lover of humanity must rebel. The advisers of the President probably told him that such opportunities never came to Washington or Lincoln; that great glory would come to him if he only seized them; that there was money for our wealthy in the exploitation of the Philippines. They probably touched his vanity. They did not remind him that he had said "forcible annexation" was "criminal aggression." Therefore, when Spain was whipped he had her held up as if by a robber, and required the cession of the Philippines at the price of $20,000,000. He compelled the trade at the point of the bayonet. The most charitable historian can not make of it a pleasant chapter.

The cession of the Philippines was not the necessary, nor was it the natural result, in view of our history and traditions, of the Spanish war. At the close of that war we had possession of only one town, Manila; but had we been in possession of all the islands Spain had ever claimed it would not have changed this particular matter. It was not incumbent on us to take these islands or to hold them after the war. The Spanish commissioners were surprised when they were demanded. Nothing required us to acquire them except the avarice of those who advised the President. The habits of the world's robbers and tyrants enticed the President, and instead of their being "benevolent assimilation" in the business, there has been a great deal of useless slaughter.

Ever since their acquisition they have been a source of bloodshed, trouble, and increased expense.

The President in his speech before the Ohio Society in the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York on March 8, 1900, said that the war with Spain was "unavoidable," but he did not assert that the Philippine trouble was unavoidable. He did say the whole matter was the "people's question." I do not believe that the high officials of any government on earth have the proper consideration of the people in entering war. They often bring on war, and tax the people of their blood and money for its prosecution, appeal to their patriotism, and try to make them think it is "their question."

In my judgment, had this Philippine question been submitted to the people by a referendum, or otherwise, it would have been repudiated by such a majority that would shock not only the conscience but the fears of those who caused it. Why should we want as a part of our country a thousand islands in the Tropics, 7,000 miles from our shores, with 10,000,000 of inferior people of an inferior race, whom Spain had for a hundred years been struggling in vain to civilize and permanently subdue?

In that speech the President calls them "our wards," and says, "Nations do not grow in strength, and the cause of liberty and law is not advanced by the doing of easy things. The harder the task the greater will be the result, benefit, and the honor." He also speaks of "breaking up our camp of ease and isolation." He thinks "the burden is our opportunity." What will the country think of one who advances a policy which will make our task harder and "break up our camp of ease and isolation?" I agree with him that his Philippine policy puts upon us harder tasks and heavier burdens and destroys our ease and isolation.

For that very reason every American patriot should oppose it. To put harder tasks upon our people, to "break up their ease and isolation" in order either to exploit or to govern these distant islands with their inferior people, exhibits a purpose as purely imperialistic as ever entered the minds of Cæsar or Alexander. It means heavier taxation upon our people, unnecessary risks and responsibilities upon them, and an absolute disregard of their right to lower taxes and peaceful conditions, and it means the beginning of many of the causes that wrecked proud nations in the past. How are these Filipinos to be treated? How is Porto Rico to be treated? Again are we reminded of the vacillation of the Republican party and the weakness of the President. In his message to Congress of December 5, 1899, prepared with solemn deliberation, he said:

> The markets of the United States should be opened up to her (Porto Rico's) products. Our plain duty is to abolish all customs tariffs between the United States and Porto Rico and give her products free access to our markets.

Plain duty! How was it plain? Why, under the Constitution. It was right in the sight of God; it was right between the two peoples; but it was a plain duty under the Constitution. Thus did the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee understand it, for he at once introduced a bill for free trade with Cuba. This bill was right. Much had been said by the President and leading Republicans about liberty and blessings following the flag. What liberty and what blessings were meant?

Why, those enjoyed under our Constitution. Never before had anyone claimed that our Constitution was not coequal with our sovereignty. Never did anyone pretend to think that the President or Congress, creatures of the Constitution, had powers above and beyond the Constitution until the demon of pride, selfishness, and greed entered Republican hearts. The spirit of the trusts was abroad. Trusts' interests, not the interest of humanity, had the consideration of the Republican party, and, as if touched by the magician's wand, in a day it changed its position in reference to Porto Rico.

One day the "plain duty" under the Constitution was to give

them free trade with us. The next day the trust interests came into the Republican party's vision again, and it was proclaimed that the Constitution did not protect the Porto Ricans and that those suffering people should be heavily taxed on their trade with us. The Republicans at first put those taxes at 25 per cent of the Dingley tariff rates. The President at once swung into accord with that. A shout of opposition was heard throughout the country. The Republicans in Congress, fearing that opposition, reduced it to 15 per cent. The President accepted that. Porto Rico was then, and is now, part of the United States. The Constitution says that all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States, and that no tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any State.

No wonder the almost unanimous press of the country criticised the Porto Rican bill, for the President, who had proclaimed that blessings followed the flag, and his allies had boldly taken the position that although our flag flies in Porto Rico and we have sovereignty and exercise jurisdiction over it, yet her people have not the greatest of all blessings, politically speaking—the rights of the Constitution. They have taken the bold position that our Government can treat our island possessions in any manner we please, however unjust or oppressive may be our measures, provided our Army and Navy are sufficient. They say the inhabitants of those islands, whatever may be their grievances, can not appeal to our Constitution, but only to our discretion. Their position is that Congress can prescribe for the Porto Ricans trials without juries and without indictments; that soldiers in time of peace can be quartered in their private houses without their consent, but they can not appeal to the great Constitution that protects us. He that approves such a doctrine with a crown on his head would be a most cruel tyrant.

The President's "plain duty" so soon by him rejected! Vacillating, unstable President! How can his course be explained? In the Senate on March 8, 1900, Senator TILLMAN was asking of Senator FORAKER, of Ohio, a kindred question, when the Senator from Ohio said not to ask him, but to ask his colleague (meaning Senator HANNA), for he, Senator FORAKER, was not the keeper of the President's conscience.

I suppose if any mortal man can explain the President's various changes of positions on important public matters that man is the chairman of the Republican national executive committee. Would that he had a better political chaperon!

Whether explained or not, the change occurred, and many conscientious Republicans who had declared that they never would vote to tax trade with Porto Rico, under the party lash fell into line with the policy which was intended to give the deathblow to the constitutional rights of our recently acquired territory. The courts had repeatedly held that our Constitution was over all our territory. Ruling a people and denying them constitutional rights is as base imperialism as the world ever knew.

Members of Congress may surrender their opinions at the dictates of a party leader, but the honest, God-fearing, liberty-loving man at home, uninfluenced by bosses, has not surrendered his right to think, and to act upon his best intelligence, nor will he be coerced by any false ideas of loyalty to a President who denies the protection of our Constitution to people under our flag and who pay allegiance to our sovereignty. Evidence has appeared sufficient to show that the acquisition of the Philippines was not from high or holy motives, but for the purposes of exploitation for the benefit of the few.

But to Porto Rico again. Suppose your son, living here as a merchant, freely trading with the people of North Carolina, should move to Porto Rico and continue from that island to sell goods to a North Carolina merchant. Is it right, is it constitutional, to compel him or the North Carolinian, both still American citizens, on American soil, under the American flag, to pay a tariff tax upon the goods they buy and sell to each other? No, sir; it is neither constitutional nor right; and all the influence of the Administration, all the sophistry of its defenders, all the greed of its supporters, can not make it right, can not make it constitutional. To hold that it is constitutional is to adopt the creed of the plunderers of earth—the creed of imperialism. It would be approving the power to destroy the Porto Rican's property without his consent, taxing him without representation. We oppose such doctrines in the name of every honest man, of every liberty lover throughout the world. They destroy justice. They build up and fortify tyrants. They menace our posterity.

We oppose them because we oppose rule by brute force and oppose large armies and their heavy expense. To-day three-fourths of all the taxes raised by the Government are paid out on account of war. More than $300,000,000 annually are paid out for the Army, the Navy, fortifications, and pensions—a sum more than the taxable property of North Carolina. Imperialism means vastly heavier burdens on the people; means breaking up our "camp of ease." It should be at once resisted. The people should rise in their might at the fall elections and repudiate it. Imperialistic tendency has kept our Administration silent while the English have proceeded to blot from the map of South Africa two republics of free men who had followed the example of our ancestors. The great American heart was in sympathy with the Boers, but no sympathy was ever expressed for them by those influential in Administration circles, because such sympathy could not exist in the hearts of those who sustain the President in his policy toward Porto Rico and the Philippines.

Men who hate kings and tyrants, men who hate injustice and oppression, men who love the government of our fathers as handed down to us, men who desire their posterity to share in a republican form of government, men who hate imperialism and love constitutional government, men who believe in America for Americans and desire to avoid entangling alliances with foreign powers, men who oppose heavier tasks and who do not want to quit our good, safe American "camp of ease and isolation," should seize the first opportunity to express their views and repudiate the Administration that has antagonized the dearest principles of our country.

WAR TAXES.

Two years ago, when the Republicans passed the war-tax act, we were told that it would be a temporary measure, for mere war purposes. The Spanish war has been over for eighteen months. The enormous taxes under the war-tax measure have brought a large surplus in the Treasury. The people are tired of paying these obnoxious taxes. They are tired of being taxed by stamp taxes upon their notes, duebills, checks, mortgages, deeds, medicines, etc. A faithful compliance with the understanding of the country when the war-tax bill became law requires the modification of that measure and the repeal of many of its taxes. I have introduced a bill to modify that act; other Democrats have introduced bills to repeal and to modify it, but not one of them has been able to pass the Ways and Means Committee. In that committee they slumber under Republican vigilance.

However much we may desire an early adjournment of this session of Congress, adjournment should not occur until the war-tax act has been greatly modified and many of its taxes repealed. We should relieve the people of many of its burdens. We on this side stand ready to vote for modification, for substantial decrease in its burdens. We invite you to bring in a bill for the relief of the people, and promise to aid in their relief.

ADMINISTRATION SCANDALS.

The present Administration has been the propagator or the victim of many scandals. It has been shown that the Government, about the time of the Spanish war, paid extravagant prices for ships, for some of them about twice their value, and purchased ships which were of little account, and that the recipients of these good bargains were nearly always Administration supporters. The *Merrimac*, which Hobson sank at Santiago, was one of them. Her cost was $192,000, but the Government paid $342,000 for her; in other words, $150,000 was made by those who sold her to our Government.

The attention of the public has again in the last week been attracted to the *Enquirer*, a yacht, for which the Government paid $80,000, and after the war listed it for sale at $25,000.

It has been but a little over a year since the Eagan scandal was performed. Brigadier-General Eagan, who had said General Miles had lied, etc., was found guilty by a court-martial of conduct grossly unbecoming an officer, but the President, more in the nature of a reward than as a punishment, suspended him from service for six years with full pay of $5,500 per year, so that he will, for doing absolutely nothing for six years, receive from the Government the sum of $33,000, at the end of which time he will be old enough to retire on three-fourths pay. Instead of dismissing him in disgrace, as he ought to have done, the President conferred upon him a punishment in the nature of approval of his conduct.

But a few weeks ago it was discovered that in Cuba, which is not ours, but now under the control of our officials, were drawing not only their regular salaries as our officers, but were also being paid large sums out of the Cuban revenues. In other words, they were, without the knowledge of the American public, increasing their pay by taking from the money belonging not to us, but to the Cuban people, whatever sums they required; and high Administration officials had approved it! This is a characteristic of tyrannous imperialism.

The beef scandal is still fresh in the public minds, and a bitter recollection to our soldiers who went to Cuba and Porto Rico. Spoiled beef was issued as rations to the soldiers. Because General Miles sustained in part the complaints of the soldiers about the character of beef furnished them, General Eagan severely denounced his superior officer, General Miles, which brought about the trial by court-martial of Eagan, above-mentioned.

The Neely scandal is still on. The papers are still full of the stealings in the Cuban postal service. High officials of that service are involved. C. F. W. Neely, Republican from Indiana, is under arrest, charged with stealing something like $100,000 from the Cuban revenues. He was financial agent of the post-office business in Cuba, appointed by the President. Rathbone, the

director of the posts in Cuba, another appointee of the President, has been suspended on account of his conduct in connection with the frauds there. It is probably true that the gang of plunderers connected with the postal matters in Cuba under our imperial rule there, for the benefit of the Cubans, stole three or four hundred thousand dollars. The end is not yet in sight. "There is money in it."

One of the worst outrages against humanity in recent years occurred in Idaho at Cœur d'Alene—not in any of our newly acquired territory, but in the State of Idaho—beginning more than a year ago when the writ of habeas corpus was suspended, martial law declared, and hundreds of workingmen were by the military authorities of the United States huddled together, imprisoned in a "bull pen" for months, because of trouble arising from differences between the men and the mine owners. These men were imprisoned without indictment or charges preferred, and held without trial or opportunity for a hearing. Terrible it was, but a characteristic of militarism.

The people should take this Government out of the hands of those who believe it is right to take any territory or do anything if "there is money in it" and place it in the hands of those who believe in the Constitution, and in doing right and in administering justice, in making no arrest without warrant of law, and in dealing honestly with all mankind, whether "there is money in it" or not. For one I have confidence in the people and rely upon their integrity and courage, and so relying I confidently look forward to the election this fall of Mr. Bryan.

The Trust Amendment.

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES H. GROSVENOR,

OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, May 31, 1900.

The House having under consideration joint resolution (H. J. Res. 138) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States—

Mr. GROSVENOR said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I avail myself of the order for general debate granted by the House to place in the RECORD an open letter addressed to me as chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and which purports to be a reply to a letter of one Peabody, a British merchant and charterer of foreign ships in our foreign trade.

I may only add that of course anything which will benefit American shipping and American labor will injure the business of Mr. Peabody and the Britico-American interests he represents.

The letter is as follows:

PELHAM, N. Y., *June 4, 1900.*

Hon. CHARLES H. GROSVENOR,
Chairman Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL: My attention has been called to a printed pamphlet containing an open letter to Representative William H. Moody, written by Mr. Henry W. Peabody, an American charterer of foreign ships in our foreign trade. The letter in question has been published in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, extracts from and comments upon which have also appeared in the public press. Mr. Peabody's letter professes to discuss "The Amended Shipping Bill" which you favorably reported from your committee on March 31, 1900. As that letter contains many serious misstatements as to fact, and much illogical argument, and as I have therein been personally singled out for attack, I venture to ask, in view of the large circulation it has received through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that this open letter to you be accorded space in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the refutation of the attacks that have been, through inaccurate statements, made against the bill, as an act of justice to the bill itself, in justice to the real facts, and in justice to its many friends and advocates, among which latter I am one of the most earnest although of the very least importance.

HOW THE BILL WILL INDUCE SHIPBUILDING.

In the first two pages of his pamphlet Mr. Peabody presents a fair summary of the chief features of the bill. On the third page, however, he says its object "is not to increase our merchant marine quickly and materially, but to induce orders for vessels to be built in the United States." I would like to be told how the "inducing of orders for vessels to be built in the United States" would "not increase our merchant marine quickly and materially." All that has been lacking for forty years has been the "inducement." This "inducement" Mr. Peabody admits this bill will create. We possess everything else with which to "quickly and materially" increase our merchant shipping. The materials needed exist in our soil in the greatest abundance and cheapness. Our mills are capable of shaping these materials in unlimited quantities. We have a considerable number of shipyards capable of almost unlimited increased capacity. We have the skill to build ships of the best. We have capital in abundance, and we have a foreign trade to carry that attracts the cream of the world's shipping to-day, but a fraction of which is of American construction. In this accurate premise that the pending bill will "induce orders for vessels to be built in the United States" Mr. Peabody himself refutes his assertion that it will "not increase our merchant marine quickly and materially."

SHALL AMERICAN OR FOREIGN LABOR BE EMPLOYED?

Right here exists the cardinal difference between the bill you have favorably reported and the bill as Mr. Peabody would have it amended. His desire is and his entire public criticism has been aimed to have the bill open wide the door for the admission to American registry of foreign-built vessels during a period of one or more years after its passage. Your bill provides for the building of these vessels by American labor in American shipyards and from American materials. Mr. Peabody would prefer to be permitted to go abroad to obtain the ships with which he would have an American merchant marine built up. He desires that foreign labor shall do that which your bill provides American labor shall do.

FULL AMERICAN OWNERSHIP ESSENTIAL TO AMERICAN REGISTRY.

Mr. Peabody professes to see great danger in the provisions of section 26 of the bill, which defines the words "person" or "persons," or "citizen" or "citizens," or "corporation" or "corporations," or "associations," or "partnerships," in that "corporations of any foreign country" are recognised. One would infer from Mr. Peabody's disingenuous manner of presenting the matter that foreigners would come in and enjoy our subsidy, and thus make more difficult American competition with foreign vessels. The bill provides throughout that only vessels under American register shall enjoy the benefits of the act, and no vessels not wholly owned by American citizens are entitled to registry. Mr. Peabody strangely overlooked section 17, which declares "that a vessel receiving compensation under this act shall not be sold to any foreign subject, citizen, company, or country, or transferred to any foreign flag, without the written permission of the Secretary of the Treasury." Not only does the bill include this provision, but in the case of such foreign vessels now built or building as are to be admitted to American registry, it is stipulated that full ownership shall first be vested in American citizens.

ATTACKING THE ONLY AMERICAN LINE IN OUR TRADE WITH EUROPE.

Mr. Peabody's assertion that "the cream of the subsidy is designed to fall to those vessels of the International Steamship Company" is not only erroneous but seems purposely designed to prejudice the public against that line—the only line, by the way, engaged in our trade with Europe under the American flag. This line has been repeatedly singled out for the most virulent, malignant, and unjustifiable attacks ever since the shipping bill has been before the public. It has been asserted, but without a word of truth, that it is controlled by the Standard Oil and the Pennsylvania Railroad companies.

CONTENDING AGAINST MOST WEALTHY AND POWERFUL FOREIGN LINES.

That line has been pictured as part of a monopolistic trust, whereas it is battling single-handed and alone against the most powerful steamship lines in the world. These other lines—all under foreign flags—are backed up with unlimited wealth and the support of their several Governments to whatever extent may be necessary to enable them to successfully compete in our trans-Atlantic trade. The American line in question is struggling at considerable pecuniary loss to succeed and to still further increase its tonnage under the Stars and Stripes in the face of this concentrated and united opposition. In doing so it has been subjected to the unbridled abuse of every free trader, every free-trade newspaper, every enemy of American shipping, and every defender of foreign shipping in the United States. If the stockholders of this line are ready to invest still further in American ships in the hope of ultimately earning a profit, and are ready to subject themselves to the fiercest and most concentrated competition of the most wealthy and powerful ships in all the world under foreign flags, the American people will applaud and commend them.

DEADLY PURPOSE OF THE OPPOSITION.

The deadly purpose of this opposition is manifest when we study the statistics of the United States for the last fiscal year. Of the total foreign trade of the United States, 66.07 per cent is with Europe—more than two-thirds of our total foreign trade is with Europe. Of our imports from Europe, valued at $337,884,524, only $15,430,242, or 4.35 per cent, was carried in American vessels. Of this, the ships of the American line carried imports valued at $14,813,033. Of our exports to Europe, valued at $936,602,093, but $27,558,076, or 1.30 per cent, was carried in American vessels, the ships of the American line alone carrying exports to Europe valued at $25,077,749.

ONE AMERICAN LINE CARRIES ONE-QUARTER OF ALL FOREIGN COMMERCE CARRIED IN AMERICAN SHIPS.

The value of the imports and exports carried in the ships of this line was $39,890,782, out of a total of $160,612,206 carried in all of the American ships engaged in our entire foreign trade. The ships of this American line carried within a fraction of 25 per cent of all of the imports and exports of the United States that were carried in American ships. If, therefore, the four steamships of the American Line—which rendered such exceptional and invaluable auxiliary naval service to our Government during the war with Spain—can be driven out of our trade with Europe, the proportion of our carrying under the American flag in that trade will drop from the present 2.15 per cent of the total to but two-tenths of 1 per cent. That is to say, the foreign ships now monopolize 97.85 per cent of our carrying trade with Europe, and are striving with all of the power and influence at their command to increase their proportion of our carrying to 99.8 per cent, leaving for the stray American vessel that will dare to venture into that trade the carrying of 0.2 per cent of our imports and exports.

By driving these ships out of our foreign trade the proportion of the entire foreign trade of the United States carried in American vessels will be reduced from 8.9 to just 7 per cent, leaving for foreign ships the carrying of 93 per cent of our exports and imports, and the earning of the estimated $200,000,000 in freights that are taken from the United States each year. No wonder the foreign steamship lines, and all other friends of foreign shipping, and every enemy of American shipping, concentrate their opposition on the American line—the single heroic carrier of the American flag in our trans-Atlantic trade!

SHIPS RENDERING GREATEST SERVICE RECEIVE LARGEST COMPENSATION.

It has been demonstrated before your committee that this American line is ready to greatly enlarge its tonnage under the American flag. That is precisely what the United States desires, for defensive and commercial reasons. It is precisely what the foreign shipping interests and their friends desire to oppose at all hazards. It is untrue that the American line is to receive "the cream of the subsidy," but if it were true it would only be because it furnished the cream of the service under the American flag required under the terms of the bill. The individual or the corporation receiving the most, under the terms of the bill, must perform the greatest service. In performing that service no line is permitted to enjoy the exclusive right to any route or character of trade, but each ship of every line is subject to the competition of all other American vessels, whose owners will be entitled to receive exactly the same compensation for the same service from the Government.

To drive the only American line in our trade with Europe out of that business has been and still is the determined purpose of the most active and powerful enemies of American shipping. With them Mr. Peabody seems to have joined hands. To drive the only American line out of our trade with Europe will be to prevent the threatened increase in the number of American ships in that trade, and with which purpose Mr. Peabody seems to be in full accord. It may be necessary to drive American ships entirely from our trade with Europe in order to still further accentuate our dependence upon foreign shipping for our foreign carrying. In this un-American and unpatriotic scheme Mr. Peabody evidences

his persistent activity. He is in full accord with every enemy of American shipping in seeking to accomplish this infamous purpose.

DEMAGOGIC APPEALS TO CLASS PREJUDICES.

Mr. Peabody employs the arts of the demagogue for the purpose of discrediting the friends and possible beneficiaries of the proposed bill. He appeals to class prejudices, and especially endeavors to discredit capital, in his desire to defeat the passage of the measure in question. This is illustrated in the following paragraph quoted from his letter:

"The foreign-built vessels which it is proposed to admit to registry are owned by five or six wealthy firms or corporations in New York City, said to aggregate 318,000 tons register, but about one-third this tonnage has very recently been absorbed by the great English Leyland Line."

A BILL IN THE INTEREST OF AMERICAN LABOR.

This American charterer of foreign vessels adroitly avoids stating the real reason for the admission of certain foreign-built vessels to American registry, regarding which it is important that a clear knowledge should be had. The great underlying purpose of any legislation designed to revive the American merchant marine should be that of utilizing our own abundant native materials, of employing our own labor in mill and shop and in shipyard, in the construction of the ships, so that we shall be entirely independent of all other nations in the essential possession of adequate means for the construction of all of the vessels our commerce may require.

Two great national purposes are thus served, to wit: (1) The creation and maintenance of American shipyards in a state of constant efficiency for the building of both our merchant and our war ships, the very possession of which is a safeguard against foreign aggression, and the large employment in which will unquestionably be of immense permanent benefit to the nation and its people. (2) The steady reduction in the cost of building merchant and war ships, resulting from the constant employment of a larger number of establishments in that great industry. This last accomplishment alone will repay the nation over and over again for whatever temporary aid it may give to incite our people to put their capital into ships and shipyards.

THE UNITED STATES THE WORLD'S SHIPBUILDER.

After the steady employment in American shipyards for a number of years has reduced the cost of construction in the United States to or below the level of foreign prices, then this country will become the leading shipbuilding nation of the world. That event will be hastened by the Government aiding in the initiatory steps that must precede any extensive employment of American capital in the foreign carrying trade of the United States, a fact fully admitted by Mr. Peabody throughout his letter.

CARDINAL PRINCIPLES UNDERLYING THE BILL.

When the bill under consideration was drafted the great cardinal principles of home construction as well as American ownership were steadily kept in view. It was found, however, that a substantial amount of foreign-built tonnage, sailing under foreign flags, was in the possession of American citizens, and that other tonnage was then in course of construction in foreign shipyards for the American owners of existing foreign-built tonnage.

WHY AMERICAN CITIZENS OWN SHIPS UNDER FOREIGN FLAGS.

The reason that American citizens had purchased, and the reason they were having built, this foreign tonnage was that it cost less than American tonnage, and the cost of operating the ships was much less under foreign flags than the cost of their operation under the American flag. The construction cost is found to be between 20 and 25 per cent less abroad than in the United States, the principal cause for which is the high wages paid in American shipyards, labor receiving between 90 and 95 per cent of the money actually spent in the construction of ships. The higher wages paid and the better and larger quantities of food furnished to those employed on board American ships make the cost of their operation between 30 and 40 per cent higher than the cost of operating competing ships under foreign flags.

Those American citizens, therefore, whose business interests required the employment of ships in our foreign trade were forced to purchase them at the same cost and run them at the same cost that their foreign rivals were able to do in order to successfully compete with them in the business. This explains why it is that American citizens do, to the extent of 200,000 or 300,000 tons, own ships now under foreign flags. To have the ships their trade required built in the United States and to run them under the American flag in our foreign trade meant to so handicap their owners in competition with their foreign rivals as to drive them out of the business.

These conditions of competition and these reasons explain fully why it is that the mere granting of American registry to foreign-built vessels owned by our citizens would be valueless. Even if they possessed the privilege, our citizens could not profitably take advantage of it. But to give a subsidy to foreign-built vessels so owned, if placed under the American flag, is an entirely different proposition; and this is the proposition advocated by Mr. Peabody. He would protect the owners of the ships, by subsidy, against foreign competition, but he would withdraw protection from American shipbuilders. It need scarcely be added that Mr. Peabody is a prospective shipowner—that he has no prospective personal interest in American shipbuilding.

HOW TO INDUCE THEM TO HEREAFTER HAVE THE SHIPS THEY NEED BUILT IN AMERICAN SHIPYARDS.

In the drafting of the bill it was suggested that if those American citizens who then owned vessels under foreign flags could be encouraged to thereafter have the ships they required for their business built in the United States it would be a very desirable accomplishment. The ships were in existence, and they were owned by our citizens for their immediate needs. The question was what could be done to induce them in the future to build their ships at home. If their present ships, it was suggested, could be brought under American registry and compensation provided sufficient in amount to offset the higher cost of operating them under our flag, and further compensation provided for such ships as were built in the United States and run under our flag, such American citizens as possessed a foreign carrying trade would then find it to their interest to build in the United States. And this explains the provision for the admission of such ships to American registry as were owned by or under construction for our citizens when the bill was drafted.

The proposition to open our registry to the wholesale admission of foreign-built ships for a period of years after the bill has gone into effect was entirely foreign to the purposes animating those who drafted the bill. The bill does not provide for the construction of one foreign-built ship after its passage; it provides then only for the construction of American-built ships.

ONLY HALF COMPENSATION TO FOREIGN-BUILT SHIPS.

The bill provides that foreign-built ships thus admitted to American registry shall receive but one-half the compensation that is provided for ships of American construction. This limitation is made because the cost of building ships abroad—the cost of buying foreign-built vessels—is less than the cost of building or buying American vessels. Mr. Peabody, however, having in prospect the purchase of foreign-built ships, desires that such ships shall be given compensation under the bill equal in amount to that provided for American-built ships.

MR. PEABODY'S PERSONAL INTERESTS.

We now understand the underlying purposes animating Mr. Peabody in his opposition to the bill as it stands. He happens to be engaged in chartering foreign vessels in our foreign trade, particularly in our trade with Australia. While Mr. Peabody objects to what he chooses to designate as "special privileges" being given to existing American owners of vessels under foreign flags, he happens to be an influential participant in a combination of firms, most of which are foreign companies, which have, by methods more or less questionable, compelled shippers to either employ the vessels belonging to the combination or submit to the boycotting of their exports to the serious injury and financial loss of the shippers' business, proof of which has been widely published in the newspapers, and, so far as I have seen, never denied by Mr. Peabody or by anyone acting for him.

Mr. Peabody comes to Congress complaining of "special privileges," in which he admits he is not a participant, but in the rather sorry guise of a participant in a "trust" or "combination" obviously restrictive of trade and injurious to American producers and exporters, and which certain sufferers from the methods employed by the combination in which Mr. Peabody is a participant have boldly characterized as "blackmailing."

AS MR. PEABODY DESCRIBES HIMSELF AND AS HE IS.

Mr. Peabody stated his objections to the bill when the public hearings were given by your committee, referring to his own business interests and connections. The latter have been more fully exploited since that time, in connection with the combination of which he is a member, the whole of which is very accurately embraced in the compass of an editorial which appeared in the Philadelphia Press, under date of May 29, 1900, and which reads as follows:

WHY HE OPPOSES THE BILL.

"Not all of the opponents of the shipping bill now pending before Congress are actuated by selfish motives, but selfishness is the inspiration of the most active opposition. The London Times and the London Shipping Gazette have acknowledged that British shipowners are opposing the bill. Representatives of subsidized German lines have been openly working against the measure. Such opposition is easily understood. The London Financial Times explained it recently by stating that the foreign shipowners regard with anxiety the probability of the passing of the bill, as that would mean brisk competition from the United States. The foreign shipowners know the absolute falsity of the statements made in Congress by such men as Representative Fitzgerald, who declare that the bill would not increase to any extent American shipping in the foreign trade and would not lead to a reduction of freight rates. If it were not absolutely certain that it would accomplish these ends the foreign companies would not employ lobbyists to oppose the bill and to prepare such a report against it as the ridiculous one Mr. Fitzgerald fathered.

"There is some honestly mistaken opposition. It comes from free traders, who have opposed every protective measure that has built up American industries. The proofs that are everywhere in evidence of the woeful mistakes of the free traders makes their opposition of comparatively little consequence. It is the selfish opposition that masks itself behind pretended patriotic motives that misleads the public. Such is the opposition of men like Henry W. Peabody of Boston, whose 'argument' against the bill was inserted in the 'Congressional Record' recently by Representative Moody of Massachusetts. It is a bad bill in the opinion of Mr. Peabody, who says that he has been engaged in the shipping business for forty years. He testified before the House Committee on Merchant Marine last January to this effect:

"I certainly appreciate that our merchant marine has decayed and that we have nothing worthy of the name. I am in favor of a subsidy. I consider it necessary that subsidy should be applied to the merchant marine in order to give it a new life. My firm is engaged in business which requires them to charter vessels and steamers, and they are almost invariably of the British flag. We can not conduct our ships under the American flag as cheaply as the English or the Germans or the Norwegians can conduct their ships, and that disadvantage it is necessary to offset by a subsidy. That is due for one thing to higher wages and better living. It is a poor investment to go and buy a vessel and pay 35 per cent more than our competitors are paying for their vessels abroad. This bill is a step in the right direction. It will replenish the merchant marine, but it will not re-create it. It does not give me or my associates an opportunity to operate under it. I believe that if subsidies were provided and the people who have not any vessels to-day had the opportunity for one, two, three, or five years to buy them in foreign countries, and then contract at the same time they put them under American registry to build in this country a similar amount of tonnage, you would see a replenishment that would run up into millions. I would be glad if the limit should not be put even at $9,000,000.

"That is Mr. Peabody's argument given before the House committee. His objection to the bill is that he could not buy at 35 per cent less than they could be built for in this country all the ships he wants to abroad for the next five years, and by hoisting the American flag get subsidies at once. That would be a fine way to build up the American merchant marine. The bill does not give Mr. Peabody and his associates 'a right to operate under it.' Why? The following blank contract will explain:

"It is hereby agreed between R. W. Cameron & Co., Henry W. Peabody & Co., Arkell & Douglas, and Mailler & Quereau, and ——— of ———, that the latter will confine exclusively ——— shipments from the East coast of the United States to ports of ——— by vessels loaded by above firms for a period of ——— years, and said firms agree to allow said ——— 10 per cent on the net amount of freight paid by ———, not including the primage. This rebate to be computed to the 31st of December of each year, and will only be payable six months thereafter, subject to the above conditions, and upon a declaration by ——— on the annexed form, with copies of bills of lading attached. No claim for rebates will be recognized unless made within twelve months from date of shipment. Statement of rebates claimed may be sent to either one of the four firms to this agreement. Privilege is given under this agreement to ship any special lines of merchandise by steamer from New York for transhipment at British or Continental ports without prejudice to claim for rebate as above noted. This agreement becomes operative from date of signature.

"R. W. CAMERON & CO.
"HENRY W. PEABODY & CO.
"ARKELL & DOUGLAS.
"MAILLER & QUEREAU,

"We hereby accept above agreement and terms contained therein.

"———.
"———.

"Mr. Peabody's firm is with the three others signed to the above blank contract engaged extensively in shipping to and from China and the Orient. They are in a combination or trust with secret agreements with shippers to give rebates in the way the Standard Oil monopoly was built up. They could not continue that monopoly under the shipping bill, owing to the trust clause and for other reasons. Hence Mr. Peabody, in his letter to Mr. Moody, printed in the Congressional Record, denounces the measure as a bad one.

"Of course, he has no selfish reason for opposing it!"

FOREIGN-BUILT SHIPS AND AMERICAN REGISTRY.

As Mr. Peabody himself points out in his letter, from the very foundation of our Government—even when ships were built much more cheaply in the United

States than abroad—American legislation has been continuously directed against the admission of foreign-built vessels to American registry. Pronounced free traders still suggest this as the only panacea required for the upbuilding of our marine in the foreign trade—this is especially true of the less practical and the more theoretical of free traders. In connection with the shipping bill this proposition has been so fully thrashed out that its insufficiency and impracticability are now admitted by far the larger number of all those best posted, even including the less radical advocates of the free-trade school of economics. So, it has occurred that at no time has the opposition to free ships been more pronounced all over the United States than it is to-day. The ten Republican members of your committee, including yourself, unite in showing the futility of the free-ship policy. In your report, on this policy, you say:

"We think it plain, therefore, from the nature of the case and from national experience, that it is of the greatest importance that the vessels which are to carry the foreign trade of the United States shall be built in the United States, shall sail under our flag, and shall be manned as far as practicable by our own citizens, although the immediate expense of their construction and the expense of operating them under our flag shall be greater than in carrying on the business with foreign ships."

In the report in favor of the passage of practically the same bill as the one that your committee favorably reported, filed by the Senate Commerce Committee, through its chairman, Senator William P. Frye, on the free-ship proposition, he makes this statement:

"If this admission be conditional, and foreign-built vessels admitted to registry be excluded from the coasting trade, such vessels will enjoy no privileges over foreign vessels, but will, on the contrary, be subject to the restrictions of our laws. All the watch officers of such vessels must be American citizens, the higher American scale of wages must be paid, and the higher statutory scale of provisions must be furnished. The repeal of the laws requiring officers to be American citizens and providing a scale of provisions, together with a reduction of wages to European levels, are propositions not to be entertained. But even if Congress should approve them, American ship owners would still be only on even terms with competing nations already established in the ocean-carrying trade. More is needed to gain a share of the trade lost for years. In either of its forms the free-ship policy is thus impracticable."

In a report filed by three of the seven Democratic members of your committee—Representatives Chanler, Small, and Ransdell—on this bill, they are even more emphatic in their opposition to the free-ship policy, regarding which they say:

"Another remedy which has been proposed is the repeal of that provision of our navigation laws which denies foreign-built vessels to American registry. It has been contended for years by many that our citizens should have the right to buy ships in any market and have them admitted to registry and sail under our flag. We regard it as useless to discuss the practical results or to lay down the arguments which have been advanced upon each of these contentions. It is scarcely a practical question. No political party has or would enact such legislation. The Democratic party did not enact into law this proposition when it had the power to do so, nor will it do so at any time in the future. It is equally true that the Republican party would decline to adopt this remedy. Such a law would be recognized as an irreparable blow to the shipbuilding interests of the country, and would result in the encouragement of foreign labor at the expense of the American workmen."

The other four members of your Committee—Representatives Fitzgerald, De Vries, Speight, and Daly—united upon still another report on this bill, in which they say, on the free ship proposition, in part:

"While we do not propose in this report to advocate the idea of free ships, we think we would be derelict in our duty if we did not point out the fact that in our investigation of this question we found that every Government except the United States allowed its citizens to purchase vessels in whatever market they pleased."

There is nothing in our statutes forbidding American citizens from "purchasing vessels in whatever market they please." We know that 300,000 tons of ships have been so purchased by Americans. These ships enjoy every privilege in our foreign carrying that is enjoyed by American ships, save alone the privilege of American registry and sailing under the American flag. Neither registry nor flag give an advantage to our ships in our foreign trade. Under the British policy of free ships Great Britain has increased her proportion of the world's ocean shipping from one-third to three-fifths. Foreigners have, to a very limited extent, bought British ships, but Britons seldom, if ever, buy foreign-built ships. Free ships only helps British shipbuilders. Free ships have failed to build up the merchant marine of other nations. With these facts in mind it must be obvious that the denial of American registry to foreign-built ships owned by American citizens has worked no hardship upon the latter, and has been of no injury to the country.

But, with this unanimous rejection of the free-ship policy, for Mr. Peabody to come forward when it is proposed that the Government shall lend assistance in the upbuilding of our merchant marine, and propose the ruination of American shipbuilders by the free registry of unlimited numbers of foreign (largely British) ships, shows how utterly his long chartered use of foreign ships has put him out of touch with the dominant—indeed, the almost unanimous—American sentiment of opposition to free ships.

AMERICAN SHIPYARDS OPEN TO MR. PEABODY.

In will be quite easy for Mr. Peabody to have all of the ships he may wish to employ in his trade built in American shipyards. And if the orders being executed in American shipyards should so fill them up that they could not immediately execute an order from Mr. Peabody, he may be sure that other shipyards will be quickly established to secure a share in the new business and to promptly meet the new demands. More than that, to permit the wholesale or unlimited admission of foreign-built vessels to American registry, even on condition that equal tonnage shall be constructed in American shipyards, would not nearly so greatly stimulate the establishment of new American shipyards as would the denial of that privilege.

GREAT PURPOSE OF THE BILL.

The great purpose of the bill under consideration is to have every new ship for the foreign trade of the United States built in American shipyards. At best, Mr. Peabody would have but half of them so constructed; the remainder he would have Congress permit our people to purchase abroad and place under American registry. The bill, voicing the wishes of a vast majority of the American people, would give all of the new work to American citizens. Mr. Peabody, for his own selfish ends, would give half of the new work to aliens in foreign—chiefly British—shipyards!

LET AMERICANS HAVE THE NEW SHIPS—LET FOREIGNERS RETAIN THE OLD.

The more new ships that are built under the stimulus of this bill, the better will the American merchant marine thrive and increase. The more foreign-built vessels—especially those now in existence—that are admitted to American registry, the more new foreign ships—chiefly British—will be built to take their places. It were better for the inexperienced Americans to have the advantage of the newest and the most economical ships with which to meet foreign competition, than to have the half worn-out foreign-built ships with which to compete with the new foreign-built vessels in the hands of the more experienced foreign rivals. This bill places the new ships, of American construction, in the possession of our citizens. Mr. Peabody would rather place old foreign-built ships in unlimited number in the possession of our people.

ANIMUS AND SELFISHNESS DISCLOSED.

The animus pervading the mind of Mr. Peabody is as apparent in his remarks in his letter as is his unpatriotic selfishness. This is shown in the following quotation from his letter:

"I may here state my greatest objection to the bill. It is class legislation, bestowing a privilege upon a few millionaires who invested in foreign-built steamships under the foreign flag because of much lower cost than could be procured in this country, or conducted under the American flag, and it seeks less to reestablish our merchant marine than to enforce business for the already occupied shipyard."

Note that Mr. Peabody unqualifiedly admits in the last quoted statement that it costs more to build ships here than abroad; also, that it costs more to run them under the American than under a foreign flag. You can not fail to note the contradiction he indulges in when he says that the bill "seeks less to reestablish our merchant marine than to enforce business for the already occupied shipyard." If it enforces business for the already occupied shipyard will there not be new shipyards established, and will not that help to reestablish our merchant marine? This last quoted contradiction of Mr. Peabody's is like the first one quoted, to wit: "Its object is not to increase our merchant marine quickly and materially, but to induce orders for vessels to be built in the United States." Mr. Peabody must have a peculiarly constituted mind to indulge in paradoxes of this transparent character. They show both the desperation of his opposition and the paucity of his ammunition.

RESULT OF A GREAT DEMAND FOR AMERICAN SHIPS.

Mr. Peabody knows, and admits in his letter, that no American, either the owner of an American or a foreign built ship, can secure any compensation under the provisions of this bill until he has had new tonnage built for him in American shipyards. If all of our shipyards are so "occupied" as to render them incapable of new construction, and no new yards are established—an utterly improbable because preposterous suggestion—then the bill, if enacted, would be valueless, and of benefit to no one. Mr. Peabody is well aware that if the demand for American ships exceeds the supply—and this the bill is expected to stimulate—then there will be a large accession of new shipyards, in order that the supply of new ships can keep pace with the demand. That is a truism so trite as to be obvious to a mind less obscured than Mr. Peabody's seems to be.

The sequence of events—that of demand exceeding supply, and of new plants being established to meet the demand—is anticipated. That very condition is the one that is largely depended upon to effect a steady reduction in the cost of building ships in American shipyards. This reduction will be most advantageous to our people and to our Government. Mr. Peabody's proposition, on the other hand, would, if adopted, defer if not defeat the expected reduction in the cost of American shipbuilding by minimizing the demand for American ships through the unlimited purchase of foreign-built ships.

DEMAGOGIC SLURS CAST UPON CAPITAL AND CAPITALISTS.

Mr. Peabody's frequent reference to the prospective beneficiaries of this bill as "wealthy" and as "millionaires" is so phrased as to discredit wealth and capitalists, and is demagogic in the extreme. Would Mr. Peabody exclude from any participation in American shipowning "wealthy" people? Would he also debar "millionaires" from any participation? Would he suggest that people without means, or only those with very moderate means be encouraged to embark in American shipowning for our foreign trade? He would seem to believe that the possession of wealth, or of millions, justified the suggestion that its possessor should not seek a profit from its investment. Mr. Peabody and his friends, surely, do not expect to acquire a considerable amount of foreign tonnage and obligate themselves to build an equal amount in American shipyards, as he says they will do if the bill is amended as he suggests, without the employment of a large amount of money—possibly a million or so?

PIONEER SHIPOWNERS WILL SUFFER LOSSES AND SMALL PROFITS.

The pioneers in the revival of our merchant marine will be those who will pay most dearly for their experience. They will, while gaining experience, pay heavily because of their ignorance. It is only men with large means and enduring courage and enterprise who will, at the beginning at least, embark large amounts of capital in such an uncertain venture as the running of ships in our foreign trade. There must, just as Mr. Peabody himself states, be an incentive to induce investment. Profits will be slow and uncertain in the beginning; investors are sure to meet obstacles and losses entirely unexpected and unprovided for, and these will defer for a considerable time any substantial profit from the establishment of new lines and new ships in our foreign trade. It will be largely those who can afford to wait for their profits, and who can afford to go without a return upon their investment for an indefinite period of time, who, in the beginning, will invest large amounts. Naturally, then, these must be men of large means. And it will be to the national advantage if the bill that is passed incites large numbers of capitalists and large amounts of capital to investment in American-built ships for our foreign trade.

MR. PEABODY'S MISREPRESENTATION OF THE PRESIDENT.

It has been Mr. Peabody's custom to represent the friends of the bill as being opposed to the recommendations of the Administration—especially of the President and the Secretary of the Treasury. It would be strange if the President and the Secretary of the Treasury should secretly reveal to Mr. Peabody an opposition that they seem to carefully conceal from the known friends of American shipping and from their own close political and personal friends. Yet Mr. Peabody would have us believe that he had been selected by the President and the Secretary of the Treasury as the sole repository of their confidence with respect to this bill.

It is noticeable that with each new outgiving regarding this bill Mr. Peabody becomes more and more inaccurate in his statements—more and more inexact in his quotations from, or assertions regarding the attitude of, the President and the Secretary of the Treasury. He now says that the bill is "not in any sense the fulfillment of the clear-cut recommendations of the Administration in messages to Congress in December, 1898 and 1899; that to recreate our merchant marine, American registry be granted for a short term of years to foreign-built vessels of American ownership, provided the owners become bound to have built in this country like tonnage," etc.

There is only one person who sends "messages" to Congress, and that is the President. In neither of the messages referred to by Mr. Peabody is there the slightest warrant for the statement that the President favors the granting of American registry for a short term of years to foreign-built vessels of American ownership. In his last message the President gave great prominence to this subject and discussed it at some length, and in the previous message it was far less conspicuous. The President does advocate Government aid, as being what other nations are doing for their merchant ships, but he does not even remotely recommend the free American registry of foreign-built ships. Mr. Peabody's statements on this point have been permitted to pass unchallenged so often that he evidently assumes he may deviate from accuracy to serve his own ends without exposure. The very assurance of his latest reference is so amazing, however, that one is forced to dispose of his inaccuracies once and for all. For instance, Mr. Peabody actually has the audacity to suggest, in the letter under review:

"It is well for those to inform themselves, who too readily accept the assertions of the interested parties that the bill is an Administration measure, when it is so

unlike the plan recommended by the Secretary of the Treasury as part of the President's two last annual messages to Congress."

In his annual message to Congress in 1898, President McKinley said on the subject of American shipping:

"The annexation of Hawaii and the changed relations of the United States to Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines, resulting from the war, compel the prompt adoption of a maritime policy by the United States. There should be established regular and frequent steamship communication, encouraged by the United States, under the American flag, with the newly-acquired islands. Spain furnished to its colonies, at an annual cost of about two millions of dollars, steamship lines communicating with a portion of the world's markets, as well as with trade centers of the home Government. The United States will not undertake to do less. It is our duty to furnish the people of Hawaii with facilities, under national control, for their export and import trade. It will be conceded that the present situation calls for legislation which shall be prompt, durable, and liberal.

"The part which American merchant vessels and their seamen performed in the war with Spain demonstrates that this service, furnishing both pickets and the second line of defense, is a national necessity, and should be encouraged in every constitutional way.

"Details and methods for the accomplishment of this purpose are discussed in the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, to which the attention of Congress is respectfully invited."

One will search in vain in the foregoing utterances for any suggestion of the free admission of foreign-built vessels to American registry for a number of years, as alleged by Mr. Peabody. Even if the recommendations of the Secretary of the Treasury had been in favor of the free registry of foreign-built ships, there is nothing in the President's reference to the Secretary's report suggestive of an indorsement of such a proposition. But, as will be shown, the Secretary of the Treasury made no such recommendation.

OUR MERCHANT MARINE AS DISCUSSED IN THE PRESIDENT'S LAST ANNUAL MESSAGE TO CONGRESS.

Second in importance, in his last annual message to Congress, the President discusses our merchant marine. At that time the pending shipping bill had, in all its chief provisions, been before the country for over a year. It had been favorably reported to each branch of Congress by the House and Senate committees having the bill in charge, early in 1899, and some ten months before the President's last annual message appeared. The bill had been indorsed all over the country by commercial and other associations, and had been widely commended and advocated by the press. If it was at variance with the President's views of what should constitute the wisest legislation on this subject, doubtless he would have employed the opportunity presented in the transmission of his message to Congress to wisely advise that body. That the President considered the subject of importance second only to the need of currency legislation, and pressing for immediate solution, is clear from his extended and earnest utterances. On this subject he said:

"The value of an American merchant marine to the extension of our commercial trade and the strengthening of our power upon the sea invites the immediate action of Congress. Our national development will be one-sided and unsatisfactory so long as the remarkable growth of our inland industries remains unaccompanied by progress on the seas. There is no lack of constitutional authority for legislation which shall give to the country maritime strength commensurate with its industrial achievements and with its rank among the nations of the earth.

"The past year has recorded exceptional activity in our shipyards, and promises of continual prosperity in shipbuilding are abundant. Advanced legislation for the protection of our seamen has been enacted. Our coast trade, under regulations wisely framed at the beginning of the Government and since, shows results for the past fiscal year unequaled in our records or those of any other power. We shall fail to realize our opportunities, however, if we complacently regard only matters at home and blind ourselves to the necessity of securing our share in the valuable carrying trade of the world.

"Last year American vessels transported a smaller share of our exports and imports than during any former year in all our history, and the measure of our dependence upon foreign shipping was painfully manifested to our people. Without any choice of our own, but from necessity, the departments of the Government charged with military and naval operations in the East and West Indies had to obtain from foreign flags merchant vessels essential for these operations.

"The other great nations have not hesitated to adopt the required means to develop their shipping as a factor in national defense and as one of the surest and speediest means of obtaining for their producers a share in foreign markets. Like vigilance and effort on our part can not fail to improve our situation, which is regarded with humiliation at home and with surprise abroad. Even the seeming sacrifices, which at the beginning may be involved, will be offset later by more than equivalent gains.

"The expense is as nothing compared with the advantage to be achieved. The reestablishment of our merchant marine involves in a large measure our continued industrial progress and the extension of our commercial triumphs. I am satisfied the judgment of the country favors the policy of aid to our merchant marine, which will broaden our commerce and markets and upbuild our sea-carrying capacity for the products of agriculture and manufacture; which, with the increase of our Navy, means more work and wages to our countrymen, as well as a safeguard to American interests in every part of the world."

Again one will search in vain in those clear-cut, earnest, and statesmanlike utterances for the least shred of indorsement of the policy of admitting foreign built ships to American registry.

SECRETARY GAGE'S RECOMMENDATIONS.

To accurately understand Mr. Peabody's contention one must clearly understand the act under which the *New York* and *Paris* were admitted to American registry, because it is upon this that Mr. Peabody bases his assertions. The recommendation of Secretary Gage particularly referred to by Mr. Peabody reads as follows:

"Extended application of the principle of the act of May 10, 1892, by virtue of which the *St. Louis* and *St. Paul* were constructed in this country upon the registry of the foreign-built steamships *New York* and *Paris*, this extension to continue for a short term of years and to be so guarded as to preserve the coasting trade to American-built vessels."

The act of May 10, 1892, provided for the admission of steamships of not less than 8,000 tons, capable of not less than 20 knots speed per hour, "of which not less than 90 per cent of the shares of the capital of the foreign corporation or association owning the same was owned on January 1, 1890," by American citizens, the act further requiring that all of the stock of the company shall be vested in American citizens before the registry is granted. It will be very clear, from the foregoing quotation from the act, that an essential feature was that the ships should have been owned almost wholly by American citizens at a date long antecedent to that of the passage of the act.

Mr. Peabody's contention is that after the passage of the bill under consideration Americans shall be permitted to acquire registry for foreign-built ships they may purchase. But Mr. Peabody would care nothing whatever for the privilege of registry if it were unaccompanied with the privilege of receiving compensation from the Government equal to that given to American built vessels. The act of May 10, 1892, makes no provision anywhere for the payment of subsidies to vessels so registered. More than that, in making his recommendation quoted, Secretary Gage did not contemplate the payment of subsidies or compensation of any kind to the owners of vessels so registered.

It is impossible for Mr. Peabody to offer a scintilla of proof, either direct or indirect, that Secretary Gage's recommendation or his intention in making it contemplated the wholesale admission of any and all kinds of foreign-built vessels for a term of years. The act of May 10, 1892, admitted only vessels of the largest size and the highest speed. To argue from that that the Secretary, in basing his recommendations upon the provisions of that act, meant to have it understood that he was in favor of the admission of any kind of foreign vessel to American register, and the payment of subsidies thereto equal to that paid to American-built vessels, is a stretch of imagination only possible with a man so easily capable as is Mr. Peabody of adjusting an expression into an entirely different meaning from that intended by its author.

There is absolutely no shred of foundation for Mr. Peabody's contention in respect of Secretary Gage, and, even if all that Mr. Peabody says in this respect were literally true, Congress in its wisdom may decide differently from what Mr. Peabody would were he the lawmaking power in toto. Certain it is that, after hearing all that Mr. Peabody has had to say with respect of Secretary Gage's meaning, the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the Senate Commerce Committee have each seen fit to favorably report the shipping bill unamended as Mr. Peabody suggested.

INDORSEMENTS BY PUBLIC BODIES.

Mr. Peabody sees fit to attack the accuracy of the indorsements the bill has received from public bodies, like chambers of commerce, boards of trade, and the like. A rampant free-trade organization in New York asserts that it instituted inquiries regarding indorsements of the bill to see if they had been correctly reported. From those making no replies, this free-trade club assumed no indorsement had been given, and this, Mr. Peabody is ready to believe, although in most cases the indorsements were not only adopted at regular meetings of the organizations in question, but certified copies of the same were forwarded to their Representatives in Congress, by whom they were filed, due recognition of which from time to time has appeared in the Congressional Record.

The friends of the bill are justly proud of the indorsements the bill has received, including so many and such strong organizations in all parts of the country. The indorsements and advocacy of the bill in the public press is equally gratifying to its friends and advocates. As one of those friends and advocates, I take delight in appending to this letter a list of such of the organizations as I happen personally to know have indorsed the bill or its principles.

SPECIFIC CASES QUOTED BY MR. PEABODY.

In order to minimize the effects of an indorsement of the bill by the New York Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Peabody is compelled to quote the malicious perversion of the strength of the vote cast from the most malignant and venomous free-trade evening daily newspaper published in the United States—a paper that is so un-American and so hostile to American merchants that its open espousal of foreign dry goods, as being superior to and cheaper than those obtainable in New York, led, more than a year ago, to the almost entire withdrawal of the advertising patronage of the firms in New York whose goods were thus misrepresented. Although this paper at first attempted to coerce and bulldoze and later cajoled and finally beseeched its former advertisers to renew their patronage, to this day but one of the many firms that withdrew has gone back.

The loss sustained by this newspaper, because of its untruthful and un-American statements, has aggregated hundreds of dollars a day during this long period. This is the character of newspaper which Mr. Peabody, professing to be a protectionist, quotes in order to bolster up a lame attempt to question the strength of the vote in the New York Chamber of Commerce in favor of the ship subsidy bill. The fact remains, despite the quotation, that the New York Chamber of Commerce did specifically indorse the principles of the bill after Mr. Peabody had spent weeks in futile preparations to secure a different vote.

The National Board of Trade is an organization representing a great many smaller State and local boards of trade, chambers of commerce, and business mens' associations in different parts of the country. Its annual conventions, held in Washington City, are notable for their large attendances and the character and influence of the representatives of large businesses who attend as delegates. One of the marked features of their annual gatherings is the fervor and enthusiasm with which protective measures for the upbuilding of the American merchant marine are urged upon the attention of Congress.

At the last convention of this board, Mr. Peabody appeared as a delegate, and attempted, as usual, to prevent the adoption of a resolution favoring the passage of the pending bill. He met with his usual failure. Mr. Peabody has attended a number of gatherings of business men in order to oppose resolutions favoring this bill, but I believe he has yet to record his first success. Ignominious defeat has been the usual result. Chagrined by his defeat before the National Board of Trade, smarting under its overwhelming unanimity, he resorts to the columns of the Boston Herald—one of the most tireless advocates of free trade, and one of the most uncompromising opponents of any form of protection—in order to quote what he affects to regard as an act of discourtesy to Secretary Gage in the board's refusal, on Mr. Peabody's amendment, to add to the resolution in favor of the passage of the bill the words "According to the recommendations of Secretary Gage in his last annual report."

Thus deprived of the chance to say that the National Board of Trade did not indorse the shipping bill, Mr. Peabody is forced to continue his misrepresentations of Secretary Gage in a futile attempt to make it appear that the provisions of the bill are contrary to the Administration's recommendations.

NO COMMERCIAL ORGANIZATION QUOTED AGAINST THE BILL.

In quoting from the newspapers referred to, as explained, Mr. Peabody states that he "cites these cases to show the fictitious value of the votes, and much matter furnished by the committee to the press, to appear as editorial, as unreal advocacy." Mr. Peabody's despair must be acute when he is compelled to resort to such trifling in order to attempt to misrepresent the action of two large and influential associations. The evidence of the unanimity with which commercial organizations in all parts of the country support this measure may be assumed from the fact that Mr. Peabody apparently could not find one to quote as being on record in opposition to it. Had he known of one, however obscure, we may be sure he would have exploited it to the limit.

A BOSTON INDORSEMENT.

Says Mr. Peabody, in his open letter:

"The Boston Chamber of Commerce and Merchants' Association of Boston, as I am officially informed, have not passed any resolutions regarding this bill."

My information is that the Boston Chamber of Commerce favors subsidies for the promotion of the American merchant marine. It also advocates the free registry of foreign-built ships. They are of one mind with Mr. Peabody, evidently. It should be stated, however, that the president of the Chamber of Commerce of Boston is the representative in that city of one of the leading foreign steamship lines, whose interests are opposed to the passage of this bill, of course. Another officer of the same association represents a foreign corporation interested in shipping. The influence of these gentlemen may be relied upon to favor the foreign interests they represent rather than American interests. As to the Boston Merchants' Association, I am informed that on January 16, 1900, a resolution which I will quote, was adopted by its board of directors:

"*Resolved*, That the Boston Merchants' Association approves the principles in

Senate bill 738, introduced by Senator FRYE December 6, 1899, and urges the early enactment of legislation framed upon the principles contained in said bill."

The secretary of this association explains that it is his judgment that the resolution in question refers to the Frye shipping bill, almost identical with that favorably reported by your committee, although the number of the bill quoted in the resolution varies from that of the Senate shipping bill. For my part I am willing to leave the matter for adjustment between Mr. Peabody and the association in question, having but to add that the most influential and representative organizations of this character in Boston are on record in favor of the bill.

THE USUAL MISREPRESENTATION.

Mr. Peabody's references to myself are as untrue, as to the facts as stated, as are all of his other statements herein refuted. Fact and fancy are, as usual, so garbled as to suit his purposes. My success in securing the adoption of resolutions in favor of the bill at the few meetings I have attended being in such direct contrast to his own utter failures, evidently I am singled out for personal misrepresentation merely to give vent to the envy and malice which seems to be consuming the gentleman.

POLITICAL CONVENTIONS INDORSING THE BILL.

Mr. Peabody seems to be keenly aware that political conventions in all parts of the country are adopting resolutions in favor of the shipping bill, and he therefore endeavors to discredit them. He even views with unfeigned alarm the possible adoption of similar resolutions in the national platforms of the great political parties. Doubtless he would make a partisan question out of the shipping bill, if thereby he thought he could discredit or defeat it. Even in this hope he seems to be doomed to his usual bitter disappointment. There will be no "politics" in the shipping question this year.

STILL ANOTHER MISSTATEMENT.

Mr. Peabody states that "the shipowner promoters of the Frye bill are mostly interested in the Atlantic trade." My information is that all of the American shipowners interested in the Pacific trade are heartily in favor of the bill. In fact, I have yet to learn of an American shipowner engaged in foreign trade who is not in favor of the passage of the bill.

"TO ADMIT AS FEW FOREIGN-BUILT VESSELS AS POSSIBLE."

"Not only is it seen that the object is to admit as few foreign-built vessels as possible," says Mr. Peabody in his letter. Herein he is accurate. That is the very object of the bill—"to admit as few foreign-built vessels as possible." Therefore Mr. Peabody opposes it. He would have the bill admit as many foreign-built vessels as possible. The distinction is clear. The provisions of the bill are such as to give to American workingmen all the employment possible. Mr. Peabody would give as much employment as possible to foreign workingmen in foreign—chiefly British—countries. In this Mr. Peabody is in full accord with every enemy of the bill—in exact accord with every foreign interest opposed to the bill.

MANY NEW SHIPYARDS WILL BE ESTABLISHED.

Mr. Peabody professes to believe that the friends of the bill are afraid that its passage may stimulate the establishment of additional shipyards in the United States. One of the most pronounced hopes of its friends is that many new and extensive shipbuilding plants will be at once established as a result of its passage. They also believe that existing shipyards will be greatly enlarged. Shipyards are in process of establishment to-day, the success or failure of which hinges upon the passage of this bill. Arrangements are perfected for the establishment of a number of others as soon as the bill becomes a law. It is the greatest hope of the friends of the bill that this will occur. It is the greatest fear of the friends of foreign shipping that it will occur.

Foreigners would far rather see Americans—if they are determined to have a merchant marine—buy second-hand foreign-built ships that would be at a disadvantage in competition with new and more economical ships than to see Americans themselves build new ships and leave the old ones in the hands of their foreign rivals. Mr. Peabody aligns himself with every opponent of the bill in suggesting the purchase of second-hand foreign, rather than the construction of new American-built ships for our foreign trade.

AN ABSURD PROPOSITION.

Mr. Peabody would have it appear that if 2,000,000 tons of shipping could at once be added to the American flag—by foreign purchase—it would be a good thing. But, as a practical man, he well knows that such a thing is entirely outside the range of probability, for the reason that immediate purchasers of such tonnage could not be found in the United States. The bill under consideration will cause the admission of from 200,000 to 300,000 tons of foreign-built shipping to American registry and the earliest possible construction of from 400,000 to 500,000 tons of new ships in the United States for the foreign trade.

The average construction in the United States during the last decade for the foreign trade has not exceeded 20,000 tons per annum. To increase this, by the passage of this bill, to 100,000 tons per annum, at once, will be an immense increase. As success attends the venture, the increase will still further expand. But, considering that the immediate additions through registry of foreign-built and the construction of new tonnage will double the present capacity of our foreign-going merchant marine, under this bill, it will be seen that ample provision has been made. When confidence has been given to capital by the performances of this large increase in tonnage, Congress may be depended upon to adjust its laws to the new conditions—conditions not now foreseen.

OWNERSHIP IN SHIPPING OPEN TO ALL OUR CITIZENS.

What has just been said should not be misconstrued. The terms of the bill permit any American citizen, during ten years succeeding its enactment, to acquire as many American-built vessels as he desires and to run them in the foreign trade, receiving compensation therefor equal in amount to that given to other ships under our flag, in proportion to size, speed, and number of voyages made. No preference is shown to any ship, or to any line of ships; all are upon the same basis of compensation, and that basis is cargo carried, size of vessel, speed attained, and voyages made.

COMBINATIONS AND TRUSTS IN PERIL.

As a charterer of foreign ships sailing to and from the United States, it may be that Mr. Peabody foresees such keen competition created by the new American ships built because of the passage of this bill as to very substantially reduce freight rates in the trade in which he has been so conspicuous in maintaining them by an artificial combination or "trust," as already shown. Indeed one of the immediate effects of the passage of this bill will probably be to break all trusts or combinations in restraint of trade on the ocean in which the American people are interested. Such a consummation would be injurious to Mr. Peabody's personal interests, but of the greatest value to American producers and exporters. This may help to explain the persistence of Mr. Peabody's opposition to the bill. Whatever the underlying motives inspiring Mr. Peabody in his opposition, its effect, if successful, will obviously redound only to the advantage of foreign shipowners, a fact that should never be lost sight of in the consideration of his alleged reasons for opposition.

AN ANONYMOUS QUOTATION.

If Mr. Peabody heard, as he alleges he did, some one friendly to the bill say at a public meeting that he was "only concerned in taking care of the fellows who have already invested in foreign ships," and that "the shipbuilders would never consent to carrying on that principle and opening the door to the present investor in foreign ships," much more value would have attached to the quotation if the person quoted had been named. Such anonymous flings are accepted at their real value by discerning people. What the friends of this bill are concerned in is building up an American merchant marine just as quickly and extensively as possible—not by the purchase of foreign, but by the construction of American, ships.

OUR "MULTIMILLIONAIRE SHIPBUILDERS."

The pending bill will create a large and steady demand for new American ships for a number of years. Mr. Peabody speaks of our shipbuilders "with their multimillion dollars capital," who are now "full of business without the foreign trade." In order to persuade Congress to permit the American registry of an unlimited amount of foreign tonnage, he proceeds to argue that Americans with multimillions of capital invested in shipbuilding would not desire to extend and enlarge their plants, and that new shipyards would not be established. If our shipbuilders are multimillionaires, and still continue in the business of building ships, it would be folly to assume that they are opposed to a measure that will increase their opportunities for a larger and more profitable business. And, if it were so, there is no monopoly of shipbuilding possible in this country. We have hundreds of seaports well adapted to the building of ships, and unlimited capital to be secured if the business assures a profit. The experienced foreign builders of ships are in no wise estopped from establishing great plants in the United States for the construction of ships if native builders are indifferent to the opportunities for a profitable increase of American shipbuilding. In short, Mr. Peabody's own argument in respect to the vast capital possessed by American shipbuilders, when analyzed, is self-destructive.

"FULL SUBSIDY" PLEA FOR FOREIGN-BUILT SHIPS.

Viewing the matter solely from the point of view of a probable purchaser of foreign-built ships, if his objections to the bill are heeded and his amendments adopted, Mr. Peabody desires that such ships shall receive "equal subsidy" to that given to American-built ships, although he knows and admits that foreign vessels are built "at much lower cost" than are vessels of American construction. If the privilege were open to our citizens to purchase and register as American a foreign-built ship for from 20 to 25 per cent less than they could obtain an American-built ship, and yet receive the same subsidy for the foreign-built ship, of course they would in every case prefer the foreign-built vessel, just as many of our citizens would purchase foreign-made goods if admitted free of duty which they refrain from purchasing because of the duty, purchasing American productions instead.

It will be readily apparent that with an American owner of a cheaper built foreign ship receiving precisely the same subsidy that the owner of a dearer American built ship receives, the latter would be at a disadvantage in competition with the former. Thus our law, if amended as Mr. Peabody proposes, would be for the benefit of the foreign rather than the American built ship. That is to say, the chief purpose of the bill, to secure an American built merchant marine, would, if amended as Mr. Peabody desires, be defeated by its passage.

APPREHENSIVE REGARDING "CORPORATIONS FORMED ABROAD."

Because the National Association of Manufacturers—one of the strongest organizations in the country—unanimously and most heartily favor the passage of the pending bill, Mr. Peabody searched the utterances of its president, Mr. Theodore C. Search, for some expression to which he could suggest an unfriendly criticism. As a result he finds, so he says, that Mr. Search once said that "Corporations formed abroad, controlled by American capital, may also participate" in the benefits of the bill. Although himself allied with foreign owners of vessels in a combination or trust in restraint of trade, Mr. Peabody has a holy horror of "corporations formed abroad," even if "controlled by American capital." Clearly, Mr. Peabody was hard put to it there.

"MAKESHIFT VESSELS" PURCHASABLE ABROAD.

Here is one of Mr. Peabody's most important and profound arguments: "When the Government needed ships it procured them abroad at once," he says; and he adds: "And these makeshift vessels are a poor sop to offer our people for registry for denial of privilege to buy the latest type." How little Mr. Peabody thought, in penning that sentence, that he was then giving his whole case away. If the best that the United States Government could do, in a great emergency, with unlimited means and the most expert buyers, was to secure "makeshift vessels" that "are a poor sop to offer our people," what chance would inexperienced Americans have, in seeking foreign-built ships, to secure those "of the latest type?"

Our Government at the time of their purchase was searching everywhere, ready to pay spot cash, and urgently needing vessels of "the latest type," and yet, according to Mr. Peabody's description, the result was the purchase of merely "makeshift vessels." And yet Mr. Peabody calmly advocates the purchase of 2,000,000 tons of foreign-built vessels for American registry. Where would our citizens obtain them, if the United States Government could not secure them? And this is the reliance—the broken reed—Mr. Peabody would have the American people look to with which to build up an American merchant marine. Does not Mr. Peabody see that he could not have put forward a more urgent and a more potential reason for the rejection of his free-ship proposition than his own admission that the best that can be procured, by the ablest buyer and with the most expert men employed, are "makeshift vessels?"

With this experience, would it not be the height of folly for the United States to put upon our statutes an act admitting an unlimited quantity of foreign-built vessels to American registry, thus creating the delusive hope that vessels of "the latest type" were procurable? Does not the experience of the United States unerringly point to the rejection of all suggestion of dependence upon foreigners to sell us ships of "the latest type" with which to build up our merchant marine? Surely. Self-dependence, it is manifest—dependence upon the shipyards and the ships of the United States—is the only safe dependence of our people for an effective American merchant marine, and it is the only safe reliance of our Government for auxiliary cruisers in time of emergency. "Makeshift vessels!" Mr. Peabody has furnished, himself, the very best reason why free-ship legislation should be rigidly excluded from our statutes.

TOO MANY ADVOCATES OF THE SHIPPING BILL.

Mr. Peabody states that the publication of the names of the active advocates of the bill would "take too long," and therefore he names only a few! He affects to regard as something reprehensible the fact that the bill has many warm advocates. Doubtless if it had but a few he would as glibly point to that fact to discredit the bill, because unsupported by any considerable number of our citizens.

THE OPPONENTS OF THE BILL.

To name the opponents of the bill, Mr. Peabody neglected to state that he would be compelled to go abroad for the list, or else secure it from the active and powerful American agents of foreign shipping interests, whose presence in Washington he affects to be utterly oblivious of. He probably is unaware of the attendance of a man at the public hearings on the bill who has been publicly and repeatedly charged with being "the paid attorney of foreign steamship lines," and which person has not, so far as I am aware, ever denied the charge. If this "paid attorney of foreign steamship lines" prepared the report in opposition to the bill signed by the four minority members of your committee, doubtless Mr. Peabody is unaware of that.

THE POOREST AND THE CHEAPEST FOREIGN-BUILT SHIPS.

Contemplating the purchase of foreign-built steamships adapted only for the carrying of cargoes at slow speed, Mr. Peabody does not see any virtue in or necessity for the payment of extra compensation under the bill to high-speed vessels of the greatest value to the Government as auxiliary cruisers in time of necessity. His sole concern is for the poorest, the cheapest foreign-built vessels obtainable, and for the very biggest subsidy from the Government that he can get. It is not remarkable that such a man, in closing his open letter on this subject, should appeal to his loyalty to "his party" as his chief claim to consideration, instead of appealing to his patriotism.

A PATRIOTIC AND MUCH-NEEDED BILL.

If the bill has any merit, or any claim to the consideration of the American people—and this I emphatically claim it has—it is on the high ground of urgent public necessity and the utmost possible public benefit, in which individual profit is a mere incident to the strengthening of our national defense and the creation of a great, powerful, prosperous American industry of the very highest value to the entire American people and of incalculable value to the nation. The bill is an essentially patriotic and urgently necessary measure, and I advocate its adoption solely upon those grounds.

Attached hereto, and a part of this letter, I submit three appendixes, namely: 1. A list of the associations and organizations known to have passed resolutions favorable to the passage of such a bill. 2. A most patriotic and timely article from Harper's Weekly of April 14, 1900, on "Subsidies for American Ships," by Hon. Arthur Sewall, of Maine, the Vice-Presidential candidate of the Democratic party four years ago. 3. A report written for the Republican Club of the City of New York by Mr. A. L. M. Bullown, and which report was unanimously adopted as the views of that club.

I have the honor to remain, with the highest respect and esteem,

Very respectfully, yours,

ALEXANDER R. SMITH.

APPENDIX No. 1

TO OPEN LETTER TO GEN. C. H. GROSVENOR BY A. R. SMITH, CONTAINING PARTIAL LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS KNOWN TO HAVE PASSED RESOLUTIONS IN FAVOR OF THE SHIPPING BILL, OR IN FAVOR OF THE PRINCIPLES AND PURPOSES OF THE BILL.

The National Board of Trade of the United States.
The National Association of Manufacturers, at their annual convention held at Cincinnati, Ohio.
Merchants and Manufacturers' Board of Trade of New York City.
The Department of Docks and Ferries of New York City.
The North Side Board of Trade of New York City.
Massachusetts State Board of Trade.
The American Shipping and Industrial League; A. K. Miller, of New Orleans, president; F. S. Gardner, of New York, secretary.
Board of Trade of Philadelphia.
Merchants' Association of Boston, Mass.
Business Men's Association of the State of Rhode Island.
Chamber of Commerce and Board of Trade of San Francisco, Cal.
The Lake Carriers Association, Charles H. Keep, of Buffalo, N. Y., secretary.
The Manufacturers' and Producers' Association of the State of California.
American Iron and Steel Association, James M. Swank, of Philadelphia, general secretary.
The Farmers' National Congress of the United States of America, Hon. W. D Hoard, president.
Merchants' Exchange of St. Louis, Mo., George F. Morgan, secretary.
Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburg, Pa.
Chamber of Commerce, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Board of Trade of Minneapolis, Minn.
Merchants' Exchange of Buffalo, N. Y.
Board of Trade of Columbus, Ohio.
California Miners' Association, Julian Sonntag, of San Francisco, Cal., secretary.
The Trades League of Philadelphia, N. B. King, secretary.
United States Export Association of New York City.
Board of Trade of San Francisco, Cal., Henry L. Smith, secretary.
Chamber of Commerce of New Orleans, La.
The National Hardware Association, T. James Fernley, of Philadelphia, Pa., secretary-treasurer.
Citizens' Association of Chicago, Ill., J. C. Ambler, secretary.
The citizens of Bath, Me., at a mass meeting held for this purpose.
Board of Trade, Oakland, Cal., E. A. Heron, president; Craigie Sharp, secretary.
Association of Iron and Steel Sheet Manufacturers of Pittsburg, Pa., J. G. Batelle, of Piqua, Ohio, president.
Merchants' Exchange and Board of Trade of Portland, Me., M. N. Rich, secretary.
Manufacturers' Association of the Northwest, Portland, Oreg., C. H. McIsaac, secretary.
Board of Trade and Business Men's Association, Norfolk, Va.
Chamber of Commerce Association, Kansas City, Kans., R. W. Hilliker, secretary.
Board of Trade, Little Rock, Ark.
Board of Trade, Bangor, Me.
Chamber of Commerce, Los Angeles, Cal., Frank Higgins, secretary.
Winter Wheat Millers' League, E. E. Perry, Indianapolis, Ind., secretary.
Mechanics' Institute, San Francisco, Cal.
American Association of Lime and Flint Glass Manufacturers of Pittsburg, Pa.
Bottlers' and Manufacturers' Association, New York City, R. E. Schoder, secretary.
Association of Master Plumbers, New York City.
Paint, Oil and Varnish Club, New York City.
Massachusetts Creamery Association, A. W. Morse, secretary, Belchertown, Mass.
Commercial Club, Topeka, Kans., Charles S. Elliot, secretary.
Northwestern Manufacturers' Association, St. Paul, Minn., William Church, secretary.
Philadelphia Oil Trade Association, Philadelphia, Pa., G. B. Heckel, secretary.
Young Men's Business Club, Cincinnati, Ohio, N. J. Edwards, secretary.
Merchants' Exchange, Oakland, Cal., Wilber Walker, secretary.
Board of Trade, Fall River, Mass.
Chamber of Commerce, Olympia, Wash.
Ohio State Agricultural Convention.
Iron Manufacturers' Association, Joseph G. Butler, jr., president, Youngstown, Ohio.
Pennsylvania Retail Jewelers' Association, Charles H. Hamer, secretary, Philadelphia, Pa.
Chamber of Commerce, San Diego, Cal., R. J. Dodge, secretary.
Iowa Retail Marble and Granite Dealers' Association, J. W. Graham, president, Des Moines, Iowa.
Lumber Exchange, Buffalo, N. Y., Knowlton Mixer, secretary.
Jobbers' Union, St. Paul, Minn., C. C. Townsend, secretary.
National League of Commission Merchants, Milwaukee (Wis.) Branch.
Builders' Exchange, Toledo, Ohio, P. J. Kenny.
Business Men's League, Hot Springs, Ark., A. R. Smith, president.
Fruit and Produce Exchange, Duluth, Minn., E. M. Ferguson, president.
Board of Trade, Santa Fe, N. Mex., Hon. L. Bradford Paine, president.
Board of Trade, Gloucester, Mass., Edw. K. Burnham, secretary.
The People's Shipping Association, Cobden, Ill., George D. Rich, secretary.
St. Louis Drapers and Tailors' Exchange, St. Louis, Mo., Roman L. Biskup, secretary.
Live Stock Exchange, Sioux City, Iowa, William Magivny, secretary.
State Dairymen's Association of North Dakota, J. B. Power, president.
National Wood Rim Association, E. S. Mead, of Winona, Minn., secretary.
Live Stock Exchange, Fort Worth, Tex., W. E. Skinner, president.
Laramie Mining and Stock Exchange, Laramie, Wyo., M. N. Grant, president.
Lumber and Log Owners' Association of Wisconsin, J. W. Cochran, president, Ashland, Wis.
Board of Trade, Naugatuck, Conn., Tracy S. Lewis, secretary.
Business Men's Association, Gloucester, Mass., Fred. A. Shackelford, secretary.
St. Paul Retail Grocers' Association, C. F. Rappe, president, St. Paul, Minn.
New Mexico Trans-Mississippi Exhibition Commission, Hon. L. B. Paine, president.
Maritime Exchange, Provincetown, Mass.
Lumbermen's Exchange, Williamsport, Pa.
Lumbermen's Association, Tonawanda, N. Y.
Chamber of Commerce, Fresno, Cal.
Merchant Tailors' Exchange, Dayton, Ohio.
Indiana State Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, Chas. B. Rigney, chairman executive committee, Terre Haute, Ind.
Alabama State Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, Hiram Hawkins, master.
Board of Trade, Mansfield, Mass., F. W. Spaulding, secretary.
Kentucky Millers' Association, Jos. LeCompte, of Shelbyville, Ky., president.
Lemon Growers' Exchange, Santa Barbara, Cal.
Citrus Fruit Growers' Association, Cucamonga, Cal.
Cerritos Heights Lemon Growers' Association, Longbeach, Cal., Henry C. Dillon, president.
Upland Citrus Association, North Ontario, Cal., C. D. Adams, secretary.
Ontario Fruit Exchange, North Ontario, Cal., C. D. Adams, secretary.
Board of Trade, Beverly, Mass., Arthur A. Forness, secretary.
Board of Trade, Biddeford, Me., Gorham N. Weymouth, secretary.
Commercial Club, Knoxville, Iowa, James Taggart, president.
Board of Trade, Glenwood Springs, Colo., S. J. Delau, president.
Fort Smith Furniture Association, Fort Smith, Ark., E. Ballman, president.
Builders' Exchange, New Bedford, Mass., Z. B. Davis, president.
Carpenters' Union, Fort Smith, Ark., A. Gardner, secretary.
Tarboro Board of Trade, Tarboro, N. C.
Dairy Board of Trade, Hortonville, Wis., W. L. Root, president, Medina, Wis.
Fruit and Vegetable Growers' Association, Hitchcock, Tex., T. J. Williams, president.
Anna Fruit Growers' Association, Anna, Ill., J. F. Williford, secretary.
Business Men's Association, Canastota, N. Y., I. L. Roberts, secretary.
Business Men's Association, Keosauqua, Iowa, W. A. Duckworth, president.
White Mountain Travelers' Association, Concord, N. H, James B. Lord, president.
Marlboro Agricultural Association, Marlboro, Ohio, Leon B. Santee, secretary.
The Joplin Club, Joplin, Mo., Geo. B. Paxton, secretary.
Commercial Mutual Accident Co., Philadelphia, Pa.
Business Men's Association, Crystal Falls, Mich.
Board of Trade, Geneva, N. Y.
Board of Trade, Freeport, Ill.
Commercial Club, Patton, Pa., Lincoln S. Bell, secretary.
Moline Club, Moline, Ill., E. H. Sleight, secretary.
Meshoppen Grange, No. 926, Patrons of Husbandry, Meshoppen, Pa., N. P. Sterling, master.
Leon Grange, No. 795, Patrons of Husbandry, Leon, N. Y., M. E. Kellogg, secretary.
Rockemeka Grange, No. 109, Patrons of Husbandry, West Peru, Me., Charles A. Hall, secretary.
Jackson Centre Grange, No. 587, Patrons of Husbandry, Jackson Centre, Ohio, C. L. Polan, master.
Hasford Grange, No. 500, Patrons of Husbandry, Hasford, N. Y., L. E. Hay, master.
Protection Grange, No. 22, Patrons of Husbandry, Brattleboro, Vt., P. S. Eames, master.
Windham County Pomona Grange, No. 5, Patrons of Husbandry, of Windham County, Pa., W. E. Banks, master.
South Greenville Grange, No. 225, Patrons of Husbandry, Neenah, Wis., Chas. Haase, secretary.
Clinton Grange, No. 370, Patrons of Husbandry, Clinton, N. Y., L. N. Brockway, master.
Bainbridge Grange, No. 726, Patrons of Husbandry, Bennettsville, N. Y., Do Francy Pinney, secretary.
Charter Oak Grange, No. 1685, Patrons of Husbandry, Pottstown, Ill., J. W. Kelly, secretary.
Elbridge Centre Grange, No. 711, Patrons of Husbandry, Elbridge., Mich., C. Leak, master.
Sebasticook Grange, No. 306, Patrons of Husbandry, Jewport, Me., J. O. Gilman, master.
Pomona Grange, No. 6, Patrons of Husbandry, Hinsdale, Mass., John S. Cole, master.
Newfound Lake Grange, No. 162, Patrons of Husbandry, Bristol, N. H., A. N. McMurphy, master.
Indian River Grange, No. 73, Patrons of Husbandry, Milford, Conn., F. M. Smith, secretary.
Ward Grange, No. 600, Patrons of Husbandry.
Open Hand Grange, No. 153, Patrons of Husbandry, Leroy, Pa., John Rockwell, master.
Honeycreek Grange, No. 1, Vigo County, Ind.
Sacramento Grange, No. 12, Patrons of Husbandry, Sacramento, Cal., Dan el Flint, master.
Marion Grange, No. 214, Patrons of Husbandry, Marion, N. Y., D. H. Crane, master.
San Jose Grange, No. 10, Patrons of Husbandry, San Jose, Cal., G. W. Worthen master, Willowglen, Cal.
Grovenors Corners Grange, No. 763, Patrons of Husbandry, Sloansville, N. Y.
Brighton Grange, No. 1263, Patrons of Husbandry, Brighton, Ohio, C. E. Fox, master.
Clinton Grange, No. 870, Patrons of Husbandry, Clinton, N. Y.
Charity Grange, No. 103, Patrons of Husbandry, Rowland, Oregon, R. G. Wight, secretary.
Hammond Grange, No. 158, Patrons of Husbandry, Hammond, Wis., T. E. Egbert, master.
Townsend Grange, No. 1392, Patrons of Husbandry, Townsend, Ohio.
Hope Grange, No. 20, Patrons of Husbandry, Torrington, Conn., H. J. Newberry, master.
Winfield Grange, No. 1105, Patrons of Husbandry, Butler County, Pa.
Denmark Grange, No. 535, Patrons of Husbandry, Denmark, N. Y., J. E. Knapp, master.
North Hampton Grange, No. 250, Patrons of Husbandry, North Hampton, N. H., George L. Seavey, secretary.
Farmers' Club, Grelton, Ohio, Malcolm Crockett, president.

West Bridgewater Farmers' Club, West Bridgewater, Mass., F. E. Howard, president.
Webster Farmers' Club, Hamburg, Mich., George Merrill, president.
Pierce County Horticultural Society, Puyallup, Wash.
Perry County, Pa., Agricultural Society.
Hanover Farmers' Club, Forestville, N. Y.
Oxford Farmers' Club, Oxford, Butler County, Ohio.
New Hampshire Horticultural Society, Milford, N. H., C. C. Shaw, president.
Farmers' Club, Saline, Mich.
Farmers' Institute Convention, Winters, Cal.
Farmers' Institute and Douglass Grove Farmers' Club, Westcott, Nebr.
Windsor Castle Farmers' Alliance, No. 428, Windsor Castle, Pa.
Wills County Farmers' Institute, Lockport, Ill.
Improvement Society, East Syracuse, N. Y.
Milton Immigration Bureau, Milton, Oreg., O. R. Ballou, president.
Home Improvement Society, Elsinore, Cal., L. B. Peck, president.
Union Furniture Company, Rockford, Ill.
Bureau of Nature Study, Ithaca, N. Y., John W. Spencer, deputy.
State Patrons of Industry, Adamsville, Ohio, G. N. Shroyer, secretary.
Milbra Grange, No. 228, Patrons of Husbandry, Erskineville, Oreg., J. W. Messinger, master.
Arena Grange, No. 827, Patrons of Husbandry, Arena, N. Y., Percy A. Haddon, secretary.
Winthrop Grange, No. 209, Patrons of Husbandry, Winthrop, Me.
South Bristol Farmers' Club, New Bedford, Mass.
Commercial Club, Kirksville, Mo.
Salem Grange, No. 291, Patrons of Husbandry of Luzerne County, Pa.
The Manufacturers' Club, Philadelphia, Pa.
Grocers and Importers' Exchange, Philadelphia, Pa.
Master Builders' Exchange, Philadelphia, Pa.
Commercial Exchange, Philadelphia, Pa.
Chamber of Commerce, St. Paul, Minn.
Chamber of Commerce, Milwaukee, Wis.
Board of Trade, Kansas City, Mo.
Board of Trade, La Crosse, Wis.
Board of Trade, New Prague, Minn.
Board of Trade, Worcester, Mass.
Board of Trade, Wilkesbarre, Pa.
Board of Trade, Canton, Ohio.
Board of Trade, Medina, Ohio.
Knights of Labor, Washington, D. C.
North Jay Grange, No. 10, P. of H., North Jay, Me.
Onaquagua Grange, No. 518, P. of H., of New York State.
Olive Branch Grange, No. 116, P. of H., Edinburg, Ohio.
Pittston Grange, No. 214, P. of H., Pittston, Me.
East Sandwich Grange, No. 139, P. of H., East Sandwich.
Fairview Grange, No. 1135, P. of H., Chester Springs, Pa.
Local Grange, No. 598, P. of H., of Cambria County, Pa.
Bristol Grange, No. 80, P. of H., Bristol, Ohio.
Marlboro Grange, No. 1401, P. of H., Marlboro, Ohio.
Cherrytree Grange, No. 284, P. of H., Cherrytree, Pa.
Horticultural Society of Jefferson County, Ind.
Latin-American Club and Foreign Trade Association, St. Louis, Mo.
The Marine Society, New York, N. Y.
Board of Trade, Philadelphia, Pa.
State Agricultural Society of Minnesota.
American Association of Masters and Pilots of Steam Vessels, in session in Washington, D. C.
National Board of Trade of the United States, in session in Washington, D. C.
National Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association of the United States, in session in Washington, D. C.
Chamber of Commerce, New Orleans, La., D. M. Kilpatrick, president.
Sugar and Rice Exchange, New Orleans, La., J. C. Murphy, president.
Produce Exchange, New Orleans, La., Lazare Levy, president.
Progressive Union, New Orleans, La.
Chamber of Commerce, San Francisco, Cal.
Board of Trade of Harrisburg, Pa.
Chamber of Commerce, Phœnixville, Pa.
Board of Trade, Lancaster, Pa.
Farmers' Institute, Gap, Pa.
Farmers' Institute, Concordville, Pa.
Marine Society, Boston, Mass.
Chamber of Commerce, Richmond, Va.
Drug Exchange, Philadelphia, Pa.
Board of Trade, New Orleans, La.
Grocers and Importers' Exchange, Philadelphia, Pa.
New York Board of Trade and Transportation, New York City.
Board of Trade, Pasadena, Cal.
Commercial Exchange, Philadelphia, Pa.
Chamber of Commerce, Milwaukee, Wis.
Maritime Exchange, Philadelphia, Pa.
Postal Clerks' Association of New York City.
Wage Earners' League of Municipal Progress, New York City.
Boot and Shoe Club, Boston, Mass.
National Association of Agricultural Implement and Vehicle Manufacturers.

Resolutions indorsing the bill have also been introduced in, and passed, so far as known, by the legislatures of the States of Kansas, Delaware, California, Wisconsin, Washington, and Idaho.

APPENDIX No. 2.

TO OPEN LETTER TO GEN. C. H. GROSVENOR BY A. B. SMITH, CONTAINING ARTICLE ON "SUBSIDIES FOR AMERICAN SHIPS," BY HON. ARTHUR SEWALL, VICE-PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY IN 1896.

[Harper's Weekly, Vol. XLIV, No. 2260.]

SUBSIDIES FOR AMERICAN SHIPS, BY ARTHUR SEWALL, LATE DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE FOR VICE-PRESIDENT.

In the grand vista opened up by this country's expanding importance among the nations of the world there are plainly visible two features of vital concern to the people; first, the finger of destiny pointing to the parting of the ways between isolation from the affairs of the foreign world and a participation in the councils of the great human family; second, the necessity for the restoration of the United States to the proud position once occupied as a leading maritime power. The two are so closely intertwined as to be inseparable. Expansion in territory means increased opportunities for the use of American capital in the direction of maritime commercial expansion. With the acquisition of Cuba, Porto Rico, the Philippine Islands, and Hawaii, the United States are brought face to face with the question "Shall we continue to allow other nations to have 90 per cent of the carrying trade of this country while we content ourselves with 10 per cent, or shall we, with the universally recognized foresight of the American man of business, see to it that our commercial expansion runs parallel with the expansion of territory that is part of our destiny?"

Every year the American nation pays to foreigners $200,000,000 for the cost of freight on our exports and imports. The humiliating sight is seen of the farmer growing wheat at a cost of 30 cents a bushel and paying foreign carriers 30 cents or thereabouts a bushel to get it from the Pacific slope to the consumer abroad. Some little profit is derived from the transportation of the wheat to our seaboard, and after that the harvest is reaped entirely by foreigners, with whom the American carrier can not compete because of the lack of profit with conditions as they are to-day. Add to this loss of what should legitimately belong to the American carrier the profit that goes to the firm that insures the wheat, and the bank through whose hands the financial transactions are carried to a conclusion, and some idea is gained of the way we are being beaten by foreign competition in this field that we should rightfully monopolize.

It is time that we brought the maritime power of America to the old honored position it held before the civil war gave it a setback from which it has never since recovered. Without going into the technicalities of the subsidy bill now pending before Congress, it is to the interest of every patriotic citizen to consider what the effect would be of the restoration of the Stars and Stripes to their old place on the commercial seas. Besides the saving of that $200,000,000 that we annually put into the pockets of foreign shipowners for the American carrying trade, the expansion of our maritime fleets means an almost unlimited boom to every mechanical industry in the country. When it becomes profitable for the American capitalist to put his money into the shipbuilding industry there will start up all along our Atlantic and Pacific seaboards vast yards that will give employment to great armies of skilled artisans; the sound of the steam hammer and the glow of the blast furnace will be heard and seen in numberless places where now is only waste land; our railways will be loaded down with freight from the interior to the seaboard, intended for the material of the shipyards; coal will be required in enormous quantities; the iron and steel mines of this resourceful country will be called upon to redouble their efforts to supply the demand for metal in these days of steel and iron ships; the ax and saw will be plied with increased energy in our great lumber regions for the masts and decks of the ships; the engineers will be called upon to furnish the hearts of the steam-propelled monsters that will be turned out as fast as modern skill and energy can build them; in a word, the mechanical industries of the entire continent will be stimulated as they have not been for years. Scarcely a means of employing labor will be left unaffected by the boom. A new era will have dawned in the industries of the nation.

Nor would the benefits from this new order of things cease with the building of the ships. There would accrue to the American skilled mechanic all the advantages that follow in the train of a great established industry. The ships that are built here would be kept in repair here. The cost of maintaining a great fleet of ships is enormous. With the establishment of our own ship yards this money would be spent here instead of being disbursed abroad. The greater the increase in the number of vessels flying the American flag, the faster the wheels of industry will revolve and the better will be the condition of the labor armies.

It is a time in the nation's history pregnant with interest to all who wish for the onward march of commercial prosperity. New avenues of commerce of vast importance are opening up in the Far East, and nearer home in the Antilles and the Pacific. Through these avenues there should steam a continual procession of ships flying the American flag, built in American yards, American from keel to topmast, carrying American freight to American possessions, bringing back the products of American enterprise and energy in these new days, and keeping every penny of the profit of production, of carriage, of sale and barter in the American family. Expansion under those conditions is the only right kind. Let our foreign carrying trade be protected as well as our coastwise trade. We as a nation have declared for protection. Let us be consistent and protect every American ship that sails the seas.

The apathy that has made us almost nowhere in the running as a maritime nation can only be electrified into life by the adoption of radical measures. The American capitalist has stood aloof from the shipbuilding industries because the cheaper cost of labor and of men to man the ships has enabled the foreign shipbuilder to do business on a basis that permits of no profit to the Americans with their higher scale of pay. Therefore it is necessary to attract capital to the shipbuilding industries by some national effort, the reward of which to the nation will be the immense increase in the national industries that I have pointed out. This is what is intended by the subsidy bill. It is argued that the bill will benefit a few. It will benefit the entire nation, as I have shown, by the establishment of great workshops where now there are none, and the immense impetus given to the mechanical arts of the country.

But chiefly the benefit derived will be one that should appeal to every patriotic heart. Why is England mistress of the seas? Not alone because of her mighty navy, but because also of her vast maritime fleets. War ships are out of date in ten years. But the plant that makes it possible to create a navy is always on hand. The maritime nation has a huge auxiliary navy ready for instant call in time of national danger. The value of these craft was amply proven in our late war. With the establishment of shipyards on our splendid seaboard we should be prepared for any emergency. There would be dry docks and coaling stations, repair shops and places of rendezvous, arsenals and depots of supplies, all at our command in time of peace or war. The navy would spring into life as if by magic, just as it did during our civil war, when we were in the heyday of prosperity as a maritime nation. Swift cruisers would be at our command in unlimited numbers, as they are at the command of Great Britain. There would be no reason why the Stars and Stripes should not wave more proudly than any flag afloat, for nowhere could there be found a country whose resources for building its own ships were more ample than ours. The days of the early fifties, when we were the leading maritime nation of the world, would be with us again. Instead of our sending abroad 90 per cent of the money expended by us for ocean freights and putting 10 per cent into our own pockets, the situation would be reversed and the coffers of our merchants would receive the money that now goes to foreigners. Our destiny leads us unerringly on to the two great fields of expansion—territorial and maritime—and this destiny should be heartily welcomed by every patriotic American as the true pathway to national and commercial progress.

APPENDIX No. 3,

TO OPEN LETTER TO GEN. C. H. GROSVENOR BY A. B. SMITH, CONTAINING REPORT ADOPTED BY THE REPUBLICAN CLUB OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, IN FAVOR OF SUBSIDIES FOR AMERICAN SHIPPING IN THE FOREIGN TRADE, UNANIMOUSLY AND ENTHUSIASTICALLY ADOPTED AT THE CLUB'S REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING, MAY 14, 1900.

GOVERNMENTAL AID TO AMERICAN SHIPPING.

"The construction of the American merchant marine and the conservation of our shipyards are as vital to the national interests as the erection of seaboard forts." (Jefferson, 1799.)

"During the last fiscal year American vessels carried the smallest percentage of our exports and imports in our history." (Report of Commission of Navigation, 1899.)

"The people look to the Administration to exert its influence and diplomacy in opening up new markets for the distribution of manufactured products which exceed our own capacity to consume; and they will heartily sustain Congress in imperatively needed legislation to develop a merchant marine for the carriage of our vast and increasing foreign commerce under the protection of the American flag, to the end that the freightage now paid to foreign ships may remain to the American shipbuilder, the American shipowner, the American seaman, and the American mechanic." (Massachusetts Republican platform, 1899.)

"That for the national defense, for the reinforcement of the Navy, for the enlargement of our foreign markets, for the employment of American workingmen in the mines, forest, farms, mills, factories and shipyards, we favor the enactment of legislation which will regain for American ships the carrying of our foreign commerce." (Iowa Republican platform, 1899.)

Those nations which from the earliest antiquity most influenced the surrounding world have been mercantile nations—the Tyrians, the Carthaginians, the Italian Republics, the Dutch, the Hanseatic Cities, Great Britain, and the United States. The ocean is the stage on which the fittest survive. The histories of ancient and mediæval nations need not be reviewed. Those which were great, were great because of their intercourse with distant peoples.

What we shall consider is the progress of modern commercial history from the beginning of the present century. This is about contemporaneous with the commencement of our nation. Then England ranked preeminent as the greatest naval power in the world. The Americans—English in ideas, in sympathies, and in ambition—watched with pride the dawning of an American marine power.

American shipbuilding grew rapidly in respect and influence, and soon we became rivals of Great Britain in the sea-carrying trade. Then questions of internal interest—the acquisition of more American territory, the development of agriculture, mining, and manufacturing, afterwards the profound questions of national integrity, the eradication of slavery, and the reestablishment of the perfected Union—occupied all the energies of our people.

A prosperity, such as before no nation ever knew, engrossed us with our home affairs, so that we neglected utterly those policies which might have ranked us as a naval power without an equal. So marvelous was the country's growth, and so rich was the reward of enterprise, that the United States willingly encouraged, by grants of lands and of money, such plans as promised (the) to develop the unknown regions of our Western country.

So Congress granted the Pacific railroad systems large subsidies of bonds and territory. Encouraged with coal and iron these railroad systems brought back gold and silver.

Such was the success of the national encouragement of American transcontinental traffic that since 1860 over 240,000 miles of railroads have grown under its fostering influence. This is a greater mileage than exists in all of Europe.

The policy was condemned by hostile partisans and short-sighted statesmen as unwarranted and extravagant.

Yet the Government, in return for its enormous outlays, has been paid every dollar, with interest, being over $100,000,000.

The impetus to the country's growth, and the access to its wealth, can not be counted in mere dollars. Every State added to the Union since 1860 owes its admission to Statehood largely to the influence of our national subsidized railroads.

The development of our inland resources was as natural as it was wise. We knew no foreign competition, and we followed the lines of the least resistance. But while we devoted our attention to these questions almost exclusively, the energies of England, France, Germany, Russia, and Japan were being directed to other fields of national endeavor.

The following table gives an idea of the marvelous increase of the commerce of the United States in spite of these conditions. It will serve also to show the rapid decadence of the influence of our ocean merchant ships engaged in foreign trade.

Date.	Total imports and exports.	Per cent carried in American ships.
1825	(About) $ 196,000,000	92
1835	(About) 272,000,000	84
1845	(About) 231,000,000	82
1855	(About) 537,000,000	75
1865	(About) 1,605,000,000	27
1875	(About) 1.200,000,000	26
1885	(About) 1.100,000,000	15
1895	(About) 1.500,000,000	12
1899	(About) 1.700,000,000	8

It will be noticed that the decade including the civil war, as if with one fell stroke, reduced the percentage from 75 to 27 per cent.

During this period ship construction had been revolutionized. The battle of the *Monitor* and the *Merrimac* marked a new era in marine history. It dazed the world. From that time metallic ships were to replace those made of wood. It was a discovery like gunpowder and the printing press.

It was to have an influence on future civilization.

England was prompt to take advantage of her opportunity. The United States was plunged in a war for existence, and although our country was rich in iron and labor and in harbors we had neither capital nor experience.

Ocean sailing vessels had given place to ocean steamships, and so fast had been the progress of mechanical contrivance and so exact the skill required by ship constructors that only at the cost of persevering patience and consistent expenditure could this country hope to keep pace with England, the veteran mistress of the seas. The bounties to European shipping were increased, while the United States took no steps to encourage its ocean traffic, dwindling so fast into insignificance.

Unless radical restorative measures be at once adopted, extinction seems inevitable.

Transoceanic carriage is growing in importance. It has become a measure of national prosperity.

In twenty-five years the seagoing steam tonnage of the world has increased from about 4,000,000 to nearly 20,000,000 gross tons, an increase of over 300 per cent. This is at the rate of about 15 per cent yearly. Notwithstanding this increase in ocean steamboat capacity, in the same period the sea tonnage of the United States decreased relatively about 20 per cent.

Last year the American people paid to the owners of foreign vessels over two hundred million dollars for ocean transportation.

What prosperity that should mean to the American shipbuilder, the American shipowner, the American seaman, and the American mechanic.

At the commencement of our Government it was determined that only American ships should navigate the great internal waterways of the country. It also became part of our national policy that only United States ships should engage in the coasting trade.

These were policies of profound political prudence. Seaboard cities are the gateways to a country's interior. Our seaport cities are among the richest in the Union. To have left our coasting trade subject to the competition of rival nations would have done much to discourage our energies and to undermine our national self-reliance and independence. It would have made our seaboard cities the business places of foreign capital and foreign labor. American labor would have been degraded from its high place and the American citizen would have been forced to compete with the poorly paid subjects of less generous and less progressive nations. The wisdom of these policies then adopted, and adhered to consistently ever since, is proven best by the fact that over our Great Lakes there is carried a far greater commerce than over any internal waterways in the world.

The boundary States and terminal cities of these waters have become our richest granaries. Buffalo and Duluth and Minneapolis and Chicago are to-day richer in their accumulated enterprise than any grain ports in Europe. The American tonnage at present enrolled for the coasting trade of the United States is the largest in our history and far greater than the coasting tonnage of any other nation.

The national encouragement of internal and coastwise shipping and the consequent accumulation of commerce has caused the States surrounding the Great Lakes to become as fertile as the districts of the Ganges in India, the Nile in Egypt, even when those were the centers of almost fabulous opulence. Here no foreign ship nor outside power can interfere or compete with our well-paid, well-conducted American shipping. The States bordering on the Mississippi River have been equally fortunate. More American ships sail the Detroit River than enter both London and Liverpool from all the world. Through the locks of Sault Ste. Marie there passes nearly three times more tonnage than passes through the Suez Canal. If such results have been accomplished for our inland waters, like effects must follow from similar causes concerning oceanic traffic. What the policy of encouragement and fair play has accomplished for our lakes and rivers will be experienced by our harbors and seaboard cities. With national encouragement of American shipping, New York, instead of London, will become the financial and commercial metropolis of the world.

England's greatness is shown by her determination to retain and enhance her maritime superiority over the United States. Soon after the war of 1812, England learned that in the ascendency of nations, land warfare must give way to the scientific encounters of marine machinery. Britain learned that with our virgin soil and newborn energies, with our inexhaustible mines of gold and coal and iron and copper, and our millions of acres of prairies and forests, America must soon supplant all Europe in its developments. That with ocean-hugged shores and protected harbors, we must soon possess all those advantages which would make ours the workshop and supply store of the world. Then the statesmen of England resolved that the influence of Great Britain must not wane.

With farseeing diplomacy, and depending upon the fealty of her subjects, the wisdom of her statesmen, and the experience of her sailors, she adopted those measures which have been copied by all great nations excepting our own. She called upon the subjects of the entire British Empire to contribute to this purpose. And the Irish and the Indian peasant alike poured into the British treasury funds, that its maritime power might be increased, and that the British Government might pay bounties to the English shipbuilder, and that England might create and propagate forever a marine population who knew the seas and could navigate them, who knew far-distant lands and would settle them, that England might carry the products of her factories and mines to every corner of the habitable globe, make trade treaties with the natives, and purchase from them and exchange with them their wares.

The nations whose material prosperity have been most marked have favored with most determination a generously subsidized shipping.

The national parsimony of the Italian Government in refusing assistance to Christopher Columbus is the signal example which forever will lower, in the estimation of history, the country of his birth. On the other hand, Isabella of Spain, with imperial spirit and noble generosity, in lending encouragement to the dauntless discoverer of America, made hers the richest country of mediæval Europe.

The policy of the granting of bounties and subsidies for the encouragement of the building and management of merchant vessels when once started has been consistently adhered to by the great nations of Europe.

In 1839 Great Britain began systematically this policy of national assistance. As she watched the prospect of American rivalry, she increased her vigilance and solicitude for her prestige on the seas. The Cunard line of steamships was the first line which received an annual national subsidy. It has accomplished much for England and for international commercial prosperity. But England's purpose is political as well as commercial. England's colonies did not cause so much the developing of her marine power, as did her sustained ocean traffic make possible a continuance of the relationship to her colonies, which is the marvel of history.

Next to England the most remarkable instance of recent national endeavor in the direction of commercial ascendency is the present maritime condition of Germany. After the unification of the German Empire under the leadership of her great chancellor, Bismarck, despite her inland position, her lack of experience in the construction of ocean steamships, her policy of domestic concentration, which had hitherto prevented her from colonizing or exploiting transoceanic countries, Germany, in 1865, voted an annual subsidy of 4,500,000 marks (about one and a half million dollars) for fifteen years to the North German Lloyd Steamship Company for new lines to Asia and Australia. The subsidy was increased last year to about 6,000,000 marks.

Another subsidy of nearly a million marks for a line of steamships to Africa is to be increased this year. A purpose of this subsidy is to develop German export trade in South Africa. The German Empire is endeavoring to control commercially those parts of Asia and Africa which most need the supplies of Europe and America. Germany's sea-going steam tonnage is the fourth largest in the world, and under the benign influence of governmental encouragement has increased since 1874 nearly 700 per cent.

France ranks third in the list of nations in respect to the amount of steam ocean carriage capacity. Besides subsidies of about four million dollars per year to the Messageries Maratimes and the Compagnie Generale Transatlantique, her two principal steamship companies, she has for some years annually expended nearly as much more for less important lines.

Italian shipbuilders labor under peculiar disadvantages. Italy has little coal or iron of her own. Nevertheless Italian legislation fosters national navigation and shipbuilding. And although the laws of ship subsidy regulation did not become operative in Italy until 1886, the Italian steam merchant marine has increased in 20 years about 400 per cent.

Japan's enterprising spirit for some years has won the world's admiration. She has paid large subsidies to her principal ocean lines, and by a law enacted in 1896 gives general construction and navigation bounties. To-day her navy ranks seventh in the entire world.

Together the seven maritime nations of Europe and Japan last year expended in bounties, subsidies, subventions, and mail contracts, for the encouragement of their shipping interests, more than $26,000,000.

The following schedule will indicate approximately how much the separate nations paid for this purpose for the year ending June 30, 1899.

Great Britain (nearly)	$6,000,000
France (over)	7,000,000
Japan (about)	3,500,000
Germany (nearly)	2,000,000
Austria (nearly)	2,000,000
Italy (over)	2,000,000
Spain (nearly)	2,000,000
Russia (nearly)	1,500,000

It will be noticed that, although legislation on this subject is comparatively recent, the tendency to strengthen it is very marked.

To ascertain why the United States, so successful in most lines of industry, should be so far behind in shipbuilding and mercantile navigation, and how this state of affairs may best be remedied, is the purpose of this paper.

We have seen that in 1825 the merchant vessels of the United States carried over

90 per cent of our imports and our exports; how gradually until 1855 it fell to 75, and in 1899 the proportion carried by American-built and American-owned vessels dropped to about 8 per cent. This means that foreign vessels have replaced those of the United States, and that they receive and take away from this country more that $200,000,000 each year as freight and charges upon our imports and exports. This is at the rate of over $600,000 per day.

Unless our Government determines to secure the restoration and the extension of American ocean navigation, so fast passing out of existence, other nations will very soon absorb the ocean-carrying of our entire foreign trade. Unless legislation is enacted to enable American-built vessels to compete with the subsidized and bountied merchant ships of foreign countries, the carriage of our imports and exports may be transferred from us forever.

Dare we permit such a state of affairs longer to continue? American pride and self-interest, political as well as commercial, forbid it. Then, too, should not the American nation contemplate with anxiety the relationship of Great Britain and ourselves? Great Britain's steam tonnage amounts to about 60 per cent of the steam tonnage of the entire world; that of the United States to less than 4 per cent. Great Britain, too, deems it necessary with a navy equal to that of any three world powers combined to maintain her mighty fleet of auxiliary cruisers. It is now time that the American people assume their proper position regarding the great foreign trade now in full view, and for which the great nations of Europe are striving with all their might.

The United States must take its stand at once, and it can not afford to recede a single step. Political as well as commercial reasons demand it.

In his last message President McKinley said:

"The expense is as nothing compared to the advantage to be achieved. The reestablishment of our merchant marine involves in a large measure our continued industrial progress and the extension of our commercial triumphs. I am satisfied the judgment of the country favors the policy of aid to our merchant marine, which will broaden our commerce and markets and upbuild our sea-carrying capacity for the products of agriculture and manufacture, which, with the increase of our Navy, mean more work and wages to our countrymen, as well as a safeguard to American interests in every part of the world."

Mr. Alexander R. Smith, the earnest advocate of American shipping, says:

"Our legitimate interests in the development of the markets of Asia are as great as those of any European power. Our geographical opportunities for sharing in those markets are superior to those of any European nation." Let us see.

The markets of eastern China supply 500,000,000 people. England, France, Germany, and Russia are jealously contending for this trade.

We sell them but $20,000,000 per year.

Japan's foreign trade amounts to $250,000,000. Her population is only about 40,000,000. These two markets represent about one-half only of the population of eastern Asia.

The United States stands at the portals which open upon the most populous, most fertile, and most promising regions in the world. We control 800 miles of coast line of the Philippine Islands. Our trade with eastern Asia should amount to over $1,000,000,000 annually.

Manila should become the distributing center of the eastern world—the London or the New York of the Pacific.

Each year we are closer to Asia and Australia. What markets for our commodities do not Central and South America offer! With the prospect of an American canal through the Isthmus, the distances to the Far East and western coast of South America soon will be diminished to our advantage; that the Pacific coast and the Gulf coast will vie with the Atlantic harbors in their shipping interests, and new San Franciscos will grow up on our western ocean. New York and Philadelphia will be nearer to Asia (and) than Liverpool and London.

Governmental aid promotes and protects the development of the foreign trade of all the great nations of Europe. It is not left to individual enterprise or combination.

Great Britain, France, Russia, Italy, and Japan annually grant about $5,000,000 to develop the Asian trade. For the same purpose the United States expended last year $48,451, a melancholy commentary on the neglect of national duty! The same considerations apply to the efforts to develop trade with South Africa and the lesser Americas. Any systematic effort to develop our trade in these markets will require encouragement similar to that granted by competing nations.

Concerning an American ship subsidy plan, the political effects are certain. The present state of our national affairs makes it advisable that the United States shall impress favorably those communities with which we do business. A well-disciplined, highly organized modern steamship, capacious, swift, majestic, deeply impresses those who contemplate it and its creation. Besides the effect on the outside world, the stimulation of our own national pride and the awakened sense of conscious excellence will tend to national dignity and respect.

Another effect of the encouragement of the merchant marine is the reenforcement of our Navy by the establishment of a shipping to be used in times of war as well as in times of peace. No steamship should be entitled to a subsidy benefit unless it be so constructed that in case of emergency and when needed for war purposes it may be utilized by the United States. What the country needs is reliable and capacious vessels which will increase the wealth and respect of the nation in times of peace, and which can be utilized in times of war for attack as well as for domestic protection.

An American-guarded seaboard and the influences of American ships and American seamen will lessen largely the cost of our military equipments. The question of foreign invasion or attack can be eliminated from our remotest anxieties only by the establishment and maintenance of American vessels capable of being utilized as ships of war.

A further benefit is that the encouragement of a merchant marine will mean the training of Americans as citizen seamen. The training will be dignified by the knowledge that they will form part of the standing navy of their country. The American seaman at present receives about double the pay of the European sailor. He should continue to earn it in efficiency and responsibility. "The officers of our ships should be active, intelligent, and interested agents for the discovery of new markets and the promotion of our trade."

Of course Great Britain, Germany, and France will not surrender their maritime supremacy without a determined effort. According to Senator Frye, the rivalry of the United States will reduce freight rates at least 25 per cent. It is estimated that the amount of our foreign commerce is about 50,000,000 tons. The average ocean freight is $4 a ton. Twenty-five per cent reduction of rates will save to our people $50,000,000 annually. Lower freights will make necessary larger and more modern vessels in order to maintain profits. This means the development of new machinery, perhaps of a new motive power. It will mean that the economy of coal and energy must still continue to reduce the cost of transportation. The cheaper freight charges become, the easier will be our competition with other countries, and our agriculture products and our cereals will replace those of other countries. Europe and Asia and Africa will demand our wheat, our corn, and our rice.

Under a system of generous subsidy encouragement, enough to establish shipbuilding plants capable of producing the highest development of the perfect steel vessel, enough to pay to our mechanics and our seamen wages commensurate with his accomplishments and his responsibility, enough to maintain for him all his high privilege and immunities as an American citizen, the industry of shipbuilding and its hundreds of allied trades and occupations will receive such an impetus that our factories long will be kept lighted and our forges ring with the demands for new ships from every side. Our national facilities, our coal and wood and steel, our opportunities for labor in the harbors of the East and especially of the Gulf, must soon invite all other countries to purchase from the United States steam vessels as they do now steam engines and machinery.

As the United States has developed its railroad systems and its internal waterways and its coasting trade, so, too, with a fair start and even opportunities, it will accomplish its proper share in transoceanic commerce.

"Subsidy has been and is the motor that drives all the merchant marines of Europe."

Concerning subsidized steamships the United States minister at Buenos Ayres writes: "I discovered that Germany has by this means increased her exports to the Argentine Republic in eight years from two and one-half to fifteen millions. It matters little what specific term we apply to the stimulant to assure outreach of marine steam. The stimulant is necessary."

A country's merchant marine should be a source of national strength, therefore it is entitled to national consideration.

It should be a source of national wealth and ought to be encouraged.

As it is an element of national integrity it must be maintained.

Jefferson, while Secretary of State in the Administration of President Washington, submitted to the Congress at its request a report on commerce and navigation and said:

"Our navigation involves the highest considerations. As a branch of industry it is valuable; but as a resource of defense essential. The position and circumstances of the United States leave them nothing to fear from their land board and nothing to desire beyond their present rights. But on the seaboard they are open to injury, and they have there, too, a commerce which must be protected.

"This can only be done by possessing a respectable body of citizen seamen and artists, and establishments in readiness for shipbuilding. If particular nations grasp at undue shares, and more especially if they seize upon the means of the United States to convert them into aliment for their own strength, and withdraw them entirely from the support of those to whom they belong, defensive and protective measures become necessary on the part of the nation whose marine resources are thus invaded, or it will be disarmed of its defense, its productions will be at the mercy of the nation which has possessed itself exclusively of the means of carrying them, and its politics may be influenced by those who command its commerce. The carriage of our own commodities, if once established in another channel, can not be resumed in the moment we desire. If we lose the seamen and artists whom it now occupies we lose the permanent means of marine defense, and time will be requisite to raise up others when disgraced, or losses shall bring home to our feelings the disgrace of having abandoned them."

When Jefferson wrote thus American ships carried 75 per cent of our foreign commerce under protective legislation.

Sir J. H. Heaton, a member of the British Parliament, considering the subject of ship subsidy, writes as follows:

"For many years American mails (as well as American goods) were carried to Europe almost exclusively in British vessels. Early in the century the British Government adopted the sagacious policy of subsidizing the shipping companies which ran vessels to the colonies and to foreign countries. Infant settlements like Port Jackson (Sydney), of the Cape, could not, of course, supply trade enough to make the voyages remunerative. And now that such settlements have shot up into rich and powerful colonies the subsidies are continued on a more lavish scale, on two conditions: First, that the subsidized vessels shall be constructed so as to be easily converted into cruisers in case of war; second, that they shall carry the mails.

"This policy of State aid was so brilliantly successful in developing trade and maintaining the supremacy of the British mercantile marine that it was adopted in turn by all the great powers, with the single exception, until quite recently, of the United States. As American ships were not subsidized their owners could not compete with the Cunard and other companies, the art of shipbuilding languished, and the American carrying trade was transferred to foreign bottoms. In 1891 only 13 per cent of the exports from the United States was carried in American ships, which at one time had engrossed 90 per cent.

"As a consequence of refusing $5,000,000 a year in subsidies during thirty years to native shipowners, or $150,000,000, the United States had to pay, in the same period no less than $3,000,000,000 for freights, while their mercantile marine dwindled into insignificance. The fact that the country bore this heavy drain upon its earnings so long without feeling it, as if it had been a flea-bite, affords the highest possible proof of its amazing vitality and vigor. At the same time, one is puzzled to understand why the proverbial shrewdness of the American, unfailingly exhibited in his private affairs, was missing for more than a generation in this important section of national business."

In a recent speech in the United States Senate, Senator Depew said:

"The markets for the products of our farms and factories accessible by the Atlantic Ocean will soon be filled. But across the Pacific are limitless opportunities. Within a distance from Manila not much greater than Havana from New York live 900,000,000 people, purchasing now annually from all nations of the things which we produce to the sum of $1,000,000,000, of which we furnish 5 per cent. That 5 should be 50 per cent."

The opportunities are so splendid; the prizes so rich; the numbers so prodigious, that the mind is dazed and the imagination confounded. A mere recital seems like a wild exaggeration. The numerals are so much as we have not before seen or written.

Our forefathers saw with prophetic vision the magnificent future that their children were to inherit and they made provisions for it. They delegated to Congress the right at all times to regulate the commerce and the navigation of the nation. Our possessions in the West and in the East Indies should make it essential for us to familiarize these people with our power, our methods, our language, our ships. We should make them feel that they can obtain from the United States and its possessions whatever is necessary for the wants of a growing people, and they should have an interest in supporting that Government which is the common benefactor of all its peoples. They will then willingly contribute directly to the support of that adjunct of the Government which will enable them to cooperate and to become more closely united. They will then take a pride in their own institutions and feel their independence of outside powers.

Considering the history of the past two years, What would we not have accomplished with an adequate merchant marine? That war with Spain has cost us nearly $300,000,000. With how much less could we not have provided our Navy with a merchant marine "so strong and so effective that any enemy would have recognized the utter futility of resistance and have promptly evacuated Cuba upon our demand without the loss of a man or a dollar!"

It is not well to anticipate the dismal side of history; but eternal vigilance is the price of safety. As suddenly and unexpectedly as the war with Spain was forced upon us, so again we may feel it to be our duty, on short notice, to prevent the oppression or the extermination of a helpless people. Perhaps our own citizens, or those whom we have pledged ourselves to care for and protect, may be attacked or abused. When this happens, the American people will again stand together, determined not to look carelessly on the suffering of their fellow-men. Should the enemy happen to be Great Britain, or Germany, or France, or Russia, or Japan, shall we be unprepared? Will the other nations, reading the history of this war, make no effort to take advantage? Will we do nothing except hope for a repetition of the unparalleled performance at Manila and at Santiago? Our nation which has accomplished so much, establishing precedents and making laws, now feels it to be its paramount duty to provide for the recruitment and

aid of our Navy before disaster and defeat make clear to us our perilous weakness upon the sea.

We therefore earnestly recommend that Congress promptly adopt measures to promote the commerce and increase the foreign trade of the United States, and to provide auxiliary cruisers, transports, and seamen for Government use when necessary.

C. H. DENNISON, *Chairman.*
WILLIAM GREENWOOD, *Secretary.*

This report was written by A. L. M. Bullowa, member of the committee.

The Record of the Democratic Party in Relation to the Annexation of Noncontiguous Territory.

SPEECH
OF
HON. W. B. SHATTUC,
OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, May 14, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 11537) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, and for prior years, and for other purposes—

Mr. SHATTUC said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Of the many inconsistencies presented by the record of the Democratic party none is more striking than that of its present attitude in opposition to the expansion resulting from the Spanish-American war. In some remarks submitted to this House on March 31 I called attention to the fact that the party which is now opposing expansion had in fact added every foot of territory to our original area, except that of Alaska, and in practically every case had done so without reference to the "consent of the governed;" and this fact has also been presented in much detail by others. Driven to the wall by this presentation of well-known historical facts, the response of the leaders of that party has been that the area which it added was contiguous and practically unoccupied territory, while that recently added (as an incident of the war with Spain) is noncontiguous and already occupied by people of another race and different characteristics.

In making this defense of their new attitude of opposition to expansion, they seem to imagine that the people of this country have forgotten comparatively recent history. In some former remarks upon this subject before this House I pointed out the fact that the Democratic party in three national conventions and two national platforms in 1860 adopted a resolution demanding that the next administration should obtain possession of Cuba, and without reference to the "consent of the governed." I now propose to examine more closely and somewhat in detail the history of that party with reference not only to Cuba but to other islands and noncontiguous territory, and show by indisputable evidence that its attitude from the very foundation of the party to the termination of the slavery period was in favor of the acquisition not only of Cuba but of other islands and noncontiguous territory—any spot, in fact, in which it could extend slavery and by so doing increase the vote of the slave-holding party in Congress.

I propose, first, to relate, in brief and consecutive form, the history of the Democratic efforts to acquire Cuba, the Hawaiian Islands, Yucatan, and the Danish West Indies, and to put on record such extracts from official documents and messages as will preserve in permanent form the expansion history of this Democratic party which is now denouncing expansion (which came to us, excepting Hawaii, as incidents and results of the war with Spain) in the very territory of which its most distinguished leaders tried to obtain control. From Jefferson to Buchanan, the constant and consistent record of the party is for the acquisition of island as well as non contiguous territory, and it was only with the termination of slavery that the party, as a party, abandoned this effort. It was only after the possibility of the extension of this curse of mankind—slavery—had passed away that we find a Democratic President so far departing from the established principle of expansion as to be willing to haul down the American flag in Hawaii, where it had been hoisted in compliance with the wishes of the people of those islands and the approval of those of the United States, with the "consent" of both the governed and the governing.

No man is more revered by the Democratic party, if it is capable of genuine reverence for anybody or anything, than Thomas Jefferson. Its leaders annually celebrate the date of his birth, and point to him as the father of their party; yet Jefferson clearly favored the annexation of Cuba and put himself plainly on record in favor of it. In a letter written August 10, 1807, during his second term as President, and addressed to Madison, his Secretary of State, discussing the possibilities of a war with European countries, he said:

I had rather have war with Spain than not, if we are to go to war against England. Our Southern defenses can take care of the Floridas, volunteers from the Mexican army will flock to our standard, and rich pabulum will be offered to our privateers in the plunder of their commerce and coasts; probably Cuba would add itself to our confederation.

Two years later, writing again to Madison, who was then President, he said:

I suppose the conquest of Spain will soon offer a delicate question to you as to the Floridas and Cuba, which will offer themselves to you. Napoleon will certainly give his consent without difficulty to our receiving the Floridas, and, with some difficulty, possibly Cuba.

A week later he writes again:

That Napoleon would give us the Floridas to withhold intercourse with the residue of these colonies can not be doubted, but that is no price, because they are ours in the first moment of the first war; but, although with difficulty, he will consent to our receiving Cuba into our Union to prevent our aid to Mexico and the other provinces. That will be a price, and I would immediately erect a column on the southernmost limit of Cuba, and inscribe on it a ne plus ultra as to us in that direction. We should then only have to include the North in our confederacy, which would be, of course, in the first war, and we should have such an empire for liberty as she has never surveyed since the creation, and I am persuaded no constitution was ever before so well calculated as ours for extensive empire and self-government.

Opportunity did not then offer for the Democracy to follow the advice of Mr. Jefferson and extend over Cuba the Constitution, which he was persuaded was "so well calculated for extensive empire and self-government," and therefore we find him again in 1823 writing to President Monroe a letter from which the official Democratic text-book issued by the Democratic party in the year of our Lord 1898, only two years ago, quotes triumphantly the following sentences:

It is better, then, to lie still in readiness to receive that interesting incorporation (Cuba) when solicited by herself. That addition to our confederacy is exactly what is wanted to round our power as a nation to the point of its utmost interest.

A few months later he wrote again to President Monroe:

I candidly confess that I have ever looked upon Cuba as the most interesting addition that could be made to our system of States.

Mr. Jefferson's advice in regard to Cuba was evidently not lost upon President Monroe, who, in a letter of June 30, 1823, quoted by Prof. James Morton Callahan, of Johns Hopkins University, in his recent work on Cuba and International Relations, says:

I have always agreed with you in the sentiment that too much importance could not be attached to that island (Cuba), and that we ought, if possible, to incorporate it into our Union, availing ourselves of the most favorable moment for it, hoping also that one would arise when it might be done without a rupture with Spain or any other power. I consider Florida and Cuba as forming the mouth of the Mississippi and other rivers emptying into the Gulf of Mexico within our limits, as of the Gulf itself, and in consequence that the acquisition of it to our Union is of the highest importance to our internal tranquillity as to our prosperity and aggrandizement.

As the country grew and the sentiment against slavery strengthened, the supporters of that Democratic institution in Congress saw more clearly every year the importance of following the advice of the founder of their party and extending over Cuba and whatever other territory they could annex that Constitution which Jefferson had described as "so well calculated for extensive empire and self-government." Even as early as 1826, in discussing a bill looking to a canal across Florida, it was urged that such a canal would protect Southern interests in case Cuba should pass into the possession of a foreign power, and, in reply to this, Randolph said:

If all constitutional restraints are to be pushed aside, let us take Cuba, and be done with it.

As the control of the slave power in Congress grew more attenuated with the growth of representation from the North, agitation for the annexation of Cuba increased. Everett, in his "Miscellaneous Essays," published in 1845, says:

The subject of Cuba will be brought, we fear, by the irresistible power of circumstances but too frequently to the notice of the people of the United States.

In the same year the Democratic Vice-President, Dallas, at a public dinner, toasted "The annexation of Cuba." In December of that year Mr. Levy (alias Yulee), a Senator from Florida, offered a resolution directing the President to open negotiations with Spain for the cession of Cuba, while a similar resolution was offered in the House.

President Polk, who came into office in 1845, cordially supported the Democratic sentiment in favor of additional slave territory, and, finding that the territory added through his war with Mexico could not be relied upon for that purpose, immediately after that war planned for the annexation of Cuba. Professor Callahan, discussing this question, says:

As soon as the struggle with Mexico was closed, Polk, ready to accept more land, undertook to annex Cuba. On May 30, 1848, at the beginning of a new Presidential canvass, and even before the ratification of peace with Mexico, he brought the subject before his Cabinet, and favored a fair purchase, and on June 6 he brought the subject before the Cabinet again. A day or so later news of the peace with Mexico arrived. * * *

Polk was a man of oral confidence, and he and Buchanan, his Secretary of State, preferred to wrap the negotiations with Spain as to Cuba in secrecy.

Polk's instructions to Saunders, then minister to Spain, were profoundly confidential; they were written June 17, 1848, but held back from the clerks for record until February 25, 1849. In his instructions Polk told Saunders to begin his negotiations by a confidential conversation concerning the distractions in Cuba; * * * to avoid any absolute refusal in treating which might embarrass the United States hereafter in acquiring Cuba, and to suggest that, on account of the situation in the Spanish cabinet and the relations with foreign governments, it was proper to avoid record of the Cuban negotiations.

That this statement of President Polk's negotiations for the purchase of Cuba is accurate can not be doubted, and the assertion is sustained by such distinguished authority as the present leader on the Democratic side of this House, Hon. JAMES D. RICHARDSON, of Tennessee, who, in the index to his Messages and Papers of the Presidents, says of Cuba:

President Polk made a proposal in 1848 for the purchase of the island by the American Government for $100,000,000.

President Polk's negotiations were unsuccessful because the Spanish Government did not desire to part with Cuba; but the slave power in Congress continued the agitation in favor of the scheme, with the election of Pierce, who succeeded him in the White House in 1853. Speeches were made in the House and Senate in favor of the acquisition of Cuba. Senator Mason, afterwards of Confederate fame, in a speech favoring the acquisition of Cuba said that its acquisition should not be attempted by forcible or unlawful methods, but added that "in the fullness of time the fruit will ripen and fall from the parent stem." Cass expressed a willingness to purchase Cuba, even at an extravagant price, and said:

It is pretty well known that I have a capacious swallow for territory, although we can wait if necessary and spend the time digesting our last acquisitions (the result of the war with Mexico), that sit lightly on the stomach and promise to promote the health of the body politic beyond expectation.

Soulé urged that the Government should not delay too long in plucking the Cuban fruit referred to by Mason as likely to "ripen and fall from the parent stem in the fullness of time," and asked:

Will the plucking of it when ripe be less marauding than the plucking of it while still green?

Mallory, also representing the slave power, was even more radical than Soulé, and, referring to the advantages of Cuba and the necessity of its acquisition, remarked that "Heaven helps those that help themselves."

President Pierce, when he came into office, made no concealment of his desire to extend the control of that constitution which Mr. Jefferson had characterized as "so well calculated for extensive empire and self-government," and in his inaugural address said:

Our position and attitude might render the acquisition of certain possessions not within our jurisdiction eminently important for our protection.

In the month following the election—

says Callahan—

Buchanan had told Pierce that he should make the purchase of Cuba the chief aim of his Administration, and thus render his name as illustrious as that of Jefferson, who had procured Louisiana for the Union.

With a view to this, apparently, Buchanan was sent as minister to London, Soulé to Spain, and Mason to France; and on April 8, 1854, Marcy, Pierce's Secretary of State, sent Soulé confidential instructions as to the purchase of Cuba, saying that the President considered $100,000,000 a liberal price, but that he would not have the annexation fail even if an additional thirty millions were required. Soulé entered upon the negotiations as directed, but they were again rejected by Spain, and this combination of supporters of the slave power evidently concluded that if fair means were unsuccessful others should be attempted; and, as a consequence, Ministers Buchanan, Mason, and Soulé were directed to hold a conference and announce the sentiment which they represented upon this subject. They held that conference at Ostend and gave to the public the celebrated "Ostend manifesto," which said:

Our past history forbids that we should acquire the island of Cuba without the consent of Spain unless justified by the great law of self-preservation. * * * After we shall have offered Spain a price for Cuba far beyond its present value, and this shall have been refused, it will then be time to consider the question, Does Cuba, in the possession of Spain, seriously injure our internal peace and the existence of our cherished Union? Should this question be answered in the affirmative, then by every law, human and divine, we shall be justified in wresting it from Spain if we possess the power.

A declaration of which Lossing, the historian, says:

The bold iniquity of the proposition amazed honest men in both hemispheres.

Even the failure of these attempts of Pierce's Administration to obtain Cuba by purchase, or, if public sentiment would consent, by force, did not discourage the Democratic party, for in the national convention nominating Buchanan as Pierce's successor, it declared that—

The Democratic party will expect of the next Administration that every proper effort be made to insure our ascendency in the Gulf of Mexico and to maintain permanent protection to the great outlets which are emptying into its waters—and that the Administration of Franklin Pierce has been true to Democratic principles.

President Buchanan, who followed Pierce, continued the efforts, openly and secretly, in favor of the annexation of Cuba. In a message to Congress, on December 6, 1858, he said:

It has been made known to the world by my predecessors that the United States have, on several occasions, endeavored to acquire Cuba from Spain by honorable negotiation. * * * The island of Cuba, from its geographical position, commands the mouth of the Mississippi and the immense and annually increasing trade, foreign and coastwise, from the valley of that noble river now embracing half the sovereign States of the Union. With that island under the dominion of a foreign power this trade, of vital importance to these States, is exposed to the danger of being destroyed in time of war, and it has hitherto been subjected to piratical injury and annoyance in times of peace. Our relation with Spain, which ought to be of the most friendly character, must always be placed in jeopardy while the constituted colonial government over the island shall remain in its present condition.

While the possession of the island would be of vast importance to the United States, its value to Spain is comparatively unimportant. * * * The publicity which has been given to our former negotiations upon this subject and the large appropriation which may be required to effect the purpose render it expedient, before making another attempt to renew those negotiations, that I should lay the whole subject before Congress. This is especially necessary, as it becomes indispensable to success that I should be entrusted with the means of making an advance to the Spanish Government immediately after signing the treaty, without awaiting the ratification of it by the Senate. I am encouraged to make this suggestion by the example of Mr. Jefferson previous to the purchase of Louisiana from France, and by that of Mr. Polk in view of the acquisition of territory from Mexico. I lay the whole subject before Congress and commend it to their careful consideration.

In another message, December 19, 1859, he says:

I need not repeat the arguments which I urged in my last annual message in favor of the acquisition of Cuba by fair purchase. My opinions on that measure remain unchanged. I therefore again invite the serious attention of Congress to this important subject. Without a recommendation on this policy on their part, it will be impossible to institute negotiations with any reasonable prospect of success.

In his message of December 3, 1860, President Buchanan says:

I reiterate the recommendation contained in my annual message of December, 1858, and repeated in that of December, 1859, in favor of the acquisition of Cuba from Spain by fair purchase. I firmly believe that such an acquisition would contribute essentially to the well-being and prosperity of both countries in all future time.

Nothing is said in any of the three recommendations of President Buchanan as to any attempt to inquire into the wishes of the people of Cuba or to obtain the "consent of the governed" before the Government of the United States should be extended over the island. So anxious was he, however, upon this subject that, in a special message to Congress on January 21, 1859, in answer to a resolution of inquiry calling for correspondence between the Government of the United States and that of Spain regarding the purchase of the island, he says:

It appears that no such correspondence has taken place which has not already been communicated to Congress. In my last annual message I stated, in reference to the purchase of Cuba, that "the publicity which has been given to our former negotiations on this subject and the large appropriation which may be required to effect the purpose render it expedient, before making another attempt to renew the negotiations, that I should lay the whole subject before Congress." I still entertain the same opinion, deeming it highly important, if not indispensable, to the success of any negotiation which I might institute for this purpose that the measure should receive the previous sanction of Congress.

During the Buchanan Administration the annexation of Cuba continued to receive attention in Congress. A bill was introduced by Senator Slidell providing for an appropriation of $30,000,000 to facilitate the acquisition of Cuba, and was favorably reported. In the discussion which followed, Robert Toombs, who once promised to call the roll of his slaves at the foot of Bunker Hill, expressed a desire for Cuba, both for its wealth and as a stepping-stone across the Caribbean, and saw no objection to its acquisition by treaty or by war.

It ought to be declared to be our settled policy—

he said,

as far as it can honestly and fairly be done, to unite all the Tropics under our flag.

Reuben Davis, of Mississippi, favored the acquisition by force rather than by purchase.

I propose—

said he—

that we shall take it now—take it in its perfection, redolent with the rich colors of its budding flowers and tropical fruits and productions.

Taylor, of Louisiana, desired it in order to increase the slavery influence in Congress, and plainly said so. He offered as a substitute for the bill another measure specifically authorizing the President to pay $120,000,000 for Cuba and to issue bonds for the amount, and also to provide for erecting Cuba into a new State. Benjamin, of Louisiana, also spoke in favor of the measure. Stephens, of Georgia, afterwards vice-president of the Confederacy, favored expansion not only as to Cuba but to Mexico and Central America; and on July 6, 1859, Jefferson Davis, in a speech before the Mississippi Democratic convention, said that the laws against the slave trade should be repealed and Cuba should be acquired.

It would—

he said—

benefit the whole Union if the Union continued, and be a still greater advantage to the South in case of a new confederacy.

With all these efforts of a Democratic President in the White House and Democrats in Congress, the attempt failed, and the Democratic convention which met in Charleston to nominate a successor to Buchanan adopted a resolution already quoted by me in this House:

Resolved, That the Democratic party are in favor of the acquisition of the island of Cuba upon such terms as shall be honorable to ourselves and just to Spain.

That convention failed to nominate, but the two Democratic conventions held at Baltimore and Richmond, which were its successors and which made separate nominations for the Presidency, each adopted that resolution, which expressed the sentiment of the Democratic party from the time of Jefferson to the close of that campaign, which ended slavery, and therefore ended Democratic ambitions for Cuba.

DEMOCRATIC SCHEME TO ANNEX YUCATAN.

The record of the Democracy in favor of expansion to noncontiguous territory does not cease with the history of its Cuban negotiations and schemes. President Polk, when the expansion fever was at its height, in a special message to Congress April 29, 1848, called attention to the opportunities for expansion then existing in Yucatan, saying:

The white inhabitants of Yucatan have been reduced to a condition of extreme suffering by an insurrection of the Indians, and have already, through their constituted authorities, implored the aid of this Government to save them from destruction, offering, in case this should be granted, to transfer the dominion and sovereignty of the peninsula to the United States. Similar appeals for aid and protection have been made to the Spanish and English governments.

We have now authentic information that if the aid asked from the United States be not granted such aid will probably be obtained from some European power, which may hereafter assert a claim to dominion and sovereignty over Yucatan. Yucatan has never declared her independence, and we treated her as a State of the Mexican Republic. For this reason we have never officially received her commissioner, but whilst this is the case we have to a considerable extent recognized her as a neutral in our war with Mexico. While still considering Yucatan as a portion of Mexico, if we had troops to spare for this purpose, I would deem it proper, during the continuance of the war with Mexico, to occupy and hold military possession of her territory.

THE DANISH WEST INDIES WANTED.

Another attempt at the addition of noncontiguous territory was made by President Andrew Johnson after his desertion of the Republican party and during the time in which he was receiving the cordial support of the Democratic party as President. In a message to Congress, on December 3, 1867, he says:

The West India islands were settled and colonized by European states simultaneously with the settlement and colonization of the American continent. * * * Although possessing considerable commercial value, they have been held by the several European states which colonized or at some time conquered them chiefly for the purpose of military and naval strategy.

In our Revolutionary war ports and harbors of the West India islands were used by our enemies to the great injury and embarrassment of the United States. We had the same experience in our second war with Great Britain. In our recent civil war the rebels and their piratical and blockade-running allies found facilities in the same ports for the work which they too successfully accomplished in injuring and devastating the commerce which we are now engaged in rebuilding. * * * I agree with our early statesmen that the West Indies naturally gravitate to and may be expected ultimately to be absorbed by the continental states, including our own. I agree with them, also, that it is wise to leave the question of such absorption to the principles of natural political gravitation. The islands of St. Thomas and St. John, which constitute a part of the group called the Virgin Islands, seem to offer us advantages immediately desirable, while their acquisition should be secured in harmony with the principles to which I have alluded. A treaty has therefore been made with the King of Denmark for the cession of these islands, and will be submitted to the Senate for consideration.

ACQUISITION OF SAN DOMINGO SUGGESTED.

Mr. Johnson's ambition to cause the islands of the Caribbean to "gravitate to the United States" was not confined to St. Thomas and St. John, for, in a message sent to Congress on December 9, 1868, after again calling attention to his treaty with the King of Denmark for the purchase of the islands of St. Thomas and St. John on the "best terms then attainable," he calls attention to conditions in other islands in those waters, and says:

It can not be long before it will become necessary for this Government to lend some effective aid to the solution of the political and social problems which are continually kept before the world by the two republics of San Domingo, and which are now disclosing themselves more distinctly than heretofore. The subject is commended to your consideration with all the more earnestness because I am satisfied that the time has now arrived when so direct a proceeding as a proposition for annexation of the two republics of the island of San Domingo would not only receive the consent of the people interested but would also give satisfaction to all other foreign nations.

I am aware that upon the question of further extending our possessions it is apprehended by some that our political system can not successfully be applied to an area more extended than our continent, but the conviction is rapidly gaining ground in the American mind that, with increased facilities for intercommunication between all portions of the earth, the principles of free government as embraced in our Constitution, if faithfully maintained and carried out, would prove of sufficient strength and breadth to comprehend within their sphere and influence the civilized nations of the world. The attention of the Senate and Congress is again respectfully invited to the treaty for the establishment of commercial reciprocity with the Hawaiian Kingdom. * * * A reciprocity treaty, while it could not materially diminish the revenues of the United States, would be a guaranty of the good will and forbearance of all nations until the people of the islands shall, of themselves, at no distant day, voluntarily apply for admission into the Union.

DEMOCRATIC ATTEMPT TO ANNEX HAWAII.

It was not alone to Cuba, or Yucatan, or the islands of the Caribbean that the Democracy looked for expansion and extension of slave territory, but an earnest effort was made for the annexation of Hawaii. Under the administration of President Pierce, his minister to the Hawaiian Islands, Mr. Gregg, was directed to negotiate for the annexation of those islands to the United States, and in a communication to him, dated April 14, 1854, Mr. Pierce's Secretary of State, Marcy, says:

In your general instructions you were furnished with the views of this Government in regard to any change in the political affairs of the Sandwich Islands. The President was aware when these instructions were prepared that the question of transferring the sovereignty of those islands to the United States had been raised and favorably received by many official individuals residing therein. You were informed that it was not the policy of the United States to accelerate such a change; but if in the course of events it became unavoidable, this Government would much prefer to acquire the sovereignty of these islands for the United States than to see it transferred to any other power. * * *

The information contained in your last dispatch renders it probable that the ruling powers of that Government will have presented to you an offer of the sovereignty of their country to the United States. The President has deemed it proper that you should be furnished with instructions for the guidance of your conduct in such an emergency. With this dispatch you will be furnished with full power to treat with the present authorities of the Hawaiian Government for the transfer of the Sandwich Islands to the United States. * * * It is reasonable to anticipate that the present rulers and chiefs would expect that some provision would be made as compensation to them for the surrender of their political possession.

This provision could not be, as I conceive, any other than a pecuniary allowance. In this respect the United States would manifest toward them a liberal spirit. Annuities to the amount of $100,000, to be distributed in such manner as they would prefer, might be secured to them in the treaty. * * * If you should succeed in making a treaty transferring the islands to the United States, it is desirable that it should receive the ratification of the Hawaiian Government before it is sent here. * * * I have good reason to believe that some of the leading powers of Europe would be very unwilling to see the Sandwich Islands become a part of the United States. These considerations and others make it important that you should bring it to a close as expeditiously as possible.

These instructions to Minister Gregg resulted in the negotiation of a treaty of annexation. It was forwarded to the United States, and was so satisfactory to President Pierce and his Secretary of State that the latter said, in a communication to Minister Gregg:

The President desires me to assure you that he takes no exception whatever to your course in this difficult and embarrassing negotiation, but, on the contrary, it is highly approved. Your efforts have been properly directed, and your ability is appreciated and commended. It gives me pleasure to communicate the President's approbation of your conduct.

He adds, however, that the President directs him to say that certain features of the treaty are unsatisfactory, and says:

There are in his mind strong objections to the immediate incorporation of the islands in their present condition into the Union as an independent State. It was expected that the Hawaiian Government would be willing to offer the islands to the United States as a Territory and leave the question in relation to their becoming a State to the determination of this Government, unembarrassed by stipulations on that point. The interests of both parties would seem to indicate this as the wisest course. A treaty which would embarrass the United States on this question would therefore be objectionable.

Thus it appears that a Democratic President under whose Administration the acquisition of both Cuba and Hawaii was pushed with the greatest vigor, objected at the last moment to the acceptance of the Hawaiian territory coupled with any agreement which would require that it should be brought in as a State into the Union, a sentiment quite out of accord with that which we have recently heard in Congress with reference to territory of this character more recently acquired. Whether this trifling disagreement would have been overcome and the Hawaiian Islands annexed will never be known, as the sudden death of the Hawaiian King ended the negotiations before they could be completed, and Pierce's successor, Buchanan, contented himself with directing his efforts to the acquisition of Cuba, as already detailed.

We see, therefore, that the attitude of the Democratic party, from Jefferson to Buchanan, was one of constant desire for expansion, not alone in contiguous area, but in noncontiguous and island territory, especially in any spot where slavery might be extended, and thus the control of the slave power in Congress and in national affairs maintained.

As has already been stated, every foot of contiguous territory added to the original area of the United States was made by the Democratic party and without reference to the "consent of the governed," while the facts which have just been presented show with equal clearness that the objections now offered to the expansion, which has come as an incident of the war with Spain, found no place in the minds of Democrats during all the years in which they were plotting for the annexation of Cuba, Hawaii, Yucatan, Haiti and San Domingo, and the Danish West Indies.

President after President, Secretary of State after Secretary of State, foreign minister after foreign minister, planned, plotted,

and schemed to bring about the annexation, peaceably if convenient, by force if necessary, of islands and other noncontiguous territory, and in not one instance was it proposed that the wishes of the people affected should be tested in any manner which should determine the "consent of the governed" as a prerequisite for the step thus proposed. On the contrary, the underlying motive with at least a large share of those actively engaged in pushing forward these annexation propositions was to find additional area upon which they could extend that outrageous form of government, slavery, which they were then exercising over millions of people in the Southern States without their consent.

I desire to append to my remarks, and thus make a matter of record at this time, copies of official correspondence relating to the annexation of Hawaii, referred to in my remarks; also a map which shows the various areas annexed by Democratic Administrations, with the date of action and area of each addition.

APPENDIX.



Mr. Marcy to Mr. Gregg.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 14, 1854.

SIR: In your general instructions you were furnished with the views of this Government in regard to any change in the political affairs of the Sandwich Islands. The President was aware, when those instructions were prepared, that the question of transferring the sovereignty of those islands to the United States had been raised and favorably received by many influential individuals residing therein. It was foreseen that at some period not far distant such a change would take place, and that the Hawaiian Islands would come under the protectorate of or be transferred to some foreign power. You were informed that it was not the policy of the United States to accelerate such a change, but if in the course of events it became unavoidable this Government would much prefer to acquire the sovereignty of these islands for the United States, rather than to see it transferred to any other power. If any foreign connection is to be formed, the geographical position of these islands indicates that it should be with us. Our commerce with them far exceeds that of all other countries; our citizens are embarked in the most important business concerns of that country, and some of them hold important public positions. In view of the large American interests there established and the intimate commercial relations existing at this time it might well be regarded as the duty of this Government to prevent these islands from becoming the appendage of any other foreign power.

It appears by your dispatches lately received at this Department that the ruling authorities of the Hawaiian Government have become convinced of their inability to sustain themselves any longer as an independent State, and are prepared to throw themselves upon our protection or to seek incorporation into our political system. Fears are entertained by those who favor such a measure that if the United States should manifest a disinclination to receive the proffered sovereignty of this country the people would seek elsewhere a less desirable connection, or be given over to anarchy.

The information contained in your last dispatch, No. 10, dated the 7th of February, renders it highly probable that the ruling powers of that Government will have presented to you, as our diplomatic agent, an offer of the sovereignty of their country to the United States. The President has deemed it proper that you should be furnished with instructions for the guidance of your conduct in such an emergency. With this dispatch you will be furnished with full power to treat with the present authorities of the Hawaiian Government for the transfer of the Sandwich Islands to the United States. This can only be done by a convention or treaty, which will not be valid until it is ratified by the Senate of the United States.

No intimation has ever been given to this Government as to the terms or conditions which will be likely to be annexed to the tender of the sovereignty. It is presumed, however, that something more than a mere protectorate is contemplated. A protectorate tendered to and accepted by the United States would not change the sovereignty of the country. In that case this Government would take upon itself heavy and responsible duties, for which it could hardly expect compensating advantages.

I understand that the measure proposed by the people, and that in which the present rulers are disposed to concur, is "annexation" as distinguished from protection; and that it is their intention that these islands shall become a part of our territories and be under the control of this Government as fully as any other of its territorial possessions. In any convention you may make it is expected that the rights to be acquired by the United States should be clearly defined.

Should the sovereignty of these islands be transferred to the United States the present government would, as a matter of course, be superseded or, at least, be subjected to the Federal authority of this country.

It is reasonable to anticipate that the present rulers and chiefs would expect that some provision would be made as compensation to them for the surrender of their political position. This provision could not be, as I conceive, any other than a pecuniary allowance. In this respect the United States would manifest toward them a liberal spirit. Annuities to the amount of $100,000, to be distributed in such manner as they would prefer, might be secured to them in the treaty.

In the convention you may make you are authorized to provide in the amplest manner for the security of individual property as held at the time of the transfer of the sovereignty, but the reservation of political rights or privileges in behalf of individuals would be inconsistent with the political power which it is proposed to vest in the United States.

If you should succeed in making a treaty transferring the islands to the United States, it is advisable that it should receive the ratification of the Hawaiian Government before it is sent here for the consideration of the President and the Senate. You are directed to induce that Government to send on one or more persons at the same time the treaty is forwarded, clothed with full powers to assent to any modifications of it which may here be made. In view of the great uncertainty as to the terms by which the cession of the sovereignty of the islands may be encumbered, the carrying out of this suggestion is deemed to be of great importance.

I have good reason to believe that some of the leading powers of Europe would be very unwilling to see the Sandwich Islands become a part of the United States, and, if an opportunity occurred, would endeavor to defeat any negotiation for that purpose. This consideration and others make it important that you should bring it to a close as expeditiously as possible. The treaty should be here in time to be submitted to the Senate at its present session.

I am, etc.,

W. L. MARCY.

Mr. Gregg to Mr. Marcy.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Honolulu, July 26, 1854.

SIR: The Hawaiian cabinet has determined at length that it will not do to allow much longer delay in bringing to a close arrangements for annexation. On the 17th a meeting was held, at which Prince Alexander was present, when it was agreed that the minister of foreign relations should immediately proceed, if possible, to arrange and sign a treaty to be submitted to the King for ratification. Mr. Wyllie called on me the next day, and we have since had several conferences, but without as yet arriving at any definite result. The difficulty, I apprehend, is that more will be demanded in the way of consideration, etc., than ought to be yielded. It is probable that by the next mail it will be in my power to communicate something more definite than I am now able to do. I have the assurance of Mr. Wyllie that, so far as he is concerned, there shall be no occasion to complain of further procrastination, and I can not doubt he is in earnest.

Prince Alexander is responsible for all past delay, and he will not hesitate to incur the responsibility of still more, unless his mind is brought to the conviction, which everyone else entertains, that it is impossible for him ever to wear a crown. He evidently sees that the existing Government is in danger, and wishes to be in condition to escape it when the crisis comes, but hopes strongly that it may be averted. If a treaty is once signed he will not oppose its ratification directly and openly, but strive to postpone it to the last moment compatible with safety.

I am convinced that a revolution will soon take place if a treaty of annexation is not concluded. The foreign residents—especially Americans—are becoming impatient under the present state of things and will not be disposed to endure much longer the feebleness and inefficiency of the Government. They have power enough in their hands, if they act in concert, to do anything they wish, and in a single week could subvert the throne and establish a republic upon its ruins.

* * * * * * * *

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

DAVID L. GREGG.

Mr. Gregg to Mr. Marcy.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Honolulu, August 7, 1854.

SIR: I am only able to write briefly by the mail which goes this afternoon, being much debilitated by an attack of sickness from which I am just convalescent.

* * * * * * * *

The Government here rests on a volcano. Its subversion is within the power of the foreign residents, and I am prepared to witness an outbreak at any moment. The dissatisfaction with the present state of things is daily increasing, and a crisis of some sort is inevitable.

On Tuesday evening last, there was an intense alarm among the native population, on account of the supposed presence of "filibusters." The troops were called out and remained under arms all night. The apprehension seems to have been excited by the discovery of a box of pistols among some goods at the custom-house.

I have succeeded in arranging the terms of a treaty of annexation with the minister of foreign relations, which meets the approval of the Crown Prince and cabinet. But it is not yet signed, and I am unable to give you any assurance that it will be immediately completed. The pretense of delay is the supposed necessity of consulting the King, which for some time has been impossible on account of His Majesty's illness.

The great difficulty I had to encounter was the inveterate prejudice of the Hawaiian authorities against a territorial form of government, which could not be overcome. Finding it impossible to provide otherwise, I finally consented to agree to the admission of the islands as a State as soon as it could be done in conformity with the principles and requirements of the Federal Constitution, leaving the existing laws, so far as they are republican and consistent with such Constitution, in full force and effect in the meantime.

There was also much controversy as to the extent of consideration. The Government absolutely refused to listen to anything short of annuities to the extent of $300,000, and I finally yielded to the sine qua non which they presented, with the understanding that it was solely ad referendum.

I had intended to send you a copy of the treaty as agreed on, for information, but I have been altogether unequal to the task of making it in time for the present mail.

I have notified the minister of foreign relations that there must be a speedy diplomatical conclusion of our negotiations, and expressed the view

that any further delay will be inconsistent with the position of the Government of the United States in the transaction. He assents to bring about the signature of the treaty.

I may therefore express the hope that a final result will soon be attained. But I fear the occurrence of a state of things which will place me in some embarrassment. There is reason to believe that upon the ratification of the treaty there will be a desire and necessity of an immediate transfer of the sovereignty of the islands to the United States in order to guard against pressing danger. If such a crisis occurs, I shall deem myself justified in accepting a provisional transfer, subject to the provision of the treaty, or such arrangements as may be finally made by the two parties. This, I have no doubt, would be decisive as to the influences hereafter to prevail in the archipelago, whatever might be the view of our Government as to the cession. A flood of emigration would pour in from California the moment our flag was raised, sufficient to put a check upon all future British and French pretensions.

Yesterday I had an audience at the palace for the officers of the St. Mary. The King was unable to be present, owing to his illness, but he was represented by the Kuhina Nui, who always stands in his place when he can not perform his functions.

The British consul-general has demanded a personal audience of the King, to communicate to him certain views of his Government, which will take place as soon as His Majesty is recovered.

I have, etc.,

DAVID L. GREGG.

Mr. Gregg to Mr. Marcy.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Honolulu, September 15, 1854.

* * * * * * *

The negotiations for annexation are in the same condition as when my dispatch of the 7th instant was written. On Saturday last the cabinet had an audience with the King and laid before him a copy of the treaty in the Hawaiian language, and through Mr. Armstrong, as interpreter, explained it in all its particulars. He expressed himself as satisfied, as I am advised, but stated that he wished to consult particularly with a few of his chiefs before final action was taken. Unfortunately he has since been in such a state of infirmity as to be able to consult with no one, and it is difficult to predict when his present fit of illness will terminate. I have insisted upon the immediate signature of the treaty, and Mr. Wyllie admits that, according to diplomatic usage, there should be no further delay.

In my last dispatch I stated that I had notified him that the negotiations must be at once concluded. I have since addressed him a letter to the same effect, setting forth strongly the reasons which induced me to take this course. A copy of it is herewith inclosed for your information. Its representations I considered would have an important bearing in bringing matters to an issue, and I still think this will be the effect. I hope I did not go further than the President will be willing to approve. The peculiar circumstances which exist seemed to demand a strong expression on my part, with all the incidental references and suggestions which are employed. I acted with regard to what I supposed to be the peculiar exigencies of the times, and it has been intimated to me that my course will probably contribute to hasten matters to a conclusion.

I forward also a copy of the treaty, the terms of which were finally settled between Mr. Wyllie and myself on the 19th ultimo. I have already informed you of the utter impossibility of such provisions as I desired in the second and eighth articles. As they stand, they will be regarded as ad referendum so far as the United States are concerned. This, of course, was the only ground upon which I could place my assent to them, especially the last. From the protocols, which are not yet in condition to be copied for transmission, the true character of the negotiation and its embarrassing circumstances will more fully appear. I shall probably be able to send them by the next mail.

The provisions of the separate article were made a matter of positive demand by the Hawaiian cabinet. I refused to incorporate them into the body of the treaty, because they contemplate an object which, if effected at all, must be brought about before any final ratification can take place. The ratification of the treaty by this Government would undoubtedly quell any disturbances that might arise from American sources, but a conditional cession, as contemplated by such article, would forever practically settle all questions as to future influence and jurisdiction. The moment our flag was raised, a flood of immigration from California would pour in, sufficient, at least, to make the islands thoroughly American and to secure an equitable and fair arrangement if the terms of the present treaty are deemed unsatisfactory.

The return of Judge Lee from the island of Maui is expected in a few days. It was through his persuasions that the King made advances for annexation, and his influence with the chiefs and native population generally is greater than that of any man on the islands. I learn that he objects to the second article of the treaty on the ground that he does not think it provides explicitly enough for a State government. In this respect I have gone to the utmost limit of what, in my judgment, the Constitution allows, and if his advice leads this Government to exact impracticable conditions I shall, of course, be fully prepared to reject them.

The British consul-general has advised this Government that he will not, for the present, seek the audience which he formerly demanded, as I advised you in my last dispatch.

The effect of the publication in the New York Daily Tribune of July 20 has been unfortunate here in giving the British consul-general weapons to fight against the United States. I regret very much that any opportunity should have occurred at this junction to confirm, in the minds of the Hawaiians, the false impressions which are constantly sought to be created in regard to our purposes and policy. If the present negotiations fall through, I shall attribute it almost entirely to the effect of such publications as that of the Tribune and other papers of like character.

I have, etc.,

DAVID L. GREGG.

Treaty of annexation concluded between His Majesty the King of the Hawaiian Islands and the United States of America.

His Majesty the King of the Hawaiian Islands, being convinced that plans have been, and still are, on foot hostile to his sovereignty and to the peace of his Kingdom which His Majesty is without power to resist, and against which it is his imperative duty to provide, in order to prevent the evils of anarchy and to secure the rights and prosperity of his subjects, and having in conscientious regard thereto, as well as to the general interest of his Kingdom, present and future, sought to incorporate his Kingdom into the Union of the United States as the means best calculated to attain these ends and perpetuate the blessings of freedom and equal rights to himself, his chiefs, and his people; and the Government of the United States being actuated solely by the desire to add to their security and prosperity and to meet the wishes of His Majesty the King of the Hawaiian Islands, and of his Government, have determined to accomplish by treaty objects so important to their mutual and permanent welfare.

For that purpose His Majesty Kamehameha III, King of the Hawaiian Islands, has granted full powers to Robert Crichton Wyllie, esq., his minister of foreign affairs, his secretary at war and of the navy, member of his privy council of state, member of the house of nobles, and chairman of the commissioners of his privy purse; and the President of the United States has invested with like powers David Lawrence Gregg, esq., commissioner of said States to the said Kingdom; and the said plenipotentiaries, after exchanging their full powers, have agreed to and concluded the following articles:

ARTICLE I.

His Majesty the King of the Hawaiian Islands, acting in conformity with the power invested in him by the constitution of his Kingdom, and with the wishes of his chiefs and people, and of the heads of every department of his Government, cedes to the United States his Kingdom, with all its territories, to be held by them in full sovereignty, subject only to the same constitutional provisions as the other States of the American Union. This cession includes all public lots and squares, Government lands, mines and minerals, salt lakes and springs, fish ponds, public edifices, fortifications, barracks, forts, ports, and harbors, reefs, docks, and magazines, arms, armaments, and accouterments, public archives, and funds, claims, debts, taxes, and dues existing, available, and unpaid at the date of the exchange of the ratifications of this treaty.

ARTICLE II.

The Kingdom of the Hawaiian Islands shall be incorporated into the American Union as a State, enjoying the same degree of sovereignty as other States, and admitted as such as soon as it can be done in consistency with the principles and requirements of the Federal Constitution, to all the rights, privileges, and immunities of a State as aforesaid, on a perfect equality with the other States of the Union.

ARTICLE III.

His Majesty the King of the Hawaiian Islands, his chiefs and subjects of every class, shall continue in the enjoyment of all their existing personal and private rights—civil, political, and religious—to the utmost extent that is possible under the Federal Constitution, and shall possess and forever enjoy all the rights and privileges of citizens of the United States, on terms of perfect equality, in all respects, with other American citizens.

ARTICLE IV.

The decisions of the land commissioners, made and not appealed from at the date of the final ratification of this treaty, shall be and remain forever valid and undisturbed, and all titles to real estate, which are now or shall have then been declared valid under the laws of the Hawaiian Kingdom, shall be held to be equally valid by the United States, and measures shall be adopted by the United States for the speedy and final adjudication of all unsettled claims to land in conformity with the laws and usages under which they may have originated.

ARTICLE V.

All engagements of whatever kind affecting the rights of corporations or individuals, validly contracted and lawfully incumbent upon the King's Government or the Hawaiian nation to pay and discharge, shall be respected and fulfilled in as prompt, full, and complete a manner as they would have been respected and fulfilled had no change of sovereignty taken place.

ARTICLE VI.

The public lands hereby deeded shall be subject to the laws regulating the public lands in other parts of the United States, liable, however, to such alterations and changes as Congress may from time to time enact. The grants of land for the promotion of education heretofore made by the Government of the King of the Hawaiian Islands shall be confirmed by the United States, which, in addition thereto, shall grant and set apart for the purpose of common schools, seminaries of learning, and universities so much of the public lands and of the prodeeds thereof as may be equal proportionally to the grants for such purposes in any of the States of the Union.

ARTICLE VII.

The laws of the Hawaiian Kingdom, so far as they are compatible with Republican institutions and conformable to the Constitution of the United States, shall be and remain in full force and effect until modified, changed, or replaced by the legislative authority of the States contemplated by this treaty.

ARTICLE VIII.

In consideration of the cession made by this treaty, and in compensation to all who may suffer or incur loss consequent thereon, the United States shall pay the aggregate sum of $300,000 as annuities to the King, the Queen, the Crown Prince, those standing next in succession to the throne, the chiefs, and all other persons whom the King may wish to compensate or reward, to be apportioned as may be determined by His Majesty the King and his privy council of state, which amounts, to be apportioned as aforesaid, shall be paid ratably, without deduction or offset on any ground or in any shape whatever, to the parties severally named in such apportionment, at Honolulu, on the first day of July of each successive year so long as they may live. It is, however, expressly agreed upon that on the demise of his present Majesty the annuity of the immediate heir to the throne shall then be increased to the same amount before allowed and paid to the King himself.

As a further consideration for the cession herein made, and in order to place within reach of the inhabitants of the Hawaiian Islands the means of education, present and future, so as to enable them the more perfectly to enjoy and discharge the rights and duties consequent upon a change from monarchical to republican institutions, the United States agree to set apart and pay over for the term of ten years the sum of $75,000 per annum, one-third of which shall be applied to constitute the principal of a fund for the benefit of a college or university, or colleges or universities, as the case may be, and the balance for the support of common schools, to be invested, secured, or applied as may be determined by the legislative authority of the Hawaiian Islands when admitted as a State into the Union as aforesaid.

ARTICLE IX.

Immediately after the exchange of the ratifications of this treaty the President of the United States shall appoint a commissioner, who shall receive in due form, in the name of the United States, the transfer of the sovereignty and territories of the Hawaiian Islands; also all public property, archives, and other things hereinbefore stipulated to be conveyed, and who shall exercise all executive authority in said islands necessary to the preservation of peace and order, and to the proper execution of the laws, until the State contemplated in this treaty can be duly organized and admitted as such State; and until the arrival of such commissioner all departments of His Majesty's Government shall continue as now constituted.

ARTICLE X.

This treaty shall be ratified by the respective contracting parties, and the ratifications exchanged at the city of Honolulu within eight months from the date hereof, or sooner if possible, but it is agreed that this period may be extended by mutual consent of the two parties.

In witness whereof we, the undersigned, plenipotentiaries of His Majesty

the King of the Hawaiian Islands, and of the United States of America, have signed three originals of this treaty of annexation in Hawaiian and three in English, and have thereunto affixed our respective official seals.

Done at Honolulu this — day of ——, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and fifty-four.

SEPARATE AND SECRET ARTICLE.

Whereas it is desirable to guard against the exigencies declared in the preamble to the foregoing treaty, and to secure the King of the Hawaiian Islands, his chiefs, and all who reside under his jurisdiction, from the dangers therein referred to and expressed, it is hereby provided and expressly agreed that at any time before the final exchange of the ratifications of said treaty, if the same shall be duly ratified on the part of His Majesty the King and satisfactory notice thereof given to the commissioner of the United States, it shall be competent for His Majesty, by proclamation, to declare his islands annexed to the American Union, subject to the provisions of such treaty as negotiated; and the commissioner of the United States, for the time being, shall receive and accept the transfer of the jurisdiction of the said islands, in the name of the United States, and protect and defend them by the armed forces of the United States, as a part of the American Union, holding the same for and in behalf of his Government, and exercising the jurisdiction provided for in said treaty, with the understanding, however, that in case the said treaty is not finally ratified, or other arrangements made by the free consent and to the mutual satisfaction of the contracting parties, the sovereignty of the islands shall immediately revert, without prejudice, to His Majesty, or his immediate heir, in the same conditions as before the transfer thereof; and it is further understood and agreed that this article shall be as binding for all ends and purposes herein expressed as if it formed a part of the foregoing treaty.

Mr. Gregg to Mr. Marcy.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Honolulu, October 2, 1854.

SIR: In my dispatch of the 7th ultimo, I mentioned that the British consul-general had demanded an audience of the King for the purpose of communicating to him certain views of his Government. It was first appointed for the 6th ultimo, the same day as that fixed for the audience to the officers of the *St. Mary*, but the King being unable on account of illness to attend it was then postponed. Subsequently, however, although General Miller at first declined, an arrangement was made to receive him on the 18th, when he made an extemporaneous speech of an hour and a quarter against annexation to the United States and in dispraise of our country, her Government, and people.

The substance of his remarks has been stated to me by those who heard them. He deprecated annexation to the United States and represented it to be one of the worst evils which could befall the Hawaiian race, denouncing our institutions as corrupt in their tendency and wholly unequal to protect in security the enjoyment of life and property. As an illustration, he referred to California and described numerous disorders, which he alleged had prevailed there, in the strongest terms, predicting that the introduction of American rule in these islands would be the signal for the commencement of a similar state of things; in which the rights of the natives would be altogether lost sight of and sacrificed.

* * * * * * *

Since my dispatch of the 15th ultimo there has been no progress in regard to the treaty of annexation. The Crown Prince is absent on the island of Hawaii, but he has been sent for and his return is daily expected. This step resulted from my letter to the minister of foreign relations of the date of September 12, a copy of which I have already transmitted for your information. I inclose herewith an acknowledgment of its receipt, from which you will perceive the cause of any recent delay that has occurred.

I now feel some confidence that immediately upon the arrival of the prince, the treaty will be signed and ratified. The King is unwilling to have any action taken in his absence, but at the same time anxious to bring matters to a speedy conclusion. Liholiho has already given his formal assent to the negotiations so far, by countersigning with the ministers the protocols and also the draft of the treaty, a copy of which I have sent you. Present appearances indicate that the period of procrastination is nearly at an end, and I indulge the expectation of being able to send home a treaty of annexation in time for the commencement of the next session of Congress.

I have the, etc.,

DAVID L. GREGG.

Mr. Marcy to Mr. Gregg.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 31, 1855.

SIR: The policy of the United States in relation to the future of the Sandwich Islands is presented in the instructions heretofore given to you. That policy is not to accelerate or urge on any important change in the government of that country, but if it has or should become so far enfeebled that it can not be continued, and the sovereignty of the islands must be transferred to another power, then a state of things will exist in which it will be proper for the United States to have a regard to the future condition of that country.

If the Hawaiian goverment and people become convinced of the necessity of such a change, it is probable that they will, if left to their free choice, look to the United States as the country to which they would wish to be united. To a proper arrangement of this kind this Government certainly has no objection.

My dispatch of the 4th of April last has reference to such a contingency which it was then supposed was about to happen. In case a transfer of the islands was proffered to the United States, you were directed to enter into negotiations as to the terms of it and conclude a treaty on that subject. The outlines of such a treaty were contained in that dispatch.

You have apprised the Department that as soon as negotiations were opened you perceived that stipulations different from those indicated in your instructions were insisted on, and you very properly notified the Hawaiian authorities that you could only entertain them as matters to be referred to your Government for its approval or rejection.

The draft of a treaty you have forwarded to the Department has been considered by the President, and he directs me to say that he can not approve of some of the articles. If ratified in its present shape at Honolulu and sent hither, he would not probably submit it to the Senate. There are in his mind strong objections to the immediate incorporation of the islands in their present condition into the Union as an independent State. It was expected that the Hawaiian Government would be willing to offer the islands to the United States as a territory, and to leave the question in relation to their becoming a State to the determination of this Government, unembarrassed by stipulations on that point. The interest of both parties would seem to indicate this as the wisest course. A treaty which would embarrass the United States in their action on this question would therefore be objectionable.

There are other objections to the draft which you have sent to the Department, though less formidable than that which the second article presents. The amount to be paid as annuities, etc., according to the draft, is much larger than contemplated.

I think it would be proper that you should inform the Hawaiian Government that the United States would not be likely to approve of a treaty differing in important particulars from the terms contained in the dispatch of the 4th of April.

This Government will receive the transfer of the sovereignty of the Sandwich Islands with all proper provisions relative to the existing rights and interests of the people thereof, such as are usual and appropriate to territorial sovereignty. It will be the object of the United States, if clothed with the sovereignty of that country, to promote its growth and prosperity. This consideration alone ought to be a sufficient assurance to the people that their rights and interests will be duly respected and cherished by this Government.

In presenting objections to the draft of the treaty which you have sent to this Department, the President desires me to assure you that he takes no exception whatever to your course in this difficult and embarrassing negotiation, but, on the contrary, it is highly approved. Your efforts have been properly directed, and your ability is appreciated and commended. It gives me pleasure to concur in and communicate the President's approbation of your conduct.

I am, etc.,

W. L. MARCY.

Mr. Gregg to Mr. Marcy.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Honolulu, December 19, 1854.

SIR: The King of the Hawaiian Islands, Kamehameha III, died on Friday last, the 15th instant, after an illness of about two weeks. He was born on the 17th of March, 1813, being in his forty-second year. By his subjects he was universally beloved, and among them the manifestations of grief are universal and striking. With scarcely an exception the resident foreigners respected him and confided in his justice and generosity. His partiality to Americans has always been strong, and it will be universally conceded that by his decease they have lost a faithful and honorable friend.

* * * * * * *

On the same day the ascension of the Prince Royal Alexander Liholiho to the throne, under the style of Kamehameha IV, was proclaimed and received universal acquiescence. The young monarch will be 21 years of age on the 9th of February next. By the Hawaiian laws the age of majority for males is fixed at twenty, so that he becomes at once ruler de facto of the kingdom.

* * * * * * *

I have, etc.,

DAVID L. GREGG.

Mr. Gregg to Mr. Marcy.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Honolulu, December 29, 1854.

SIR: * * * From information which has recently come to my knowledge, I am inclined to entertain the opinion that the present head of the Government will be disposed to preserve, if possible, the separate independence of the Hawaiian Islands. I anticipate, therefore, a notification, as soon as affairs are somewhat settled, to the effect that the negotiations for annexation to the United States are no longer to be entertained. This is rather a matter of inference than of positive certainty, but my own mind is convinced that the anticipation I entertained will prove to be well founded.

American Policy for the Nicaragua Canal—Equal Commercial Advantages to all Nations—Military Advantages to the United States only.

SPEECH
OF
HON. EDWARD T. NOONAN,
OF ILLINOIS.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, May 2, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 2538) to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans—

Mr. NOONAN said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Political economy is the science of the production, distribution, and consumption of wealth, and political science is a knowledge of the causes and effects of the regulation thereof by the State.

Labor-saving devices, which bring the minds of men together or which lessen the cost to producer and to consumer, are the object of the inventive genius of man.

Transportation is one of the most successful applications of labor-saving devices, and even in this age of railway building the benefits and economy of waterway transportation were never more fully appreciated.

European nations have made great strides in the construction of waterway transportation. In Germany there are 29,461 miles of railroad and 8,654 miles of canals and rivers. In England and Wales there are 14,818 miles of railroad and 3,813 miles of canals.

France, with a population of 38,000,000, and only a total area of 203,000 square miles, has 23,693 miles of railroad and 5,475 miles of canals and rivers. The relative importance of the possible development and growth in the United States can be appreciated when it is considered that the area of France is about equal to that of Illinois, Wisconsin, Michigan, and Indiana, and from the further fact that the per capita circulation of money in France is greater than that of the United States.

The United States, with its 10,000 miles of coast, its few natural harbors, its chain of Great Lakes, and its great rivers, has as yet many great public improvements to make in the way of harbor construction, canalized rivers, canals, and ship canals.

SHIP CANALS FROM GREAT LAKES.

The people of the Northwest, the upper lake region, and the Mississippi Valley, are particularly concerned in the construction of ship canals from the lakes to the Atlantic seaboard, and from the lakes to the Gulf of Mexico.

The importance of the commerce carried on on the Great Lakes may be realized from the fact that during the year 1899 the tonnage passing through the St. Marys Falls Canal was 21,958,347 tons, and the total tonnage of the Great Lakes is estimated to have been over 50,000,000 tons.

Commenting on the increased cost in transportation of grain and other products from the lakes to the seaboard by the transshipment at Buffalo to canal boats or railroads, and the transshipment again at the seaboard of the same cargoes to ocean-going vessels, and as a discrimination in favor of these lines of transportation which operates to the disadvantage of the commerce of the Northwest, of the State of New York, and the nation, the distinguished New York engineer, Mr. E. P. North, says:

The continued maintenance of two toll gates in the United States, that the few may receive large gains from handling the minimum amount of merchandise to the loss of the many, is a commercial outrage, and we have to go back to the revenue reforms of the Rhine barons for an analogue.

Pursuant to a joint resolution of Congress passed in February, 1895, for the purpose of inquiring and reporting whether it is feasible to build a ship canal from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic Ocean, a commission, consisting of Lyman E. Cooley, of Illinois, James B. Angell, of Michigan, and John E. Russell, of Massachusetts, was appointed.

In 1897 the commission submitted an elaborate report to Congress, the conclusions of which are in part as follows:

First. That it is entirely feasible to construct such canals and develop such channels as will be adequate to any scale of navigation that may be desired between the several Great Lakes and the seaboard, and to conduct through same domestic and foreign commerce, and that, in our opinion, it will be wise to provide for securing a channel of navigable depth of not less than 28 feet.

Second. That, starting from the heads of Lakes Michigan and Superior, the most eligible route is through the several Great Lakes and their intermediate channels and the proposed Niagara Ship Canal (Tonawanda to Olcott) to Lake Ontario; and that the Canadian seaboard may be reached from Lake Ontario by way of the St. Lawrence River, and the American seaboard may be reached from Lake Ontario by way of the St. Lawrence River and Lake Champlain and the Hudson River, or by the Oswego-Oneida-Mohawk Valley and the Hudson River.

* * * * * * *

Seventh. That the completion of the entire system as quickly as proper projects can be matured and economically executed is fully justified.

Eighth. That the Niagara Ship Canal should be first undertaken, and incidentally the broadening and further deepening of the intermediate channels of the lakes, the same being in the logical order of development and also requiring the least time for consideration.

Pursuant to an act of Congress of June, 1896, directing the Secretary of War to make surveys and estimates of cost of construction of a ship canal by the most practicable route, wholly within the United States, from the Great Lakes to the navigable waters of the Hudson River, of sufficient capacity to transport the tonnage of the lakes to the sea, an exhaustive report was submitted to Congress in July, 1897, by Maj. Thomas W. Symons, of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, the conclusions of which are in part as follows:

A ship canal which would permit lake vessels to reach tide water and ocean vessels to reach lake ports would be valuable in reducing and regulating lake freights, transfer charges, etc., on such freight as might be tributary thereto.

To justify construction the benefits to be derived from such a canal should be clearly shown to be suitably commensurate with its cost and the cost of maintenance and necessary improvements.

The present and prospective conditions of lake and interlake channels and harbors limit the reasonable depth of a ship canal to that required for vessels of 20-foot draft.

Any ship canal built should be entirely within the territory of the United States, and should terminate at a first-class American seaport and commercial and manufacturing center, in order that Western products for domestic consumption, as well as those designed for exportation, may be transported at minimum cost, and that return freight of the greatest possible magnitude may be secured, and the canal benefit alike the people of the West and of the East.

Any ship canal built should not only subserve the interest of foreign-bound commerce, but as well the domestic commerce between the centers of population in the East and the producing regions of the West.

Domestic commerce is of more importance to consider than the commerce destined to or from foreign countries.

A ship canal by the St. Lawrence route to Montreal, or by the St. Lawrence-Champlain route to New York, does not fulfill these conditions and should not be considered by the United States.

The route considered best for a ship canal is by the Niagara River, Lake Ontario, Oswego, Oneida Lake, and the Mohawk and Hudson rivers.

For the highest economy in transportation, special types of vessels are needed for use on the ocean, on the lakes, and on the canals, and neither can replace the other in its proper waters without suffering loss of efficiency. Ocean vessels could not, as a general rule, engage in the business of passing through a ship canal and the lakes to upper lake ports, and the lake vessels are not fitted for use upon the ocean, and if they made use of a canal they would have to transfer their cargoes at the seaboard. For economical transportation through a canal from the Great Lakes to the sea special vessels, differing from and far less costly than ocean or lake vessels, are required.

Important and serviceable canals already exist between the Great Lakes and the Hudson, the Erie Canal connecting Lake Erie with the Hudson, and the Oswego-Erie Canal connecting Lake Ontario with the Hudson. By these canals low rates of freight are attained.

These canals are being improved by the State of New York to the extent that when completed the capacity of the boats navigating them will be increased about 70 per cent, the time of transit will be materially reduced, and it will be possible and practicable to move freight between Lake Erie and New York for about 60 per cent of the present cost.

Under existing conditions and methods these canals require, and will when improved require, the transference of freight from lake vessels to canal boats, and vice versa, at lower lake ports. This transference is an important and expensive item in the cost of through freight, and its avoidance or material reduction is very desirable.

The amount of tonnage which it is estimated may be possibly tributary to a ship canal is 24,000,000 annually—18,000,000 tons transported eastward and 6,000,000 tons transported westward.

The cost of a ship canal suitable for use by the largest vessels of the lakes from Lake Erie to New York, and necessary work in connection therewith, would be approximately $200,000,000, and the cost of operation and maintenance would be approximately $2,000,000 per year. The cost would depend largely upon the arrangement which could be made with New York State for the possession of its canals, feeders, reservoirs, etc., which would necessarily be absorbed in the greater canal.

This able engineer opposes the construction of a ship canal and favors the enlargement of the Erie Canal.

The Erie Canal, as it is being enlarged by the State of New York, will, if all restrictions upon its use be removed, give commercial advantages practically equal to the commercial advantages which would be given by a ship canal. * * *

The construction of a ship canal from the Great Lakes to the sea is not a project worthy of being undertaken by the General Government, as the benefits to be derived therefrom would not be properly commensurate with the cost.

The enlargement of the Erie Canal as suggested, with everything adapted to transport the tonnage of the lakes, is a project worthy of being undertaken by the General Government, as the benefits to be derived therefrom would be properly commensurate with the cost.

The same distinguished engineer, in a recent contribution on the same subject, says:

The cost of constructing a ship canal, together with the needed improvements of lake harbors and interlake channels, such as would permit the realization of the beautiful picture of large ocean ships going to Chicago, Duluth, and other upper lake ports, would be so great as to be entirely incommensurate with the good to be accomplished thereby.

And, after discussing the various routes, he says:

And this leads up to the fact that the natural outlet of the Great Lake region, the line of least resistance and the shortest and cheapest route for a ship canal to tide water, is by the St. Lawrence to the seaport of Montreal.

For New York State to build such a canal, or permit it to be built, would, in my opinion, be to commit commercial suicide.

And instead of a ship canal he recommends that the Erie Canal be enlarged to accommodate boats or barges of 1,000 to 2,000 tons capacity, at an estimated cost of $60,000,000.

It is therefore apparent that the people of the Northwest and the upper lake region can only secure a ship canal from the Lakes to the seaboard by the consent of the State of New York, whose engineers only favor the enlargement of the Erie Canal.

The legislature of New York has recently appropriated $200,000 for surveys of the Erie Canal for this purpose.

A ship or barge canal from the Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico is a possibility of the near future. Chicago has contributed the greater part of the cost of the construction of such a waterway by the expenditure of $33,000,000. And it remains for Congress to complete this great work by Government surveys and the speedy enactment of necessary legislation and appropriations.

By the building of great canals from the Lakes to tide water on the Atlantic and on the Gulf, and the consequent cheapness of transportation of our grain and food stuffs, our iron, cotton, coal, coke, and lumber to the seaboard on their way to foreign markets, the assembling of raw materials, the cheap transportation of the manufactured products thereof, and the application of the laws of political economy and political science, the city of Chicago will attain supremacy in the industrial world, and the Mississippi Valley will become the manufacturing center of the world.

THE SUEZ CANAL.

The first and greatest triumph of engineering skill in the construction of ship canals in modern times is the artificial waterway which connects the Mediterranean and Red Sea.

In 1869, after fifteen years of arduous exploitation on the part of Ferdinand de Lesseps, the Suez Canal became an accomplished fact. It is a canal 99 miles long with no locks, which had cost, up to the time of opening, about $20,000,000, and whose stock in the market is now worth seven times its original cost.

The English Government in 1875 purchased from the Khedive about one-half of the total issue of stock at a premium, and by her occupation of Egypt in 1882 increased her power over the canal.

The tonnage for the year 1899 through the Suez Canal was 9,893,022. Receipts for tolls, $17,510,142. The total number of vessels passing through the canal was 3,480, of which 2,207 carried the British flag and only 25 the American flag.

From 1877 to 1883 De Lesseps proposed to the English Government the canal should be neutralized. In 1888 the treaty of Constantinople was signed by Great Britain, France, and the six other great powers for the neutralization of the canal in peace and war.

Nevertheless, by the terms of the convention the neutrality of the strategic points of Gibraltar, Malta, Cyprus, Aden, and Port Said, all of which are owned and fortified by England, was not considered, and in regard to which I will have something to say later.

WAR MEASURES.

The German Government in 1895 opened the Kaiser Wilhelm Canal, connecting the North and Baltic seas, a distance of 61 miles, at a cost of $40,000,000. The canal runs through German territory, and was built as a war measure to enable the German fleet to be quickly moved from the Baltic to the North Sea. The canal is open to all nations at peace with Germany.

The great Trans-Siberian railroad is approaching completion. Russia will soon have in operation 4,300 miles of railroad, extending from St. Petersburg across Russia and Siberia through Manchuria, China, and a combined railroad and waterway in the direction of Irkutsk and Vladivostok. This great work will cost $500,000,000, of which $295,000,000 has already been expended. The net annual receipts are less than 1 per cent on the investment. Nevertheless, the present military necessities and the future commercial advantages more than commensurate the Russian Government for its expenditure.

NICARAGUA CANAL.

For centuries the commercial world has appreciated the benefits which would accrue from the construction of a canal to connect the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans.

Since the memorable trip by the U. S. battle ship *Oregon* of 12,000 miles around the Horn, this country has more fully appreciated the military necessity of such a waterway.

The Isthmus has been honeycombed with surveys which have resulted in three most practicable routes: The Darien, the Panama, and the Nicaragua. Of these, American capitalists and American engineers have concluded that the Nicaragua route is the best.

This bill provides for the construction of the Nicaragua Canal, 190 miles long, of which 70 miles is through Lake Nicaragua, at a cost of $140,000,000, to be owned and fortified by the United States.

The construction of a canal across the Isthmus during the last half century has been a constant subject of diplomatic correspondence and many treaty stipulations.

The most important treaties regarding same are what are known as the Clayton-Bulwer treaty and the Hay-Pauncefote treaty.

CLAYTON-BULWER TREATY.

The Clayton-Bulwer treaty was entered into April 19, 1850, for the immediate construction by English capital of the canal, and is in part as follows:

ARTICLE I.

The Governments of the United States and Great Britain hereby declare that neither the one nor the other will ever obtain or maintain for itself any exclusive control over the said ship canal, agreeing that neither will ever erect or maintain any fortifications commanding the same or in the vicinity thereof, or occupy, or fortify, or colonize, or assume or exercise any dominion over Nicaragua, Costa Rica, the Mosquito coast, or any part of Central America; nor will either make use of any protection which either affords or may afford, or any alliance which either has or may have to or with any state or people, for the purpose of erecting or maintaining any such fortifications, or of occupying, fortifying, or colonizing Nicaragua, Costa Rica, the Mosquito coast, or any part of Central America, or of assuming or exercising dominion over the same; nor will the United States or Great Britain take advantage of any intimacy, or use any alliance, connection, or influence that either may possess with any state or government through whose territory the said canal may pass, for the purpose of acquiring or holding, directly or indirectly, for the citizens or subjects of the one, any rights or advantages in regard to commerce or navigation through the said canal which shall not be offered on the same terms to the citizens or subjects of the other.

ARTICLE II.

Vessels of the United States or Great Britain traversing the said canal shall, in case of war between the contracting parties, be exempted from blockade, detention, or capture by either of the belligerents; and this provision shall extend to such a distance from the two ends of the said canal as may hereafter be found expedient to establish.

ARTICLE III.

In order to secure the construction of the said canal, the contracting parties engage that if any such canal shall be undertaken upon fair and equitable terms by any parties having the authority of the local government or governments through whose territory the same may pass, then the persons employed in making the said canal, and their property used or to be used for that object, shall be protected from the commencement of the said canal to its completion, by the Governments of the United States and Great Britain, from unjust detention, confiscation, seizure, or any violence whatsoever.

HAY-PAUNCEFOTE TREATY.

The Hay-Pauncefote treaty was entered into February 5, 1900, and, in the language of the President's message, "is to facilitate the construction of the canal and remove any objections which might arise out of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty," and is in part as follows:

To the Senate:

I transmit herewith, with a view to receive the advice and consent of the Senate to its ratification, a convention this day signed by the respective plenipotentiaries of the United States and Great Britain to facilitate the construction of a ship canal to connect the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, and to remove any objection which might arise out of the convention of April 19, 1850, commonly called the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, to the construction of such canal under the auspices of the Government of the United States.

WILLIAM McKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, D. C., February 5, 1900.

The United States of America and Her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, Empress of India, being desirous to facilitate the construction of a ship canal to connect the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, and to that end to remove any objection which may arise out of the convention of April 19, 1850, commonly called the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, to the construction of such canal under the auspices of the Government of the United States, without impairing the "general principle" of neutralization established in Article VIII of that convention, have for that purpose appointed as their plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States, John Hay, Secretary of State of the United States of America,

And Her Majesty the Queen of Great Britain and Ireland, Empress of India, the Right Honorable Lord Pauncefote, G. C. B., G. C. M. G., Her Majesty's ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the United States:

Who, having communicated to each other their full powers, which were found to be in due and proper form, have agreed upon the following articles:

ARTICLE I.

It is agreed that the canal may be constructed under the auspices of the Government of the United States, either directly at its own cost, or by gift or loan of money to individuals or corporations, or through subscription to or purchase of stock or shares, and that, subject to the provisions of the present convention, the said Government shall have and enjoy all the rights incident to such construction, as well as the exclusive right of providing for the regulation and management of the canal.

ARTICLE II.

The high contracting parties, desiring to preserve and maintain the "general principle" of neutralization established in Article VIII of the Clayton-Bulwer Convention, adopt as the basis of such neutralization the following rules, substantially as embodied in the convention between Great Britain and certain other powers, signed at Constantinople, October 29, 1888, for the free navigation of the Suez Maritime Canal, that is to say:

1. The canal shall be free and open, in time of war as in time of peace, to the vessels of commerce and of war of all nations, on terms of entire equality, so that there shall be no discrimination against any nation or its citizens or subjects in respect of the conditions or charges of traffic, or otherwise.

2. The canal shall never be blockaded, nor shall any right of war be exercised nor any act of hostility be committed within it.

* * * * * * *

7. No fortifications shall be erected commanding the canal or the waters adjacent. The United States, however, shall be at liberty to maintain such military police along the canal as may be necessary to protect it against lawlessness and disorder.

ARTICLE III.

The high contracting parties will, immediately upon the exchange of the ratifications of this convention, bring it to the notice of the other powers and invite them to adhere to it.

CONTENTIONS.

In opposing the passage of the bill, the distinguished chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee [Mr. BURTON] contends that—

The American policy, without dissent, for the first eighty-five years has been in favor of a neutral canal; that the Clayton-Bulwer treaty was made in pursuance of such policy, and is a subsisting treaty, and that the Hay-Pauncefote treaty is a triumph of diplomacy.

The honorable chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs [Mr. HITT] says:

That he objects to the passage of the bill by the House, because it utterly and defiantly violates a treaty which is in full force and which is vital and binding upon the conscience of every American.

The able chairman of the Appropriation Committee [Mr. CANNON] objects to the passage of the bill, because—

The commission now investigating is not prepared to say whether any canal should be constructed, or which is the best location on the Nicaragua route.

Mr. James Bassett Moore, formerly Assistant Secretary of State, and counsel for the Peace Commission at Paris, recently contributed to the literature upon this subject, in which he concludes:

First. That the Clayton-Bulwer treaty has been repeatedly and distinctly referred to and acted upon by the United States as a subsisting engagement, and has never, in fact, been declared to be at an end.

Second. That if the Clayton-Bulwer treaty were abrogated the situation would not be radically altered, since the neutralization of the canal is guaranteed by various other treaties.

Third. That the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, while adhering to the policy of neutralization, permits the United States to construct, own, and manage the canal, does away with all stipulations for joint intervention, and concedes to the United States the liberty to afford protection against lawlessness and disorder.

Another distinguished gentleman, Mr. James Gustavus Whitely, vice-president of the International Diplomatic Congress, has contended that—

The Clayton-Bulwer treaty has long been a menace to the peaceful relations of England and America on account of the divergent views entertained in the United States as to its validity and utility.

From time to time parties have risen which desired to secure exclusive control of the canal, and which, therefore, convinced themselves that the treaty was no longer binding. There has always been a danger that these views would induce some misguided Administration to disregard at a critical juncture the obligations and agreement and bring on a dispute—perhaps a conflict—with England. With admirable foresight, Mr. Hay has taken up the question at a convenient season and in a friendly manner. A dangerous source of dispute is settled, for the meaning of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty is made premise by a new agreement.

The legitimate ambitions of the United States are gratified by receiving the right to build and own the canal.

* * * * * * *

The Hay-Pauncefote treaty declares that it shall be open to the ships of all nations in time of war as well as in time of peace, and that the powers shall be invited to guarantee the neutrality of the route; that the details are practically the same regulations as those adopted for the Suez Canal.

It is an error to suppose that the neutralization of the canal is contrary to the Monroe doctrine. That doctrine was designed to prevent a combination of European powers from intervening in the internal affairs of the American nation. An agreement among European and American States to neutralize a portion of the Isthmus is an engagement not to meddle with that

portion of America. Hence it is a contract to observe the Monroe doctrine so far as that part of the Isthmus is concerned.

I contend that the American policy for the last generation has been opposed to a neutral canal; that while the Clayton-Bulwer treaty may be a subsisting treaty, its provisions relating to the canal are not binding upon the American conscience; that the Hay-Pauncefote treaty is in violation of the Monroe doctrine, and is anything but a triumph of American diplomacy.

The passage of this bill by the House of Representatives is an expression of the policy of the American people in regard to the control of the Nicaragua Canal. It is notice to the executive department of the Government, and to the treaty-making power, that if there be existing treaties which are in danger of being violated, the occasion is ripe for our diplomatic representatives to subserve the will of the American people.

CONSTRUCTION OF CLAYTON-BULWER TREATY.

It is true that divergent views have been entertained in the United States regarding the validity of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. Refreshing utterances have been made by American statesmen from time to time regarding this treaty.

President Hayes, in his message to Congress in 1880, said:

The policy of this country is a canal under American control. The United States can not consent to the surrender of this control to any European power or to any combination of European powers.

* * * * * * *

If existing treaties between the United States and other nations, or if the rights of sovereignty or property of other nations stand in the way of this policy—a contingency which is not apprehended—suitable steps should be taken by just and liberal negotiations to promote and establish the American policy on this subject consistently with the rights of the nations to be affected by it.

In a letter to Mr. Lowell, our minister at London, James G. Blaine, while Secretary of State, wrote June 24, 1881:

Nor in time of peace does the United States seek to have any exclusive privileges accorded to American ships in respect to precedence or tolls through an interoceanic canal any more than it has sought like privileges for American goods in transit over the Panama Railway, under the exclusive control of an American corporation.

* * * * * * * *

It is as regards the political control of such a canal, as distinguished from its merely administrative or commercial regulation, that the President feels called upon to speak with directness and with emphasis. During any war to which the United States of America or the United States of Colombia might be a party, the passage of armed vessels of a hostile nation through the Canal of Panama would be no more admissible than would the passage of the armed forces of a hostile nation over the railway lines joining the Atlantic and Pacific shores of the United States or of Colombia. And the United States of America will insist upon her right to take all needful precautions against the possibility of the Isthmus transit being in any event used offensively against her interests upon the land or upon the sea.

In another letter, dated November 19, 1881, Mr. Blaine wrote to Mr. Lowell, referring to the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, and used the following vigorous language:

This convention was made more than thirty years ago, under exceptional and extraordinary conditions which have long since ceased to exist—conditions which at best were temporary in their nature, and which can never be reproduced.

* * * * * * *

The presumptive intention of the treaty (Clayton-Bulwer) was to place the two powers on a plane of perfect equality with respect to the canal, but in practice, as I have indicated, this would prove utterly delusive, and would instead surrender it, if not in form, yet in effect, to the control of Great Britain.

* * * * * * *

For self-protection to her own interests, therefore, the United States in the first instance asserts her right to control the Isthmus transit; and, secondly, she offers by such control that absolute neutralization of the canal as respects European powers which can in no other way be certainly attained and lastingly assured.

* * * * * * *

The following is a summary of the changes necessary to meet the views of this Government:

First. Every part of the treaty which forbids the United States fortifying the canal and holding the political control of it in conjunction with the country in which it is located to be canceled.

Secretary Frelinghuysen, in 1882, in a letter to the United States minister at London regarding this treaty, said:

Under the treaty of 1850, while it is binding, the United States have not the right to exercise dominion over or to colonize one foot of territory in Central America. Great Britain is under the same rigid restrictions. And if Great Britain has violated and continues to violate that provision, the treaty is, of course, voidable at the pleasure of the United States.

The Clayton-Bulwer treaty was concluded to secure a thing which did not exist and which now never can exist.

The President does not feel himself warranted in making any engagement or any admission respecting the extinct provisions of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty.

To the suggestion made by Lord Granville that the United States should take the initiative in an invitation to other powers to participate in an agreement based upon the convention of 1850, the President is constrained to say that the United States can not take part in extending such an invitation, and to state with entire frankness that the United States would look with disfavor upon an attempt at a concert of political action by other powers in that direction.

A TRIUMPH OF DIPLOMACY?

The distinguished chairman of the River and Harbor Committee declares that the "Hay-Pauncefote treaty is a triumph of diplomacy." I think the great majority of the American people regard it as a triumph of English diplomacy.

The first line of Article I says:

It is agreed that the canal shall be constructed under the auspices of the Government of the United States.

The Government of England agrees that we may construct it at our public or private expense and give her an equal share of its military and commercial advantages. And this is "a triumph of diplomacy" on the part of our distinguished Secretary of State, our former ambassador to the Court of St. James. If this be a "triumph of diplomacy," alas for the efforts of Jefferson, Monroe, Adams, Jackson, Seward, and Blaine.

It can hardly be considered a triumph of diplomacy for the distinguished Secretary of State to recognize and revive, at this most inauspicious time, the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, which was officially declared by some of his predecessors to be "voidable" and "violated" by the English Government as to its provisions regarding the colonization and exercise of dominion over territory in Central America, and as "extinct," "delusive" and "to be canceled," and "contrary to the Monroe doctrine" in its provisions relating to the Nicaragua Canal.

If the ulterior motive of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty be to prevent the construction of the canal, or as a dilatory measure, it certainly is a triumph of diplomacy for the opponents to the passage of a bill at this time by Congress for its construction.

MONROE DOCTRINE.

I contend that the Hay-Pauncefote treaty is in violation of the Monroe doctrine. Professor Vattel long ago, in his able work on the Law of Nations, gave expression to the fundamental idea that—

The end or object of civil society is to procure for the citizens whatever they stand in need of for the necessities, the convenience, the accommodation of life, and in general whatever constitutes happiness with the peaceful possession of property, a method of obtaining justice with security, and, finally, a mutual defense against all external violence.

* * * * * * *

Since, then, a nation is obliged to preserve itself, it has a right to everything necessary for its preservation.

* * * * * * *

A nation ought carefully to avoid, as much as possible, whatever might cause its destruction. * * *

A nation has a right to everything that can help to ward off imminent danger and to keep at a distance whatever is capable of causing its ruin, and that from the very same reasons to establish its right to the things necessary to its preservation.

It ought to avoid what may hinder its perfection or retard its progress.

And the doctrine enunciated by President Monroe to the effect that the United States considered the extension of the European system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety, has become firmly established as part of the American policy. And in the light of recent events, its maintenance is absolutely necessary for the welfare of this country.

Secretary of State Frelinghuysen said, in his letter to our minister at London, in 1882:

The President, therefore, considers it unnecessary and unwise, through an invitation to the nations of the earth, to guarantee the neutrality of the transit of the Isthmus, or to give their navies a pretext for assembling in waters contiguous to our shores, and to possibly involve this Republic in conflicts from which its natural position entitles it to be relieved.

* * * * * * *

That the formation of a protectorate by European nations over the Isthmus transit would be in conflict with a doctrine which has for many years been asserted by the United States. * * *

It is not necessary now to define that doctrine, but its history clearly shows that it at least opposes any intervention by European nations in the political affairs of American republics. * * *

The doctrine formulated by Monroe and expounded by Adams has since remained a cardinal principle of our continental policy.

To assert that the Hay-Pauncefote treaty is a contract to observe the Monroe doctrine as far as that part of the Isthmus is concerned is a fallacy. By its ratification this Government would surrender to all nations part of the territory of the Isthmus and afford greater accessibility to our coasts, which in time of war would be a greater potential danger to this country than would be the acquisition or colonization of territory by any European nation in Central America, Mexico, Venezuela, Brazil, or the Danish Islands, for instance.

NEUTRALITY OF SUEZ CANAL.

The Hay-Pauncefote treaty provides that in order to preserve the general principles of neutrality of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty it adopts as a basis the rules substantially embodied in the treaty of Constantinople for free navigation of the Suez Canal. That the canal shall be free and open in time of war as in time of peace to vessels of commerce and of war of all nations.

Mr. Blaine, when Secretary of State, in his letter of November 19, 1881, relating to the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, says, regarding the control of the Suez Canal by England:

And as England insists by the might of her power that her enemies in war shall strike her Indian possessions only by doubling the Cape of Good Hope, so the Government of the United States will equally insist that the interior, more speedy, and safer route of the canal shall be reserved for ourselves, while our enemies, if we shall ever be so unfortunate as to have any, shall be remanded to the voyage around Cape Horn.

Lord Granville, the British prime minister, in reply to this point, says:

Her Majesty's Government can not admit that the analogy which it is sought to draw from the conduct of Great Britain in regard to the Suez Canal is correct or justified by the facts. They have made no attempt to fortify the Island of Cyprus, or to establish it as an armed position on an important scale, though they have an undoubted right to do so. The fortress at Gibraltar, the island of Malta, and the military establishment of Aden came into the possession of England at a date long anterior to the time when the Mediterranean and the Red Sea could be regarded as a military route to India.

And his lordship further facetiously observes:

Nor has any serious addition been made to the strength of these positions since the opening of the canal beyond what has been a natural consequence of the improvements in military science.

While the treaty of Constantinople guaranteed the neutrality of the Suez Canal, it does not guarantee the neutrality of the English forts of Gibraltar, Malta, Cyprus, Aden, and Port Said to any enemy of England. The neutrality of the Suez Canal to any power at war with England is a delusion and a snare.

CONCLUSION.

Twenty years ago arguments were made by American statesmen that during the thirty years that had elapsed the change in circumstances surrounding the subject-matter of the canal justified the cancellation and abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. Since that time events have transpired which more than fortify the arguments then made.

As to the perpetuity of the obligation of a treaty where the subject-matter is a question of expediency and may be rendered inapplicable to the new conditions of things, I desire to quote from that distinguished English authority on international law, Sir Robert Phillemore (volume 3, page 800), who in 1885 said:

It appears to the writer of these pages that the doctrine intended to be conveyed in the English note was "that the doctrine is that there is a distinction between the parts of a treaty which recognize a principle and object of permanent policy and the parts relating to objects of passing and temporary expediency."

Most international compacts, especially treaties of peace, are of a mixed character, and contain articles of both kinds, which renders it frequently difficult to distinguish between those stipulations which are perpetual in their nature and such as are extinguished by war between the contracting parties, or by such changes of circumstances as affect the being of either party, and thus render the compact inapplicable to the new condition of things.

I repeat the utterance of President Harrison in his message to Congress December 9, 1891:

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN], in his argument upon this subject before the Senate at the last session, did not overestimate the importance of this work, when he stated that "the canal is the most important subject now connected with the commercial growth and progress of the United States."

And I declare that, next to the construction of the Nicaragua Canal, the most important work for the industrial development of the United States is the construction of great inland canals from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic seaboard and to the Gulf of Mexico.

Now, Mr. Chairman, while the importance of the Nicaragua Canal to the commerce of the world and to the United States is obvious, its construction as a military necessity is paramount, and our arguments for the American policy against neutrality in times of war are wholly based upon the considerations of military necessity and self-preservation.

Whenever and by whomsoever a canal may be built connecting the waters of the Atlantic and the Pacific, the American policy is to grant equal commercial privileges of that canal to all nations, and by the application of the Monroe doctrine it will retain the military advantages of that canal to the United States only. And in stating this proposition, I believe, Mr. Chairman, I represent nine-tenths of my constituency.

Trusts.

SPEECH
OF
HON. HENRY F. NAPHEN,
OF MASSACHUSETTS,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Thursday, May 31, 1900.

The House having under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 138) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States—

Mr. NAPHEN said:

Mr. SPEAKER: How to deal with trusts is one of the most important problems which absorbs the public thought to-day. It is not temporary; it will remain until properly solved. I admit that paternal theory of government is very objectionable, yet I believe that the National Government, which protects us from foes from without, should have authority to guard us against foes from within—combinations which restrain trade, create monopolies, and increase or decrease the price of commodities at their will. They are commercial cancers on the body politic, and if not removed will endanger our safety.

In 1865 Abraham Lincoln wrote:

I see in the near future a crisis approaching that unnerves me and causes me to tremble for the safety of my country. As a result of the war, corporations have been enthroned, and an era of corruption in high places will follow, and the money power of the country will endeavor to prolong its reign upon the prejudices of the people until all the wealth is aggregated into a few hands and the Republic is destroyed. I feel at this moment more anxiety for the safety of the country than ever before, even in the midst of war.

Prophetic words—the crisis to which he referred is upon us. We require legislation to protect us from the power of corporations and trusts. I am therefore emphatically in favor of a constitutional amendment giving to Congress authority to deal with this danger. I object, however, to the amendment in its present form.

Section 1 reads as follows:

All powers conferred by this article shall extend to the several States, the Territories, and the District of Columbia, *and all territory under the sovereignty and subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.*

By the language of this section I am justified in assuming that the majority of the Judiciary Committee maintain that the Constitution does not extend to Porto Rico or the Philippines of its own force and vigor, and that Congress can extend it or withhold it as in its judgment seems best.

The United States includes all places over which our jurisdiction extends. Our jurisdiction extends over new possessions, and its peoples owe us their allegiance. Those islands are as much a part of our great Republic as Alaska or Oklahoma, and the Constitution is as much there as it is in any of our domestic Territories. The Constitution is the source of all power given to Congress to legislate. This power is not absolute. The Constitution is the measure and test of this power. Whatever powers are not expressed or implied from the grants in the Constitution are reserved, and Congress can not act outside or beyond those powers. To assert otherwise is to say that it is greater than its creator—the Constitution. If the Constitution does not extend to our new possessions of its own force and vigor, and it requires Congressional action to send it there—and we have not exported it there yet—by what process will the proposed amendment to the Constitution reach there in advance of the instrument itself?

If we admit that in any emergency an amendment to the Constitution can by an act of Congress apply to those islands and the rest of the instrument be withheld, we concede that any section or clause of this instrument can be detached by Congress, and that Congress can extend it to one portion of our land to-day and take it away from another part to-morrow, for the power to repeal is incident to the power to enact; and the people would be at the mercy of the arbitrary power of Congress to establish royalty or other unrepublican institutions or form of government as it saw fit, and this government would no longer be of the people, by the people, and for the people. The Constitution must not become the shuttlecock for Congress, to be sported back and forth, here and there, as its fancy may dictate. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Section 2 of the proposed amendment reads as follows:

Congress shall have power to define, regulate, control, prohibit, or dissolve trusts, monopolies, or combinations, whether existing in the form of a corporation or otherwise. The several States may continue to exercise such power in any manner not in conflict with the laws of the United States.

By this section Congress will be the sole depositary of the power on this subject. Where power is given to Congress over a certain subject-matter to regulate, power over such subject-matter is taken from the States and can not be reserved to them by general terms, as in this section. There can not be concurrent jurisdiction in the State and Federal courts or legislatures where the legislative or judicial power to define and regulate is placed in Congress. We should reserve to the States respectively the power which they possess at the present time over this question, when a trust or a combination exists or operates exclusively within the confines of a single State.

The proposed amendment will take all powers from the States and nullify the existing State statutes. I admit that laws have been passed by many of the States to prohibit those unlawful combinations, and that they have increased and grown strong. So they have likewise regardless of the law enacted by Congress. It is rather the lack of the enforcement of the law, than the lack of the law that is the cause of their growth.

In no State are there stronger laws against combinations than in Massachusetts. The main purpose sought by the laws of Massachusetts is to protect the consuming public from overcharge, and at the same time protect the investor in shares of corporations organized in that State. There is no power, however, to protect the public from investments in shares of overcapitalized and fraudulent corporations organized in other States.

If it were possible for all States to adopt laws similar to those in Massachusetts, or if Federal laws on the subject could be adopted, the result would be a desirable one. It is needless to say that the proposed amendment will nullify the existing statutes on this subject of Massachusetts. This amendment may also interfere with the police power, under which States in legislating exercise governmental functions of the highest order, and of a class with which

the courts should not interfere, as there is a difficulty to determine sometimes how far certain legislation can be upheld under the police power.

Chief Justice Fuller in the Knight case said:

It is vital that the independence of the commercial power and of the police power and the delimitation between them, however sometimes perplexing, should always be recognized and observed, for while the one furnished the strongest bond of union, the other is essential to the preservation of the autonomy of the States as required by our dual form of government; and acknowledged evils, however grave and urgent they may appear to be, had better be borne than the risk be run, in the effort to suppress them, or more serious consequences by resort to expedients of even doubtful constitutionality.

Section 2 is further objectionable by the fact that the word "combinations" might be construed to refer to labor organizations, and might therefore prohibit such combinations to protect their rights. It should be amended to apply to combinations in restraint of trade and be distinctly stated not to apply to labor organizations, which are necessary for the protection of the workmen of this country, as many of the trusts have greater control to-day over labor than in the past, and have it within their power to coerce the workmen to become more submissive. It therefore becomes necessary for the laboring man to organize for self-protection, and such organizations should not come within the prohibition of this amendment.

The attitude of the Republican party on this trust question is much like the citizen who was in favor of the prohibitory law but against its enforcement. The Republican party professes to be against trusts. Though laws have been upon our statute books against combinations they have not been enforced when the representatives of this party had the power. This Constitutional amendmend coming now on the eve of the adjournment of Congress, is convincing proof to any observer, that it is offered for campaign purposes, and not in good faith.

The Republican party has been in power four years, yet no attempt had been made to legislate against trusts or combinations until after a resolution to amend the Constitution to enlarge the power of Congress on this subject was offered at the beginning of the present session by a Democrat. Even in the last Republican national convention no reference was made to trusts, though the Democratic party in one of the planks of its last national platform declared that—

The formation of trusts and pools require a stricter control by the Federal Government over these arteries of commerce.

Away down deep in the souls of the advocates of this amendment they do not want it to become a law. Though professing to offer it for the welfare of the people, it is offered for the welfare of their party, and they are attempting to mislead the people as to the real cause of the trusts and the remedy to reach them. They know full well that without reserving to the States the power they now possess this amendment will never be adopted. It is simply a sop thrown out to the public which they will not accept.

The people do not want politics; they will not be deceived—they want justice and fair dealing. They want a party to be honest in its declarations. If not, the people will sooner or later discover this and inflict a punishment. Nevertheless, if this be the only legislation that through the generosity of the Republican party we can obtain, with all its faults I shall be constrained to vote for it, as I am against trusts and combinations in restraint of trade, first, last, and always, and any legislation having that end in view I cheerfully welcome. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, there will be no necessity for a constitutional amendment if we reduce the high tariff. Trusts are the direct result of this high-tariff policy. It is their incubator, and while it exists they will continue to multiply and grow strong.

By excluding foreign productions or enhancing their price to such an extent that they could not be sold here, except at greatly more than their actual value—that is, the cost of their production plus a reasonable profit—an opportunity was afforded to the American manufacturer to increase or decrease the price of his product without adding to the cost of production. The result of this was that a large amount of capital was immediately invested in the protected industries. Manufacturing industries were multiplied, and this increase, coupled with the invention of machinery and processes, so stimulated production that it outran the demand for the product.

That was the condition which confronted the country when the trust movement began. The unit of production had exceeded the unit of consumption. This meant that when sufficient goods had been made to meet the demand, production must be suspended for a greater or less length of time, according to the facility and rapidity of the manufacturer of the particular article. This condition led to the formation of trusts. Those carrying on a certain industry combined, not to find a wider market for their products, not for the public good, but to increase prices by curtailing production.

A, B, and C, for instance, engaged in a certain manufacture, came together and agreed to run their plants a certain portion of the time, or they shut down the factory of C and turned the workmen into the street, and increased the price of the article without increasing the wages of the workmen. This they could do when they were the principal producers of the article in question. The hardship fell first upon the employees who were employed only a part of the time, or who lost their employment altogether, and next upon the general public, who were obliged to pay the increased price. The result is that the prices of everything we buy to-day are not regulated "honestly by fair and open competition in the public market," but arbitrarily and dishonestly by "combinations."

The people pay extravagantly for every article used which is controlled by such combinations. They charge the maximum price for everything purchased, and if they have an excess of product they send it abroad, selling it in competition with the foreign products, which they say would ruin them if admitted to this country, at prices less than the people pay here. American products of innumerable kinds can be purchased cheaper in European countries, for less than we are compelled to pay for them in America. Steamers plying between New York and Boston and Philadelphia and European ports buy their supplies—mostly American—on the other side of the Atlantic, because they are cheaper there than they are here.

If foreign products were admitted to this country with only a reasonable rate of duty, and the American producer placed his price at an exorbitant figure, the people could buy the foreign article and the home producer would be compelled to lower his price, and we would have the same advantage which the foreign consumers of American products now get at the expense of the people here. In other words, the doctrine of the trust manipulators is, "keep out the competition of foreign producers; restrict our production to what the people must have, and make them pay the uttermost dollar we can squeeze out of them."

Though the price of every article which is absolutely necessary to the existence of the American workman has increased, his earnings have not increased in proportion. His vote, however, can secure for him a cheaper market, if he but exercise his rights.

Another serious objection to trusts is the opportunity it affords for overcapitalization; that is, A, B, and C, which are each worth $50,000, can form a stock company and put the capital at $300,000.

This overcapitalization is a great stimulus to speculation and gambling in trust stocks. The president of a corporation can realize more in a month in "bulling" and "bearing" the stocks of his corporation than the corporation can legitimately make in a year. The business of the trust, whether the manufacture of sugar, tobacco, or copper, is sacrificed to the dealing in its securities. These are elevated or depressed in value, by artificial means, without reference to the actual business conditions or profits of the mine, factory, or refinery. The necessity of declaring a dividend to maintain the market price of the stock may necessitate a reduction of expenses, which almost invariably means a reduction in the wages of the workmen, and hence come strikes, violence, bloodshed, the interposition of troops, distress to employees, general demoralization, and loss to both employers and employees.

These trusts are dangerous to the public in other ways. They control vast sums of money. The aggregate capital of all trusts in this country to-day is not much below $5,000,000,000, which is equal to one-fifth of the assessed valuation of all taxable property of the United States at the time of the last census. In 1898 alone there were 98 new trusts organized, with a capital amounting to nearly $2,000,000,000.

They have influenced legislatures, packed juries, defied the law, and done more to lower the standard of political honesty and morality than all the other agencies combined. They support lobbies. There is no more dangerous tendency in the United States than the increasing use of money in procuring legislation. The logical outcome of this tendency will be that we shall have a government of money and not of men.

Pretty much everything that is consumed is now controlled by the trusts, and the cost has been increased by restriction of production or the necessity of paying dividends on watered stock. And this increase extends to every article that is used into which enters any product controlled by a trust. It touches us indirectly in innumerable ways. By indirectly I mean without perhaps bringing the fact to the attention of the people directly.

The iron and steel trust enhances the price of steel rails, for instance. You may think that this does not affect the public, as they are not dealing in steel rails, but the increased cost to the railroads directly affects the people in the matter of fares. Every increase in running expenses deprives a railroad of so much money, which otherwise would be expended in greater facilities, better accommodations, and lower rates. It affects the cost of stoves, and tools, and the thousand and one things into the manufacture of which iron enters. It increases the cost of machinery, and therefore the cost of everything the machinery produces.

The price of your coal is arbitrarily fixed by half a dozen men in New York. The output might be kept even and the price would be constantly reduced, but with an excess of supply the production is restricted and the price advanced.

Copper, tin, iron, steel, tobacco, sugar, salt, beef, leather, rubber, biscuits, and a hundred other articles are controlled by those gigantic monopolies, the stockholders of which grow rich at the public's expense.

The people are aware of the colossal fortunes which the Standard Oil Company has produced for its managers. The Rockefeller millions came from every man using a kerosene lamp. If these men had been contented with moderate incomes the oil would have cost less than one half of what is paid for it. But by bribery of legislatures, by collusion with railroad corporations, this company has built up the most stupendous monopoly that has ever existed. It has defied judicial control and wields a deadly war against any competitor.

The same thing is true, or will be true to a greater or less extent according to the opportunity offered, of all other trusts. They will grow in power and wealth, and unless they are checked they will become the real masters of the people. They control the legislation of the country and govern it as a matter of fact; and we have substantially come to a time when the people are almost helpless, and will soon be entirely helpless, unless they rouse themselves and put an effective stop to the present tendency.

This has been the result of Republican legislation. Now that the people have become disturbed and alarmed at the increase in number and power of these combinations, the Republican party is seeking by legislation to evade its responsibility in the matter, and to proclaim its purpose to repudiate its own offspring.

The attitude of the Republican party toward these organizations is well illustrated by Dogberry's instructions to the watch in Shakespeare's "Much Ado About Nothing."

DOGBERRY. This is your charge: You shall comprehend all vagrom men; you are to bid any man stand in the Prince's name.

WATCHMAN. How if he will not stand?

DOGBERRY. Why, then, take no note of him, but let him go; and presently call the rest of the watch together and thank God that you are rid of the knave.

The Republican party now bids the trusts to stand, but later will take no note of them and let them go.

We can control the industry of one country, if we are protected from competition from other countries; but we can not control a given industry all over the world. We might as well undertake to fix the output and price of any world-wide commodity for all countries and peoples.

The different conditions, advantages, necessities, intelligence, wants, industries, productive power, and climate prevent that uniformity and agreement which would be required to make industrial control of any product practically effective.

If our people are prevented by artificial contrivances from buying to advantage in this country, give them the privilege of the world's markets. Wherever you find a trust controlling a product, and arbitrarily enhancing its cost to the people, make that product free. In a world-wide competition the prices of the trust products would fall to their normal position, there would be no profits for inflated and watered capital, and the inducement of extravagant gains which led to the formation of these organizations being removed, they will close their books and go out of existence. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Rebellion Claim of the State of Nevada.

If there are any claims that are just and proper, which the United States ought to pay, this is one of them. It is as sacred an obligation, in my judgment, as the national bonds.—*Senator Teller.*

There is no sort of question as to its justice. It is just as much due as your board bill, which you have to pay every month.—*Senator Hawley.*

I want to say to the Senator from Nevada that the Senate is committed to these State claims by vote, by sentiment, and it is only a question of time when they will pass.—*Senator Hale in 1891.*

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. STEWART,

OF NEVADA.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

Wednesday, June 6, 1900.

The Senate having under consideration the rejection by the House of the following amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11212) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes:

"To pay the State of Nevada the sum of $462,441.97 for moneys advanced in aid of the suppression of the rebellion in the civil war, as found and reported to Congress on January 22, 1900, by the Secretary of the Treasury, as provided in the act of Congress approved March 3, 1899"—

Mr. STEWART said:

Mr. PRESIDENT: I regret very much that the House did not agree to this amendment. It will be a sorry disappointment to Nevada. I am compelled to take the liberty to make a short statement with regard to it, although the hour is late. The erroneous impressions which surround the claim must be now dispelled. There is no other claim of any State bearing the slightest analogy to it, except the claims of California and Oregon. There is no danger of its being made a precedent, for every other State has been paid in full for like aid in suppressing the rebellion. The contention that other States have claims of a similar nature is false. The claims of California, Oregon, and Nevada are precisely of the same character as the claims of the other States which have been paid. These claims are for arming, equipping, and paying soldiers in aid of the suppression of the rebellion. Although bounties were paid to soldiers by California, Oregon, and Nevada and by individuals with great liberality, no claim has been presented for any such bounties. The claim they present is for supplying, equipping, and paying soldiers.

A peculiar condition arose on the Pacific coast which did not exist elsewhere. The United States for more than eleven years preceding the outbreak of the rebellion paid the army operating on the Pacific fully twice as much as was paid to the soldiers in the Atlantic States, for the reason that the expense of living on the Pacific coast was more than double the expense of living in the Atlantic States.

The following acts of Congress show the legislative policy of the Government:

On the 17th of June, 1850, an act was passed, the third section of which reads as follows:

SEC. 3. *And be it further enacted*, That whenever enlistments are made at, or in the vicinity of, the said military posts, and remote and distant stations, a bounty equal in amount to the cost of transporting and subsisting a soldier from the principal recruiting depot in the harbor of New York to the place of such enlistment be, and the same is hereby, allowed to each recruit so enlisted, to be paid in unequal installments at the end of each year's service, so that the several amounts shall annually increase and the largest be paid at the expiration of each enlistment. (U. S. Stat., volume 9, page 439.)

On the 28d of September, 1850, the following provision was inserted in the Army appropriation bill:

For extra pay to the commissioned officers and enlisted men of the Army of the United States, serving in Oregon or California, $325,854, on the following basis, to wit: That there shall be allowed to each commissioned officer as aforesaid, whilst serving as aforesaid, a per diem, in addition to their regular pay and allowances, of $2 each; and to each enlisted man as aforesaid, whilst serving as aforesaid, a per diem, in addition to their present pay and allowances, equal to the pay proper of each as established by existing laws, said extra pay of the enlisted men to be retained until honorably discharged. This additional pay to continue until the 1st of March, 1852, or until otherwise provided. (U. S. Stat., volume 9, page 504.)

Under these acts it was the established policy of the Government to make extra allowance to the officers and men amounting to fully double the amount paid in the Atlantic States. By some strange freak of fortune, probably accidental, a provision crept into the act of August 3, 1861, reorganizing the Army, which changed the whole policy of the Government with regard to officers and soldiers serving on the Pacific coast. The ninth section of that act reads as follows:

SEC. 9. *And be it further enacted*, That the three months' extra pay allowed by the twenty-ninth section of the act of the 5th of July, 1838, for reenlistments under certain conditions, the bounty granted by the third section of the act of the 17th of June, 1850, for enlistments at remote and distant stations and the premium now paid for bringing accepted recruits to the rendezvous, be, and they are hereby, abolished. (12 Stats., 288.)

This legislation repealed all laws allowing extra pay on the Pacific and placed the Government in an unfortunate position. As the civil war progressed, the forces of the Confederate States invaded New Mexico and Arizona, and through their agency the Indians were inspired to cut off overland mail communication. In the meantime greenbacks had fallen from 40 to 50 per cent on the dollar. A soldier on the Pacific coast receiving his pay in greenbacks was compelled to convert it into coin, which reduced the amount to less than $8 per month. Plenty of men were ready to enlist in the cause of their country, but they could not with $8 a month supply themselves with those necessaries which a soldier serving in that country must have, and of course nothing was left for their families.

The States of California and Oregon, and the Territory of Nevada were not behind any other section of the country in paying bounties to soldiers and in contributing to the sanitary fund. The Territory of Nevada contributed to that fund more in proportion to population than any State in the Union. None of the Pacific States have ever dreamed of demanding a dollar to be refunded from the General Government for bounties paid or for any other patriotic contributions. Still it is contended that if California, Oregon, and Nevada are paid for the advances which they made to put soldiers in the field, the other States must be paid for donations and bounties. This is the only argument adduced against the claim, and it is contended in another place that if California, Oregon, and Nevada are paid, as the other States have been paid, for the money advanced to equip soldiers and put them in the field, the other States which have already received their money for their legitimate advances will come forward and demand to have refunded all the money they have paid for bounties and donations. Such contention is without merit and extremely unjust to the Pacific States.

Before Congress repealed the double pay and allowance which had been the established policy on the Pacific coast an act was

passed on July 27, 1861, for the reimbursement of every State which had advanced and should advance money to equip and pay soldiers. It is as follows:

An act to indemnify the States for expenses incurred by them in defense of the United States.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to pay to the governor of any State, or to his duly authorized agents, the costs, charges, and expenses properly incurred by such State for enrolling, subsisting, clothing, supplying, arming, equipping, paying, and transporting its troops employed in aiding to suppress the present insurrection against the United States, to be settled upon proper vouchers, to be filed and passed upon by the proper accounting officers of the Treasury.

Approved, July 27, 1861. (12 Stat. L., page 270.)

In 1862 Congress, by a resolution, gave this act a liberal construction. The following is the resolution:

A resolution declaratory of the intent and meaning of a certain act therein named.

Whereas doubts have arisen as to the true intent and meaning of act No. 18, entitled "An act to indemnify the States for expenses incurred by them in defense of the United States," approved July 27, 1861:

Be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the said act shall be construed to apply to expenses incurred as well after as before the date of the approval thereof.

Approved, March 8, 1862. (12 Stat. L., page 615.)

The United States Supreme Court in the New York cases (160 U. S., 598) held that the act of July 27, 1861, and the resolution of Congress of March 8, 1862, created on the part of the United States an obligation to indemnify the States for any costs, charges, and expenses properly incurred for the purposes expressed in the act of 1861, the title of which shows that its object was "to indemnify the States for expenses incurred by them in defense of the United States."

And again, on March 19, 1862, Congress adopted the following resolution:

A resolution to authorize the Secretary of War to accept moneys appropriated by any State for the payment of its volunteers, and to apply the same as directed by such State.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That if any State during the present rebellion shall make any appropriation to pay the volunteers of that State, the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to accept the same, and cause it to be applied by the Paymaster-General to the payments designated by the legislative act making the appropriation, in the same manner as if appropriated by act of Congress; and also to make any regulations that may be necessary for the disbursement and proper application of such funds to the specific purpose for which they may be appropriated by the several States.

Approved, March 19, 1862. (12 Stat. L., page 616.)

When the war was over all the States, except California, Oregon, and Nevada, which contributed to put soldiers in the field and pay them, were reimbursed for their expenditures. The sum of $44,725,072.38 was distributed among the States as follows:

[Senate Report No. 145, Fifty-fourth Congress, first session.]

Statement accompanying Third Auditor's letter to the Secretary of the Treasury, dated March 15, 1892.

State.	Allowances by Third Auditor.				
	As reported in Senate Ex. Doc. No. 1438, Fortieth Congress, second session, p. 57.	Allowances made since said list.	Total allowances by Third Auditor.	Allowances by Second Auditor, as reported in Senate Ex. Doc. No. 11, Fifty-first Congress, first session, p. 63.	Total allowances up to Mar. 15, 1892.
Connecticut	$2,096,950.46	$6,014.83	$2,102,965.29	.....	$2,102,965.29
Massachusetts	3,660,483.07	301,133.28	3,961,616.35	$7,608.88	3,969,225.23
Rhode Island	723,530.15	.....	723,530.15	.....	723,530.15
Maine	1,027,185.00	448.99	1,027,633.99	.....	1,027,633.99
New Hampshire	976,081.92	476.56	976,558.48	450.00	977,008.48
Vermont	832,557.40	.....	832,557.40	.....	832,557.40
New York	3,957,906.98	*102,737.32	4,060,734.30	198,938.52	4,259,672.82
New Jersey	1,420,167.35	3,548.45	1,423,715.80	99,859.44	1,523,575.24
Pennsylvania	3,204,636.24	14,390.04	3,219,026.28	667,074.55	3,886,100.63
Ohio	3,245,319.58	71,348.20	3,316,667.78	.....	3,316,667.78
Wisconsin	1,035,050.17	24,102.86	1,059,163.03	.....	1,059,163.03
Iowa	1,030,759.45	3,705.35	1,043,464.80	.....	1,043,464.80
Illinois	3,080,442.51	1,532.92	3,081,975.43	.....	3,081,975.43
Indiana	2,668,529.78	.....	2,668,529.78	1,073,208.51	3,741,738.29
Minnesota	70,798.45	462.45	71,260.90	276.75	71,537.65
Kansas	384,138.15	2,298.21	386,436.36	.....	386,436.36
Colorado	55,238.84	.....	55,238.84	.....	55,238.84
Missouri	7,580,421.43	996.37	7,581,417.80	.....	7,581,417.80
Michigan	844,262.53	1,493.16	845,755.69	.....	845,755.69
Delaware	31,988.96	.....	31,988.96	.....	31,988.96
Maryland	133,140.99	3,140.65	136,281.64	.....	136,281.64
Virginia	48,469.97	.....	48,469.97	.....	48,469.97
West Virginia	471,063.94	.....	471,063.94	.....	471,063.94
Kentucky	3,504,466.57	47,137.40	3,551,603.97	.....	3,551,603.97
Total	42,092,068.89	587,967.04	42,680,655.93	2,044,416.45	44,725,072.38

*Included in this sum is an allowance of $16,197.42 to New York not yet actually paid, but upon the list to be reported to Congress at its present session, for a deficiency appropriation.

L. W. F.

SECOND AUDITOR'S OFFICE, *March 19, 1892* (*mail room*).
THIRD AUDITOR'S OFFICE, *March 15, 1892*.

When California, Oregon, and Nevada presented their claims for precisely the same kind of disbursements, a technical objection was made thereto in the Treasury Department. It was argued that inasmuch as the Government paid the officers and soldiers serving on the Pacific coast the same amount in greenbacks which it paid the soldiers of the Eastern States, the Pacific States had no claim for money advanced by them. This argument wholly ignores the fact that the cost of living on the Pacific coast at that time was at least three times as much as the cost of living in the Eastern States, and that the Government had recognized that fact and had, at all times previous to August 3, 1861, paid double compensation to officers and soldiers serving on the Pacific coast. Unfortunately the repeal of this extra allowance for the army of the Pacific occurred at a time when the difference in the cost of living and of supplies between the Atlantic and the Pacific was greater than ever before. Freights across the Isthmus and around the Horn were more than doubled by reason of the war, and mail communication was hazardous and uncertain.

An emergency finally arose in the early part of 1863 which made the raising of troops in California, Oregon, and particularly in the Territory of Nevada indispensable. Overland mail communication was cut off from the East by Indians cooperating with the Confederate forces, and the privateers of the Confederacy endangered mail communication by water. The Government pay of $13 a month in greenbacks, amounting to about $8 in gold, was wholly inadequate. More money had to be furnished to put troops in the field. The commanding officers on the Pacific coast, under instructions from Washington, made requisition upon California, Oregon, and the Territory of Nevada for more troops. The legislatures of those States and of the Territory of Nevada responded liberally and advanced enough money to make the pay of the soldiers very nearly equivalent to the amount which the Government had been in the habit of paying in those regions. Nobody had the slightest doubt that these advances would be reimbursed under the act of July 27, 1861, above quoted, which has served so good a purpose to the other States in securing for them over $44,000,000.

On the 27th day of June, 1882, another act was passed to secure payment for the Indian wars of Texas and other States arising subsequent to the rebellion. California, Oregon, and Nevada were included in that act under the supposition that it would secure the payment of the war claims of those States. The first section of that act reads as follows:

That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed, with the aid and assistance of the Secretary of War, to cause to be examined and investigated all the claims of the States of Texas, Colorado, Oregon, Nebraska, California, Kansas, and Nevada, and the Territories of Washington and Idaho, against the United States of America for moneys alleged to have been expended and for indebtedness alleged to have been assumed by said States and Territories in organizing, arming, equipping, supplying, clothing, subsisting, transporting, and paying the volunteer and military forces of said States and Territories called into active service by the proper authorities thereof between the 15th day of April, in the year 1861, and the date of this act, to repel invasions and Indian hostilities in said States and Territories and upon their borders, including all proper expenses necessarily incurred by said States and Territories on account of said forces having been so called into active service as aforesaid, and also all proper claims paid or assumed by said States and Territories for horses and equipments actually lost by said forces while in the line of duty in active service (excepting and excluding therefrom any claim said State of Oregon may have for money expended and indebtedness assumed or incurred in suppressing Modoc Indian hostilities during the Modoc Indian war and in defending that State from invasion by said Indians during the years 1872 and 1873, which were submitted to and passed upon, by either approval or rejection, by Insp. Gen. James A. Hardie, United States Army). Said accounts for and on behalf of said State of Texas shall be confined to claims arising since the 20th day of October, 1865, and shall include the necessary expenses of defense against Mexican raids or invasions, as well as those for defense against Indian hostilities, and for and on behalf of said Territories of Idaho and Washington for said claims arising in the years 1877 and 1878. (22 Stats., 111.)

After the passage of this act the Secretary of War represented that he could not perform the labor required under the act without assistance, and a board of war claims examiners was provided by Congress under the following act:

An act for the benefit of the States of Texas, Colorado, Oregon, Nebraska, California, Kansas, and Nevada, and the Territories of Washington and Idaho, and Nevada when a Territory.

* * * * * * *

SEC. 2. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to detail three Army officers to assist him in examining and reporting upon the claims of the States and Territories named in the act of June 27, 1882, chapter 241 of the laws of the Forty-seventh Congress, and such officers, before entering upon said duties, shall take and subscribe an oath that they will carefully examine said claims, and that they will, to the best of their ability, make a just and impartial statement thereof, as required by said act.

Approved August 4, 1886. (24 Stat. L., 217.)

Secretary Lincoln considering these acts together, namely, the acts of 1861, under which the other States were paid, and the act of 1882, came to the conclusion that the claims of California, Oregon, and Nevada could be paid under them without further legislation. But his successor, Secretary Endicott, raised all sorts of technical objections and nothing was done. Whereupon the Senate adopted a resolution requiring the board of war claims examiners to investigate and report upon the claims of California, Oregon, and Nevada. The board did its duty faithfully and examined with great care and particularity these claims and all the circumstances connected with them. Every item was scrutinized.

Elaborate reports were made to Congress, consisting of three large volumes of about 750 pages each. (See Sentae Executive Documents 10, 11, and 17, Fifty-first Congress, first session.)

These reports were referred to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, and that committee reported a bill for the payment of the claims, and an amendment for that purpose was put on the general deficiency bill of the second session of the Fifty-first Congress.

The Pacific Coast States, however, were unfortunate in the House. They had no representation on the Committee on Appropriations. Mr. Sayers, of Texas, was a member of that committee and was fortunate enough to secure for Texas $1,175,793.87 for Indian wars which arose subsequent to the rebellion.

The history of these claims in the two Houses of Congress is as follows:

Fiftieth Congress, first session. Senate bill 2918. Reported from Committee on Military Affairs by Mr. STEWART. Senate Report 1286.

Senate bill 3420. Introduced by Mr. STEWART. Reported from the Committee on Military Affairs by Mr. STEWART. Senate Report 3014. Passed the Senate.

Senate bill 3489. Favorably reported from the House Committee on War Claims by Mr. STONE. House Report 3306.

Fifty-first Congress. Senate bill 2416. Introduced by Mr. STEWART. Favorably reported by Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Military Affairs. Senate Report 644.

Letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report upon the war claims of the State of Nevada. Senate Executive Document 10.

House bill 7450. Introduced by Mr. CLUNIE. Favorably reported by Mr. STONE, from Committee on War Claims. House Report 2553. Passed the Senate in general deficiency bill March 3, 1891.

Fifty-second Congress. Senate bill 52. Introduced by Mr. STEWART. Favorably reported by Mr. DAVIS, from Committee on Military Affairs. Senate Report 158.

House bill 42. Introduced by Mr. CAMINETTI. Favorably reported by Mr. STONE, from the Committee on War Claims. House Report 254.

Fifty-third Congress. Senate bill 1295. Introduced by Mr. White. Favorably reported by Mr. DAVIS from the Committee on Military Affairs. Senate Report 287.

S. 101, by Mr. STEWART.

House bill 4959. Introduced by Mr. Maguire. Favorably reported by Mr. Hermann from the Committee on War Claims. House Report 558.

Fifty-fourth Congress. Senate bill 51, by Mr. STEWART, and Senate bill 53, by Mr. Mitchell. Senate bill 1650. Introduced by Mr. White. Favorably reported by Mr. STEWART from Committee on Claims. Senate Report 145.

House bill 31, by Mr. Johnson, of California.

House bill 1243. Introduced by Mr. Maguire. Favorably reported by Mr. OTJEN from the Committee on War Claims. House Report 1648.

House bill 8733, reported by Mr. Hermann as a substitute.

Fifty-fifth Congress. Senate bill 441. Introduced by Mr. STEWART. S. 1141, by Mr. MCBRIDE. Claim was favorably reported by Mr. STEWART from the Committee on Claims, as amendment to S. 3545 (the "omnibus bill"). Senate Report 544, part 2. Passed the Senate in "omnibus bill."

H. R. 396, by Mr. Maguire, of California.

Fifty-sixth Congress. Amendment by Mr. STEWART to House bill 11537. Favorably reported from the Committee on Claims by Mr. STEWART, Senate Report 1351, and passed the Senate May 31, 1900.

All these reports were unanimous, and it never occurred to the committees of the House or the Senate, where these cases were frequently argued, that there was any want of equity in the claims of these States.

The difficulty of passing these claims and other acknowledged meritorious claims on appropriation bills led to a movement to consolidate them in an "omnibus bill." For that purpose the following section was incorporated in the general deficiency appropriation bill of July 19, 1897:

To enable the Committee on Claims of the Senate to fully examine into all the evidence in all cases of just claims that are now before them, or that have been favorably reported and not finally disposed of, with the view of reporting the same to the Senate at the beginning of the next session of Congress, $1,000, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of said committee, and said sum, or any part thereof, in the discretion of the chairman, may be paid as additional compensation to the clerk and assistant clerk of said committee. (30 Stats., 138.)

In the following session an "omnibus bill," providing for the payment of Southern claims, French spoliation claims, etc., was enacted into law. As the bill passed the Senate it contained the claims of California, Oregon, and Nevada without opposition. But the fate of the measure was very different in the House. An objection came in that body from a most unexpected source. Although I am not at liberty to discuss the conduct of members in the other House, still I may allude to matters which have gone into history. The opposition of Mr. LOUD of California defeated the claims of California, Oregon, and Nevada on the "omnibus bill." When that bill was before the House Mr. LOUD said:

Now, I want to say one word about the claims of the State of California. When this bill went into conference, I took occasion to repeat on this floor what had been repeated for many years and what I, without investigation, had accepted as a fact. You remember I held this claim up some time before permitting it to go into conference. My own State had in that bill claims amounting to nearly $4,000,000. It is a great temptation to the average member of Congress, Mr. Speaker, to see a claim of his own State or his own community amounting to $4,000,000 included in a bill. There was an agreement, as I stated at that time, that those claims never should be passed upon favorably by the conferees. I made at that time the charge that there was a compact. Believing then that those claims were just, I took occasion to say that every State in the Union had been paid for similar claims, and I immediately proceeded to investigate the record in this case, covering hundreds and hundreds of pages, musty now, to fortify myself to support these claims upon the floor of the House.

The further I went into the investigation of these claims the more I was convinced, step by step, that they never had even equity before Congress. It may require some courage to say this with regard to the claims of a man's own State, but the claims of the State of California, the State of Oregon, and the State of Nevada, standing upon exactly the same plane, are simply claims for bounty; and there has not been a single State in the Union so far that has been reimbursed for the extra pay or bounty given to troops.—*Congressional Record*, Fifty-fifth Congress, third session, volume 33, part 3, page 2658.

This speech, of course, was fatal to the claims of the Pacific States. They were beaten in the House. The bill went into conference. The conferees on the part of the House could not agree to the payment of these claims, but suggested that the claim of Nevada, which was a Territory at the time the advances were made, be referred to the Secretary of the Treasury for another investigation, and accordingly the following provision was incorporated in the "omnibus bill" and became a law:

That the claim of the State of Nevada for moneys advanced in aid of the suppression of the rebellion in the civil war be, and the same is hereby, referred to the Secretary of the Treasury to investigate and report to Congress at the next session the amount furnished by said State of Nevada, or by the Territory of Nevada and assumed by said State, in aid of the suppression of the rebellion of the civil war, with such interest on the same as said State has actually paid, together with what amounts have been heretofore paid by the United States. (30 Stats., 1203.)

The Secretary of the Treasury performed the duty required by this statute, and on the 19th day of January, 1900, made the following report (House Document 322, Fifty-sixth Congress, first session), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., January 19, 1900.

SIR: Referring to the act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat., page 1203), upon the subject of the claim of the State of Nevada for moneys advanced in aid of the suppression of the rebellion in the civil war, and calling for report to Congress by the Secretary of the Treasury thereon, I have the honor to transmit herewith copy of statement of the case made by the Auditor for the War Department January 18, 1900.

Respectfully,

L. J. GAGE,
Secretary.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF AUDITOR FOR THE WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 18, 1900.

SIR: In reply to your communication of March 11, 1899, requesting a report under provisions of act of March 3, 1899, paragraph "State claims" (Public, 190), upon the claim of the State of Nevada for moneys advanced in aid of the suppression of the rebellion in the civil war, I have the honor to state the following:

On December 24, 1889, the Secretary of War, acting in accordance with a resolution of the Senate of February 27, 1889, transmitted a full and complete statement showing the amount expended by the State of Nevada, with such interest on the same as the State had paid between February 10, 1865, and June 30, 1889, amounting in all to the sum of $412,600.31. This report is found in Executive Document No. 10, first session Fifty-first Congress.

From a certified statement of Samuel P. Davis, State comptroller of Nevada, made on December 19, 1899, it appears that since the time covered by the report of the Secretary of War—i. e., from June 30, 1889, to December 31, 1899—the State of Nevada has paid the sum of $58,401.27 as interest upon money paid by the State in aiding in suppressing the rebellion in the civil war. Accordingly, assuming this statement to be correct, the total amount expended by the State of Nevada, or by the Territory of Nevada and assumed by said State, with such interest on the same as the said State has actually paid, amounts to $471,001.58.

Upon reports of an examination of this claim made by the State war claims examiners, the Third Auditor, and the Second Comptroller of the Treasury, under act of June 27, 1882, the sum of $7,559.61 was allowed and paid to the State of Nevada on April 10, 1888. This amount, deducted from the total amount paid by the State of Nevada, leaves the sum of $462,441.97 for which the State has not been reimbursed. The following is a tabulated statement of this claim:

Amount of claim of the State of Nevada, including interest up to June 30, 1889, as shown in the report of the Secretary of War (see page 10, Senate Document No. 10, Fifty-first Congress)	$412,600.31
Amount of interest paid by Nevada from June 30, 1889, to December 31, 1899	58,401.27
Total claim	471,001.58
Amount which the State was reimbursed on April 10, 1888, under act of June 27, 1882	8,559.61
Total paid by the State for which no reimbursement has been made	462,441.97

Respectfully,

F. H. MORRIS, *Auditor.*

In compliance with this report the Senate inserted the following amendment in the sundry civil appropriation bill on May 31, 1900:

To pay the State of Nevada the sum of $462,441.97 for moneys advanced in aid of the suppression of the rebellion in the civil war, as found and reported to Congress on January 22, 1900, by the Secretary of the Treasury, as provided in an act of Congress approved March 3, 1899.

When this amendment was pending in the House, Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts, as was natural, relied on the speech of Mr. LOUD to defeat the claim. He said:

Now, one single word more, and I am done. The gentleman from Nevada said my first impression was in favor of this claim. So it was. As I understood it at first, I thought it ought to be paid. The gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD] made a speech on this subject at the last session of Congress which I want this House to hear. It refers to just the state of mind that I was in during the various stages of investigation. First I thought the claim ought to be paid; then I knew it ought not to be paid unless we were ready to set a dangerous precedent.

Gentlemen will remember that while the State of Nevada has a claim of $400,000, the State of California has a claim of $4,000,000 of the same kind, standing on all fours, and that is agreed. Now, I ask the House to listen to what the gentleman from California said about this claim, his own State included, only March of last year; and I call for order, Mr. Speaker, while this speech is read. I think the judgment of the gentleman from California is always good; and when I find he has investigated a claim of $4,000,000 of his own State and says it ought not to be paid, his statement is doubly entitled to the attention of the House; and therefore I ask the House to give it attention.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Now I want to say one word about the claims of the State of California. When this bill went into conference, I took occasion to repeat on this floor what has been repeated for many years and what I, without investigation, had accepted as a fact. You remember I held this claim up some time before permitting it to go into conference. My own State had in that bill claims amounting to nearly $4,000,000. It is a great temptation to the average member of Congress, Mr. Speaker, to see a claim of his own State or his own community amounting to $4,000,000 included in a bill. There was an agreement, as I stated at that time, that those claims never should be passed upon favorably by the conferees. I made at that time the charge that there was a compact. Believing then that those claims were just, I took occasion to say that every State in the Union had been paid for similar claims, and I immediately proceeded to investigate the record in this case, covering hundreds and hudreds of pages, musty now, to fortify myself to support these claims upon the floor of the House.

"The further I went into the investigation of these claims, the more I was convinced, step by step, that they never had even equity before Congress. It may require some courage to say this with regard to the claims of a man's own State, but the claims of the State of California, the State of Oregon, and the State of Nevada, standing upon exactly the same plane, are simply claims for bounty; and there has not been a single State in the Union so far that has been reimbursed for the extra pay or bounty given to troops."

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is true, and the concluding words of the gentleman from California are true. There has never been a single State paid any one of these claims. Millions and millions of dollars were paid by the States. Are you ready to begin now to pay one State a claim of that kind?—*Congressional Record*, June 6, 1900.

How anyone could have asserted that the claims of the Pacific States were for bounties and their payment would be a precedent for refunding all the bounties paid by other States is incomprehensible. Certainly, anyone reading the reports of the war claims examiners and the numerous reports of the committees of both Houses of Congress would have been informed as to the nature of these claims. The following extracts from the reports of the war claims examiners show the nature of the claims of California, Oregon, and Nevada, and the equitable grounds upon which they rest:

NEVADA.

Extra monthly pay—Liabilities assumed.

It appears from the affidavit of the State comptroller (herewith, marked Exhibit No. 2) that liabilities to the amount of $1,153.75 were assumed by the State of Nevada as successor to the Territory of Nevada on account of "costs, charges, and expenses for monthly pay to volunteers and military forces in the Territory and State of Nevada in the service of the United States," and that State warrants fully covering such liabilities were duly issued. It is also shown in the affidavit that of said warrants two for the sum of $11.33 and $8.50, respectively, have been paid, such payment reducing said liabilities to $1,133.92.

The circumstances and exigencies under which the Nevada legislature allowed this extra compensation to its citizens serving as volunteers in the United States Army are believed to have been substantially the same as those that impelled the legislatures of California and Oregon to a similar course of action for the relief of the contingent of troops raised in each of these States. Prices of commodities of every kind were extravagantly high during the war period in Nevada, which depended for the transportation of its supplies upon wagon roads across mountain ranges that were impassable for six months of every year, and at certain times, at least, during the said period the rich yields of the newly opened mines produced an extraordinary demand for labor, largely increasing wages and salaries. These high prices of commodities and services were coexistent with, though in their causes independent of, the depreciation of the Treasury notes, which did not pass current in that section of the country, though accepted through necessity by the troops serving there; and it is safe to say that in Nevada, as in California and Oregon, the soldier could buy no more with a gold dollar than could the soldier serving in the Eastern States with the greenback or paper dollar.

On the whole, therefore, we are decided in the conviction that in granting them this extra compensation the legislature was mainly instigated by a desire to do a plain act of justice to the United States volunteers raised in the State and performing an arduous frontier service, by placing them on the same footing, as regards compensation, with the great mass of the officers and soldiers of the United States Army serving east of the Rocky Mountains. It is true that the seven companies of infantry that were called for on October 19, 1864, had not been organized; and that on March 8, 1865, three days before the approval of the State law above noticed, the commanding general Department of the Pacific wrote as follows from his headquarters at San Francisco to the governor of Nevada (see page 287, Senate Executive Document No. 70, Fiftieth Congress, second session):

"What progress is making in recruiting the Nevada volunteers? I will need them for the protection of the State, and trust that you may meet with success in your efforts to raise them. I hope the legislature may assist you by some such means as have been adopted by California and Oregon."

But the fact remains that the declared purpose of the monthly allowance was to give a compensation to the Nevada volunteers (see section 1 of the act last referred to), and that when measured by the current prices of the country in which they were serving, their compensation from all sources did not exceed, if, indeed, it was equal to, the value of the money received as pay by the troops stationed elsewhere, i. e., outside of the Department of the Pacific.—*Senate Executive Document No. 10*, Fifty-first Congress, first session, page 7.

CALIFORNIA.

Extra pay to enlisted men.

By an act approved April 27, 1863, the legislature appropriated and set apart "as a soldiers' relief fund" the sum of $600,000, from which every enlisted soldier of the companies of California volunteers raised or thereafter to be raised for the service of the United States was to be paid, in addition to the pay and allowances granted him by the United States, a "compensation" of $5 per month from the time of his enlistment to the time of his discharge.

Drafted men, substitutes for drafted men, soldiers dishonorably discharged or discharged for disability existing at time of enlistment, were not to share in the benefits of the act, and, except in cases of married men having families dependent upon them for support, payment was not to be made until after discharge. Seven per cent interest-bearing bonds to the amount of $600,000, in sums of $500, with coupons for interest attached to each bond, were authorized to be issued on July 1, 1863. (Pages 349-351, Statement for Senate Military Committee.)

A few unimportant changes respecting the mode of payment in certain cases was made by act of March 15, 1864, and on March 31, 1866, the additional sum of $550,000 was appropriated for the payment of claims arising under its provisions, such sum to be transferred from the general fund of the State to the "Soldiers' Relief Fund."

Fearing that the total amount of $1,150,000 specifically appropriated might still prove insufficient to pay all the claims accruing under the act of April 27, 1863, above mentioned, the legislature directed, by an act which also took effect March 31, 1866 (page 604, Stats. of California, 1865-66), that the remainder of such claims should be audited and allowed out of the appropriation and fund made and created by the act granting bounties to the volunteers of California, approved April 4, 1864, and more fully referred to on page 19 of this report.

Upon the certificate of the adjutant-general of the State that the amounts were due under the provisions of the act and of the board of State examiners, warrants amounting to $1,459,270.21 were paid by the State treasurer, as shown by the receipts of the payees indorsed on said warrants.

It is worthy of note here that on July 16, 1863, the Governor of California, replying to a communication from the headquarters Department of the Pacific, dated July 5, 1863, advising him that under a resolution of Congress adopted March 9, 1863, the payments provided for by the State law of April 27, 1863, might be made through the officers of the Pay Department of the United States Army, stated that the provisions of said law were such as to preclude him from availing himself of the offer.

Some information as to the circumstances and exigencies under which this money was expended may be derived from the following extract from the annual report of the adjutant-general of the State for the year 1862, dated December 15, 1862:

"The rank and file of the California contingent is made up of material of which any State might be proud, and the sacrifices they have made should be duly appreciated and their services rewarded by the State. I do most earnestly recommend, therefore, that the precedent established by many of the Atlantic coast States of paying their troops in the service of the United States an additional amount monthly should be adopted by California, and that a bill appropriating, say, $10 per month to each enlisted man of the troops raised or to be raised in this State be passed. * * * This would be a most tangible method of recognizing the patriotic efforts of our soldiers, relieve many of their families from actual destitution and want, and hold out a fitting encouragement for honorable service." (Page 58, Statement for Senate Committee on Military Affairs.)

Your examiners are of the opinion that the favorable action which was taken on the above recommendation of the Adjutant-General can not be justly ascribed to any desire on the part of the legislature to avoid resort to a conscription, although the exclusion of drafted men from the benefits of the act indicates that they realized and deemed it proper to call attention to the possibility of a draft. Unlike the law of April 4, 1864, the benefits of which were confined to men who should enlist after the date of its passage and be credited to the quota of the State, the provisions of the act now under consideration extended alike to the volunteers who had already entered or had actually completed their enlistment contract and to those who were to enlist in the future. There is every reason for the belief that the predominating if not the only reason of the State authorities in enacting this measure was to allow their volunteers in the United States service such a stipend as would, together with the pay received by them from the General Government, amount to a fair and just compensation. In fact, as has already been stated, this was expressly declared to be the purpose of the act.

It appears that up to December 31, 1862, those of the United States troops serving in the Department of the Pacific who were paid at all—in some cases detachments had not been paid for a year or more—were generally paid in coin, but on February 9, 1863, instructions were issued from the Treasury Department to the assistant treasurer of the United States at San Francisco that "checks of disbursing officers must be paid in United States notes." (Letter of Deputy Paymaster-General George H. Ringgold, dated February 13, 1863, to Paymaster-General; copy herewith marked Exhibit No. 10.)

Before this, greenbacks had become the current medium of exchange in all ordinary business transactions in the Eastern States, but in the Pacific Coast States and the adjoining Territories, gold continued to be the basis of circulation throughout the war.

At this time the paper currency had become greatly depreciated, and on February 28, 1863, the price of gold in Treasury notes touched 170. This action of the Government in compelling troops to accept such notes as an equivalent of gold in payment for services rendered by them in a section where coin alone was current gave rise to much dissatisfaction: for although gold could be bought in San Francisco at nearly the same price in Treasury notes as in New York, it must be remembered that the troops in the Department of the Pacific were largely stationed at remote and isolated points.

When paying in greenbacks for articles purchased by, or for services rendered to, them in these out-of-the-way places they were obliged to submit not only to the current discount in San Francisco but also to a further loss occasioned by the desire of the persons who sold the articles, or rendered the service, to protect themselves against possible further depreciation. It admits of little doubt that by reason of his inability to realize the full value of paper money, as quoted in the money centers, and of the fact that wages and the cost of living and of commodities of every kind were abnormally high (owing in great part to the development of newly-discovered mines in that region), the purchasing power of the greenback dollar in the hands of the average soldier serving in the Department of the Pacific was from the latter part of 1862 onward from 25 to 50 per cent less than that of the same dollar paid to his fellow-soldier in the East.

Representation of the great hardship the Treasury Department's instructions entailed upon the troops were promptly made. On March 10, 1863, the legislature telegraphed to Washington a resolution adopted on that date, instructing the State's delegation in Congress to impress upon the Executive "the necessity which exists of having officers and soldiers of the United States Army, officers, seamen, and marines of the United States Navy, and all citizen employees in the service of the Government of the United States serving west of the Rocky Mountains and on the Pacific coast, paid their salaries and pay in gold and silver currency of the United States, provided the same be paid in as revenue on this coast." (Page 46, Statement for Senate Committee on Military Affairs.)

And on March 16, 1863, Brig. Gen. G. Wright, the commander of the Department of the Pacific (comprising, besides California, the State of Oregon and the Territories of Nevada, Utah, and Arizona), transmitted to the Adjutant-General of the United States Army a letter of Maj. C. S. Drew, First Oregon Cavalry, commandant at Camp Baker, Oregon, containing an explicit statement of the effects of and a formal protest against paying his men in greenbacks. In his letter of transmittal (page 154, Ex. Doc. 70), General Wright remarked as follows:

"The difficulties and embarrassments enumerated in the major's communication are common to all the troops in this department, and I most respectfully ask the serious consideration of the General in Chief and the War Department to this subject. Most of the troops would prefer waiting for their pay to receiving notes worth but little more than half their face; but even at this ruinous discount officers, unless they have private means, are compelled to receive the notes. Knowing the difficulties experienced by the Government in procuring coin to pay the Army, I feel great reluctance in submitting any grievances from this remote department, but justice to the officers and soldiers demands that a fair statement should be made to the War Department."

It was under circumstances and exigencies such as these that the legislature themselves—all appeals to the General Government having proved

futile—provided the necessary relief by the law of April 27, 1863. They did not even after that relax their efforts on behalf of United States troops, other than their own volunteers, serving among them, but on April 1, 1864, adopted a resolution requesting their representatives in Congress to "use their influence in procuring the passage of a law giving to the officers and soldiers of the Regular Army stationed on the Pacific coast an increase of their pay, amounting to 50 per cent on the amount now allowed by law."—*Senate Executive Document No. 11*, Fifty-first Congress, first session, page 23.

OREGON.

Extra monthly compensation to officers and enlisted men of volunteers.

The certificate of the State treasurer, duly authenticated by the secretary of state under the seal of the State, sets forth that the amounts severally paid out for the redemption of relief bonds, as shown by the books of the treasurer's office, as reported by the treasurer to the several legislative assemblies and as verified by the several joint committees (investigating commissions) of said assembly under the provisions of a joint resolution thereof, aggregate $90,476.33. The following books, papers, etc., are also submitted in evidence of payment:

(1) The canceled bonds.

(2) A copy of the relief bond register, the correctness of which is certified by the secretary of state and State treasurer, showing number of bond, to whom issued, date of issue, and amount of bond; also showing the date and rate of redemption. The reports of the joint committees of the legislature above mentioned, to the effect that they compared the record kept by the State treasurer with the bonds redeemed and found the amounts correct and agreeing with the amounts reported by the State treasurer to the legislative assembly, are entered in said bond register.

(3) Certificates of service given to the several Oregon volunteers upon which warrants were given entitling the holders to bonds. These certificates cover service for which the sum of $86,639.85 was due. The remainder of the certificates, the State authorities report, were not found, and are probably lost or destroyed.

(4) Copies of the muster rolls of the Oregon volunteers, certified to by the secretary of state, setting forth the entire service of each officer and enlisted man.

In all, bonds amounting to $93,637 were issued. As has been stated, but $90,476.33 is found to have been expended in the redemption of these bonds, some of which were redeemed at less than their face value. Five bonds, valued at $731, have not been redeemed.

The authority by which these bonds were issued is contained in an act of the legislature, which was approved on October 24, 1864 (copy herewith), appropriating a sum not exceeding $100,000, to constitute and be known as the "commissioned officers and soldiers' relief fund," out of which was to be paid to each commissioned officer and enlisted soldier of the companies of Oregon volunteers raised in the State for the service of the United States to aid in repelling invasion, etc., from the time of their enlistment to the time of their discharge, $5 per month in addition to the pay allowed them by the United States. Enlisted men not receiving an honorable discharge from the service, or volunteers discharged for disability existing at the time of enlistment, were not to be entitled to the benefits of the act, nor was payment under the provisions thereof to be made to an enlisted soldier until he should be honorably discharged the service; but enlisted married men having families dependent upon them were authorized to allot the whole or any portion of the monthly pay accruing to them for the support of such dependents.

A bond, bearing interest, payable semiannually, at 7 per cent per annum, redeemable July 1, 1875, with coupons for the interest attached, was to be issued by the secretary of state for such amount as the Adjutant-General should certify to be due under the provisions of the act to each man, whose receipt for the amount so paid him was to be taken by the secretary of state. Said bonds were to be paid to the recipient or order.

The circumstances and exigencies that led to the enactment of the above-cited law and to the expenditures incurred under its provisions were substantially the same as those which brought about the adoption of similar measures of relief in California and Nevada. It must have been patent to every one fully acquainted with the circumstances of the case that the volunteers that had been raised in Oregon at this time (October 24, 1864), consisting only of the seven companies of the First Oregon Cavalry and the independent detachment of four months' men, a majority of whom had then nearly completed their term, had been greatly underpaid, considering the nature of the service performed by them and the current rate of salaries and wages realized in other pursuits of life.

At the time of the enrollment and muster in of the First Oregon Cavalry, and up to the latter part of 1862, the Government paid those of its troops in the Department of the Pacific, that were paid at all, in specie; but, as often happened during the war, a number of the companies of the regiment named, occupying remote stations, remained unpaid for a long time and were finally paid in Treasury notes, some of the members having more than a year's pay due them.

During the remainder of the war the Government paid its troops in the Department of the Pacific, as elsewhere, in greenbacks. Referring to this condition of things and to the fact that coin continued to be the ordinary medium of exchange in Oregon in private business transactions, Maj. C. S. Drew, First Oregon Cavalry, in a letter to his department commander, dated March 4, 1863 (page 154, Ex. Doc. 70), called attention to the fact that at his station (Camp Baker) Treasury notes were worth "not more than 50 or 55 cents per dollar;" that each officer and soldier of his command was serving for less than half pay, and had done so, some of them, for sixteen months past; that while capital protected itself from loss and perhaps realized better profits than under the old and better system of payment in coin, "the soldier did not have that power, and if paid in notes must necessarily receipt in full for what is equivalent to him of half pay or less for the service he has rendered, and must continue to fulfill his part of the contract with the Government for the same reduced rate of pay until his period of service shall have terminated; and that "good men will not enlist for $6 or $7 a month while $13 is the regular pay, and, moreover, being realized by every soldier in every other department than the Pacific."

In forwarding this letter to the Adjutant-General United States Army, the department commander remarked that the embarrassments enumerated in the major's communication were common to all the troops in the department, and he therefore asked "the serious consideration of the General in Chief and the War Department to this subject." Some months later (August 18, 1863) General Alvord, while reporting to the department commander the location of a new military post at Fort Boise, referred to the difficulties encountered by the garrison charged with the duty of establishing it, as follows:

"Some difficulty is experienced in building the post in consequence of the low rates of legal-tender notes. In that country they bear merely nominal value. The depreciation of the Government currency not only embarrasses the Quartermaster's Department, but also tends greatly to disaffect the men. The differences between their pay and the promises held out by the richest mines, perhaps, on the coast, the proximity of which makes them all the more tempting, is so great that many desertions occur."—*Ex. Doc. 70*, page 188.

About the same time (September 1, 1863) the adjutant-general of the State complained of the inadequacy of the soldiers' pay, resulting from the depreciation of the paper currency with which they were paid. Referring to the fact that after the expiration of eight months from the date of the requisition of the United States military authorities for six additional companies for the First Oregon Cavalry but one had been raised, he said:

"And yet we are not prepared to say that it is for the want of patriotism on the part of the people of Oregon, but from other causes, partly from the deficiency in the pay of the volunteer in comparison with the wages given in the civil pursuits of life, as well as with the nature of the currency with which they are paid, the depreciation of which renders it hardly possible for the soldier to enlist from any other motive save pure patriotism. And I would here suggest that the attention of our legislature be called to this defect, and that additional pay, either in land, money, or something else, be allowed to those who have volunteered. Justice demands that this should be done."

In enacting the relief law of October 24, 1864, it is fair to presume that the legislature was largely influenced by the following statements and recommendations of the governor contained in his annual message dated September 15, 1864:

"The Snake and other tribes of Indians in eastern Oregon have been hostile and constantly committing depredations. The regiment has spent two summers on the plains, furnishing protection to the immigration and to the trade and travel in that region of the country. During the past summer the regiment has traveled over twelve hundred miles, and the officers and men are still out on duty. The officers and most, if not all, the men joined the regiment through patriotic motives, and, while some of the time they have been traveling over rich gold fields, where laborers' wages are from $3 to $5 per day, there have been very few desertions, and that, too, while they were being paid in depreciated currency, making their wages only about $5 per month.

A great many of these men have no pecuniary interest in keeping open the lines of travel, protecting mining districts and merchants and traders. The benefit of their service thus insures [inures] to the benefit of others, who should help these faithful soldiers in bearing these burdens. Oregon, in proportion to her population and wealth, has paid far less than other States for military purposes. California pays her volunteers $5 per month extra in coin. It would be but an act of simple justice for this State to make good to the members of this regiment their losses by depreciated currency. (Page 87, Statement for Senate Military Committee.)

It is to be noted here that while the officers and men who became the beneficiaries of this law had been paid in a depreciated currency, which in Oregon does not appear to have had more than two-thirds of the purchasing power it had in the East, the Government provided them with clothing, subsistence, shelter, and all their absolutely necessary wants. On the other hand, it is to be borne in mind that the legislature must have been aware of the fact noted, and that it granted the extra compensation from a sense of justice and without any purpose calculated to benefit the State at large, such as might be reasonably inferred from the granting of bounties to men "who should hereafter enlist." As has been already mentioned, the terms of the Oregon volunteers were drawing to a close and the benefits of the law were restricted to the volunteers "raised," and did not therefore include those "to be raised."—*Senate Executive Document No. 17*, Fifty-first Congress, first session, page 14.

The majority of the House of Representatives, relying upon the statement of Mr. LOUD, were evidently under the impression that these claims are for bounty and would be precedents for paying other States vast sums of money, and therefore voted against the claim. That impression may be removed by a correct understanding of the facts. If California would send a united delegation to Congress in favor of her just claims they would undoubtedly be paid, and Nevada would also receive what honestly belongs to her. Nevada is poor and needs the money. She contributed it at a time when the nation was in need of troops and when the Government could not obtain them without the assistance of the Territory of Nevada.

The claim of Nevada was so well understood in the Senate that it needed no argument to put it upon an appropriation bill. It had been considered so often and was so well understood by the able and leading men of the Senate who had participated in its discussion that as early as March 3, 1891, when an amendment for the payment of the claims of California, Oregon, and Nevada was pending in the Senate, which amendment passed that body, Mr. HALE said:

I want to say to the Senator from Nevada that the Senate is committed to those State claims by vote, by sentiment, and it is only a question of time when they will pass.

And on the 31st of May last, when the amendment for the payment of the claim of Nevada was pending in the Senate, and which was defeated in the House on the strength of the speech of Mr. LOUD, Senator HAWLEY, chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, from which the Pacific States' claims had been twice favorably reported, said:

There is no sort of question as to its justice. It is just as much due as your board bill, which you have to pay every month.

On the same occasion Senator TELLER, who had reported the claims of California, Oregon, and Nevada in the omnibus bill and passed them through the Senate, rose in his place and said:

If there are any claims that are just and proper which the United States ought to pay, this is one of them. It is as sacred an obligation, in my judgment, as the national bonds.

I might quote almost without end statements of leading Senators to the same effect. The reports of the committees of the House are equally strong in favor of the equity of these claims.

I do not want to be understood as claiming that the California delegation as such has been uniformly opposed to these claims. On the contrary, so far as my knowledge goes, the representatives from California in both Houses have been strongly in favor of the justice and equity of the claims of the Pacific States. Messrs. Clunie, Maguire, Caminetti, Johnson, Morrow, and McKenna and Senator White were active in their support. Senator PERKINS has been very earnest and persistent in supporting these claims ever since he has been a member of the Senate, and I believe that California will ultimately come to the rescue and aid in the passage of bills for their payment. I hope no further opposition to the payment of the just claim of Nevada will come from that source.

Trusts.

SPEECH
OF
HON. CHARLES E. LITTLEFIELD,
OF MAINE.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, June 1, 1900.

The House having under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 138) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States—

Mr. LITTLEFIELD said:

I am not certain, Mr. Speaker, but that the saying that is written in Chronicles is quite likely to prove to be true, and it is this: "And he said, go ye up and prosper, and they shall be delivered into your hand." That, I think, will turn out later to be the condition of our friends who represent the other side upon this proposition. I trust, Mr. Speaker, in the discussion of this question, that I shall not find it necessary to become delirious or hysterical over the question of trusts. I have been sitting here and listening to the debate upon the other side. I have heard trusts characterized as "hydra-headed monsters," "robbers," "thieves," and the awful combinations that were grinding innocent women and children into the earth and bringing down prematurely Cimmerian darkness over the firmament. Assaults upon aggregations of capital have been inflammatory, intemperate, and unstinted.

Notwithstanding all this, I think it is proper to say at the outset that there are aggregations of capital, that there are corporations in this land which are legitimate and useful. The prevailing phase of modern business development undoubtedly involves the aggregation of extensive capital. It contemplates small profits and large volume of sales. It also requires the consolidation of separate interests, and these work out economies. It is sometimes the result of the cooperation of individuals representing the smaller units. This condition of things has advantages, and is subject to disadvantages. The advantages are that the consumer to-day, with this peculiarity of development which exists, receives and buys his goods cheaper than he ever did before. The disadvantages are that it eliminates individual competition and tends to sink individualism in the great aggregation or corporation. It is perfectly competent and proper for a legislative body to fulminate its denunciation against an evil aggregation, or against the corporation that violates the purposes of its organization, and undertakes to oppress the people.

But where there is one aggregation, where there is one corporation that is what might be called a "hydra-headed monster;" or, to use the expressive and beautiful language of my friend from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND], that "has its villainous clutch on the throat of American energy," I desire to say, Mr. Speaker, that there are hundreds, aye, I may say thousands, that are legitimate elements of enterprise, that conserve the interests of the people, that are in fact indispensable to the general welfare; and they are not to be railed at on this floor or in any campaign. Without great aggregations of capital no railroads could exist, no water power could be developed, no spindles could turn, no manufactories could turn out the multitudinous products of human ingenuity. The earth could not be compelled to surrender up its magnificent treasures for the uses of men, and it ill becomes this great body to make a general and universal assault upon capital because it is aggregated or consolidated. It is not enough to show that large dividends are paid, that the business is widely diffused, or that it is centralized and subject to the control of a president or board of directors.

It is only when it is injuriously aggregated, it is only when it is improperly aggregated—when it crushes out or seeks to crush out competition, when it is operated to restrain trade and commerce and oppresses the public—that it becomes a proper subject of legislation, a proper subject of judicial attention.

Great difficulties inhere in dealing practically and efficiently with a problem so intricate. To establish the line of demarcation between the lawful and unlawful corporation, aggregation, or syndicate may well engage the attention of the most acute mind.

That the change from syndicates to corporations, as a mode of operation for a monopoly, does not necessarily emancipate the enterprise from judicial control is quite clear if the principle announced by Mr. Justice Bailey is sound when he says:

* * * The trust, then, being repugnant to public policy and illegal, it is impossible to see why the same is not true of the corporation which succeeds to it and takes its place. The control exercised over the distillery business of the country—over production and prices—and the virtual monopoly formerly held by the trust, are in no degree changed or relaxed, but the methods and purposes of the trust are perpetuated and carried out with the same persistence and vigor as before the organization of the corporation. There is no magic in a corporate organization which can purge the trust scheme of its illegality, and it remains as essentially opposed to the principles of sound public policy as when the trust was in existence. It was illegal before and is illegal still, and for the same reasons. (*Distilling, etc., Co. v. The People*, 156 Ill., 491.) (1895.)

We all recognize the fact that there are in this country organizations, aggregations, corporations, trusts, that in their operation tend to stifle competition, tend to materially and improperly injure in their productive capacity our people, and interfere with the development of our resources. The Republican party suggests as an affirmative legal remedy for this condition of things, in addition to those which already exist two propositions—a constitutional amendment and an amendment to the existing law—and upon both of these propositions they are met by the Democratic party—a party, as I shall demonstrate before I finish the suggestions which I have occasion to make, uniformly and always of obstruction and never of construction.

NO UNNECESSARY DELAY IN THE LEGISLATION.

Is it suggested that these measures have been delayed until it is so late in the session that they can not receive favorable joint action on the part of both Houses, and therefore the majority are chargeable with insincerity? It should be remembered that the bill was introduced April 7 and referred to the Judiciary Committee; that various propositions as to constitutional amendments were introduced and referred prior to that time. Nor should it be forgotten, inasmuch as the minority have assumed to refer to the deliberations of the committee, that delays occurred in its deliberation at the request of the minority, and that at no time did the minority make any effort to bring about a speedier report to the House. More than this. These measures were reported to the House May 15 and 16, while the resolution fixing the day of adjournment was not introduced until May 21. Meanwhile it was impossible to arrange by agreement with the minority upon a time for their consideration. When attempt to get unanimous consent for their consideration was made by the chairman of the Judiciary, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] objected. The majority, in order to get consideration at all, were compelled to resort to a rule against the united opposition of the minority to force consideration at this time. Our Democratic friends have obstructed rather than facilitated consideration, and now complain because they were not forced to this point earlier. This is consistency. Besides, many important matters have occupied the attention of the House.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.

I address myself, in the first instance, to the constitutional amendment. What are the objections of our friends on the other side to this constitutional amendment? By the way, before I reach those considerations, let me say one word in relation to my friend from Massachusetts, who, in my judgment, is unnecessarily disturbed in relation thereto. He seems to labor under the impression that this constitutional amendment has concealed within it such tremendous possibilities that it is liable to obliterate the liberties of mankind—that is, that portion of it included within the United States.

Let me suggest for his consideration that the construction of the word "combination" would be a trifle more apt and proper if he would construe it in the connection in which it is used, rather than divorce it from its connection and look to the dictionary for some other literal application and construction. Let me illustrate.

This amendment provides that Congress shall have power to dissolve "trusts, monopolies, or combinations." The gentleman from Massachusetts sees trouble in that word "combinations" for blacksmiths, carriage makers, etc. Now, let me ask him this question and let me suggest it to any other doubting friend; let me suggest it to my Democratic friends. What does the word "trust" mean in this constitutional amendment? Every man here knows what it means in its ordinary use. Has it any other meaning? Every man here knows that it has. Will the courts, however, hold under this constitutional amendment that the word "trusts," collocated as it is, is intended to apply to the relation existing between a trustee and his *cestui que trust*, which in legal parlance is a trust—that Congress would have power under this amendment to define or dissolve such a "trust?" That would be absurd. The court would construe that word "trust" in connection with the position which it occupies in the amendment and the purpose for which it is obviously used, and would construe the word "combinations" in exactly the same way. If Congress undertook to act capriciously in defining the court would unquestionably restrain such action.

Be not unduly disturbed; the country will still live and the liberties of the people be preserved. Have no apprehension about that. The obvious meaning of that language as used in that connection would be the rule of construction. No objection is made to this amendment by my friends on the other side on that ground. But their objections are what? And I address myself at the very outset to the objections. I may remark in passing that, in accordance with their universal history, as I will disclose before I am through, the Democracy are arrayed upon the floor of the House voting

against a rule to even consider this constitutional amendment and this bill which is suggested as an amendment to the law. That is consistent with their legislative history in connection with trust legislation.

What are their objections? They are two: First, the constitutional amendment suggests indirectly that the Constitution does not control Congress in legislating outside the limits of the forty-five States, and therefore no loyal Democrat can vote for it; second, this constitutional amendment interferes with and infringes upon the sacred doctrine of States' rights. No one can blame our Democratic friends for their loyalty to and their adulation of the hoary-headed doctrine of States' rights. They were born and bred that way. Before I get through with this analysis I wish to demonstrate that the amendment which my friend suggests upon that point was wisely kept out by the rule adopted here, because otherwise, when it came to be analyzed, my friends would feel that they had allowed themselves to be "buncoed" by their own amendment.

FIRST DEMOCRATIC OBJECTION—IMPROPER INFERENCE FROM LANGUAGE USED.

The first proposition is that this constitutional amendment as it reads undertakes indirectly to construe the Constitution contrary to the views entertained by my friends and entertained by myself. I pause a moment to render my thanks to my distinguished friend from Missouri for the magnificent encomium that he pronounced upon my humble self. After hearing it I felt like saying, with the just and devout man of old, "Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace" [laughter], for I have great apprehension that as time goes on and unrolls its web it may be entirely possible that, while I have the greatest admiration for my distinguished friend (which I know he reciprocates), he may not be able, perhaps, to pronounce it again in so handsome and enthusiastic a manner.

His proposition is that the Constitution does extend to our new possessions, and he apprehended that I differed from the majority on that proposition. I say here and now that in that respect I adhere to my view of the Constitution. I believe it to be right; I believed it to be right when I announced it; but I do not think I am situated perhaps quite as the gentleman from Missouri and my other Democratic friends are. I apprehend that there is a possibility that I may be mistaken! It is entirely possible that the Supreme Court when they come to pass upon this great question may determine it otherwise than I think it should be determined.

I suggest that our friends on the other side are laboring under a temporary attack of intellectual biliousness on this subject—I will tell you why as I go along. If my view of the Constitution should prove to be correct, there was no occasion for inserting the language objected to in the amendment; but there are men, able men, good men, who take a contrary view, and if their view is correct, this ought to be inserted in the constitutional amendment.

The proposed amendment reads:

ARTICLE XVI.

SECTION 1. All powers conferred by this article shall extend to the several States, the Territories, the District of Columbia, and all territory under the sovereignty and subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

SEC. 2. Congress shall have power to define, regulate, control, prohibit, or dissolve trusts, monopolies, or combinations, whether existing in the form of a corporation or otherwise.

The several States may continue to exercise such power in any manner not in conflict with the laws of the United States.

SEC. 3. Congress shall have power to enforce the provisions of this article by appropriate legislation.

Let me submit some suggestions for the consideration of my distinguished friend in analyzing the particular language of the amendment.

It is suggested that the fact that "all territory under the sovereignty and subject to the jurisdiction of the United States" is specifically mentioned gives rise to the sole and necessary inference that otherwise such territory would not be included in its operation, and that therefore we have territory which we could control without constitutional limitations. If the fact of being specifically mentioned necessarily raises this inference, then if other localities are also specified, the same inference, for the same reason, ought to arise in connection with them.

The "several States" are specified. It is quite clear that the Constitution now applies to the "several States," and therefore no legitimate inference arises from their mention that the amendment without this language would not apply to the States. Strictly speaking, it may be that their mention was unnecessary; but inasmuch as the effect of this amendment is to deprive the States of a portion of their power, by some it might be thought necessary to specifically refer to them in order to eliminate the possibility of any question as to the scope of the amendment. That the States are referred to demonstrates that the inference that the Constitution would not operate upon a locality unless specified is not the only one to be drawn from the fact of specification. I doubt very much if it was necessary to mention any place or places over which this amendment was to operate. If the language, however, does not add to, it certainly does not take from or narrow the scope of the amendment. If it does no good it can do no harm. It is idle to assert that language that some may think it necessary to use, in order to make this amendment universal in its operation, can have any legitimate interpretative force in determining the proper construction to be placed upon the language used in framing the Constitution and the original amendments.

When the great question as to how far Congress is controlled by constitutional limitations in dealing with our newly acquired possessions is determined, it will be determined upon the Constitution as it was written then, not as we may undertake to write an amendment now. It is what the fathers actually meant and said, not what their children's children declare that they meant and said, either directly or indirectly, that will determine the construction to be placed upon the Constitution.

If my view of the Constitution is correct, the use of this language may be unnecessary. If, upon the other hand, I am wrong, it might be essential. We must concede the possibility of a construction not in harmony with our views. While this great question of constitutional construction is in doubt ordinary prudence and the exercise of legislative common sense justifies and requires the use of such language in framing an amendment, which is designed to become a part of our fundamental law, as will cover all possible contingencies, and eliminate every element of doubt as to the universality of its operation. No man surrenders his opinion, much less stultifies his judgment, when he exercises such laudable and necessary precaution. This bugbear is not substantial enough to justify my friends who agree with me in my construction of the Constitution in voting against this constitutional amendment.

But I want to call attention for a moment to the precision and ability of my friends on the other side of the House in their use of language when they undertake to construct legislation. And this bears upon my suggestion that they are suffering from the difficulty that I mentioned a few moments ago. In section 9 of the amendments which they propose, in lieu of section 9 of the bill reported from the committee which they are complimentary enough to call the "Littlefield bill," the minority of this committee, seven great lawyers of this House, the leading lawyers upon the Democratic side, with the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] upon it, undertake to provide for the care and control of a monopoly in the various jurisdictions. I read the whole amendment:

SEC. 9. That every corporation, association, joint stock company, or partnership formed or made, or managing or carrying on its business, in whole or in part, for the purpose of controlling or monopolizing, *or in such manner as to control or monopolize, or tend to control or monopolize*, the manufacture, production, or sale of any article of commerce or merchandise, *intended for interstate commerce or commerce with foreign countries*, or for the purpose of controlling or increasing or decreasing the cost or price of the same to the purchaser, user, or consumer thereof, for the purpose of preventing, *or in such manner as to prevent*, competition, or of preventing competition in the manufacture, production, or sale thereof, is, for the purposes of this act, hereby declared to be illegal *and a monopoly; and all such corporations, associations, joint stock companies, and partnerships, and their officers, agents, managers, and attorneys are hereby forbidden and prohibited from shipping or putting in transit any such article of commerce or merchandise to any State, Territory, foreign country OR PLACE, outside the State, Territory, OR PLACE in which it was manufactured or produced, and from selling or offering to sell any such article or merchandise to be so shipped or put into any such transit, unless for the private or personal use of the consignee; and for any violation of this provision shall be deemed guilty of an offense against the United States, and on conviction shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 nor more than $5,000, and by imprisonment not less than thirty days nor more than six months.*

All such corporations, associations, joint-stock companies, and partnerships as above declared illegal shall be, and hereby are, forbidden and prohibited the use of the United States mail in aid or furtherance of any such business or purposes, and all laws now in force for the prevention of the fraudulent use of the mails, so far as the same may be applicable, shall apply in the execution of such prohibition.

Any such corporation, association, joint-stock company, or partnership may be proceeded against at the suit of any person or persons, or corporation, or association, or by and in behalf of the United States, and perpetually enjoined and restrained from doing or carrying on any interstate or foreign commerce whatever, either with the States or the Territories of the United States or the District of Columbia, or any foreign country; and no article of commerce produced, or manufactured, or owned and dealt in by any such corporation, association, joint-stock company, or partnership so organized, formed, managed, or carrying on business, shall be transported or carried without the State or Territory in which produced or manufactured, or in which same may be, or without the District of Columbia if produced, manufactured, or found therein, by any individual, corporation, or common carrier, in any manner whatever. All such articles of commerce, shipped in violation of the provisions of this act, shall be forfeited to the United States, and may be seized by any marshal or deputy marshal of the United States, or by any person duly authorized by law to make such seizure, and when so seized shall be condemned by like proceedings as those provided by law for the forfeiture, seizure, and condemnation of property imported into the United States contrary to law.

Bear in mind that according to the theory of my friends upon the other side there are only three political jurisdictions, a State, a Territory, and foreign countries. When upon their theory you have said "State," when upon their construction you have said "Territory," that takes in organized and unorganized territory, Porto Rico and the Philippine Archipelago; and when you have said "foreign country," you then include everything in the line of political jurisdictions. That is, you would ordinarily

think you did. Now, my friends, when they try to write an amendment, do not think that they do, and I want to show this House, inasmuch as they are so hypercritical and so hypersensitive as to the first section of this amendment, how they undertake to provide for a territory that they could not very well describe. Here is the way they do it. They prohibit "shipping or putting in transit any such article of commerce or merchandise to any State, Territory, foreign country"—

And having stated that, then what do they say? They have found that peculiar and nondescript thing, some geographical area on the face of the earth that our Democratic friends can not describe as a State, as a Territory, or as a foreign country, and how do they describe it? They say,

State, Territory, foreign country, "*or place.*"

[Laughter on the Republican side.]

There is somewhere on the surface of the earth a political subdivision that is a "place." [Laughter.] They do not know where it is; they do not know how to describe it. It is not under any jurisdiction that they can define, but it is a "place," and they do not want any trust-made goods transported into a "place." And there is another provision in this bill in which they say it shall not be transported from a "place" to a "place," from the unknown to the unknown. And this peculiar and indefinite unknown and indescribable locality, it is to be noticed, is supposed to be "outside" of a State or Territory. And yet my distinguished friend from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] stands up here, for about an hour and a quarter, and undertakes to convince himself and his loyal Democratic friends that we did not use exactly the kind of language that we ought to use when we drew this constitutional amendment.

Well, we did not say "place." I want to tell you that. We knew better than to do that. There is a sample copy of Democratic constructive legislation. [Laughter on the Republican side.] And every Democrat, if he has the courage, will have the chance a little later to vote or try to vote into the statute a declaration that there is somewhere in some locality a geographical area that can only be described as a "place." [Laughter on the Republican side.] This is straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel of unusual size.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Will the gentleman permit me?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Yes.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Will you permit the suggestion that as to the bill opportunity has been given under the rule to amend?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Yes.

Mr. DE ARMOND. And if there is one "place" too many we can get rid of it. But I should like to ask the gentleman what is meant by this language in section 1——

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Of the bill?

Mr. DE ARMOND. Of the constitutional amendment? What is meant by this:

All powers conferred by this article shall extend to the several States, Territories, the District of Columbia, and all territory under the sovereignty and subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

Does the gentleman hold that the States, the Territories, and the District of Columbia are not under the sovereignty and jurisdiction of the United States, or does he hold that this is a repetition? If you want to be so very precise——

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Yes; be entirely precise. Carve it out cameo-like.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Might it not be well to omit the words "and all territory under the sovereignty and subject to the jurisdiction of the United States?"

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. You want to know what the gentleman says about that. "The gentleman" has already stated his views upon it, but he will briefly restate them again. In the first place, I think that language would cover "place." And if there is anything anywhere that is only a "place," and the United States has any jurisdiction over it, you undertake by your amendment to assume to cover that. I say that I do not think it necessary to use the language, in my view of the Constitution. I repeat it again for the gentleman, but I do not undertake to stand here, and it ill becomes any man, Republican or Democrat, to stand here in view of the fact that in the history of the construction of the Constitution from the days of John Marshall down to Mr. Chief Justice Fuller, who now presides over the greatest court in the civilized world, many of the decisions of the Supreme Court upon constitutional questions have been rendered by a divided court, and many of them by a majority of one—I say it ill becomes any man, Republican or Democrat, to undertake to assert his individual opinion and say that it is not possible for the contrary to be held in the light of that history. So that it is legitimate and proper, as a matter of precaution, to insert this language.

Mr. TERRY rose.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Does the gentleman from Arkansas want to ask a question?

Mr. TERRY. Yes, if the gentleman consents.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Yes. I am a good deal as he was with the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY]; I like to see his smiling face.

Mr. TERRY. I would ask the gentleman, under his construction of the law and the Constitution and all those other things, whether the District of Columbia is a part of the United States?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. In my opinion it is. I have just answered that same question, but I will answer it again. I wish to be accommodating. I think that territory is a part of the United States, and so I think is the Philippine Archipelago. I can reiterate these answers all day.

Mr. TERRY. Why, then, did you use the words "District of Columbia" after you had said "the United States?"

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. For the same reason I have already given you in relation to the Philippine Archipelago. Let me ask you, what did you mean by "place" when you put that in your amendment? By the way, what is a "place," anyhow? Tell us what it is.

Mr. TERRY. The place outside of which the article was manufactured; that is all.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Haven't you already described that?

Mr. TERRY. It will not take a very great stretch of the intellect, if you take it in its proper connection, to see that it is a proper thing to say.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I read it in its connection, and I will pull it out of its connection. I will read it in and I will read it out, as far as that is concerned.

Mr. TERRY. It means the place outside of which the article was manufactured.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Outside of a State, outside of a Territory, outside of a foreign country, from place to place. [Laughter on the Republican side.] Now, I have a good many things to say——

Mr. TERRY. I will not take much of your time. Instead of using the words "District of Columbia" there, you might have simply said "place outside of which it is manufactured." The District of Columbia is neither a "State," nor a "Territory," nor a "foreign country."

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Well, if we had been using language in that indeterminate, inconclusive, and, shall I say, unintelligent, way, it would have been just as well to have said "place;" but I do not like that kind of expression, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. NOONAN. Just a word.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Do not bother me just now. I have many suggestions that I wish to make, and they will interest you a great deal more than those that I have made. You need not worry about that. When I get pretty well along——

Mr. NOONAN. I simply want to ask if the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution is Democratic construction or Republican construction?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. It is not either construction, I will tell you that. Let me answer your question. Some law professors have used the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution, adopted in 1868, for the purpose of undertaking to demonstrate what the fathers meant in 1787. They may succeed in imposing that upon people who are credulous and uninformed, but they can not impose it upon any intelligent man. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. NOONAN. But the word "place" is used there, and the expression "any place subject to the jurisdiction" of the United States.

Mr. GROSVENOR. That is a proper use of language there. They have not said "territory" and all that.

Mr. FLEMING. The same use as we use.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Very good. I am glad the gentleman has discovered the thirteenth amendment. "Place," as there used, it is claimed, relates to territory that otherwise would not be reached by the Constitution. If it is admitted that the minority used the word in that sense in their amendment their last state is worse than their first. Has the gentleman spoken to the gentleman from Arkansas? Has he told him that the committee in their report use the word "place" proposed as an amendment to the amendment as it is used in the thirteenth amendment?

Mr. NOONAN. Not at all.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. It is "another place." [Laughter.] I hope if the brethren find anything that is entertaining to them at any time they will be kind enough to suggest it.

Mr. DE ARMOND. That leads me to suggest a question. I understand the gentleman from Maine to say that the office of this section—that is, the first section—is mere transportation of these articles, provided his view of the Constitution is incorrect, and to be held that the old Constitution does not go out anywhere——

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I beg your pardon.

Mr. DE ARMOND. I understood the gentleman to say that the office of this first section was to afford transportation facilities to this sixteenth article, provided that it be held that the Constitution of its own vigor does not go to the outlying possessions.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. What you heard the gentleman from Maine say, if you listened, was that the office of this language was to provide against any possible contingency of an adverse constitutional construction.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Now, I wish to ask the gentleman one or two questions, if not really one. The first question is why, if that construction be put upon the Constitution, it is necessary to have this provision in the Constitution? If that construction be put upon the Constitution, if Congress is all-powerful and everything, why is it necessary to take care of the protection of this sixteenth amendment against adverse construction, and why limit it; why may it not take care of the entire Constitution? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I will tell you. I was expecting just such a conundrum.

Mr. DE ARMOND. I do not expect you to answer it.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. The gentleman knows that there are people who, upon their theory of the Constitution, claim that some of its provisions may apply now to all territory, and some may not. The gentleman very well knows that no man can, with positiveness, state what that construction in the end will be, and the gentleman very well knows that his last suggestion has been covered entirely by the answers that I have already made. It can not take care of the entire Constitution, as it does not purport to. I say it ill becomes the Democrats of this House to state that as one of the reasons why they do not vote for this constitutional amendment. Something has been said about a great deal of hypocrisy in connection with these measures. I will not get down to that subject. I am not going to take time to bandy words about hypocrisy in the matter, although there has been some provocation given, and the facts will justify the statement. I shall not say that there has been hypocrisy on the part of the Democracy, but I say here and now that I will demonstrate it in connection with trust legislation before I am through.

That is all that I care to say about that branch of the objection.

SECOND DEMOCRATIC OBJECTION—INFRINGES STATES' RIGHTS.

The other branch is this: The gentleman from Missouri says and the gentleman from Arkansas says they ought to have the privilege of amending this constitutional amendment, so that it would be concurrent. I ask the attention of the House to an analysis of that beautiful proposition. Its feasibility is argued by the gentleman from Arkansas, and he illustrates it by the fact that the United States Government now punishes for counterfeiting and the State governments also punish for counterfeiting. The power that exists to-day over this subject between Congress and the several States is divided. Between them they possess it all. Congress exercises its powers solely by virtue of the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution, which reads as follows:

To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.

When persons, corporations, trusts, or syndicates avail themselves of the facilities of interstate commerce, then they subject themselves to Congressional control. When any article becomes an item of interstate commerce, then the national power operates upon it. Until then Congress has no control, and its control ceases when the article ceases to be an item of interstate commerce. Upon the other hand, the State has the sole control until the line of interstate commerce is reached, when its power ceases. The State has no power to obstruct, interfere with, or control interstate commerce. The line which divides interstate and local commerce is the line of division between the two jurisdictions.

It is simply a legal impossibility to increase the power of Congress upon any practicable plan without decreasing the powers of the State, and this amendment does undertake to and will, if adopted, decrease to the extent of its terms the powers of the States; and hence the objection by men who believe in State rights, and hence the suggestion by my friends on the other side that concurrent power is what they want. They have stood here complaining and finding fault for not having been allowed to offer an amendment for consideration. Why? Because they have not been allowed to modify the amendment—this amendment to the Constitution—by introducing this provision providing for concurrent power.

You may look over the report of the minority, and you will not find any suggestion of any such amendment in terms. You will not find any suggestion offered to the Judiciary Committee, where they had the privilege of discussing it and whose deliberations they participated in and have commented upon in the course of this debate. Concurrent legislative power in this particular is simply a legal absurdity. That means equal power, power in the same degree, to the same extent. What would it mean when applied to these different things we are undertaking to remedy? It means the State could exercise the power, and the United States could exercise the same power to the same extent and to the same degree. Both have equal power. Now, if they happened to be inconsistent, one was in conflict with the other, which under that proposition would prevail?

If New Jersey saw fit to declare that a certain corporation was legitimate, innocuous, and wise, and the United States Government should undertake to say that they would dissolve that corporation, which one of these concurrent and equal powers would prevail? Neither; and you would have paralysis of legislative action. That is the Democratic theory of amending the Constitution; putting in a power that could not be effectively exercised by either, unless it was exercised on exactly parallel lines. If conditions that now prevail continue to prevail, and there is no reason to expect otherwise, there would be inconsistent legislation throughout the length and breadth of the land, and you would have a worse condition than exists to-day. And now they rail because they haven't been allowed to vote for that proposition. These are the only objections that our Democratic friends have to the constitutional amendment.

BRYAN'S PLAN.

I want to call your attention now to a suggestion made by a gentleman for whom I suppose my Democratic friends have the greatest respect. I refer to our distinguished fellow-citizen who, during the last four years, has apparently been standing upon a mental eminence looking out over the country and crying out: Oh, America, America, how often would I have gathered thee "as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wing, and ye would not!" And she will not. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

I have great admiration for Mr. Bryan. He is an orator of great ability and a distinguished public character; a man upright in his private character. I have no doubt upon his lines he may be sincere, but I can not say that I think my friend Bryan is really a great lawyer. I am going to read what he suggested as a remedy for the great trust problem. This is from a speech he delivered in Chicago:

One method has occurred to me, and to me it seems a complete method. It may not commend itself to you. If you have something better, I shall accept it in the place of this which I am about to suggest. But the method that occurs to me is this: That Congress should pass a law providing that no corporation organized in any State should do business outside of the State in which it is organized until it receives from some power created by Congress a license authorizing it to do business outside of its own State. Now, if the corporation must come to this body created by Congress to secure permission to do business outside of the State, then the license can be granted upon conditions which will, in the first place, prevent the watering of stock; in the second place, prevent monopoly in any branch of business, and, third, provide for publicity as to all of the transactions and business of the corporation.

Now, the joke about that is that it does not relate to interstate commerce at all; it simply suggests, upon Mr. Bryan's comprehension of the legal proposition, that Congress can control a local corporation in a State by reason of the mere fact that it happened to be organized in another State. Every lawyer knows that the Congress of the United States has no more control over such a corporation, under such circumstances, than it has over the precession of the equinoxes. There happened to be a man in the audience who knew that, and this followed:

"A VOICE"—

I suppose it was the "voice of one crying in the wilderness." [Laughter.]

"A VOICE. Colonel"—

That brought him up. Perhaps I should state here, in order that the facts may be fresh in our minds, that the "Colonel" had recently returned from the ensanguined camping ground of the serried ranks of the armies of the United States, where he had courageously braved the dangers inherent in unripe fruit, impure water, and unsanitary conditions [laughter on the Republican side], and he was still "Colonel."

A VOICE. Colonel, would such a law be constitutional?

Mr. BRYAN. I was coming to that. I am glad you mentioned it. What I mean to say is that Congress ought to pass such a law. If it is unconstitutional, and so declared by the Supreme Court, I am in favor of an amendment to the Constitution that will give to Congress—

I want to commend this to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY], who is ready to adopt a constitutional amendment provided he can have it in the homeopathic form. He does not want it in the allopathic, to apply to every trust, but he wants it in the homeopathic, to apply to only those engaged in interstate commerce. What is there about trusts that will drift around in States and not engage in interstate commerce, that they should be protected by the suggestion of the gentleman from Texas? I submit this to the consideration of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Bryan says:

I am in favor of an amendment to the Constitution that will give to Congress the power to destroy every trust in the country.

This amendment will do it. Under the Constitution as it is Congress can not do it. Now, our Democratic friends have this proposition: "Choose you this day whom ye will serve." At 5 o'clock you will have an opportunity to register your votes. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CUMMINGS] contends that this is not Mr. Bryan's amendment. Bryan has never suggested any form of amendment. It is Mr. Bryan's amendment because he wants one that will go to the root of the matter and tear out

every trust, and this amendment will accomplish that purpose by conferring the power upon Congress. Choose you whom ye will serve—Col. Bryan, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY], or the gentleman who heads the minority on the Judiciary Committee—when you come to vote upon this constitutional amendment. These quotations from the opinion of the court in the Knight case will illustrate the futility of the suggestion of Mr. Bryan:

It can not be denied that the power of a State to protect the lives, health, and property of its citizens, and to preserve good order and public morals, "the power to govern men and things within the limits of its dominion," is a power originally and always belonging to the States, not surrendered by them to the General Government, nor directly restrained by the Constitution of the United States, and essentially exclusive.

* * * * * * *

That which belongs to commerce is within the jurisdiction of the United States, but that which does not belong to commerce is within the jurisdiction of the police power of the State.

* * * * * * *

It was in the light of well-settled principles that the act of July 2, 1890, was framed. Congress did not attempt thereby to assert the power to deal with monopoly directly as such; or to limit and restrict the rights of corporations created by the States or citizens of the States in the acquisition, control, or disposition of property. (*United States* vs. *E. C. Knight Co.*, 156 U. S., 16.)

Instead of hiring a hall, my friend Colonel Bryan ought to hire a lawyer, and then he might come somewhere near making a valuable suggestion. [Laughter.]

BILL AMENDING SHERMAN ANTI-TRUST ACT.

Inasmuch as the minority have in caucus expressed an intention of supporting the committee bill, it is not necessary to now refer to its provision except to say that in the opinion of the committee it goes to the verge of Constitutional power.

I come now to the minority report on the bill. I can not spend much time upon it. I am going to pick out a few sample bricks to illustrate the capacity manifested by my distinguished friends on the other side whenever they undertake to make a law.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF LACK OF CAPACITY OF DEMOCRACY TO CONSTRUCT LEGISLATION.

Their proposed section 11, reads:

SEC. 11. That every contract, combine, device, trust, or combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, tending to create a monopoly in the *manufacture, production, sale*, exchange, transportation, or dealing in any article of commerce or merchandise, entering into trade or commerce among the States or with foreign countries, or designed to create impediments to, or resulting in restrictions to such trade or commerce or aids to commerce, or to limit or control the *manufacture or production* of such articles or merchandise, for the purpose of increasing or decreasing, or operating in such manner, or with such result, as to increase or decrease the price of such article or merchandise to the user or consumer, for the purpose of preventing competition in the *manufacture, production, sale, exchange*, transportation, or dealing in such articles or merchandise, or to give power to charge unreasonable prices for merchandise or articles produced or manufactured to be bought, sold, exchanged, dealt in, or transported in such trade or commerce, or for the purpose of imposing, or in such manner as to impose, unjust or onerous restrictions upon, or impediments to, the lawful business of any person, company, or corporation engaged in the *production or manufacture* of such merchandise or articles, is hereby declared to be illegal and a monopoly within the meaning of this act, and every person who shall make, or enter into, or engage in, any such contract, combine, device, trust, or combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, or shall be a promoter thereof or officer or agent therein, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not less than five hundred dollars and not exceeding five thousand dollars and by imprisonment not less than six months and not exceeding one year.

It will be seen that it attempts to control the "manufacture, production, and sale" of articles that enter "into trade or commerce" without reference to the fact as to whether it actually becomes a part of interstate commerce or whether the acts prohibited interfere in any way with interstate commerce, and in this respect it is clearly unconstitutional.

It is difficult to specify an article that does not sooner or later enter into interstate commerce, and it is only when it does so enter that it can be controlled. This section attempts to control it before that time.

Their section 13 reads:

SEC. 13. That wherever any State or Territory shall, in any law against trusts, combines, combinations, or monopolies, provide that no foreign corporation, association, joint-stock company, or partnership, *or stockholder* member, or officer belonging to or interested in any such trust, combine, monopoly, or combination of any kind, *shall be permitted to carry on or do any business, or have any office or place of business, in* such State, or shall make provision to regulate or suppress the business of any such corporation, association, or partnership, or prohibit the sale or offering for sale in such State of any article or merchandise produced by it, every such corporation, association, or partnership carrying on, or attempting to carry on, or do any business or have any office or place of business therein, and all its articles or merchandise carried thereto, shall be subject to the operation and effect of such law, to the same extent and in the same manner as though it had been incorporated, organized, or formed in such State and such articles or merchandise had been made and not brought therein; and no such law shall be regarded as 'in any way trenching upon the power of Congress to regulate commerce among the States or with foreign nations: *Provided, however*, That such articles or merchandise may be shipped and transported into any such State or Territory for the personal and private use of the consignee.

This is an attempt to suspend the operation of the interstate-commerce power, or to waive it, under the principle of the Wilson bill, relative to the prohibition of the sale of intoxicating liquor, so as to allow a State to legislate at will, even if the legislation interferes with interstate commerce. One of the interesting things which they propose to authorize a State to do is to provide that no "stockholder" of a foreign corporation interested in a trust "shall be permitted to carry on or do any business, or have any office or place of business in such State." Under this, an owner of a single share of stock in such a foreign corporation could not do any business of any kind in such State, and as he could not have any office or place of business, an owner of a single share could not practice any profession which required the use of an office. This is certainly drastic enough.

The American Sugar Refining Company, for instance, has 11,000 stockholders, and it is probable that a very large proportion of them reside in States other than that in which the company was organized. Say 6,000, for the purposes of illustration, are or would be engaged in business. Then, under this bill, there would be 6,000 people whom it would be possible to wholly deprive of the power or right to do business of any kind merely because they held the stock as investment. They should include bondholders. It may be that a more preposterous proposition has been presented before; if so, I have never heard of it.

Their proposed section 14 provides:

SEC. 14. That every corporation, association, joint-stock company, or partnership in the United States, or any Territory thereof, or in the District of Columbia, whether organized or formed under and pursuant to the laws of the United States or of a State or of a Territory, *owning or controlling any plant or business*, or a majority of the stock in any plant or business, similar to its own, *in any other State, Territory, or place outside of the one in which it was first chartered, organized*, or formed, shall, before being permitted to ship, consign, take, carry, or transport, or sell or deliver for shipment to any State or Territory, or into or from the District of Columbia, or any foreign country, any article of commerce or merchandise of its own production or manufacture, or receive consignments or shipments of articles of commerce or merchandise, manufactured or produced in any other State or Territory, or in the District of Columbia, or any foreign country, *file in the office of the Secretary of State of the United States a certified copy of its articles of incorporation, association, or partnership, together with a duly verified statement showing the article or articles or merchandise manufactured, produced, or dealt in by it or intended to be manufactured, produced, or dealt in by it, a copy of its by-laws, rules, and regulations; the names and places of residence of its officers and stockholders; the amount of its capital stock and the amount thereof actually issued; the amount thereof actually paid in in cash; the nature and value of the property owned by it, and also a full statement of all its debts and liabilities; the number of its employees and wages paid; the dividends paid, if any; the amount of its surplus, if any; the character of additions and improvements made each year and the cost thereof, and a statement of its operating and other expenses, together with a balance sheet showing its profits and losses; and shall annually thereafter file in said office a report verified by a majority of the directors of a corporation, or by a majority of the members of an association, joint stock company, or partnership, showing the same facts as then existing, and shall*, before shipping, or offering or attempting to ship, or sell or deliver for shipment, or *put in the way for transit*, to any other State or Territory, or the District of Columbia, or any foreign country, any article of commerce or merchandise manufactured, produced, or dealt in by it, *plainly and conspicuously stamp thereon, when susceptible of being so stamped, and also on the outside of packages, boxes, or tanks containing the same, the name of* the article or merchandise, and the name of the corporation, association, joint stock company, or partnership manufacturing, producing, or dealing in the same, and the place from and to which it is to be shipped or transported.

Every such corporation, association, or partnership as referred to in this section, and every officer, agent, or attorney thereof, *that shall ship, or offer or attempt to ship, or sell or deliver for shipment, or put in the way of transit, to any other State or Territory, or to the District of Columbia, or to any foreign country, any article or merchandise dealt in, manufactured, or produced by it, or shall violate or fail to comply with any of the provisions of this section, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 and not exceeding $5,000, and by imprisonment of not less than six months and not more than one year.*

Here we have the word "place" again.

The fact which determines what corporations, firms, etc., are subject to the provisions of this section is simply whether it owns or controls any plant or business or a majority of the stock in any plant or business similar to its own in any "other State, Territory, or place outside of the one in which it was first chartered, organized, or formed," etc.

Observe that they do not provide that the corporations or institutions in regard to which they legislate shall be engaged in interstate commerce or shall be engaged in crushing out competition or that they shall be monopolies. They do not undertake in this section to deal with this juggernaut, this "hydra-headed monster." They submit this bald, naked proposition. A firm organized and doing business, for instance, in the city of Washington can not have a place of business of similar character in Baltimore unless it first files a long rigmarole of details specified in regard to publicity.

Next, what? That it shall before shipping or attempting to ship any of its goods brand them with the name of the article, the name of the firm selling same, and the place to which it is to be shipped.

Next, what? Having provided that a firm which has a place of business in two States, though not in any way connected with a trust—there is no suggestion of a trust made in this section—after having complied with these provisions with reference to publicity and the requirement that they shall brand their goods before undertaking to ship them, they go further, and say that they shall not be shipped at all. That is the proposition; that is the proposed Democratic legislation. Here is the language:

Every such corporation, association, or partnership as referred to in this section, and every officer, agent, or attorney thereof, *that shall ship, or offer*

or attempt to ship, or sell or deliver for shipment, or put in the way of transit, to any other State or Territory, or to the District of Columbia, or to any foreign country, any article or merchandise dealt in, manufactured, or produced by it, or shall violate or fail to comply with any of the provisions of this section, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not less than five hundred dollars and not exceeding five thousand dollars, and by imprisonment of not less than six months and not more than one year.

A couple of barbers, composing a firm having a shop in Washington and another in Baltimore and selling ordinary articles of toilet use, or cigars, which are often sold in such places, would, under this proposed legislation, be required to file this list giving publicity to all their affairs; if they undertake to ship a razor or a cake of soap from Washington to Baltimore they must brand it, and after having branded it, they can not take it from one city to the other, even though one of them carries it in his pocket, and thus "puts it in the way of transit" without being subject to a fine of $500 and imprisonment for six months.

It may be that the crushing out of the "hydra-headed monster" involves necessarily a monumental absurdity of this character, but I respectfully request to be allowed to dissent.

That is the practical operation of this legislation proposed by my friends of the Democracy. I understand our Democratic friends are to be invited to vote for this amendment. It is very fortunate for us that they thus illustrate before the country their capacity to construct legislation—that they have had the high privilege of putting into their report some things that they would like to offer as amendments to this bill.

PROPOSITION TO SUSPEND TARIFF ON TRUST-MADE ARTICLES.

I now come to the favorite panacea of our friends, the Democracy, for this gigantic disease, the trust. Section 12 provides:

That whenever the President of the United States shall be satisfied that the price of any commodity or article of merchandise has been enhanced in consequence of any monopoly as defined in this act, he shall issue his proclamation suspending the collection of all customs duties or import taxes on like articles of merchandise or commodities brought from foreign countries. Such suspensions shall continue as long as such enhancement in price of such commodity or article of merchandise exists, and until revoked by the proclamation of the President.

My first objection—it may be a Democratic objection—is this: There never was attempted to be written into the statute books of any State or of the United States a provision so violently imperial and czar-like as this proposition. It gives to the President of the United States the power to enforce upon an organization which is assumed to be criminal, for the express purpose of punishment, and that punishment is expected to be business ruin, the penalty of the law without even giving the offending party the right to be heard. The President brings the charge; he tries the cause; he renders judgment, and he executes the sentence. If that is not Cæsarism, if that is not imperialism, if that is not centralization run mad, I ask you to distinguish it. Search the records of this country or any other and see if you can find anything that will equal it. No court within the borders of Christendom ought to countenance for one moment a statute which, under any circumstances, so flagrantly violates the fundamental law as to authorize any man to pass upon the guilt or innocence of any other man or set of men without allowing them an opportunity to be heard. It is only in the infernal regions that they determine a cause without hearing. Yet that is the proposition of our friends on the other side.

This arbitrary power is in no sense parallel with the power vested in the President under a reciprocal clause in a treaty, where he only has to perform an act dependent upon the existence of a fact over which he has no control, as its existence is determined by the action of an independent power. Under this section he has the power to determine ex parte whether a crime had been committed, and then proceed to punish on the Democratic theory by ruining the criminal. As the tariff must be suspended upon all such articles, innocent parties who were dependent upon the tariff for success would have to meet the fate of the guilty. Again, it is only to be suspended when the "price is enhanced," but the great weapon of the trust is to crush competition by lowering prices, and while this interesting process was going on under this section they would have the benefit of the tariff, as it can only be suspended while the "price is enhanced." I deny wholly the efficacy of this legal nostrum.

SUGAR AND OIL CONTRASTED.

Let me call attention to two of the great trusts that are supposed to exist within the borders of the United States—the sugar trust and the Standard Oil trust. In order to be able to understand which of these great aggregations of capital bears most oppressively upon the general public, upon the ordinary citizen, upon the laboring man, I have made a calculation to ascertain how much the average American citizen in the course of a year pays per capita for oil, for sugar, and for wheat. I took the aggregate amount of consumption or sale of oil at the wholesale price; I took the aggregate amount of consumption of sugar, with the wholesale price; I took the same facts in relation to wheat. I found that according to this computation the seventy-six millions of people in the United States paid per capita for oil during a single year 36 cents; that they paid per capita for sugar $2.99, and for wheat $4.74.

The inference from this is that if these trusts are equally oppressive, then when the Standard Oil Company oppresses the public once the sugar trust oppresses it eight times. Its clutch is eight times as villainous upon "the throat of American energy."

HAVEMEYER ON TRUSTS.

Now, I want to call your attention to the author of the sugar trust, an eminent Democrat, Mr. Havemeyer, who, in his testimony before the Industrial Commission, states this proposition:

The mother of all trusts is the customs tariff bill.

And then he has the monumental assurance in that same statement to say that the tariff upon sugar should be doubled.

In order that this illustration may be intelligently apprehended, and the real animus of an ideal trust disclosed, I will allow Mr. Havemeyer to speak for himself.

Senator MALLORY. Now, I also understand you to imply at least that it is the policy of the American Sugar Refining Company to crush out all competition, if possible.

Mr. HAVEMEYER. But that is not so; there is no such testimony. I understand it has been put in that form by one of the gentlemen here, but it is not the fact. What I said was that it was the policy of the American Company to maintain and protect its trade, and if it resulted in crushing a competitor it is no concern of the American Company; if he gets in the press that is his affair, not ours.

Senator MALLORY. And if anyone interferes with the business, profits, or competition of the American Sugar Refining Company it is its policy to prevent it if possible?

Mr. HAVEMEYER. By lowering the profits to defy it.

Senator MALLORY. And if it results in crushing him out——

Mr. HAVEMEYER (interrupting). That is his affair.

Senator MALLORY. Not the affair of the American Sugar Refining Company?

Mr. HAVEMEYER. No.

Senator MALLORY. Now, suppose in the natural course of events the American Sugar Refining Company should suppress—we will not use the word crush out—all opposition, all opposition. I understand from your theory—business principles—that you would then seek to get out of the public and consumer the largest amount of profit consistent with your idea of business principles?

Mr. HAVEMEYER. Precisely.

I make no attack upon this particular trust. "Thine own mouth condemneth thee and not I, yea, thine own lips testify against thee."

This is a favorite proposition of our friends upon the other side, that the mother of trusts is the tariff. Well, I submit, with great confidence, that if the trust is the creature, the tariff is the creator; if the trust is the effect and the tariff the cause, wherever you have the effect you would expect to find the cause—wherever you have the creature you would expect to find the creator.

How will that logic apply to existing facts? The Standard Oil Company—and the Democracy know all about the Standard Oil Company, as I shall show you a little later—existed in 1888. The Standard Oil Company never had the protection of a cent upon petroleum or oil. The sugar trust, to be sure, had protection, to which I shall call your attention in a few moments. But go into England, free-trade England, and the trusts and aggregations of capital in England exceed the aggregations of capital and the formation of trusts in the United States under the protective tariff. It is literally covered with them. They create no surprise.

To illustrate this I read a clipping from the Washington Times, an able Democratic paper:

GREAT BRITAIN'S TRUSTS—LITTLE ATTENTION PAID TO THEM BY ENGLISH NEWSPAPERS—THE FORMATION OF A GIGANTIC COMBINE NOT TREATED AS A MATTER OF GREAT IMPORTANCE IN THE DAILY JOURNAL—ILLUSTRATIONS AS TO STYLE IN WHICH THE NEWS IS CHRONICLED.

Consul Halstead writes the State Department, from Birmingham, March 1, 1900, in regard to the apathy with which the people of Great Britain regard the formation of trusts:

"The news editor of the London Mail (circulation, 1,200,000) gives only some thirty-two lines to an item of the kind, and the editor in chief is not disturbed to the extent of a single editorial paragraph. Except an approving paragraph or two in the financial columns when the flotation is advertised, one can look in vain in other papers for either news or editorial notice referring to English trusts." Mr. Halstead continues:

"I have a clipping from the February 1 issue of the London Daily Mail. It is an announcement of a proposed formation of a worsted spinners' trust. This trust is to have a capital of $37,597,000, and 106 firms are concerned; yet the news editor of the Mail judges this item to be worth only a two-line head, twenty-eight lines of small type, set solid. The item is as follows:

"'A meeting of spinners engaged in the worsted trade was held yesterday in Bradford to consider the question of forming a combination of firms in that branch of business. One hundred and six firms were represented.

"'Mr. Scott Ling, of Manchester, who presided, explained that it was proposed to buy out firms on the basis of allowing nothing for good will of concerns which show only 5 per cent profit. All profit beyond 5 per cent would be multiplied seven and one-half times, and that amount allowed for good will. On such a basis he calculated they could show 7½ to 8 per cent for ordinary shareholders.

"'Opinion is divided as to the possibility of a successful combination. Some put the probable total capital at £18,000,000.'

"I take from the same issue of the Daily Mail the following extract in regard to the amalgamation as a 'trust' of two great South African steamship companies:

"'Details are now fully arranged of the recently announced amalgamation of the two well-known Cape mail companies.

"'The object of the amalgamation is to provide for the more efficient working of the South African trade and for the carrying out of the joint

mail contract which the companies have made with the Cape government for ten years from October next.

There they exist on every hand. But where is the creator of trusts in England? Have we creatures without creators? Can it be possible that they are like Topsy, they simply grow, or are they like the original protoplasm in the theory of evolution, they come and nobody knows how they come? I take the report drawn by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND], in his magnificent English, and I find that he states that the tariff is the mother of trusts. This is his language:

Consider for a moment how the tariff operates to make and perpetuate the shameful monopoly known as the paper trust.

I went on and read his report to see *how* it operated. Did he tell how? Did he tell why? No. Did he show how it was brought about? No; and no other man who has made that assertion has ever told. They simply assert that the tariff is the mother of trusts. That is equal to the argument, "That it is so if it ain't so, if I say it's so." It reminds me of the lawyer in the West who was arguing a case before a justice on the frontier, and was pictured by Bill Nye as standing up before the justice, with his clenched fist uplifted in the air, his mouth wide open, saying: "When I holler, it's law." [Laughter.] So it is with my friends upon this proposition, when they say it is so, it is so; but the man does not live who has yet given a reason why it is so.

WILSON-GORMAN TARIFF.

Assuming for the moment that it is so. The Democratic proposition to-day, when they are out of power, when they have no power to enact legislation or to control the trusts, is to do what? To suspend the tariff on trust-made articles. Now let me call your attention to a little recent history. In 1894 we had what was known as the Wilson-Gorman tariff bill, well described as a measure of perfidy and dishonor, so disreputable that Cleveland would not even sign it. What did the Wilson-Gorman tariff do? I have the figures here, given me by an expert. Upon raw sugar it imposed a tariff of 40 per cent ad valorem. These figures are made upon actual importations, actual results, in 1895, nothing theoretical. Upon refined sugar the tariff was 44.42 per cent, or a preferential in favor of the sugar trust of 4.42, or 10 per cent in favor of the sugar trust. And I may say here in order to make this schedule a little more authentic, that it is well understood that the original schedule in this Wilson bill was in the handwriting of Hon. John G. Carlisle, then Democratic Secretary of the Treasury.

Now, my friend from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] says that a "simple little bill would accomplish this reform." He makes that statement in his report. The gentleman from Missouri was a member of the Fifty-second Congress, he was a member of the Fifty-third Congress, he was a member of Congress when the Wilson bill was passed. I ask the gentleman from Missouri, I ask the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY], I ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], where they were when this tariff was being framed with a preferential duty in favor of the sugar trust, framed to perpetuate rather than destroy a trust that is eight times as oppressive upon the laboring men throughout the United States as the Standard Oil Company? Where was the gentleman from Missouri with his "simple little bill?" [Applause on the Republican side.]

Where were they? There was a tariff bill that instead of destroying the sugar trust encouraged it. And where was William J. Bryan—Colonel Bryan the Great? He was a member of the Ways and Means Committee that reported the Wilson bill that had a preferential tariff perpetuating the sugar trust under these circumstances. Now our Democratic friends say, "Oh, let us suspend the tariff on trusts." But where was William J. Bryan with his "simple little bill" in 1894? Let William J. Bryan take that and explain it in some of these speeches that he is about to make throughout the country. Let him answer that when he discusses the question of trusts. William J. Bryan introduced in the Fifty-second Congress a bill, H. R. 8977, and another bill, H. R. 9004, providing for placing trust-made articles upon the free list. It was the session when the Wilson bill was passed.

What did William Jennings Bryan do with those bills? He had them very promptly referred to the Ways and Means Committee, of which he was a member, and of which our Democratic friends had the control. Where are those bills? They never were resurrected until I dug them up two or three days ago, encumbered by the dust by which they were intended to be smothered when they were referred to this Democratic committee. [Applause on the Republican side.] But now they stand here and say that a "simple little bill" would do this whole business. Where was your "simple little bill" then? It will not do to say that you did not have this trust in mind, because in 1888, as I shall show you in a few moments, the Democracy spent a good deal of time investigating the sugar trust, and the tail end of this Wilson bill had a provision in relation to trusts. So the Democracy was thinking about it; but the more they thought about it the more they thought they would not bother the sugar trust, Mr. Havemeyer being the head of it. I do not suppose he contributes anything to the campaign fund of the Democracy. It would be very unkind to suggest that. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

They made provision in that Wilson bill for what? Against combinations that interfered with foreign commerce, but did not make any against combinations that interfered with local production or manufacture, while one is precisely as injurious as the other (sections 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, and 77).

DINGLEY BILL.

Let me compare this Wilson bill, which our friends did not make in accordance with their pretended theories, with the Dingley bill, drawn by the distinguished gentleman whose place I am undertaking to fill upon the floor of the House. A similar comparison for 1898 shows that in the Dingley bill the tariff upon raw sugar was 84.62, and upon refined sugar it is only 77.74 per cent, a difference against the trusts of 6.88, figured upon an actual importation, taking sugar of 96 polariscope test, the largest amount imported being of that saccharine strength.

Here is the Dingley bill, framed with a duty which in practice operates against this trust. Here is the Wilson bill framed with a preferential duty in favor of the trust. Because the tariff on raw sugar is the tariff that injures the trust and the preferential tariff upon refined sugar is the tariff that benefits the trusts. The trust buys the raw and manufactures and sells the refined. Let me go a little further on this proposition and call your attention to the fact that in the thirty-six months when the Wilson bill was in operation, with this preferential tariff sustaining and encouraging the sugar trust, the total receipts from revenue were only about $87,000,000. During the last three or four months prior to the going into effect of the Dingley bill large increases in importations were made in order to avoid the effect of the Dingley tariff, more than nine hundred millions of pounds, so that upon the first of July, 1897, when the Dingley bill became a law there was a surplus of sugar in this country by reason of the extra tariff imposed by the Dingley bill, with its preferential against the interests of the trusts, of about 800,000,000 pounds. What under those circumstances was the effect of these two measures upon the prosperity and welfare of the country in which we live?

The Democratic tariff for revenue is supposed to exceed the protective tariff in its revenue-producing power.

The Dingley bill produced in thirty-four months about $145,000,000 of revenue; or about $2,000,000 a month by the Wilson bill as compared with more than $4,000,000 a month by the Dingley bill, against the interests of the trusts. (Loud applause on the Republican side.)

BRYAN SHOWS TARIFF IS NOT THE CAUSE OF TRUSTS.

Now, I want to quote to my friends what Colonel Bryan the Great, said upon this proposition that our Democratic friends say that they believe in. Here it is:

Now, some one has suggested that to put everything on the free list that trusts make would destroy trusts. I do not agree with this statement, as it is made so broadly. I believe that the high tariff has been the means of extortion and that it has aided trusts to collect more than they otherwise could collect. *But I do not believe you can destroy all trusts by putting all trust-made articles on the free list.* Why? Because—

And he gives a reason, which is something that no Democrat has ever yet done, who says that the tariff is the "mother of the trusts." He gives the reason why it is not.

Because if an article can be produced in this country as cheaply as it can be produced abroad the trust could exist without the aid of any tariff, although it could not extort so much as it could with the tariff. While some relief may come from modifications of the tariff, we can not destroy monopoly until we lay the ax at the root of the tree and make monopoly impossible by law.

Now, in view of his last suggestion, when we have the adoption of a constitutional amendment pending here, the question is whether our friends will follow the lead of the Colonel or will they follow the suggestion of my friend from Missouri, who says that it has been so long since the Constitution has been amended that it can not be amended, or my friend from Texas [Mr. BAILEY], who objects to the amendment because it would take away all the powers of the State, or my friend from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], who says the Constitution can not be amended except by bayonet and saber stroke, and shot and shell, and the spilling of blood. I had hoped it was not as bad as that. We have not reached the period of blood, except the blood that my friends on the other side are sweating in connection with the vote that they expect to have to cast here in a few minutes. [Loud laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

DEMOCRATIC INCAPACITY TO DEAL WITH TRUSTS DEMONSTRATED.

I want to call the attention of the House now for a few moments to the record of our friends upon the other side upon this question. There is not a syllable of legislation except that provision upon the tail of the Wilson bill that has not been put upon the statute books by the constructive action of the Republican party. But our Democratic friends here stand and say that *they* are to be relied upon by the American people as a party to construct legislation that will control this evil. That statement, in the light of their record, is simply grotesque. In 1888

the Democracy had charge of Congress. They introduced a resolution on January 25 authorizing the Committee on Manufactures to investigate and report recommendations in relation to trusts. That committee went on investigating from January 25, 1888, up to July 22, 1888, and then they made a partial report, which read, in part, as follows:

Your committee further report that the *names of various combinations and trusts* have been from time to time furnished to your committee; *that the number of such combinations is very large;* and that your committee, in calling witnesses and taking testimony, proceeded upon the following plan of investigation, i. e., to inquire— * * *

Your committee has particularly directed its inquiry into the methods of and the extent of the business done or controlled by *the sugar trust and the Standard Oil trust*, and respectfully submit herewith the testimony taken before it in relation to these two trusts.

Clifton R. Breckinridge, William L. Wilson, and William D. Bynum were members of this committee.

This committee proceeded to investigate after July 22, 1888, and while it was investigating a modest, mild, unassuming, but able and courageous gentleman from the State of Ohio came out here and procured a copy of the agreement under which the Standard Oil Company was doing business. While the Democrats continued to investigate, this unobtrusive gentleman, a lawyer of great ability, incorruptible and fearless, went to his home in Ohio and proceeded to litigate. Mark you, the Democracy investigated, and the attorney-general of the State of Ohio—for this man was the attorney-general—litigated. I wish to show the distinction between this attorney-general, the Hon. D. K. Watson, and Attorney-General Monnett, over whom my friend from Ohio [Mr. LENTZ] seems to be so hysterical and in such great trouble. Mr. D. K. Watson produced results, which Mr. Monnett never yet has. In the suit which he brought this judgment was rendered:

"Judgment ousting the defendant from the right to make agreements set forth in the petition and of the power to perform the same." The case is State ex rel. D. K. Watson *vs.* Standard Oil Company (49 Ohio State, 189).

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LENTZ] thinks Attorney-General Monnett was not appreciated, as he was not elected governor; as if a man must necessarily have a reward for simply doing his duty. Perhaps results may have had something to do with it. Mr. Watson was elected to Congress from the district now represented by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LENTZ], which had a normal Democratic majority of 2,500, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LENTZ] only defeated him in 1896 by 49 votes. This tends to show that the people of Ohio know whom to honor.

But the Democrats continued investigating. Perhaps I should call your attention right here to the fact that while the committee was investigating, two national conventions were held, one Democratic and the other Republican. The Democratic convention introduced into its platform this plank:

Judged by Democratic principles, the interests of the people are betrayed when, by unnecessary taxation, trusts and combinations are permitted to exist, which, while unduly enriching the few that combine, rob the body of our citizens by depriving them of the benefits of natural competition.

Not a word as to the remedy; not a promise that they would correct it; not a hint that they would correct it. It was a generality that did not even glitter. Let me read the plank in the platform adopted by the Republican convention in 1888 while our friends the Democracy were investigating here in the city of Washington.

We declare our opposition to all combinations of capital, organized in trusts or otherwise, to control arbitrarily the condition of trade among our citizens; and we recommend to Congress and the State legislatures, in their respective jurisdictions, such legislation as will prevent the execution of all schemes to oppress the people by undue charges on their supplies, or by unjust rates for the transportation of their products to market. We approve the legislation by Congress to prevent alike unjust burdens and unfair discriminations between the States.

The man that drew that resolution was a lawyer. He was a member of the House of Representatives, and he well knew that the jurisdiction of Congress was confined to the enforcement of the provisions of the Constitution known as the interstate-commerce clause, and that other legislation as to trusts would have to be enacted by the States. That resolution therefore recommended Congress to act, and it also recommended the various States to act.

I said he was a lawyer. He was a Republican, a statesman and a patriot, and was then a member of the House of Representatives. He came from the State of Ohio, and his name was William McKinley, jr. [Applause on the Republican side.] He was chairman of that Committee on Resolutions.

STATE LEGISLATION SINCE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM IN 1888.

I want to stop right here to call your attention to the fact that thirty-one States and Territories have since that resolution enacted anti-trust legislation. These are the States and the Territory:

1. Alabama, approved February 18, 1897. Applies simply to insurance companies.
2. Arkansas, approved March 16, 1897. Quite general in its extent and application.
3. California, approved February 27, 1893. Relates to live stock only.
4. Delaware, passed February 15, 1891. Relates exclusively to insurance companies.
5. Florida, approved June 11, 1897. Applies to beef cattle and meats solely.
6. Georgia, approved December 23, 1896. Quite general in its application.
7. Illinois, approved June 10, 1897. Quite general in application.
8. Indiana, approved March 5, 1897. Quite general.
9. Iowa, approved May 6, 1890. Quite general.
10. Kansas, approved March 8, 1897. Very broad and sweeping.
11. Kentucky, approved May 20, 1890. Quite general in application.
12. Louisiana, in effect July 7, 1892. Quite broad and general.
13. Maine, approved March 7, 1889. Quite broad and general.
14. Michigan, in effect July 1, 1889. Broad and general.
15. Minnesota, approved April 20, 1891. Quite general.
16. Mississippi, approved March 11, 1896. Quite broad. First in effect in 1892.
17. Missouri, approved April 2, 1891. Since amended and broadened. Quite general and efficient.
18. Montana, enacted in 1895. Quite general.
19. Nebraska, enacted April 8, 1897, but there was an act in 1895. Quite broad and general.
20. New Mexico, approved February 4, 1891. Quite general.
21. New York, in effect May 7, 1897. Quite broad and general.
22. North Carolina, ratified March 11, 1889. Quite general.
23. North Dakota, approved March 9, 1897. Quite general.
24. Oklahoma, in effect December 25, 1890. Quite general.
25. South Carolina, approved February 25, 1897. Quite general.
26. South Dakota, approved March 1, 1897. Quite general.
27. Tennessee, approved April 6, 1889. Quite broad and general.
28. Texas, approved March 30, 1889. Broad and general.
29. Utah, approved March 9, 1896. Quite broad and general.
30. Washington, in constitution and law approved March 21, 1895.
31. Wisconsin, approved April 27, 1897. Broad and general.

With the exception of three, which had some legislation indirectly applying to the subject, no such legislation existed in any of them before that time. I do not go so far as to claim that this plank in our platform compelled the adoption by the legislatures of this anti-trust legislation, but I do say that the Democracy of 1888 did not have the courage to even suggest a remedy or give any advice, but simply set up a wail in their platform about the evils without even intimating how they could be controlled, and that the suggestion of the Republican platform was followed.

Let me go back to this committee that was charged with the duty of investigating these trusts. It investigated the Standard Oil trust, the sugar trust, the cotton-bag trust, and the whisky trust. Nine hundred and fifty-one pages of testimony in connection with the Standard Oil trust were taken up to the fall of 1888. The last meeting of this committee was September 1, 1888. They made their report to Congress on the 2d day of March, 1889. From September 1, 1888, nothing, so far as the record of the committee shows, was done. So far as the record shows, our Democratic friends were thinking what they would do. Thus was the "native hue of resolution sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought." Mark you, here were our Democratic friends, who stand here today and grow red in the face and froth at the mouth with vehement denunciation of the trusts; here they were up against four trusts, which they were investigating—four deadly octopuses, which had their "villainous clutch upon the throat of American energy," and let us see what our Democratic friends did when they were up against the real thing. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Perhaps I should say first that they introduced a resolution in the House October 20, 1888, authorizing the continued employment of a clerk after they had ceased to hold any meetings, after they had ceased to do any business; I suppose for the purpose of helping them think on this most important question. [Laughter.] He does not appear to have served any other useful purpose except to punctually draw his $6 per day.

He was paid from September 1, 1888, up to March 2, 1889. I am afraid that it will appear that our friends hardly knew then what to even think they thought. They had the octopus in his lair. Four of them at the conclusion of this period of travail with this tremendous burden, while they were overshadowed with this cimmerian darkness, in the presence of the "hydra-headed monsters" "grinding into the earth unfortunate women and children," these "robbers" and "thieves," four of them right there, with their "villainous clutch on the throat of American energy"—they should have known that all that would be necessary to do was to have "a simple little bill." [Laughter.]

Let us see what the Democratic party did when it had the responsibility of initiating and constructing legislation. I read from the report of this committee. They say:

The committee respectfully submit herewith the testimony taken before

them in relation to the whisky trust and the combination affecting the article of cotton bagging.

Then they go on to say that they—

respectfully report that the number of combinations and trusts formed and forming in this country is, as your committee has ascertained, very large—

They had found that out in July, 1888; so they corroborate their previous finding. They are still "very large." They continue:

and affect a large portion of the important manufacturing and industrial interests of the country.

"They do not report any list of these combinations, for the reason that new ones are constantly forming."

That is to say, the trusts were forming so fast that the committee could not count those that had already been formed! [Laughter.] It reminds one of the story of the farmer who sent out his hired man to count a new litter of pigs; and the hired man returned, saying that he had counted all except the little speckled pig, who ran around so that he could not count him! [Laughter.] So our Democratic friends found these trusts growing so fast that they could not count them. It was an awful and terrible condition of things that confronted them. They found, too, that—

Old ones are constantly extending their relations, so as to cover new branches of business and invade new territories.

Now they come to the essential point:

Your committee further report that, owing to present differences of opinion between the members of the committee——

Mr. SHATTUC. I rise to a point of order. There is so much noise in the Hall that we can not hear the gentleman occupying the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MORRIS). The House will come to order. The Chair is constrained to state that in consequence of the want of order on the floor he himself can not hear the remarks of the gentleman addressing the Chair.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I do not suppose my friends over there like to hear what I am saying. I hate awfully to state it; it is no doubt a little chilly—as chilly as some things which my Democratic friends in the ice trust have been learning! [Laughter.]

TAMMANY AND ICE TRUST.

I refer for a moment in passing to this ice trust about which the gentleman from New York is so much disturbed and which last evening came so near giving rise to a violent collision on this floor between a distinguished Democratic candidate for the Vice-Presidency and the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, so that it seemed at one time that somebody might be obliged to interfere in order to prevent, for the sake of the traditions of this House, a scene of violence.

This ice trust, as I understand it, let me say, went to the State of Maine—I merely suggest this as a political proposition—for the purpose of procuring a charter for a corporation with a capital of $60,000,000. The State of Maine had a Republican legislature, with a Republican judiciary committee, and upon that committee was my friend Joseph H. Manley, a member from the State of Maine of the national Republican committee. Now, what did that Republican legislature do upon the question of organizing and assisting the trust? The Republican legislature promptly "turned down" the ice trust, which then went to New Jersey and obtained its charter, and afterwards, I suppose, took under its protecting folds the mayor of New York and other distinguished sachems of Tammany Hall. So that "the Tiger" may be said, during this warm weather, to be carefully preserved upon ice. [Laughter.] And paradoxical as it may appear, the nearer he gets to the ice the hotter he grows, if our Vice-Presidential friend is a fair sample.

Mr. FLEMING. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I will, after I get through with this point. I want to show what our Democratic friends do when they are right up against the real thing.

Your committee further report that owing to present differences of opinion between the members of the committee they limit this report—

Now, remember what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] says, and what the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLEMING] says, and what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] says, and what the other gentlemen who constitute the minority of the Judiciary Committee say. In 1900 "a simple little bill" would do. That is what they say now at the beginning of a campaign after Colonel Bryan has said that the issues of this campaign are to be imperialism, trusts, and finances. In 1889 this committee had had under investigation four trusts for more than a year, and what conclusion did they reach? Here is their language:

They limit this report to submitting to the careful consideration of *subsequent Congresses* the facts shown by the testimony taken before the committee.

Was not that courageous? The mountain travailed and did not bring forth even a mouse. When our Democratic friends have no power and know it, when they can not enact a statute and know it, they become simply frantic in their determination to do something. Incidentally they stand up here filling the air with charges of deceit, and fraud, and insincerity. Under these circumstances you can not stop them from accomplishing something, or hold them down, even though you should hitch on a span of horses, a yoke of oxen, an automobile, and a steam engine. They simply *will* do something. But run them up against something, stand them up in front of a trust, or four of them, and what happens to them then? They stand still and turn pale. They shiver and they tremble, and the hair upon their flesh stands up. Their courage oozes from the ends of their nerveless, paralyzed fingers, their feet are shod with lead, and they cravenly turn the question over to "subsequent Congresses." It is significant that they then knew that the next Congress was Republican and could be relied upon for courage and intelligence enough to do something.

There is only one conclusion about this condition in which we find our distinguished friends. When they had this question before them, and had been thinking of it—William L. Wilson, William D. Bynum, Clifton R. Breckenridge, Bacon of New York—when they had been considering it for six months and one day, either they did not have the intelligence or they did not have the courage to attack the "hydra-headed monster." [Applause.] Now I will listen to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLEMING].

Mr. FLEMING. The gentleman from Maine has been giving us a very interesting recital——

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I hope so.

Mr. FLEMING. Of the action of the Republican party in its attempt to destroy trusts. He referred, I believe, to some platform declarations.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Put your question quickly, for I know what it is.

Mr. FLEMING. Now, will the gentleman from Maine——

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Will the gentleman from Maine let you know why they did not put it in their platform of 1896?

Mr. FLEMING. That is exactly what I want to know.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Yes; I will tell you why.

Mr. FLEMING. Was it to meet campaign emergencies?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Sit down, do not make a speech, and I will tell you why.

Mr. FLEMING. I have asked you. Now, I would like to know.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. The promises of the Republican party never outlaw, and it is unnecessary for the Republican party to repeat its promises. [Applause on the Republican side.] The promises of the Democratic party are never performed. They are like the promissory note of an insolvent debtor, every time it is renewed the poorer and meaner it grows. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] That is the reason.

Mr. FLEMING rose.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Now, do not interrupt me. I have no time. I want to call your attention to another thing for a minute. They did put in "a simple little bill." I will call your attention to your platform in a minute. The only "simple little bill" that the Democracy put in in connection with their investigation of the sugar trust in 1888 was a "simple little bill" for $11,968, for the expenses of this committee, for accomplishing nothing and then being obliged to stand up before the country and admit their incompetency to deal with the question. I recollect nothing in history that is equal to the carnage, destruction, and havoc that was visited upon the "hydra-headed monsters" by this assault of the Democracy in 1888, unless it may be paralleled by Cervantes' immortal hero Don Quixote, when, commending his soul to his lady Dulcinea, imploring her to succor him in his hour of peril, covered with his buckler, with his lance in rest, astride of his Rosinante, with Sancho Panza tagging along behind, he made that sanguinary charge upon the windmills upon the plain of Monteil. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

For the satisfaction of the gentleman, I come, just for a moment, to his platform, that heterogeneous, conglomerate aggregation of pessimism, communism, anarchism, nihilism, socialism, hoboism, Coxeyism, 16-to-oneism, middle-of-the-roadism, anything-to-beat-Grantism, raise-the-devil-generallyism that they adopted in Chicago in 1896. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

But you had a plank in your platform at that time, a diluted copy of your plank in 1892, in which the Democracy, that did not have the courage and the ability to attack the trusts in 1889, demanded some changes in the interstate-commerce law. The Democracy did not, however, make any attempt to amend that law, and, as usual, their promise went unperformed. I will give in this connection the platforms since 1888:

[Democratic platform, June 21, 1892.]

We recognize in the trusts and combinations which are designed to enable capital to secure more than its just share of the joint product of capital and labor a natural consequence of the prohibitive taxes which prevent the free competition which is the life of honest trade; but we believe their worst evils can be abated by law; and we demand the rigid enforcement of the laws made to prevent and control them, together with such further legislation in restraint of their abuses as experience may show to be necessary.

[Republican platform, June 7, 1892.]

We reaffirm our opposition, declared in the Republican platform of 1888, to all combinations of capital, organized in trusts or otherwise, to control arbitrarily the condition of trade among our citizens. We heartily indorse the action taken upon this subject and ask for such further legislation as may be required to remedy any defects in existing laws and to render their enforcement more complete and effective.

[Democratic platform, 1896.]

The absorption of wealth by the few, the consolidation of our leading railroad systems, and formation of trusts and pools require a stricter control by the Federal Government of those arteries of commerce. We demand the enlargement of the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and such restrictions and guaranties in the control of railroads as will protect the people from robbery and oppression.

The last Republican utterance upon the question is the recommendation of William McKinley, in his message to this Congress, in which, among other things, he says:

It is universally conceded that combinations which engross or control the market of any particular kind of merchandise or commodity necessary to the general community, by suppressing natural and ordinary competition, whereby prices are unduly enhanced to the general consumer, are obnoxious not only to the common law but also to the public welfare. There must be a remedy for the evils involved in such organizations. If the present law can be extended more certainly to control or check these monopolies or trusts, it should be done without delay. Whatever power the Congress possesses over this most important subject should be promptly ascertained and asserted.

The people having weighed our friends upon the other side, found them wanting. When they made this report, turning this question over that they could not handle, a Republican Congress had already been elected.

SHERMAN ANTI-TRUST LAW.

When that Republican Congress met the first bill introduced in the Senate was introduced by that "noblest Roman of them all," John Sherman, of Ohio. [Applause on the Republican side.] It was the anti-trust act of July 2, 1890, known as the Sherman Act. It was opposed by Senator George and Senator VEST, who fell upon it with great force and violence, because it was "unconstitutional."

After the due course of procedure it was finally reported to the House. After it was reported to the House, in the course of its consideration the Democracy, not daring to vote directly against it, undertook on the 20th day of June, 1890, to side track it in the interest of a silver bill, on the 16-to-1 proposition, that they did not dare to stand up in this House and register a vote upon. The vote upon that proposition was what? The leading Democrats voted to side track the Sherman anti-trust law, which was then under the charge of William McKinley, jr., of Ohio, a member of Congress upon this floor. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The following leading Democrats voted to side track that bill: BANKHEAD, Blount, Boatner, Bland, Bynum, Crisp, Dockery, Enloe, Holman, Kilgour, LANHAM. The gentleman from Texas then voted in favor of side tracking the anti-trust law. Now he is very anxious to enact one. RICHARDSON, now the leader of the other side, voted to side track the anti-trust law, but now he is very anxious to put in "a little bill." Sayers, Springer, Turner of Georgia. ELLIOTT, now a member of the Judiciary Committee, then voted to side track the anti-trust law, but now is very anxious to enact one.

Mr. FLEMING. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I can not. I have only seven minutes, and there is considerable more of this history. McMillin, JAMES R. WILLIAMS of Illinois, McRAE, Mills, the author of the Mills bill, voted to side track the anti-trust bill. By the way, I should say here, perhaps, regarding the Mills bill that it gave a preferential tariff of 26 per cent in favor of the sugar trust, when it was reported and passed the House. That is the Democratic record upon this legislation.

INTERSTATE-COMMERCE LAW RESULT OF REPUBLICAN LEGISLATION.

Just a word in relation to the interstate-commerce law.

The interstate-commerce law, enacted in 1887, was introduced by whom? By Senator CULLOM of Illinois. From what committee? A Republican committee in the Senate. The amendment in 1891 was introduced by whom? CULLOM of Illinois. From what committee? A Republican committee in the Senate. The next amendment was introduced by whom? CULLOM of Illinois. From what committee? A Republican committee in the Senate.

There is the interstate-commerce law, there is the anti-trust law, both the result of Republican legislation, against the active, determined opposition of our friends upon the other side. There is the record of the Republican party, there is the record of the Democratic party. There is the record of Mr. Bryan, there is the record of William McKinley. Now let me read you just what some of our insinuating friends upon the other side said when the anti-trust law was being considered. I want to show you what assistance the Republican majority had in 1890 when they were passing this Sherman anti-trust law. Mr. Wilson, of West Virginia, said this:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I shall not oppose this bill, although even so great a lawyer as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Culberson] is not able to tell us what it means. I do not believe that anybody can tell us what it means. This is merely experimental legislation. It is a blind legislation to answer a popular demand that something shall be done about trusts.

It is proper to state right here that Mr. Culberson, a great man, noble Democrat, and patriot as he was, stood up as a member of the Judiciary Committee, representing a Democratic constituency, steadfastly in favor of the bill, and he was the only Democrat of any prominence who did stand by this anti-trust legislation.

Mr. GAINES. Every Democratic vote in this House was cast in favor of the anti-trust law.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Oh, yes, when you could not do anything else, when it came to a direct vote on the proposition, but before that many of you voted to side track it. When it came to the vote squarely on the proposition you did not dare vote against it; but when an attempt was made to side track it every leading Democrat in the House, except Mr. Culberson, voted to side track it. Yet our friends stand up here and talk about deceit and fraud and insincerity and hypocrisy. "Physician, heal thyself." [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

Here is what Mr. Enloe said:

I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Kerr] if he believes that when this bill is passed into a law it will be worth even the blank paper it is written on?

William L. Wilson, the leader of your House, sneered at it by declaring that it was absolutely worthless, and unworthy to be passed.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Was not he right?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. No, he was not right; and I am going to give you the record to show you. I call attention in detail to only two cases under this law.

CRIMINAL PROSECUTIONS UNDER SHERMAN ACT.

By the way, I will stop right here, if I have the time, and I would like to ask any man who signed that minority report whether he knows of any criminal conviction obtained under the Sherman anti-trust law in case of laboring men on a strike for higher wages? And if he does, give me the name of the case.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Debs was imprisoned that way.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. That was not a criminal conviction, and the gentleman certainly knows it.

Mr. FLEMING. He went to jail.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Is that all the answer the gentleman can give me?

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Debs was sent to jail is what I say.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. That is not the point at all. I make this assertion——

Mr. FLEMING. That is the only man that went to jail under a trust.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I make this assertion: There never yet has been within the limits of the United States a single criminal conviction of a man connected with a labor trouble under this act; and the gentleman from Georgia, if he does not know that, simply discloses his ignorance when he stands here——

Mr. FLEMING. The gentleman does not stand here and deny that Debs was put in jail.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. That is simply trifling. A man that makes that kind of a statement simply discloses his own ignorance of legal language. The Democratic minority of this committee know no such cases. I asked the ranking Democratic member of the committee more than three days ago to give me the name of a case, and he did not do it, and he can not do it. This Debs case is not a case in point. That was a violation of an order of the equity court. The imprisonment was not for crime, but for contempt. You are juggling with words when you undertake to use it. They close the report of the committee with a false statement for the purpose of undertaking to make the laboring men of this country believe that this law has been enforced against them and not against other people. That is absolutely without foundation. It is a baseless effort to inflame labor against capital. [Applause.]

Upon the other hand, it is a fact that vigorous, though unsuccessful, efforts have been made to prosecute criminally combinations of capital under the Sherman Act, as the cases which I now give show:

United States *vs.* Greenhut, May, 1892; whisky trust; indictment quashed.

United States *vs.* Nelson, October 10, 1892; lumber dealers; demurrer to indictment sustained.

United States *vs.* Patterson, February 28, 1893; cash-register case; demurrer sustained as to certain points and overruled as to others.

United States *vs.* Certain Coal Dealers in Ohio; Chesapeake and Ohio Fuel Company; still pending upon demurrer to indictment.

Moore *vs.* United States, February 14, 1898; coal dealers at Salt Lake City; tried and convicted; judgment reversed on the ground that the court had no jurisdiction.

TRANS-MISSOURI AND JOINT TRAFFIC ASSOCIATION CASES.

The two cases to which I have referred are the Trans-Missouri case and the Joint Traffic Association case. The Trans-Missouri case involved a combination of 18 railroads, covering a territory from the Gulf of Mexico and the Rio Grande on the south to the Missouri River line on the east, to the British possessions on the north, and to the Pacific Ocean on the west. That was declared an illegal combination by the Supreme Court of the United States on the application of the Department of Justice. The Joint Traffic Association included 31 railroads, nearly all the railroads in operation between Chicago and the Atlantic coast, representing an aggregate capital of $2,377,369,466, and they had the power, if that combination had been sustained, to impose such tariff as they saw fit upon all the products of the great West, to the extent, if need be, of depriving the producer of any return; but that was declared illegal and void. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Such is the record of the Republican party in regard to legislation, and such is the record of the Republican party in enforcing its legislation. Such is the pitiable record of the Democratic party. Such, my friends, is the record of William J. Bryan in connection with anti-trust legislation, and such is the record of William McKinley, soon to be again the candidate of the Republican party, upon this great question. [Applause on the Republican side.]

We are ready to go to the people in November and to submit to their candid common sense and good sound judgment whether the Democratic party, that has admitted itself incompetent to deal with this question, and does not move except backward, shall be trusted; whether they will rely for action upon the party that obstructs, or the party that constructs—the Republican party. If the people of this country shall register their verdict in accordance with the proposition that "you can fool some of the people all of the time and all of the people some of the time, but that you can not fool all the people all of the time," then their verdict will demonstrate that the sun which rises upon the day that sees William McKinley renominated as the candidate of the Republican party will prove to be the sun of Austerlitz illumining the banners of the Republican party with the splendors of its approaching victory. [Loud and long-continued cheering and applause on the Republican side.]

Porto Rico.

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLAUDE A. SWANSON,

OF VIRGINIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, April 11, 1900.

The House having under consideration the bill (H. R. 8245) entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues for the relief of the island of Porto Rico, and for other purposes," and the Senate amendments thereto—

Mr. SWANSON said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I will not discuss this evening whether we should have free trade or impose a tariff between Porto Rico and this country. I have previously discussed that fully. It is evident that the Republican party is determined to ignore the "plain duty" pointed out by the President; it is evident that it is determined to ignore the "highest justice and fair dealing" pointed out by Secretary Root; it is evidently determined to ignore the "imperative necessity" pointed out by the commander in chief, General Davis; it is evident it is going to ignore the entire independent press of this country; it is evident that it is going to ignore the ablest portion of the Republican press of this country and many of its most trusted leaders, and sustain the imposition of a tariff duty between this country and Porto Rico.

But, Mr. Speaker, upon that issue we are willing to be judged by the country. Our position is that when a people annex themselves to the United States or when we annex them there is an equality of burdens and an equality of benefits. We take it that the Constitution and the flag go hand in hand. But in the short time given to me I want to discuss the second step of this imperial policy that has been added to the bill in the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him a moment to call attention to a recognition in the bill of the Constitution—that it does exist in Porto Rico? In line 6, page 12, it is provided that the officials in Porto Rico shall swear allegiance to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. SWANSON. Yes. Now, Mr. Speaker, what is this imperial policy disclosed in this bill? What is the second step as promulgated by the Senate? In the first place, it incorporates Porto Rico, not as a nation, not as a people, but as a corporation, like any other corporation, with the privilege to sue and be sued. It deprives them of all citizenship of any nation on the face of the earth. In other words, in this bill the people of Porto Rico are incorporated like a railroad, or like any other vast corporation. What are the means provided to govern this corporation created by Congress? The bill appoints eleven directors who have absolute control and absolute power over everything in Porto Rico. Six of them need not be residents of Porto Rico. Five of them must be residents.

Now, then, these 6, who are not compelled to be residents of Porto Rico, have absolute power and control in that island. How? It provides that they shall elect 35 members of the subordinate or coordinate branch of the legislature. But this bill provides that this executive council, composed of 11 members, shall fix the qualifications, shall fix the method of registration, shall fix the time and place and notice, so that these 11 men have the absolute power and control of electing the 35 members who are to be the coordinate branch of the legislature in Porto Rico.

Now, it goes further. It says that the method of fixing the qualifications of voters, the registration of voters, the time, place, and method of holding the elections, shall be as provided by that executive council until it is repealed. Now, the only way that you can repeal the law under the bill fixing this is by a majority of the executive council and a majority of the 35 members. This the executive council will never do. Thus this executive council is given power to perpetuate itself. Thus the power to elect and control the 35 coordinate members of the legislature, really belongs to the 6 nonresident members of the executive council appointed by the President under this bill.

I guarantee that there is no nation on the face of the earth that is so permanently enslaved and left under such restricted and iniquitous control. What power is given this directory, as you may call it, of this corporation? All franchises, all privileges allowed to railroads, street cars, and everything, is given to the absolute control and disposition of this executive council, only requiring the approval of the governor. You Republicans passed a bill through the House for a government for Hawaii, and it is now in the Senate, with a provision that the President must approve the bestowal of all franchises.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. The approval of Congress.

Mr. SWANSON. Of Congress. Why give these six members of the executive council the right to barter away for generations the franchises and privileges of property and the rights of 1,000,000 people whom we took and annexed to ourselves as a voluntary act on our part without their request or desire. I prophesy, if this bill is passed, when it becomes a law, and this carpetbag government has full sway in Porto Rico, you will have created a system of government, a system of control, a system of power, dependent upon people appointed from here, and having no connection with the interests of Porto Rico, and I believe you will inaugurate a carnival of corruption, a carnival of scandal and of disgrace that will bring shame on everyone who votes for this iniquitous and damnable bill. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LORIMER] has well said, there is not a man on this floor who is so derelict in humanity that would accept any such government for himself or for his people. And yet we are asked to force upon Porto Rico a system or form of government that a man on this floor would scorn to accept for his own constituency and his own people. Now, gentlemen, there is in the American heart a sense of justice, a sense of right, a sense of what is proper and what is honest and fair dealing. To make rulers just, honest, and responsible for the interests confided to them, we in this country have put the responsibility between the rulers and the ruled; we make the rulers in this country responsible to their constituents, and yet you propose in this bill, as a part of your imperial policy, a system which makes the ruling power, the real rulers of Porto Rico, responsible not to the Porto Ricans, but to the President here alone.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that same policy will be pursued in every possession to be annexed to the United States. It carries out the Republican ideas upon the Constitution; their position is that the inhabitants of Oklahoma, of Arizona, the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands, the inhabitants of Porto Rico are simply the creatures of Congressional despotism; that we can give or deny them the right of trial by jury, the right of habeas corpus; that if they receive these blessings they come not as inherent rights, but as a gift from Congress. Carrying out this idea of Congressional despotism you incorporate them into this bill. They simply have a charter, like a railroad, which can be repealed at any time Congress sees fit to repeal it. They are not citizens of the United States, but a simple incorporated body of people, a gift from Congress, with the right to sue and be sued.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make this note: it is the first time in the history of the American people that a despotic power has been claimed anywhere; it is foreign to the American interests, it is

foreign to the genius of the American people. We have not given despotic power to the Federal Government; we have not given it to the State government, because each shares it with the other. We have not given it to the legislature, judiciary, or executive; each share power with the other; but now it is claimed for the first that despotic power over territory is reposed in Congress. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

American Commerce with Gold-Standard Countries, and the Volume of Our Currency.

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM ALDEN SMITH,

OF MICHIGAN,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, June 5, 1900.

The House having under consideration the conference report on the bill (H. R. 11583) making appropriations for the Military Academy—

Mr. WILLIAM ALDEN SMITH said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I greatly appreciate the privilege accorded me by the Committee on Military Affairs in yielding time during the debate which has been so animated and interesting. I desire, however, to digress briefly from the subject under discussion for the purpose of meeting statements frequently made upon the other side of the Chamber regarding the gold production of the world and the criticism often carelessly repeated that to depend upon gold as the standard of value is to depend upon a diminishing product which will grow greater with the years and furnish a constantly diminishing basis of value.

I have, through the kindness of the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics, been enabled to place upon the record the relative gold production in the world during the last fifty years as compared with the three hundred and fifty years preceding, making a most interesting and instructive history of gold production.

I have also deemed it especially desirable to produce the report of the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics of the Treasury Department, showing the commerce of the United States with the gold and silver standard countries of the world, all of which will be especially instructive and interesting as matter of historical and accurate commercial data. The showing thus made clearly demonstrates the wisdom of the course of the present Administration, which has enacted the gold standard into law, and thus placed our country upon an equal commercial basis with the leading nations of the world. The total commerce of the gold-standard countries of the world amounts to $18,295,410,000, while that of the silver-standard countries of the world amounts to but $1,029,302,000, or but a trifle over 3 per cent. The commerce of the United States with the gold-standard countries of the world amounted in 1899 to $1,909,339,000, while with the silver-standard countries our commerce the same year amounted to but $124,136,000, or about 6 per cent of our commerce.

The total exports of the United States in 1899 to the gold-standard countries of the world aggregated $1,197,067,000, while we sold to the silver-standard countries of the world $60,658,000 worth of products, or a trifle over 4 per cent. How idle and foolhardy it would be for us to come to the commercial basis of silver-standard countries in the face of this showing. Indeed, the height of political wisdom has been shown in keeping our finances upon such a firm and well-recognized basis that we can do business with the world in a standard recognized and known wherever the highest civilization and the greatest industrial progress has been made.

During the last Presidential campaign the Democratic party, under the leadership of Mr. Bryan, argued to the American people that if the Republican party was successful and enacted the gold standard into law, the circulating money of our country would be lessened and the value of money thereby enhanced. I find, upon inquiry at the Bureau of Statistics, information upon which the following statement can be accurately based, and I insert it for the purpose of illustrating the recklessness of our political opponents fighting under the silver standard borne by Bryan and Sewell, and ask whether their predictions have in the slightest degree been realized. It is a pleasure to assert without fear of contradiction that the present Administration of President McKinley has witnessed not only an increase in the circulating money of more than 33 per cent since the beginning of the fiscal year 1897, while the increase in the circulation of gold certificates alone is 61 per cent greater than at the time President McKinley was inaugurated.

I invite a most careful perusal of this statement:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF STATISTICS,
Washington, D. C., May 21, 1900.

Hon. WM. ALDEN SMITH,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Replying to your request for specific information regarding the relative production of gold in the last 50 years as compared with the preceding 350 years, also the commerce of the gold and silver standard countries of the world, respectively, and the share of the commerce of the United States with the gold and silver standard countries, respectively, I have the honor to state as follows:

The world's gold production, as based upon available data, may be conveniently divided into three distinct periods: First, from 1492 down to 1848, the date of the discovery of gold in California; second, from 1848 to 1873; third, from 1873 to date. The gold production of the three periods, adopting the statements of Soetbeer for the earlier period and the statements of the Mint Bureau for those covering later years, is as follows:

Period.	Production.
1492 to 1847	$3,146,094,000
1848 to 1873	3,003,739,000
1874 to 1899	3,673,484,000

It will be observed from the above statement that more than twice as much gold has been produced in the world in the last fifty years as in the three hundred and fifty years prior to that time.

Regarding the commerce of the gold and silver standard countries respectively, and that of the United States with them, I hand you herewith a table giving the details with reference to each group—gold and silver standard countries separately.

The total commerce of the gold-standard countries named is $18,295,410,000; that of the silver-standard countries, $1,029,302,000; per cent of silver-standard countries, 3.33. The commerce of the United States with the gold-standard countries in 1899 was $1,909,339,000, and with the silver-standard countries, $124,136,000; per cent with silver-standard countries, 6.15. Of our total exports in 1899, the amount to the gold-standard countries named was $1,197 067,000; to the silver-standard countries, $60,658,000; per cent to silver-standard countries, 4.82.

These figures, which are in each case for the latest available year, include 97 per cent of the total commerce of the world.

Very respectfully,

O. P. AUSTIN,
Chief of Bureau.

Mr. Chairman, I will not detain the House longer, but with the permission of the House will print a table which I hold in my hand in connection with this letter, and with the statement which I have made.

Gold-standard countries.

Countries.	Population.	Total commerce.a	Commerce with United States.a	
			Total.	Imports from United States.
Algeria	4,429,400	$108,417,000	b $811,000	b $147,000
Austria-Hungary	41,359,000	c 833,606,000	14,413,000	6,359,000
Belgium	6,587,000	659,197,000	57,549,000	45,816,000
British Africa	35,160,000	263,282,000	16,800,000	15,424,000
British Australasia	4,794,000	556,587,000	27,670,000	24,143,000
British Honduras	34,000	2,826,000	771,000	562,000
British North America	5,031,000	205,714,000	124,164,000	88,285,000
British West Indies	1,501,000	53,345,000	25,247,000	10,382,000
Bulgaria	3,311,000	27,987,000	No data.	No data.
Costa Rica	295,000	10,068,000	4,832,000	1,283,000
Cuba	1,632,000	135,120,000	54,481,000	24,861,000
Denmark	2,185,000	201,395,000	19,125,000	18,474,000
Dutch East Indies	34,090,000	146,589,000	33,961,000	1,653,000
Egypt	9,734,000	113,318,000	9,109,000	525,000
France	38,518,000	c1,564,518,000	140,512,000	70,107,000
Germany	52,280,000	c2,186,918,000	250,985,000	161,406,000
Great Britain	40,189,000	c3,969,876,000	652,280,000	569,958,000
Hawaii	109,000	27,577,000	33,494,000	11,306,000
India and Ceylon	290,514,000	495,717,000	42,896,000	4,510,000
Japan	42,708,000	186,114,000	54,808,000	20,606,000
Netherlands	5,004,000	1,292,138,000	98,879,000	83,601,000
Peru	2,622,000	23,240,000	3,492,000	1,395,000
Roumania	5,800,000	113,000,000	145,000	145,000
Russia	108,721,000	460,093,000	14,462,000	9,172,000
Servia	2,315,000	19,734,000	.....	.....
South African Republic	1,096,000	158,234,000	No data.	No data.
Sweden and Norway	7,011,000	205,509,000	14,904,000	11,817,000
Switzerland	3,083,000	302,418,000	16,505,000	216,000
Uruguay	828,000	50,492,000	3,215,000	1,702,000
United States	75,000,000	c2,074,345,000	.....	.....
ON A PAPER BASIS.				
Argentina	3,955,000	$192,477,000	$17,322,000	$11,325,000
Brazil	14,334,000	235,149,000	71,035,000	11,454,000
Chile	3,049,000	47,445,000	7,474,000	2,240,000
Greece	2,434,000	38,051,000	1,229,000	227,000
Haiti	960,000	18,252,000	3,220,000	2,358,000
Italy	31,668,000	444,769,000	52,222,000	25,763,000
Portugal	5,050,000	76,856,000	8,888,000	5,113,000
Spain	17,566,000	334,490,000	16,871,000	11,529,000
Turkey	22,584,000	105,685,000	7,257,000	563,000
Venezuela	2,444,000	34,751,000	8,311,000	2,641,000
Total gold-standard countries	929,934,000	18,295,410,000	1,909,339,000	1,197,067,000

a Statements of general commerce are from official reports of the countries named or from accepted authorities; those of commerce with United States are from official reports of the United States Government.
b 1897.
c 1899.

Silver-standard countries.

Countries.	Population.	Total commerce.	Commerce with United States.	
			Total.	Imports from United States.
China	402,680,000	$285,738,000	$39,421,000	$15,225,000
Guatemala	151,535,000	16,971,000	3,041,000	843,000
Honduras	400,000	5,908,000	1,919,000	1,039,000
Hongkong	222,000	30,000,000	10,128,000	7,788,000
Korea	10,529,000	19,041,000	129,000	128,000
Mexico	12,620,000	102,673,000	53,965,000	29,310,000
Nicaragua	420,000	5,547,000	3,081,000	1,486,000
Persia	9,000,000	43,798,000	No data.	No data.
Salvador	804,000	10,833,000	1,718,000	635,000
Straits Settlements	512,000	413,047,000	No data.	No data.
Siam	5,000,000	27,681,000	No data.	No data.
ON A PAPER BASIS.				
Bolivia	2,020,000	$22,557,000	$27,000	$27,000
Colombia	4,000,000	26,617,000	8,448,000	2,986,000
Ecuador	1,272,000	11,008,000	2,278,000	1,180,000
Paraguay	600,000	7,883,000	11,000	11,000
Total silver-standard countries	451,614,000	1,029,302,000	124,136,000	60,658,000

Commerce of gold-standard countries	$18,295,410,000
Commerce of silver-standard countries	1,029,302,000
Per cent, silver-standard countries	5.33
Commerce of United States with gold-standard countries	1,909,339,000
Commerce of United States with silver-standard countries	124,136,000
Per cent with silver-standard countries	6.15
Exports of United States to gold-standard countries	1,197,067,000
Exports of United States to silver-standard countries	60,658,000
Per cent to silver-standard countries	4.82

NOTE.—The above includes 97 per cent of the world's commerce at the latest available date.

O. P. AUSTIN,
Chief of Bureau of Statistics, U. S. Treasury Department.

Every year's developments seem to justify the assertion that this is a "billion-dollar country." The year 1899 brought our foreign commerce for the first time past the $2,000,000,000 line, and the month of February, 1900, shows our money in circulation for the first time as more than $2,000,000,000. Thus by a curious coincidence the announcement of two billions of foreign commerce and two billions of money in circulation are made within a single month, the totals indicating that the $2,000,000,000 line had been crossed in our commerce for 1899 having been only completed by the Treasury Bureau of Statistics on January 14, while the Treasury Bureau of Loans and Currency on February 1 announced that the total money in circulation had also crossed the $2,000,000,000 line, while gold and gold certificates alone had crossed the $800,000,000 line. The total foreign commerce for the year 1899 was $2,074,345,242, while the total money in circulation on February 1 was $2,003,149,355. The use of ten figures with which to show the business conditions of the country is indeed becoming surprisingly frequent. The tables of the December Summary of Commerce and Finance show, for instance, the total resources of national banks at $4,475,343,924; the latest report of the Comptroller of the Currency shows the deposits in savings banks to be $2,230,366,954; the total resources of all banks in the United States are given by the same report as $5,196,177,381, and the latest number of the Summary of Commerce and Finance shows the December clearing-house returns of all cities outside of New York at $3,012,896,144, and those of the city of New York at $5,348,285,867.

The announcement that the money in circulation in the United States has for the first time crossed the $2,000,000,000 line also calls attention to the fact that the amount of money for each individual is greater to-day than ever before. The Treasury Bureau of Loans and Currency publishes each month a statement of the amount of money in circulation, and by combining with this the actuary's estimate of population, presents a monthly statement of the amount of money in circulation per capita. This statement puts the population on February 1, 1900, at 77,116,000, the money in circulation at $2,003,149,355, and the circulation per capita at $25.98. This gives a larger per capita than in any earlier month in the history of the country. On February 1, 1899, it was $25.42; on February 1, 1898, $23.42; on February 1, 1897, $23.05, and on February 1, 1896, $22.47.

No period in our financial history has shown a more rapid growth in the amount of money in circulation than that covered by the past three or four years. The total in circulation to-day is 33 per cent greater than at the beginning of the fiscal year 1897, and the gold and gold certificates in circulation are 61 per cent greater than at that time, the actual increase in money in circulation during that period being $493,424,155, and of gold and gold certificates $305,886,000, practically two-thirds of the increase, therefore, having been in gold.

The following table shows the amount of gold and total money in circulation at the beginning of each quarter of the fiscal year from July 1, 1896, to date:

Date	Gold (coin and certificates) in circulation.	Total money in circulation.
July 1, 1896	$498,449,242	$1,509,735,300
October 1, 1896	517,508,129	1,582,302,289
January 1, 1897	555,630,668	1,650,223,400
April 1, 1897	554,582,096	1,609,000,694
July 1, 1897	556,432,594	1,646,028,246
October 1, 1897	564,997,312	1,678,840,538
January 1, 1898	584,126,049	1,721,100,640
April 1, 1898	618,448,941	1,756,058,645
July 1, 1898	696,780,519	1,843,435,749
October 1, 1898	658,043,721	1,816,596,392
January 1, 1899	732,980,135	1,897,301,412
April 1, 1899	727,748,591	1,927,846,942
July 1, 1899	734,716,728	1,932,484,239
October 1, 1899	745,234,744	1,948,708,186
January 1, 1900	779,100,627	1,980,398,170
February 1, 1900	804,330,065	2,003,149,355

Army Appropriation Bill.

SPEECH
OF
HON. E. R. RIDGELY,
OF KANSAS,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, May 5, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 8582) making appropriations for the support of the Regular and Volunteer Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901—

Mr. RIDGELY said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This bill appropriates $114,220,095.55 for one year's support of the Army. I have not intended to speak at this time, but as the time allotted to our side is limited, and I am informed that others are to be recognized later in the debate, I shall have to speak now if at all. As we are legislating on military affairs I will first notice one item of importance omitted from the bill and then pass to the general problem of a large standing army, its purposes and burdens. The omission I refer to is needed legislation providing for the one and two months' extra time allowed the soldiers of the Spanish war at the time of their discharge.

It seems the War Department is withholding this pay in a great many cases, claiming that more authority is needed; hence I believe we should hasten new legislation by putting it into this bill as an amendment. These soldiers ought not to be kept waiting. I have ever claimed that the private soldiers are not paid as well nor treated as liberally by the Government as they should be. We make too much discrimination between the private and the officer.

DOUBLE THE PRIVATE'S PAY AND IMPROVE HIS PENSION.

Whatever else we may do, I would change the law to provide, at least, double present pay for the private, even if to do so it should become necessary to reduce the pay of officers. Another change I would make would be to simplify and improve the benefits of our pension system by providing, instead of the present complex, difficult, and unequal pension scale, I would have the law provide a compact between the Government and each individual soldier which should be a guaranty on the part of the Government to every soldier and his dependents against want.

The Government should say to the soldier, in consideration of your taking upon yourself the extra hazards of war in behalf of your country, your country will guaranty that you and your dependents shall be protected against poverty and want so long as you live.

The soldier who returns to civil life and who is fortunate enough to gather ample means to enable him and his dependents to live in comfort has no need of a pension; but there are thousands of our soldiers and their families suffering in abject poverty, and equally as many more who are unable to procure common comforts. It is a shame and a disgrace to our Government to permit these conditions so long as there is abundant wealth which should be taxed, and might be if we would but put human life first above hoarded wealth.

REDUCE INSTEAD OF INCREASE THE ARMY.

Mr. Chairman, the balance of my time shall be devoted to my protest against the rapid growth of our Army.

Within the last three years we have increased the burden of our Army more than fourfold. The close of the Spanish war brought no reduction of this burden, but to the contrary we at once increased our standing Army almost threefold and authorized a Vol-

unteer Army of 35,000. For several months we have been repeatedly assured that our unholy war against the Filipinos is over, yet we hear no suggestion of a reduction of the Army. To the contrary we know that in both ends of this Capitol legislation is well under way to increase the Army and make the increase permanent. When in connection with this we take into consideration the rapid growth of our Navy we are forced to admit that if the present tendency to militarism shall continue, the dead weight of a nonproductive but ever-consuming military burden is to be perpetual, and it has already grown until the taxpayer to-day has to pay at least $5 in addition to every dollar he paid at the beginning of the present Administration, and this terribly increased burden will rapidly increase instead of diminish.

Unless we shall change present policies, both domestic and foreign—for we are not only threatened with foreign wars by reason of our greedy conquest of the Filipinos, but we are permitting England to use us as an ally, if not an open partner, in forcing her greedy commercialism into China and all the Orient—this will certainly lead to foreign wars while the Republican press of our country is kept busy deluding our people into the belief that they are to reap great benefits by making conquest of Asia even to the extent of forcing this policy by the sword.

REVERSED BANKRUPTING AND IMMORAL POLICY.

Mr. Chairman, this sudden reversal of our former national policy, from that of peace and nonintervention in the affairs of the Eastern Hemisphere, to a policy of conquest, is, in my judgment, not only an absolute violation of our national ethics but it is downright immoral, and will prove to be disastrous in its financial result, costing us the lives of hundreds of thousands more of our best young men and hundreds of millions more money than will ever return to us.

LET US LOOK INTO THIS ORIENTAL COUNTRY AND ITS CONDITIONS AS A BUSINESS PROPOSITION—UNDER THE COMPETITIVE WAGE SYSTEM IT MEANS RUIN TO US.

If we break down the wall of exclusion—forcing our industries and commerce upon the hordes of sleeping Asiatics—what may we reasonably expect will be the effect upon ourselves in all of that country, where the population is almost ten times as thick per acre as our own? The condition of the great hosts there is that of impoverished existence, the people inured to privations that would be death to us; and yet so skillful are these serfs in their imitative and mechanical art that years ago we found ourselves compelled to deny them access to our machinery as competitors against our own laborers.

But now our great capitalists propose to take our machinery direct to these Malays, Chinese, and oriental competitors in order that they, the capitalists, may get the benefits of hundreds of millions of laborers at from 10 to 20 cents per day. Our laborers and our merchants, dependent upon them, may well ask what is to be done with the manufactured goods which are to be produced by this cheap labor and our improved machinery. These goods cannot be sold to the people who create them, as their purchasing power will be limited to a few pennies per day, leaving the great bulk of their productions to be thrown upon our own and the world's market, in which we are seeking to find purchasers for our own productions. We may well ask what will be the effect of such crushing competition upon our home industries and laborers. There can be but one answer and one result, and that will be a disastrous reduction of wages in this country and the shutting down of most of our industries.

TO GRATIFY GREED OF CAPITAL THE MOTIVE.

Mr. Chairman, as proof that our present military and commercial conquest of the Orient is dictated by our capitalistic exploiters, I will have the Clerk read an editorial which has just appeared in the Washington Post, one of the strongest Republican papers in the nation, standing as the spokesman and defender of President McKinley's Administration.

The Clerk read as follows:

LET US BE HONEST!

Why can not we be honest in our utterances touching the territories we have recently acquired? Really, it would save time and trouble, to say nothing of life and treasure, to come out frankly with the announcement that we have annexed these possessions in cold blood, and that we intend to utilize them to our profit and advantage. All this talk about benevolent assimilation; all this hypocritical pretense of anxiety for the moral, social, and intellectual exaltation of the natives; all this transparent parade of responsibility and deep-seated purpose; all this deceives nobody, avails nothing, helps us not an inch in the direction of profit, dignity, and honor. We all know, down in our hearts, that these islands, group, etc., are important to us only in the ratio of their practical possibilities. We value them by the standard of their commercial usefulness, and by no other. All this gabble about civilizing and uplifting the benighted barbarians of Cuba and Luzon is mere sound and fury, signifying nothing. Foolishly or wisely, we want these newly acquired territories, not for any missionary or altruistic purposes, but for the trade, the commerce, the power, and the money there are in them. Why beat about the bush, and promise and protest all sorts of things? Why not be honest? It will pay.

As a matter of fact, we are not concerned in the ethical or religious uplifting of the Filipinos. After all, the difference between a breech clout and a starched shirt front is a mere matter of climate and personal opinion. Dishonesty, untruth, crime, and general wickedness are here in our midst—present with us as part of our daily life and growing with our growth. We need not go to the West Indies or the Philippines in search of material for moral rescue. Our own slums abound with opportunities for missionary zeal. Why not tell the truth and say—what is the fact—that we want Cuba, Porto Rico, Hawaii, and Luzon—together with any other islands in either ocean that may hereafter commend themselves to our appetite, because we believe they will add to our national strength, and because we hope they will some day become purchasers at our bargain counters? We might as well throw off the pious mask and indulge ourselves in a little honest candor. It will cost us nothing, and it may profit much. At any rate, we shall have the comfort and satisfaction of being honest with ourselves and the privilege of looking into the mirror without blushing.

Mr. RIDGELY. Mr. Chairman, this editorial has the merit of frankly stating to the world what is apparent to every observer, and especially to those in this city who are permitted to witness the gradual unfolding of this new departure in our national policy.

THE ROBBERS WANT A LARGE ARMY.

We can now understand this constant pressure for an ever increasing army. The great financiers who are directing this policy and using the great power of Government to advance their greedy schemes are wise enough to know that it will not only be necessary to keep up a large army to force and protect their monopoly of the lands and natural resources of the Orient and their use of the serf labor there, but they know full well what all of this means in its effects upon our great army of wage-workers.

TROUBLE FOR HOME LABORERS.

The suffering in store for our people if these schemes go on will be excruciating, as they are forced to meet this oriental competition and its inevitable reduction of wages in this country. Strikes, lockouts, and shutdowns will follow in rapid succession, with all their attending strife. As a warning proof that the great captains of industry are preparing for this day of trouble, I cite the fact that in all of our large cities, and especially where large armies of labor are employed, we know our city governments, in compliance with the demands of capital, have already erected frowning fortifications called armories, with their portholes and gatling guns covering every street.

WHY THESE ENGINES OF DEATH IN OUR CITIES?

We may well ask ourselves, Who is to occupy these fortifications and at whom are these guns to be aimed? The answer is clear. Our standing Army must be enlarged to occupy these fortifications. Our laborers in the streets of the cities they have built are the contemplated victims.

MILITARY DESPOTISM OUR RUIN.

Mr. Chairman, I am not alone in these warnings against this new policy of imperialism by which our Government is to enter upon a system of armed colonial expansion, subjugation, and government by force, with its necessary and ever-growing burdens of militarism. If we are to go out making conquests by force, the same power by which we go will return to curse and crush us at home. Despotism will stalk the land; the ballot, as the people's instrument for determining and directing public affairs, will be overthrown; the Republic will die while lingering in name only.

HOPE OF ESCAPE.

There yet remains the hope that our people will arouse themselves to patriotic action, forget minor party differences, and rescue the Republic from this impending and certain destruction. In support of this hope I will close by quoting the remarks of Justice David J. Brewer, of the United States Supreme Court, in his recent address at Buffalo. These remarks are especially significant to me, coming as they do from an eminent jurist of my own State, a life-long Republican, appointed to the Supreme Bench by President Harrison.

BREWER ON IMPERIALISM—PREDICTS THE NATION IS SOWING THE SEEDS FOR HARVEST OF TROUBLE.

Justice David J. Brewer, of the United States Supreme Court, recently delivered an address on "Imperialism" before the Liberal Club, of Buffalo. Coming from such an authority, his views on this important topic are well worth attention. Justice Brewer said in part:

"It is said that the Anglo-Saxon race has manifested a capacity to govern well; that we are of that race, and that, therefore, we could well govern the Philippine Islands as colonies. I do not question the capacity of the race well and wisely to govern others. I object to the Philippine policy because it antagonizes the principles upon which this Government was founded, which have controlled its life up to the present time, and the perfection of which has been the hope and aspiration of every true American.

"Very few nations, very few individuals, live up to their high ideals, but surely the Declaration of Independence has been the ideal of our life, and we have striven to make it more and more real. Now, government by force is the very antipodes of this, and to introduce government by force over any portion of the nation is to start the second quarter of the second century of our life upon principles which are the exact opposite of those upon which we have hitherto lived. It is one thing to fail of reaching your ideal; it is an entirely different thing to deliberately turn your back upon it.

"The test of government is not in the outward mechanical display of order, but in the capacity to develop the best men, and we have lived in the faith that government by the consent of the governed develops the best men. We have not let the wise rule the ignorant, the learned the unlearned, the rich the poor, but we have appealed always to 'the plain people' as the ones on whose judgment to rely and upon whose shoulders should rest the burden of government.

"Ideas are, after all, the eternal force. Human life and destiny are controlled by them. They may seem to-day of little significance, but around them gather material interests, and to-morrow their power is disclosed.

"Government by consent and government by force, no matter how well the government may be administered, are two essentially antagonistic principles. Doubtless no immediate conflict will follow. We may see a large

measure of prosperity, but are we not sowing the seeds which in the days to come will grow up into a harvest of trouble for our children and our children's children?

"A necessity of colonial possessions is an increase in our Regular Army, and the first increased proposed is from 30,000 to 100,000 men. It is a strange commentary that at the close of the nineteenth century the head of the most arbitrary government in the civilized world—the Czar of the Russias—is inviting the nations of the world to a decrease in their arms, while this, the freest land, is proposing an increase in its. Yet such seems to be the imperative need, if we enter upon the system of colonial expansion.

"Now, the great economic problem in this country is not how can a few men make more money and pile up larger fortunes, but how can the great body of the people make a fair and comfortable living? The right to work is again and again insisted upon as more important than the right to vote, and the cry of the right to work is supplemented by the cry that the State furnish work to all who can not obtain it elsewhere.

"Are we likely to aid in solving this problem by bringing into our national life 10,000,000 or 12,000,000 of unskilled Malay laborers? We have shut the doors against the Chinese. Are they any worse than the Malay? Shall we introduce in this nation more cheap labor? I do not wonder at the action of the Federation of Labor in protesting against a new competition of cheap labor as well as an increase of the Army, with its consequent increase of burden and taxation on the employed laborer.

"But there is money in it. And after all this is really the most potent factor in the proposed reaching out after the islands of the Orient. The wealth of Ormus and of Ind is to-day, as in the days of Milton, the expectation and the dream of many. Possession of the Orient, with its accumulated wealth of centuries, dazzles the imagination and confuses the judgment. The haze of mystery hangs over that vast domain. Wealth untold is believed to be there, ready to be appropriated by any dominant power. All the nations and tribes come within Lord Salisbury's definition of dying nations, and must soon be divided between and appropriated by the living and growing nations. China is held out as a dying nation, filled with inexhaustible wealth, and why should not we share in its appropriation? What a picture this is! The eagle of liberty standing like a buzzard to grow fat over an expected corpse.

"'Ill fares the land to hastening ills a prey
Where wealth accumulates and men decay.'

"The Cæsars saw the spears of their victorious legions flash in the sunlight of every known land, and in their triumphant return they brought with them the accumulated wealth of all the nations they had subdued. The splendor of imperial Rome outshone the world, but the wealth thus obtained without value given undermined the empire, and the glory of Rome is simply a memory. Napoleon beheld the shining star of destiny, and then? Does human nature change through the centuries? We stand to-day facing the temptation which comes from the possibility of rapidly accumulated wealth. What right have we to anticipate that the same result will not follow if we pursue the same course of taking what we have not fully earned?

"The problem we have sought to work out in this nation is that of government of and by and for the people. A great nation upon that principle seems possible only under a federal system, a system which relegates all matter of local interest to the several States, and exercises through the national government only those powers and functions which make for the general welfare. We have wonderfully prospered in administering such system in a compact, continental territory, each part of which has been possessed and controlled by a race capable of self-government.

"This is no trifling question, and is not answered by any gush about duty and destiny. We are not the victims, but the masters of fate, and to attempt to unload upon the Almighty responsibility for that which we choose to do is not only an insult to Him, but to ordinary human intelligence.

"We are told that we have become so great and powerful that the world needs us; but what the world most needs is not the touch of our power, but the blessings of our example. It needs the bright example of a free people not disturbed by any illusions of territorial acquisition, of pecuniary gain, or military glory, but content with their possessions and striving through all the abilities, activities, and industries of their wisest and most earnest to make the life of each individual citizen happier, better, and more content.

"Two visions rise before me:

"One of a nation growing in population, riches, and strength; reaching out the strong hand to bring within its dominion weaker and distant races; holding them by force for the rapid wealth they may bring—with perhaps the occasional glory, success, and sacrifice of war; a wondrously luxurious life into which the fortunate few shall enter; an accumulation of magnificence which for a term will charm and dazzle, and then the shadow of the awful question whether human nature has changed, and the old law, that history repeats itself, has lost its force, whether the ascending splendor of imperial power is to be followed by the descending gloom of luxury, decay, and ruin.

"The other of a nation where the spirit of the Pilgrim and the Huguenot remains the living and controlling force, affirming that the Declaration of Independence, the Farewell Address of the Father of his Country, and the Monroe doctrine shall never pass into innocuous desuetude, devoting its energies to the development of the inexhaustible resources of its great continental territory; solving the problem of universal personal and political liberty, of a government by the consent of the governed, where no king, no class, and no race rules, but each individual has equal voice and power in the control of all; where wealth comes only as the compensation for honest toil of hand or brain; where public service is private duty; a nation whose supreme value to the world lies not in its power, but in its unfailing loyalty to the high ideals of its youth, its forever lifting its strong hand, not to govern, but only to protect, the weak; and thus the bright shining which brightens more and more into the fadeless eternal day."

THE WAY OUT.

Mr. Chairman, I will add a suggestion as to our "plain duty." Let us at once stop this imperial policy of conquest and subjugation, reaffirm our eternal principle of government by consent, adhere to our declaration to the world when we commanded Spain to cease the persecution of her island subjects. We declared then that we did not enter the war for conquest, but to assist a struggling people to build for themselves a republic.

By this declaration we are committed as much to the people of Porto Rico and the Philippine Islands as we are to the Cubans, and we have no right to assume to govern either without their voluntary consent.

We should at once reaffirm this policy to the Filipinos and assure them of our good offices to help them reestablish their government. Ask and require of them only protection of our subjects and those of other nations, retain all harbor privileges necessary for our commercial and naval fleets. To these we are justly entitled as our indemnity.

Do this, and we can bring our soldiers home—let them return to peace and industry. We can then turn our attention to the establishment of justice in our own land by providing all of our people free and voluntary access to all necessary instruments of production and distribution on such terms as will give to every producer and laborer the full values their labor creates. This will bring peace and prosperity at home and forever abolish the competitive wage system, and our people will at once have the ability to buy all that their most active industries can create, thus solving forever the question of a market; overproduction and forced idleness will disappear forever.

ABOLISH THE COMPETITIVE WAGE SYSTEM BY PUBLIC OWNERSHIP.

This will at once free our laborers from the low wages and competition of foreign lands and abolish both at home. Our producers themselves, owning all of the products of their labor, would be able to exchange property for property, giving and receiving equal value, expressed by the money in the market where the exchange takes place, whether at home or abroad; hence foreign wages or prices could in no way damage or affect our people.

MAKE OUR ENTIRE ARMY A MILITARY SCHOOL.

With this system of public ownership perfected, all these blessings are possible. We can reduce our standing Army to its old maximum of 25,000 men, make the term of service for officers and privates not to exceed five years, making the Army a military school in which to give our young men military discipline and sufficient military knowledge to fit them for an effective volunteer army in case any foreign nation should attack us. This is the only use a just government can have for an army. We must turn our attention to peace and equity if we would preserve the Republic and maintain the liberties of our people.

The Late Hon. Lorenzo Danford.

REMARKS
OF
HON. J. H. SOUTHARD,
OF OHIO,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Saturday, January 20, 1900.

The House having under consideration the following resolutions:

"*Resolved*, That the business of the House be now suspended, that opportunity may be given for paying tributes to the memory of Hon. LORENZO DANFORD, late a member of the House of Representatives from the State of Ohio.

"*Resolved*, That, as a particular mark of respect to the memory of the deceased and in recognition of his eminent abilities as a distinguished public servant, the House at the conclusion of these memorial proceedings shall stand adjourned.

"*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the family of the deceased.

"*Ordered*, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate"—

Mr. SOUTHARD said:

Mr. SPEAKER: My personal acquaintance with Mr. DANFORD began with the commencement of the Fifty-fourth Congress. Of course I had known of him before, but I can only speak of him as he impressed me. He was always what he appeared to be—honest, open, and frank on all occasions. He never desired to appear what he was not. He never hesitated to oppose what he believed to be wrong; and that which he believed to be meritorious always commanded his vigorous support. Our relations were of the pleasantest kind, and with the years that I knew him my respect for him constantly increased.

Those matters which were committed to his care as a member of Congress always received careful attention and consideration, and he was ever willing to help a friend. He was most considerate of those whose experience was less than his, and always ready to lend a helping hand to those who sought his assistance.

He served his country well, and if his constituents honored him by repeatedly sending him here to represent their interests and those of the country, he in turn honored them and the Commonwealth of which he was proud and in whose behalf he was always faithful and zealous.

I must leave to others who knew him longer and better the privilege of presenting his record as a soldier, statesman, and citizen. I knew him only as a brother member of Congress; but when he died I shared in that sorrow which came to all who had associated with him here. His memory will always be respected and honored by all his associates, especially in this House; and his Congressional district, his State, and his country must always acknowledge his faithful and valuable service.

Naval Appropriation Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. SYDNEY E. MUDD,

OF MARYLAND,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, April 19, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 10450) making appropriations for the naval service for the year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes—

Mr. MUDD said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not propose to enter upon a discussion of the general provisions of this bill. I desire merely to make some very brief observations on that feature of it which relates to a subject-matter that I need not remind the committee I have given some special attention to and feel a particular and special interest in, and that is the portion of the bill which makes appropriations and provisions relating to the reconstruction of the Naval Academy.

After much deliberation and some degree of controversy on the part of the Committee on Naval Affairs as to just what should be done for the Academy, the provisions now in the bill, I think I may say, represent an agreement, and stand to-day as the unanimous conclusion of the committee upon this branch of the naval establishment.

We have suggested for present purposes and for expenditures during the next fiscal year the sum of $877,500.

We have reported authorizations for buildings and improvements that contemplate a total and ultimate expenditure of $2,827,500, or if we include the probable approximate cost of the buildings for which we appropriate for the piling and foundations, we will have a contemplated expenditure of about $3,000,000, in round numbers.

With the exception of the provisions for the construction of sea walls and dredging, which present nothing new, and I apprehend will need no explanation, and for the erection of a temporary electric-light plant and building, to show the necessity for which, I take it, there will be no need of argument from any source, the chief and essential provisions in this bill for new works are as follows:

First. The construction of a new building for cadets' quarters, which is to be the best and the most expensive and distinctive building of the whole plan of reconstruction, at an estimated cost of $2,500,000.

Second. The renovation and reconstruction of the old colonial building, the former residence of the colonial governors of Maryland, as a residence for the superintendent of the Academy, at a cost of $25,000.

Third. To provide for the work of piling and laying the foundations for buildings adjoining the power house, which buildings, while not specifically so stated, are intended to be two in number and to consist of a building for the department of steam engineering and a building for the common purposes of a general storehouse and warehouse and workshops for the mechanics of all the trades employed at the Academy.

The buildings for which we now provide (and this may be said most particularly of the building for cadets' quarters) are those for which there is now the most exigent and pressing necessity; and the buildings we authorize to be removed are those which have been pronounced as unsafe, and condemned by experts, boards of visitors, officers of the Academy, and the Secretary of the Navy, as unsuitable, unsanitary, worthless, dangerous, and in a condition threatening to totter to the ground.

It seems to me that in view of this statement, the absolute and almost amazing truth of which has been overwhelmingly confirmed by the testimony and official reports of everybody authorized to investigate the facts, and by the testimony of the eyesight of every one who has taken occasion to look over the grounds, it will not be contended by anyone that we have acted hastily; and I believe it will just as clearly appear that we have not provided too extravagantly in the appropriations which we seek to make toward the upbuilding of this institution, whose fate is so closely interwoven with the future and the efficiency of our Navy.

We say nothing in this bill, as reported, about plans, of which there has been so much controversy in former days, but about which, I take it, Congress by its past action has already manifested its feeling of satisfaction in committing these to the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, to be provided as he may best see fit, in accordance with the means placed at his disposal from time to time, and with the end in view always, as we may justly and fairly assume he has before him, of an ultimate complete, comprehensive, harmonious, and tasteful reconstruction of this institution.

It is proper to say, however, that the Secretary thus far has proceeded along the lines—and I believe we are warranted in saying it is his intention to continue to proceed along the lines—of a general plan of reconstruction and relocation, prepared in the year 1896 by what is known as the "Matthews board," at the head of which was Commodore Matthews—a board appointed by Secretary Herbert on the recommendation of the Board of Visitors to the Academy.

He has proceeded upon this plan in the construction of the buildings authorized by the last Congress, and I say that it is his intention to proceed along the lines of and in general conformation to that plan in the buildings which we are authorizing in this bill; and a more suitable plan, a more comprehensive, systematic, harmonious, and artistic plan, considered either within itself or with reference to the general configuration of the grounds and waters that approach and surround them, could not, in my judgment, be framed if we should get together all of the architects of the country and spend a generation in preparing and maturing it.

I think we can safely rest assured, Mr. Chairman, therefore, that the matter of plans will be well looked after, and that we can safely leave them where we have thus far reposed them—in the hands of the Secretary of the Navy—by analogy to just that course which is pursued in reference to buildings constructed under authority of the Treasury Department and by other Departments of the Government to which the construction of public buildings may be or may have been committed.

The only question remaining to be considered—and that is, after all, the chief question and decisive question for Congress to determine—is whether or not we are willing to make the expenditure of the money required for the construction of these buildings on the scale and style which have thus far been outlined.

The estimate of eventual expenditure for all of the buildings contemplated by the Matthews board in 1896 amounted, I believe, to about $6,000,000—somewhere between this and $7,000,000.

That estimate contemplated a construction of these buildings of brick. The Secretary of the Navy has heretofore asked, and Congress has heretofore authorized and the Department has already entered upon, the construction of the buildings thus far appropriated for of granite.

The building herein provided for, for cadets' quarters, it is contemplated to construct, and the estimates are made up to provide for its construction, of granite.

If we shall go along in future years and provide for all of the buildings outlined in the plan of the Matthews board, which Congress may or may not do, as it sees fit, and shall construct them all of granite, which Congress may or may not do, as it shall see fit, the added expenditure on account of change in material would bring up the amount to about $8,000,000; and if the enhanced price of materials which is prevailing now, over and above that which prevailed a year or two ago, at the time that these estimates were made—and which enhanced price of material we can perhaps regard as an evidence and object lesson of the general prosperity which we say, and which we hope we may say truthfully, obtains now in the country—shall continue, we should perhaps have to add to that $8,000,000 another million, making nine millions in all. Such, at least, is the estimate made by the architect, as will be found in the concluding paragraph on page 67 of the published and bound volume of hearings had before the committee, which I have before me now.

But we have made a reduction of $1,000,000 from the face of this estimate, or a little more than that, in the building for cadets' quarters, for which we are now providing, that board having estimated, and the Secretary having estimated and asked for an authorization of $3,536,000, while we have limited the amount that can be expended for this building to $2,500,000; so that, according to this basis of calculation, on the assumption that we shall provide for the construction of each and every building specified in that plan, and provide for the construction of each and every one of them of granite, we ought yet to be able to complete the whole scheme and project of the reconstruction of the Academy at an expenditure of $8,000,000.

It is for Congress to say whether or not we have been building with too much grandeur, and whether or not we shall go back to the old brick and the old wooden structures, or whether we shall go ahead and build up this institution on a plan and scope that shall be commensurate with the scale of excellence which we are contemplating for our Navy, and with the wealth and greatness of the country, for which the future holds in store, as we believe, so much of progress and of glory among the nations, through the instrumentality of the naval arm of the public service.

I am in favor of the latter plan, Mr. Chairman, and I would push that plan vigorously toward completion.

About a year or so ago, in one of the hearings before the committee on this subject-matter of the Naval Academy, some one undertook to make comparison between the cost of this institution

and that of an insane asylum in one of the States of this country, and rather vigorous protest was made because, it was stated, a building for an insane asylum, that had accommodated a great many more people than this, had been constructed at a much smaller expenditure of money.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that that is about the standard and style of comparison that has prevailed in former years in the consideration of plans for the building of this institution.

I would not figure upon any such standard. If we are to estimate the cost and the worth of the education of the young men we are training to be the future commanders of our navies by the cost of the maintenance of the inmates of an asylum or some of the penal institutions of the country, then we have been too extravagant in our calculations and provisions, and it is the duty of Congress to call a halt right now.

But I do not believe that Congress will look at this institution from any such standpoint. We are preparing to build up a great navy and put it in the front rank of the navies of the world. The Naval Academy is the foundation of our Navy, and the young men who are educated at this institution constitute the very flower and chivalry of those who make up and lift up and give the tone and character to that great branch of the service. When they enter the Academy they place themselves in a position that marks their transition from the domain of their homes to the work of the dedication of themselves to the service of their country. They ought to be cared for and trained in a manner worthy of the life and the great responsibilities that lie before them.

I would not place them in luxury or gaudy surroundings, but they should be so provided for, in the structures in which they live and do their work and receive their training, as to give them comfort and adequate facilities and to impress them with somewhat of the enduring character and magnitude and, if need be, the solid splendor of this institution of the Navy, and the broader and greater field that lies before them in their days of service upon the world's great highway of the seas.

I admit, sir, that the appropriation which we recommend seems to be a large sum of money. I admit that it would perhaps erect a more than adequate penitentiary building or a more than magnificent insane asylum, but I do not think that the requirements of these young men should be gauged by any such comparison as that.

There are, or there are supposed to be, about 350 cadets there. The Secretary of the Navy has told us that if we are to construct a building for their accommodation of the same general character as Congress has already authorized, we can not do it for a smaller sum than is here proposed. The architect, after a careful estimate, has calculated the cost of this building to be what we have provided in this bill.

This building is to afford not only quarters for the cadets, strictly speaking, but it is to furnish, to some extent at least, accommodations for offices for the various officers in charge of the cadets. We are to have a large memorial hall—I admit not a specially common and unpretentious hall, but one of dignity and architectural attractiveness—a hall suitable for graduation exercises, for meetings of the alumni association, and other such purposes. There are to be dining rooms—and I will say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], what I trust will not offend his sensibilities as to the proper requirements and needs of these young men—that there are to be bathrooms, and separate sleeping rooms, comfortable and suitable quarters for them in the prosecution of the work which we have marked out for them.

We have, I say, or are supposed to have, about three hundred and fifty-odd cadets down there, the same number as there are members of Congress here. I do not believe that I would speak wide of the mark, or would shock the equanimity of this body, or disturb the harmony of the spheres, if I should hazard the suggestion that these three hundred and fifty-odd cadets, the future commanders of the navies of the United States, are, in many respects, of as much importance to the country as this body of three hundred and fifty-odd members of Congress, many of us of fleeting and uncertain tenure of incumbency.

I admit that $6,000,000, which the gentleman from Illinois seems to think an adequate ultimate expenditure of money for the reconstruction of this institution, seems to be a magnificent sum, but it is insufficient for the needs of the Academy under present conditions.

Six millions was the original estimate for the completion of this project, but this was upon a basis of calculation which contemplated the construction of these buildings of brick.

The Secretary of the Navy, in the last Congress, asked permission to construct the buildings theretofore authorized of granite, and Congress granted the permission. We have constructed the armory and the boathouses, or we are now constructing them, of granite; and I submit to every fair-minded member of this body that it would be a pity and an anomaly that this building, the cadets' quarters, which is to lie between and to be connected by covered colonnades with the armory and the boathouse, to be the most commanding and attractive building of all, to be located in the most commanding spot, and having the finest outlook upon the bay of them all, should be of brick or wood or some cheaper structure, thereby destroying the harmony and symmetry in design and appearance of the group which, with the others named, it will form, and which is intended to be the most attractive and, I admit, the most expensive part of the whole Naval Academy.

I do not know that it is worth while for me to discuss this phase of this proposition any longer.

If you restrict this building to a smaller expenditure than that which we have provided, you must entirely rearrange your plans; you must employ other architects and begin the work anew. You must call a halt, stop the work, and postpone the completion of this great institution, which has been so long delayed by a spirit of petty parsimony, if I should not say, and I do not want to say, sectional jealousy and discrimination.

Mr. DOLLIVER. My friend speaks of altering plans. Is there a general plan——

Mr. MUDD. There is just this——

Mr. DOLLIVER (continuing). And if so, what is it?

Mr. MUDD. Well, I can not, of course, draw the plan.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Has a plan been drawn?

Mr. MUDD. Yes; I will say to the gentleman there has been a plan drawn. It was a plan prepared, I repeat, by what is known as the Matthews board, in 1896. I think perhaps I have the general outlines of it before me now. At the head of this board was Commodore Matthews, and another member of it was Captain Cooper, then the Superintendent of the Academy. They constructed a plan, to some extent a complete plan, and that is the plan in conformation to which, as far as we have authorized the Secretary to go, he has been acting in the construction of the buildings heretofore authorized and appropriated for.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Now, I will say to my friend that a gentleman who, I think, is not evil-disposed, has told me that these plans involve buildings costing $12,000,000 and that the architect's fees in drawing the plans are upward of $600,000.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. That would be the customary 5 per cent for plans and supervision, whatever it may be.

Mr. MUDD. I think the gentleman who gave to my friend from Iowa the information to which he refers must have been evil-disposed, or else badly and sadly mistaken.

Mr. DOLLIVER. It struck me that it was a little voluptuous.

Mr. MUDD. Yes, if there were any truth in the statement. The estimate for the total reconstruction of the Academy, made by the Matthews board, was $6,000,000, from start to finish. I have the plans here now, and the gentleman can inspect them if he would like to do so.

Mr. CANNON. If my friend will allow me, the chairman just showed me an estimate of over $8,000,000, and that does not cover furnishing or anything of that kind, and it was made at a time when prices of material and labor were at low tide, and I have no doubt that that estimate now, with the advance, would put the increase to $12,000,000.

Mr. MUDD. I will answer that, Mr. Chairman. That is about a fair sample of the statements that have been made about this Academy and in order to prejudice it before this House.

I repeat again, that the Matthews board made an estimate of $6,000,000. Now, it is calculated, however, and the Secretary of the Navy asks, that we shall build each and all of these buildings, which the Matthews board recommended and for which that board asked an expenditure of $6,000,000, of granite. If such shall be the material of their construction, it is calculated that the added cost for all of the buildings and of the granite required would make a total of $8,000,000.

I recall the gentleman's attention to the statement on page 67 of the published hearings, in which the architect gives it as his opinion that if the enhanced prices of material which prevail now should continue, according to his plan there would perhaps be an increase of $1,000,000, making $9,000,000; but we have right here, as I have heretofore said as specifically as I knew how to do it, already made a reduction from the face of that estimate of $1,036,000, because the Matthews board estimated and planned for these cadets' quarters an expenditure of $3,536,000, and we have limited that to $2,500,000; so that, even if we should provide for every building contemplated and construct every one of granite, even at the enhanced price of material which now prevails, which may or may not continue, we should be able to provide for them all within $8,000,000. That is the amount I have been contending for, that I shall continue to contend for, and shall be willing to have fixed as the limit of expenditure for this Academy in this bill.

Mr. SOUTHARD. That is for all of the buildings?

Mr. MUDD. All the buildings.

Mr. SOUTHARD. But your scheme involves an expenditure far beyond that.

Mr. MUDD. The scheme involves no such thing. A misrepresentation of facts in this matter should not be permitted to affect the action of this House. It involves an expenditure, at the

topmost limit, if we shall construct every single building of the style that the Matthews board planned, of not more than $8,000,000, for we have reduced the cost of the cadets' quarters $1,036,000.

It seems to me that I have made this statement now with sufficient frequency of iteration, and fortified it with sufficient proof from the official hearings before the committee, to satisfy any one, even the most incredulous or the most hostile to this institution.

Mr. SOUTHARD. Does it involve the reclaiming of the land from the sea and the bay, or the purchase of new land?

Mr. MUDD. All of that. All of the reclamation that we have provided for comes within this estimate, as the architect stated before the committee this year, as the plans here show.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Now will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. MUDD. Yes.

Mr. DOLLIVER. You say you have reduced the estimate for the cadets' quarters a million and a half.

Mr. MUDD. One million thirty-six thousand dollars.

Mr. DOLLIVER. How did you arrange that?

Mr. MUDD. Why, because the Secretary suggested that we should build for about 550 cadets. The Secretary, I apprehend, feels as most of us do, that the number of cadets will be largely increased in a few years; but upon the suggestion of our committee and the advice of the architect, it was concluded that we could provide a commodious and suitable building in conformity with the surroundings for $2,500,000, which would accommodate, I believe, 400 cadets or thereabout. That is the action of the committee, wherein we have reduced the cost of these quarters in the manner and to the extent that I have indicated.

The demands of the service require more cadets now. While we are putting up these buildings we may as well provide for the demands of the future that will come upon us in a very few years. I think the gentleman from Iowa will agree with me as to the wisdom of this course.

Mr. Chairman, if we are to stop the buildings now in progress, and if we are to alter the plans for the construction of those for which we are now providing, it is possible that we might confine ourselves within the limitations of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Illinois; but I do not think we ought to handicap and to cripple, alter, and mutilate the plans of the Department as to the cadets' quarters, which will be, and ought to be, the chief and distinctive building of the whole Naval Academy.

The great arm of defense of our country in the years to come is to be, not the Army, but the Navy. The Navy will grow, and it ought to grow. The number of cadets, who are to be the officers of the days to come, will be increased. We shall have occasion for larger quarters. Not so with the Army. It is to be hoped that there will be no necessity for an appreciable increase in the size of the Army of the country; but there will be an enlargement of the Navy and the needs of the Navy, a gradual, progressive enlargement, that shall be responsive to the new conditions and the recent rapid growth and expansion of the country, and its entrance upon a new field of power and influence among the nations of the world.

If there is a criticism which I would make upon this bill, Mr. Chairman, it is not that in any branch of it it appropriates too much, but rather that it does not appropriate enough.

The Secretary of the Navy, in his hearing before the committee, said that but for the fact that he feared Congress might consider it too extravagant, he would have asked for three battle ships as well as for the twelve gunboats, I believe it was, which he had already asked and which were at first contemplated to be provided for by the committee.

Admiral Dewey stated that he would recommend the battle ships, and if need be, as an alternative to that, in the way of a compensating reduction, that he would lop off the provision for the gunboats, inasmuch as we had captured some gunboats from Spain in our recent war.

I would provide for both, sir, both battle ships and gunboats. I am in favor of giving both Secretary Long and Admiral Dewey everything that they want and recommend in the line of development of the Navy.

I would build up our Navy until it would be not simply the fourth in rank among those of the world, as was stated by the chairman of the committee yesterday, but until it should be the first of the navies of the nations of the world; and I would provide for it now, now that there is an adequacy of revenue in the Treasury, and now that the vim and vigor of national spirit, as engendered by the splendid termination and magnificent results of the Spanish war, look perhaps with greater favor and with broader patriotism than ever toward the upbuilding of the Navy and all that follows in the line of the commercial development of this country.

We have not given this Naval Academy all that I would provide, but it is fair to the committee to say that they have given substantially and almost precisely just what the board of naval officers who came before the committee have asked for and have stated could be profitably expended and utilized in the time intervening between now and the reassembling of Congress in December.

Were I to have my own way, and had I the power, I would, in this bill, authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter at once upon a plan and to contract for a project for the total reconstruction and rebuilding of the Naval Academy, at a limit, I should say, of about $8,000,000, along the lines of the plan which he has already before him, with such modifications as he in his judgment might see fit to adopt.

I would build up this institution until it should become the finest of its kind in the world; and if it should be that the style and character of the buildings and the excellence of their architectural design and beauty should be for this age and country what the age of Pericles was for Athens and for Greece, I should feel that we would have acted in accordance with the dictates of a sound public policy, and in accordance with the desire, the sentiment, and the pride of the people of the country.

Perhaps I may be an enthusiast upon this matter, but I hope and believe that I would vote for as liberal appropriations for this institution if it were situated in some other State or some other district than my own.

I have no apology to make for the feeling which I have shown and the activity which I have manifested in this behalf. I am familiar with this institution. Our State is proud of it. I have spent some days of my life in the midst of its surroundings and made frequent visits there, and the spectacle which I have witnessed and admired there in what has seemed to me to be the most splendid exhibition of young and vigorous American manhood to be found in this country may perhaps have touched the tender side of my nature and impressed me deeply with the idea and the conviction that we ought to be not merely just but generous and liberal in the provisions which we shall make for the education of these young men and the appropriations for the upbuilding of this branch of our country's Navy.

One thing, at least, will have been settled, and settled forever, by the passage of this bill and the enactment thereby into law of the provisions which it makes for this Academy. There will be no further agitation of the old question which long lingered in the minds of the committees of former years as to the removal of this institution from Annapolis. It will be rebuilt, as it ought to be rebuilt, and will remain where it ought to remain, where it is today, on the banks of the Severn, on the Chesapeake Bay, in the State which has furnished its complement and contribution to recent naval history; in the State which gave to this country its Schley [applause], and yet has within its borders none of that spirit which would dim the glory of other heroes in that or other struggles of this country [applause]; in the section of the country known as the South, where, in conjunction and in sisterhood with the Military Academy, which rests upon the Hudson at the North—the one belonging to the Navy and the other to the Army—it will tend to represent and to typify the splendid unification of the sections of this land of ours, which was brought to its best and highest and happiest development through the outcome of the recent Spanish war, in which the graduates of this Academy, for whose upbuilding I here now plead, did more than all other men and all other agencies and instrumentalities to bring about a successful and brilliant conclusion for this country. [Applause.]

Trusts and Failures of the Republican Administration.

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. KING,
OF UTAH,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Thursday, May 31, 1900.

The House having under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 138) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and the bill (H. R. 10539) to amend an act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraint and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890—

Mr. KING said:

Mr. SPEAKER: The American people are watching with great interest the conduct of this Administration. Its accession to power was accompanied by many promises its eulogists in lofty panegyrics proclaimed what mighty results would be accomplished by it. The day is far enough advanced to enable us to judge of its achievements and anticipate what the limited period of its existence will permit. Can anyone not blinded by partisan zeal view with satisfaction the record of this Republican Administration or defend the unconstitutional, un-American, vicious, and destructive policies advocated and followed by it? It has been false to the traditions of the past and the teachings of the fathers. It

has been led by false lights and has abandoned the inspiration that made our country great in liberty and majestic in the strength and power of its people.

It has broken its solemn pledges, violated the Federal Constitution, and permitted organized combinations of wealth and illegal and corrupt monopolies and trusts to assault the national organic law, destroy private enterprises, cripple competition, and rob and despoil the great army of consumers. It has made of the Constitution a "rope of sand," and sought to convert a republic into an empire. It found a people and government resting securely upon the foundations laid by patriots who consecrated their work more than a century ago, and attempted their overthrow by secret machinations and defiant conspiracies. It entered upon its career with a homogeneous people, with an indissoluble union of indestructible States, bound in fraternal union; it approaches the close of its day with a heterogeneous population, and a government of colonies and dependencies and warring and unconquered provinces.

It is only necessary to direct a glance at the record of President McKinley's Administration to ascertain the radical departure made from the policies and principles held sacred for more than a century. That this departure is proof of political, if not moral decadence, no student of history can deny. The passing of the years do not change the forces or currents that bear humanity.

The present finds its counterpart in yesterday. Time deals in reproductions. There are the same uplifting forces to-day as yesterday; and the same enemies of civilization and order and peace and the triumph of eternal verities, that have stricken down the individual and overturned the state.

Mr. Speaker, I charge the Republican party with having perverted our institutions and robbed us of our high ideals. The American people loved peace; they believed that a republic founded upon free and sovereign States, and a people having the same high purposes, impelled by the same principles, and all so equal and free as to be units in the social and political organism, would meet unchanged the storms and revolutions, and remain as a refuge to the oppressed and a living example to struggling peoples everywhere.

Now we think of war and standing armies and mighty navies, of military glory and renown, of becoming a "world-power" and a participant in the unholy contests of greedy and unbridled nations.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican party is utterly indifferent to the cries of the masses. Every centralizing tendency, whether of wealth or power, finds its proponent and faithful coadjutor in the Republican party.

In every government there is a constant warfare to maintain a proper equipoise between the individual and the state. Democracy has struggled to preserve inviolably the sacred rights of individual liberty. It gave to this nation and its people political and civil liberty. It is now engaged in a titanic contest to preserve the industrial liberties of the people. What matters it if men have the crown of political and civil liberty if they dwell in industrial servitude?

To be told that one is free, that he is, in theory at least, the political equal of every other unit in the political or national organism, and yet to be condemned to social degradation and industrial bondage, is supreme irony and mockery, and adds to the bitterness of intolerable environments. Great wealth is being massed in few hands. Gigantic corporations control the channels of trade and the sources of wealth. This is an age of "bigness." Man is overshadowed and forgotten. Wealth is apotheosized. Individuals are lost in the vortex of power. The principles of justice, of equality, the question of right, of morals, these are regarded as too abstract and academic for consideration and too unreal and impracticable for rigid or literal enforcement. The light of the millionaire is obscured in the blazing effulgence of the billionaire. The speculator, the stock jobber, the wrecker of small fortunes and builder of stupendous ones, looks from dizzy heights upon struggling mortality below and accepts the servile flattery of some, while he remorselessly crushes all impediments to additional conquests.

The law of association is forgotten; the interdependence of man is ignored. It is forgotten that all the world is linked together, and that it should be, in fraternal power. To divide it, to dissever humanity by artificial and arbitrary and tyrannous conditions, is a sin the enormity of which is scarcely apprehended.

"An injury to one is the concern of all" is the motto of the Knights of Labor. Apart from the altruism involved in this motto, it announces a living truth, which lies at the basis of society. When governments are used as vehicles for the aggrandizement of those who control them, and the changeless and sweeping laws of trade are interrupted so that all the system does not receive their enriching influence, injury inevitably follows.

Providence has so organized and environed humanity that, when the least of His creatures suffers, retribution falls upon all. A truth promulgated advances all; an error accepted, though by a few, detracts from the moral reservoir of all. If one suffers in his liberty, in his right to earn a competency, in life, or the pursuit of happiness, directly and not remotely, all are harmed.

"As nations can not be rewarded or punished in the next world, they must be in this. By an immutable chain of causes and effects, Providence punishes national sins by national calamities." It is a national sin to deprive the people of power which is theirs. When the humblest is robbed, congestion results in some other place. Aside from the physical wrong, if such a distinction is permissible, resulting from taking power or rights or liberty from another, there is a moral wrong. The continuance of such wrongs produces a moral degeneracy which is a sure precursor to national decadence, if not destruction.

The application of unjust laws, the exercise of unrighteous authority, create unnatural conditions, which result in class distinctions, unequal conditions in society, combinations that illegally and corruptly enrich a few and pauperize many. Such combinations then seize power to perpetuate the evil system by them established and protect the wealth criminally acquired. Then follows the impulse for new markets in which to invest their illegal exactions; and so the appetite for criminal aggression is formed and the desire for colonial conquest arises.

It is a natural evolution. Then imperialism follows. With it comes the demand as well as necessity for standing armies and naval armaments. The tramp of soldiers, the sound of shot and shell, the cries of the distressed, are sweeter than the hum of industry and the grateful songs of a prosperous, God-fearing people.

Mr. Speaker, there is an infection in the air. People are intoxicated over the dreams of military splendor and renown. The simplicity of a republic is not as beautiful as the ostentation of empire. The rugged virtues of our fathers, their earnest, sincere lives, fail to find approval when measured by the superficial and volatile standard so much to be seen in our day. Jingoism finds an echo in imperialistic policies, and we are more interested in "seizing slices of the globe and glozing it over with religious posturings" than upholding the fundamental principles of the Republic.

By questionable, if not unconstitutional, legislation the Federal Government has become all powerful. Its shadow dominates the States and affrights the people. Under the legislation of the Republican party, paternalism has grown, the autonomy of the States interfered with, and the sovereignty of the individual assailed.

The Constitution has been violated and one of the money metals robbed of its high functions. The sovereign power to control the currency has been abdicated and a money trust has been organized.

Extravagance and profligacy followed the intrusion of this unwholesome spirit into our national life.

When the Government is regarded as the repository of all power, it is then seized upon and its authority prostituted to make a favored few the beneficiaries of usurped power. An eminent Senator has denied in effect that this is a Government of delegated powers, contending that "the sovereign power is in the Government" and not the people.

Under this view, there are no limitations upon the Federal Government. Impelled by this spirit, war taxes are continued and riotous extravagance in the Government prevails, the Chief Executive governs territory regardless of the Constitution, and wages war and seeks to conquer remote lands without constitutional warrant.

At the close of the fiscal year 1895 the United States owed $901,672,966.74, but at the close of the fiscal year 1899 our national obligations amounted to $1,155,320,235.19. There was a per capita increase of indebtedness of $2.27. During the fiscal year 1895 $390,373,202, or $5.69 per capita, was collected from the people; while in 1899, $610,982,004, or a per capita tax collected of $8.04.

In 1790 the per capita tax for all national expenses was 91 cents. In 1830, under Jackson, our national expenditures amounted to but $24,385,281, or $1.90 per capita, and at the close of Buchanan's Administration there had been no material increase.

In the year *1899* it cost the people of the United States more than $9 per capita to meet the expenses of the National Government. The expenditures of 1899 were $894,006,489.64 and for the fiscal year of 1900 $738,855,248.78, with millions yet to be added. In 1895 the expenditures for the War Department were $53,898,370; Navy Department, $29,208,069, and State Department $1,188,046. In 1899 the expenditures for these departments, respectively, were: War, $232,395,365; Navy, $64,354,735; State, $22,871,614. The tide of militarism is rising, and, departing from the paths of peace and safety, we are launching upon a sea of unrest and danger. Already we excite the animosities of monarchical nations, and foreign entanglements must result. Our standing army has been quadrupled and the demand is for a still greater increase. Mr. Edward Thery places the cost of the European war establishments at $900,000,000 annually. Three million one hundred and twenty-one thousand four hundred and thirty men were in the armies of Europe in 1897.

Mr. Speaker, the party in power in this Government is responsible for these reckless, un-American, unconstitutional, unrepublican policies now guiding us. It is time that the American people called a halt and threw from power those who are hastening our Republic toward Charybdis or Scylla. But, Mr. Speaker, it was not my purpose in rising to discuss imperialism and the evils attending it. I purposed addressing myself mainly to the attitude of the Republican party upon the question of trusts and monopolies, and particularly its relation to the proposed constitutional amendment now under consideration.

A national election is at hand. The party in power, realizing its many delinquencies and cognizant (without contrition) of its betrayal of the people, is now engaged in the unsatisfactory effort of attempting to convince the people of its friendship for them. It is vastly amusing to witness the gyrations and smirks and smiles of those who for three years have been in power, without making the slightest effort to regulate or control or prohibit trusts and criminal combinations in restraint of trade, as they vainly profess abhorrence of such combinations and such sincere, disinterested and affectionate regard for the "people."

Do gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber imagine that the people of this country can longer be duped by the professions of friendship toward them on the part of the Republican party? The Republican party is not, nor has it ever been, the friend of labor. It favored the importation of pauper labor to compete in the markets of this country with the American workingman. Under the domination of its present leaders it exalts the dollar and attempts to debase the man. It refuses to prevent criminal combinations of capital, but attempts to crush out the organizations of the laborer. The power of the Federal courts is not invoked to destroy trusts, but the machinery of the law and Federal troops are employed to overthrow the associations of laborers.

The people know that since the passage of the Dingley tariff law and under the Republican Administration more than 400 trusts and combinations have been formed, with an aggregate capital of more than $8,000,000,000. Neither do they forget that though the Republican party has had control of all branches of the Government for more than three years it has made no law nor made the slightest effort to prevent the formation of these unlawful and harmful organizations. Though there is a Federal statute which, if strictly enforced, would drive many trusts out of existence and reduce to a minimum the outrages and exactions committed by them, the Administration has refused to execute it and has loudly cried for condonation of its course by juggling explanations and windy lamentations over the alleged impotency of the law. In an editorial in the American Law Review for March-April, 1900, this aspect of the Administration's derelictions is discussed, as follows:

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL ON TRUSTS AND COMBINATIONS IN RESTRAINT OF TRADE.

On the day following that on which the Supreme Court of the United States rendered its decision affirming the court of appeals for the Sixth circuit in the Addystone Pipe Company case Attorney-General Griggs sent his annual report to Congress, reviewing the work of the Department of Justice during the year 1899. He says that application is occasionally made to the Department to have legal proceedings brought in the name of the United States against corporations or combinations of companies that are alleged to be engaged in forming or maintaining monopolies or agreements in restraint of trade. He ought to have added that such applications have been frequently made in perfectly plain cases, by distinguished persons, both to him and to his predecessor, Judge McKenna, and that the letters in which they were made were not even answered.

"Such actions," the Attorney-General says, "can be maintained only when the offense comes within the scope of the Federal statute. The only Federal legislation against combinations in restraint of trade is contained in the so-called Sherman Act of July 2, 1890.

"It will be observed that this statute is directed only at combinations or monopolies in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States or with foreign nations. It does not pretend to go into other branches of business or commerce, or attempt in any way to interfere with those transactions which are carried on exclusively within the confines of a State, or which do not amount to what, under the decisions of the United States Supreme Court, is understood by the term 'interstate commerce.'

"The Federal Government has no constitutional right to supervise, direct, or interfere with the transaction of ordinary business by the people of the several States, unless such business relates directly, and not incidentally, to interstate commerce; and such has been the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States."

The Attorney-General discusses this subject at some length, quoting freely from the decisions of the courts sustaining his position. In conclusion he says:

"In all cases where the facts presented to the Attorney-General were capable of legal proof and have established satisfactorily such an agreement or combination in restraint of interstate commerce as is contemplated by the Sherman Act, legal proceedings have been taken by him in the name of the United States either to dissolve the combination or to punish the offenders by indictment."

The last paragraph of the Attorney-General's report we take leave to qualify. We know the contrary to be the fact, so far as his predecessor was concerned in an important case and in the same case so far as he is concerned. When the office was held by Judge McKenna, Hon. Nathan Frank, who was personally acquainted with the Attorney-General and who had served with him on at least one committee in Congress, wrote to him requesting him to instruct the United States district attorney for the eastern district of Missouri to bring a proceeding in equity under the act of Congress of 1890, known as the Sherman anti-trust law, to restrain the Associated Press from maintaining its monopolistic feature, whereby its so-called "local board"—that is to say, the proprietors of newspapers whom it served in any particular town—could exclude any other newspaper from receiving its service, even by the dissent of a single one of them. This letter was never answered. Subsequently Hon. Frank Bartlett, counsel for the Sun Printing and Publishing Association, the publisher of the New York Sun, made a similar application to the present Attorney-General, and his letter was never answered.

The State of New Jersey, be it said to her shame, has invited the organization of these illegal combinations under her laws. Yet to that State the President goes to select an Attorny-General, and upon the latter devolves the duty of enforcing the anti-trust law of 1890. It is universally admitted that the trusts contributed millions of dollars to Mr. HANNA, which was used by the Republican party in the last national campaign. I have heard it stated on the floor of this House what amounts were paid by various corporations and there has been no denial. For what purpose were these millions paid? Can it be that the hope of immunity from prosecution was held out to the trust magnates? It is unnecessary to say that they are not philanthropists; that the contributions were not for charitable purposes. But passing over the reason of the gift, we discover that the administration of the law is intrusted to a distinguished gentleman who does not enforce it. While I frankly admit that the present law is too restricted to meet all emergencies, yet a faithful execution of its provisions will result in incalculable benefit to the people.

But the Republican party is the friend of trusts. It breeds them, and they feed and fatten upon its policies. Republicanism centralizes and congests power. Trusts are congestions of capital. They are combinations to restrain competition among producers; to crush and destroy the honest manufacturer and producer as well as vender, and to secure control of the armies of production and wealth. They destroy individualism. They are a "sordid despotism," that leaves sorrow and distress in its wake. The chairman of the national Republican party recently stated that there were no trusts. Later he declared that if they did exist, some were good trusts, and that in any event the Republican party would take care of them. That the latter part of his statement is true is evidenced by the fact that most all the trusts in this country have been organized within the past three years under Republican misrule. All are thrifty, and private competition is being destroyed and individual enterprise stifled.

That the Republican party is friendly to the trusts is further demonstrated by the fact that no trust is protesting against this proposed constitutional amendment offered by the Republican members of the Judiciary Committee. They regard it, as it is, as a delusion and a sham; as an effort to induce the people to support the Republican party in the coming campaign. The efforts of Republican politicians to convince the people that no trusts exist having proven futile; they now assume the heroic, and pose as the great and only trust-destroyers. Carnegie stated, "There is no possibility of maintaining a trust. The public may regard trusts or combinations with serene confidence." Doubtless many will have no difficulty in believing that Mr. Carnegie, whose profits last year from the steel-trust were perhaps $25,000,000, regards trusts with perfectly "serene confidence."

It is a significant fact that the Republican party found no evils in illegal combinations and trusts when it promulgated its platform of 1896. This is a most remarkable omission for a party that now pretends to be the foe of criminal combinations. I think the answer is found in the fact that to win the election unlimited wealth was required, the payment of which was promised by the trusts and the great corporations. The Democratic platform contained a ringing, emphatic declaration against the menace of capitalistic combinations, and the Democratic party stands ready to supplement present legislation by such as will protect the people against combinations of capital organized to prevent competition and to work serious evils to the masses. That organizations of capital into trusts are harmful and dangerous to society is almost universally recognized. The marvelous growth of trusts, the tremendous power they exercise, have aroused the people, who demand their suppression. So earnest are the people upon this matter that President McKinley directed the attention of Congress to the matter in his annual message December 5, 1899, in these words:

> Combinations of capital organized into trusts to control the conditions of trade among our citizens, to stifle competition, limit production, and determine the prices of products used and consumed by the people are justly provoking public discussions, and should early claim the attention of Congress. It is universally conceded that combinations which engross or control the market of any particular kind of merchandise, or commodity necessary to the general community, by suppressing natural and ordinary competition, whereby prices are unduly enhanced to the general consumer, are obnoxious, not only to the common law, but also to the public welfare. There must be a remedy for the evils involved in such organizations.

Notwithstanding this apparently earnest appeal for the suppression of the denounced organizations, nothing has been done by the party in power looking to the consummation of this desirable work. Of course I must except the labors of the House Judiciary Committee, now before us for consideration. But we challenge the good faith of the Republican party whenever its representatives approach this question. F. S. Monnett, the faithful attorney-general of Ohio, was refused a renomination by the

Republican party because he endeavored to execute the law against the Standard Oil trust. Through the New York Journal, he says:

The Standard Oil trust has for eight years defied the supreme court of Ohio, and yet without punishment. A Republican legislature in Ohio deliberately voted down every anti-trust resolution offered this winter at the dictation of the bosses at Washington and the trust magnates of New York.

In a recent interview, the same gentleman expresses himself, in reference to the Republican party and its attitude toward trusts, in the following language:

I do not see how the Republican party can escape punishment this fall. The platform of the Republican party in Ohio strongly condemns the trusts and their unlawful methods. I was elected as attorney-general of Ohio on such a platform, and as the officer of the State and the representative of the party I carried out as best I could the paltform of the party. Yet I was not supported in this by many of the leaders, and the party organs criticised me for doing just what the platform of my party pledged me to do. Newspapers of the State, about 110 of them, printed paid articles criticising my actions, and they, too, party newspapers.

This is not all. The legislature which has just adjourned killed the Russell bill and the maximum freight bill, and that too by almost a strict party vote. Will not the people punish the party for such actions upon the part of its servants? The party, as such, is not in sympathy with such methods. Although the Russell bill was bill No. 10, it was side-tracked by the trust lobbyists and held back until near the adjournment, and then over the protest of some of the best men of the party, and almost all of the Democratic members, it was defeated. This was a repudiation of the party platform and the sentiment of the party. I can not believe that we will escape punishment, and I believe it will come this fall. Why should not the party be punished when the men who control its actions disregard the will of the people?

What shall be done with this growing evil? This should be no partisan question. It has ceased to be exclusively an economic question, and finds a prominent place in our political discussions, and requires legislative consideration. It can not be settled by demagogic appeals or by anathematizing the trusts and their promotors. Property rights are involved and the interests of all are concerned. We must consider the subject in the light of modern industrial development and the mighty changes that have been wrought during the last fifty years.

This century has witnessed the accomplishment of many economic wonders, chief of which are the inventions of labor-saving machinery, greatly multiplying the efficiency of labor in every art and trade; the application of steam power and electricity to the propulsion of that machinery; and the building of the vast net of railroads over all civilized countries, thus affording a rapid, safe, and reasonably cheap means of transporting the product of man's labor to almost every land and clime. This has aided the consolidations in business which now exist. The small shop yielded to the larger one, and that was displaced by the factory, and the factory was swallowed up in the maelstrom of combination. Competition was fierce between individuals, improved articles resulted, and prices were lowered to the consumer.

As an economic question, we first see man engaged in producing what he consumes; then as he advances in civilization, a division of labor ensues. One tills the ground, and another follows the chase, while still another manufactures the rude implements of husbandry, or the weapons used in war or field. Exchange and trade follow; the buyer and the seller then appear, and the prices of commodities are fixed; manufacturing increases; commerce expands. The net result is that competition stimulates activity, improves the production, and develops newer and improved methods of production, and cheapens prices.

To check this competition and control prices, to secure absolute control of commodities in the markets, and thus determine who shall be buyers as well as sellers, and what the former shall pay, is the object of the monopoly or trust, which in so sinister a form is attacking the peace and prosperity of the people to-day.

Many writers regard trusts as rapacious monopolies which annihilate the individual and by their exploitations breed discontent and socialism.

Judge Cooley, in an article in Belford's Magazine, June, 1888, uses this strong language:

They—

trusts—

are things to be feared. They antagonize a leading and most valuable principle of industrial life, and in their attempt to curb competition bring it under strict control. And when we witness the heartless manner in which some trusts have closed manufactories, and turned men, willing to be industrious, into the street, in order that they may increase profits already reasonably large, we can not help asking ourselves whether the trust, as we see it, is not a public enemy; whether it is not teaching the laborers dangerous lessons; whether it is not helping to breed anarchy.

Gen. Roger A. Pryor, before the New York State committee, announces some of the arguments against trusts, as follows:

1. Competition between buyers of the raw material enhances the price to the producer.
2. Competition between sellers of the manufactured article reduces its price to the consumer.
3. Reduction of price multiplies the number of consumers.
4. Increase of consumption stimulates production to supply the increased demand.
5. Increase of production implies an increase in the employment of labor.
6. Competition between employees of labor enhances the wages of laborers.
7. Enhancement of wages of laborers involves the material and moral amelioration of the condition of the laboring class.
8. Competition to sell stimulates to improvement in the quality of the article offered.
9. Competition to sell urging reduction in the cost of the article, ingenuity is quickened to the invention of expense—labor—saving machinery, and so a stimulus is applied to the progress of the useful arts and sciences. In short, competition ministers to the welfare of all classes of the community, and augments the resources and power of the state. But the evil of excessive competition is counteracted and arrested by the principle of self-interest and the operation of the law of supply and demand. On the other hand, all these salutary results are arrested and prevented.
(1) There being but a single buyer of the same material, he dictates to the producer what price he pleases.
(2) There being but a single seller of the finished article, he extorts from the consumer an exorbitant price.
(3) The increased price to the consumer diminishes the number of consumers and restricts consumption.
(4) Diminished consumption necessitates diminished production.
(5) Diminished production diminishes the employment of labor.
(6) There being but a single employer of labor, he hires it at his own reduced price.
(7) Monopolizing the market and assured of a sale in any event, the seller has no motive to increase production, but, on the contrary, is urged by interest to save the expense of, to him, unnecessary production, and so takes factories in the combine for the purpose only of dismantling them and stopping them.

In one word, monopoly despoils and oppresses all classes of the community and despoils and impoverishes the state.

But the political effects of the monopoly are even more menacing than its economic results, as is illustrated by the impressive warning of the late Judge David Davis. Great corporations and consolidated monopolies are fast seizing the avenues of power that lead to the control of the Government. It is an open secret that they rule States through procured legislation and corrupted courts, that they are strong in Congress, and that they are unscrupulous in the use of means to conquer prejudice and to acquire influence. This condition of things is truly alarming, for unless it be changed quickly and thoroughly, free institutions are doomed to be subverted by an oligarchy resting upon a basis of money and corporate power.

While the foregoing view of the results of trusts may be colored, there is much in the industrial conditions prevailing to warrant it. It is not a sufficient answer to say that trusts are the results of natural development and economic evolution. I grant that some combinations or trusts grew out of fierce competition, which made the enterprises in which they were engaged unprofitable. That large contributions of capital are the new order of things, may be believed; that a return to conditions of small business and limited capitalization is improbable, I think will be admitted by all. The desire of all should be to promote legitimate business, stimulate activity in every industrial department, impose no barrier or restriction to honest toil or proper investment. All evils can not be cured by legislation. Arbitrary governmental interference destroys enterprise, hampers trade, lowers wages, and produces stagnation, with the resultants of diminished rewards of labor and increased sorrow and distress.

Many of the new school of economists regard the present movements of capital toward consolidation and union in great undertakings as unavoidable, and the necessary outgrowth of organic development.

Even President Andrews, Professor Jenkes, and Mr. George Gunton "approve of the tendency toward organization, which they believe to be necessary, but they think that control and protection against the frequent abuses of combinations are badly needed." Van Halle (trusts), 118.

Upon the statement of Stephenson that "when combination is possible, competition becomes impossible," President Andrews, fifty years later, was led to observe that "the day of competition has set. Law or no law, capital will henceforth march in phalanxes."

Our country while it was purely agricultural was not confronted with this momentous question. But as manufacturing was entered upon and railroads were constructed, the opportunities for combinations of capital multiplied, and the advantages to those concerned became apparent. As early as 1882 Rockefeller obtained control of the oil trade and organized the Standard Oil trust. Other combinations followed, spreading ruin and devastation. The idea stated by Professor Ely that "production on the largest possible scale will be the only practical mode of production in the near future" was accepted as the rule of business and financial activity, and a relentless warfare was waged against the small dealer. As this mighty Juggernaut advanced it crushed helpless victims.

The small manufacturer, producer, and dealer, whether buyer or seller, was bankrupted; the country factory, giving employment to a score of people, was dismantled; the independent, prosperous owner was compelled to yield to the rapacity and ruthless oppression of the monopoly. The combination triumphed; the employers became employees; the country poured its population into the cities; monopolies flourished; stock gambling, wild and hazardous speculation, predatory financial and operating schemes, and an unwholesome congestion of wealth replaced legitimate enterprise, honest, conservative business, and a harmonious development of all the interests of the people.

To restrain this growing power, a strong sentiment set in against the physiocratic principles which had prevailed. The belief that the Government ought not to interfere with the business enterprises

of individuals, when acting in a corporate capacity or otherwise, underwent modification. The doctrine of laissez-faire (that the government should confine itself to the prevention of violence and crime, and the maintenance of its honor and integrity, leaving the industries of the country to develop according to natural law) was assailed and attacked with a determination which presaged at least a different application of its spirit, if not a modification of its principles, in the affairs of life.

It was contended that though the Constitution aimed at securing equal personal rights to all, and the prohibition by the Government of national interference in private and individual concerns, yet when through monopolies and combinations competition was destroyed, private enterprise hindered if not prevented, and the control of the commodities of life compassed by a few, then the personal rights of the many were assailed and the pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness arrested; and the interposition by the Government for their protection is not only proper but imperative, under the letter and spirit of the Constitution.

In 1885 Congress yielded to the demands of the people, abandoned the attitude of noninterference, and after two years of consideration passed the interstate-commerce law, which prohibited discriminating rates among railroads.

In 1890 the Sherman anti-trust law was passed. While this law has many imperfections and fails to reach manifold evils existing, still it is sufficiently comprehensive to embrace combinations engaged in interstate business. Though importuned to enforce its provisions, this Administration has declined. Evidence of a conclusive character has been furnished the Attorney-General of the United States as to the existence of criminal combinations in restraint of trade, which were daily violating the provisions of this law, yet a Republican Administration refused to prosecute. Its conduct upon this point is indefensible and justifies the charges that it is in league with the trusts and is sheltering them under its protecting mantle.

If the law is inadequate to suppress the trusts, as the Attorney-General claims, why has it not been amended? If it needed emendation, this fact was known when President McKinley convened Congress in special session in March, 1897. There was no suggestion by the President or the Republicans in Congress that legislation should be enacted against the trusts, although their operations were becoming stupendous and their power oppressive. It is admitted on this side of the Chamber that the present law is imperfect, that it does not reach many of the illegal combinations and monopolies, but we are ready to join hands with those on the other side, and exhaust the full authority of the Federal Government in legislating upon this serious and perplexing problem.

We know that gentlemen on the other side are insincere in pretending to desire anti-trust legislation; that this sudden spasm results from a desire to "fool" the people, and by this *coup de théâtre* and play of virtue to secure a vote of confidence. This is apparent from the fact that notwithstanding the marvelous growth of trusts during the past three years, together with the bold and menacing attitude assumed by criminal monopolies, neither the Administration nor a Republican Congress (until within the past few days) has presented any measure for their suppression or to strengthen existing law.

It is also conclusively proven by the fact that the constiiutional amendment now proposed is unnecessary, is such a monstrosity as to provoke dissent from every student of our Constitution and the history of our Government, and can not be ingrafted upon our organic law. The party in power has had time to pass an infamous tariff law, filled with discriminations against the people, and which fixed such prohibitive rates as to surrender to trusts and monopolies the absolute control of the home market, as a result of which billions of dollars of capital were marshaled and formed into a destructive oligarchy to further magnify the few and enslave the many.

Foreign competition being thus prevented and the primacy of the trusts being thus secured, the work of spoliation and ruin was vigorously prosecuted. The small dealers were devoured, local competition destroyed, the flags of honest commerce driven from the sea and the flags of the freebooters were flung to the breezes, while "Republicanism and Robbery" were acclaimed. Republicans have had time enough to pass a law for the further bonding of this nation, and under its terms $200,000,000 of bonds were issued. They have had ample time to pass a war-revenue law by which millions of dollars more of taxes are annually wrung from the people; but they have found no time to repeal it or relieve the people from its intolerable burdens.

They found that the days were sufficiently numerous to permit the formation of trusts, the illegal monopoly by them of the commodities and necessaries of life, the destruction of private enterprise and honest competition, the conspiracy to raise prices, and increase the dividends paid to trust magnates; but the days and months and years have been too short to permit expressions of regret for the victims whose name is legion, or to admit of any effort to throttle or restrain these criminal combinations in their infamous work. They have found time to turn the law against labor organizations, but not against labor destroyers.

Nor have they experienced difficulty in taxing the poor; but when the Democrats in the Fifty-fifth Congress urged an income tax, they flew to the protection of wealth.

Tyrannous in the exercise of the taxing power, they have been prodigal in the expenditure of the people's money, unjustly taken from them. Not satisfied with plunder at home, they have sought exploitation abroad. They have held and still hold Cuba, as Rome held Britain, if we are to believe Tacitus, as a rich pasture in which Administration heelers and politicians may satiate their rapacity. They have had the time, as well as the inclination, to send such precious scoundrels as Neely and Rathbone to Cuba, as well as hordes of Administration minions and carpetbaggers, who are to *instruct* the *ignorant*, *barbarian* people of that island in the *purity* of our motives and the *disinterestedness* of our efforts, as well as the *essentials* of self-government.

There is time, too, to allow the Executive to govern by military power for years, a "foreign country," and to become the evangel of the new doctrine that he is above and beyond the Constitution, outside of its limitations, and independent of Congress or the people; but there is no time to withdraw our troops, or subordinate the military to the civil power, or redeem our pledges, or recognize Cuba as belonging to the Cubans, or practice honesty toward them, or economy in the use of their money, or to observe constitutional limitations in our conduct toward that island.

This administration has had ample time to attempt the destruction of the Monroe doctrine; to enter into a treaty with Great Britain (the Hay-Pauncefote treaty), by which the latter's right to participate in the canal to be constructed and have a voice in the affairs of this hemisphere are recognized; to agree that the canal when constructed shall not be employed to defend this Government and its people, though constructed and paid for by it, but that it shall be completely neutralized; to court a rapprochement with Great Britain, and promote foreign entangling alliances; to view with complacency the Tory policy of England which starves millions in India and overthrows republics in South Africa; to surrender the fiscal affairs of the Government to the bankers and money-changers of Wall Street and Europe, and write upon the statute book of our country such measures as were prepared by them; to wage a bitter warfare against silver, though promising to labor for international bimetallism, and at last to compass its defeat; to pass the most infamous currency bill ever devised, under the operation of which the gold standard is fixed upon the people, the issue of currency by the Government prohibited, and the retirement of the greenbacks, silver certificates, etc., now outstanding accomplished; and to abdicate the sovereign power of the Government to control the issue of money, in favor of private persons and moneyed corporations.

The Republicans have proven beyond question their friendship for trusts and their hostility to the people by legislating to destroy one-half of our standard money, thus increasing the purchasing power of the residue. This results in advancing the value of the dollar, measured by toil and the results of labor, to the great advantage of the rich and the creditors and the impoverishment of the poor and the debtors.

This Republican Congress has organized the most gigantic trust the world has ever witnessed. By striking down one-half of our metallic money, the gold being controlled by the creditor class, and yielding supreme power to private banks to determine the volume of paper money in circulation, to expand or contract the quantity at pleasure, it has created a money trust compared to which all other trusts are Lilliputians, and before which States, nations, and monarchies must do obeisance.

During the campaign of 1896 the Republican party masqueraded in silver attire and pretended to favor its remonetization. When invested with power it threw off all disguise, confessed its hypocrisy and fraudulent pretenses, and, with premeditation, planned the destruction of silver, recking naught of its past promises or the wishes of the people.

To obtain favor with the friends of civil-service reform it professed attachment to the present civil-service law and promised important extensions in its operations, but when clothed with power it violated every promise and profession, and with a brazenness and disregard for law and decency that is without parallel it foisted into position incompetent place hunters and pestiferous, scurvy party workers, whose *services* demanded that they should feed upon the public.

When the war with Spain was in progress officers and men of experience and character were ignored and commissions were distributed to the "sons of someone" as political rewards. In the War Department chaos and incompetency were supreme and extravagance and recklessness prevailed. "Canned beef and Algerism," incapacity and insubordination, jobbery and wastefulness to the point of criminality characterized this period of the Republican Administration. If these were blunders, what can be said of the Philippine policy? There is not one bright spot to be

found. We discover 8,000,000 of Asiatics, in a tropical clime, thousands of miles from our shore, differing in everything, unassimilable. War is declared against Spain for "humanity's sake," to free the Cubans from unbearable tyranny and unspeakable cruelties, and is then prosecuted against the inhabitants of the Philippine Archipelago (who have struggled intermittently for more than a century, as Cuba did, against the same tyrannies and the same cruel master) by this country, that was a "liberator."

Though they possessed at least a de facto government, which preserved peace and protected life and property, and though the power of Spain was broken, and the impossibility of Spain's supremacy ever again being established or restored was recognized and known by this Administration, yet it deliberately planned the purchase of the Philippine Islands and the subjugation of their people.

The lives of nearly 2,000 American boys have been sacrificed; millions of dollars have been spent, and the end is not yet. The revolution had been so successful in the Philippines that when the treaty of Paris was negotiated Spain had no soverignty over or property in them. The islands, except a few fortified cities, were held by the forces of Aguinaldo and were lost to Spain. And yet the Republican Administration paid $20,000,000 for a people that had won their independence.

When Mr. McKinley was inaugurated revolution was devastating the island of Cuba and spreading death and destruction among her people. The revolutionary forces had made such progress as to entitle them to belligerent rights at the hands of this Republic. The American people, with remarkable unanimity, insisted that the President accord to the Cuban people the rights of belligerents, contending that if such were done the latter would soon secure their independence, and that without any interposition on our part.

The bondholders and other influences prevented the adoption of this course. The sickening struggle continued until at last the force of public sentiment drove the Administration to act, and war with Spain resulted. It would have been avoided if the course suggested had been pursued.

Not satisfied in rescuing Cuba from Spanish control and obtaining fair indemnity from the defeated nation, the Administration found time and determined to enter upon a scheme of conquest and colonial development. The madness of empire was in its blood, and the dream of military greatness lured it from the path of safety.

The statement of President McKinley was soon forgotten: "The war with Spain was undertaken not that the United States should increase her territory, but that the oppression at our door should be stopped. This noble sentiment must continue to animate us, and we must give to the world a full demonstration of the sincerity of our purpose." This high-sounding declaration is conspicuous, because it evidences the great gulf between promises and fulfillment.

Though we declared at the time Spain was required to recognize the independence of Cuba that the Government "disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island, except for the pacification thereof," and also asserted a determination, "when that is accomplished, to leave the control of the island to its people," our course toward the Cuban people is such as to cause them to question the sincerity and good faith in the occupation of the island. Indeed in many quarters of our country it is boldly said that we will never relinquish Cuba.

There seems to be no intention upon the part of the Administration to carry out the solemn pledge given to the world. The regulations being enforced in Cuba, and the whole bearing of this Government, would rather indicate a purpose to permanently retain control of the island and its people. Cuba is pacified, and yet our armies are quartered there and American soldiers and officers enact and execute the law. We began a war for the liberation of the Cubans and the independence of their island, and have so far progressed that we subject her people to military rule, and by peculations and scandals and frauds provoke the contempt, if not hatred, of the Cubans, and the derision of enlightened nations. We have also been so successful in this *humane* policy that we take death and destruction to the Philippines, overturn their government, fill their islands with thousands of armed men, and their harbors with fleets that bear destruction on their wings.

The Filipinos fought for freedom against Spain, and we deny their aspirations, denouncing them as barbarians and fit subjects for republican colonial experimentation. But, Mr. Speaker, the Republicans, while not having time to legislate against trusts or execute the present law for their suppression, found time to make a most deadly assault upon the Constitution, and to announce to the Filipinos and the inhabitants of the desolate and sorrowing isle of Porto Rico that the Constitution had no application to them; that it was not the palladium of their rights, nor did it give them shelter when the blasts of oppressive legislation fiercely assailed them; that they could be held by the United States, but not be a part of them; that they were to be governed by this nation, but not to be a portion of it; that the flag must float, but only as a symbol of power and not of freedom; that the Constitution was a mere dead, inanimate thing, which could be vitalized only when touched by the omnipotent hand of Congress, and being so much less than the legislative branch of the Government created by it, it had force and efficacy only when that branch willed; that the right of trial by jury, freedom of speech and thought and press, the right to religious liberty, and to a participation in the affairs of government, including the right of representation, were not to be guaranteed to them, and were not to be their heritage.

This unconstitutional, un-American, un-Republican, un-Democratic, and infamous doctrine is the creation of the Republican party of to-day. It is supported by the trusts, buttressed by Mr. HANNA and the legions marshaled by him, and finds support in the mercenary, brutal, unholy, grasping, sordid commercialism of the hour. The question of expansion is not involved; the issue can not be concealed; it is whether this Republic will survive or perish.

The Constitution of the United States does not permit this Government to acquire territories and peoples to be held as subjects and vassals. It does not authorize wars of conquest. The Republic is a union of States, and our organic law contemplates that all territory shall be carved into States and all the inhabitants of the same shall be citizens of such States and of the United States. This view is entertained by the Supreme Court of the United States, as shown by the following language:

> There is certainly no power given by the Constitution to the Federal Government to establish or maintain colonies bordering on the United States or at a distance to be ruled and governed at its own pleasure, nor to enlarge its territorial limits in any way except by the admission of new States. That power is plainly given, and if a new State is admitted, it needs no further legislation by Congress, because the Constitution itself defines the relative rights and powers and duties of the State and citizens of the State and Federal Government. But no power is given to acquire a new territory to be held and governed permanently in that character.
>
> And, indeed, the power exercised by Congress to acquire territory and establish a government there according to its own unlimited discretion was viewed with great jealousy by the leading statesmen of the day. * * *
>
> We do not mean to question the power of Congress in this respect. The power to expand the territory of the United States by the admission of new States is plainly given, and in the construction of this power by all the departments of the Government it has been held to authorize the acquisition of new territory not fit for admission at the time, but to be admitted as soon as its population would entitle it to admission. It is acquired to become a State, and not to be held as a colony and governed by Congress with absolute authority; and as the propriety of admitting a new State is committed to the sound discretion of Congress, the power to acquire territory for that purpose, to be held by the United States until it is in suitable condition to become a State upon an equal footing with the other States, must rest upon the same discretion.

Justice McLean said:

> In organizing the government of a Territory, Congress is limited to means appropriate to the attainment of the constitutional object. No powers can be exercised which are prohibited by the Constitution or which are contrary to its spirit, so that, whether the object may be the protection of the persons and property of purchasers of the public lands or of communities who have been annexed to the Union by conquest or purchase, they are initiatory to the establishment of State governments, and no more power can be claimed or exercised than is necessary to the attainment of the end. This is the limitation of all the Federal powers.

The true theory of our Government is that the Constitution is supreme, and that Congress possesses only such authority as is expressly conferred by the Constitution; and that the encircling arms of the Constitution are found protecting wherever the flag of the Republic floats. But this sacred and, as was always supposed, impregnable doctrine has been challenged by the Administration. It has found time to attempt the overthrow of constitutional government.

The "privileged classes," the "rich and well-born," the trusts and mighty combinations of wealth see beauties in the monarchial systems of Europe. They see that Rome held provinces and dependencies; that the full glory of Roman citizenship was denied to the people of such colonies and the right of self-government withheld; that by such a course the exploitation of the people was most easily effected, and by condemning them to political inferiority, bureaucracy flourished. They see that Great Britain has "Crown Colonies," and that "land grabbing" and founding colonial dependencies are the policies of "great nations."

To establish a like system the Constitution must be disregarded, and the policy which has made our nation the greatest and most glorious on earth must be overthrown. The Constitution declares that "All duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States." Porto Rico is a part of the United States, and her people are entitled to the protection of all constitutional guaranties. This fact was recognized by President McKinley, who declared that it was "our plain duty" to provide for unrestricted trade between Porto Rico and the rest of the United States.

But the sugar trust and tobacco trust urgently demanded that tariff duties be imposed, and this Administration found time to surrender to the trusts and to establish a precedent for the destructive and odious doctrine that we can treat acquired territory as a colony and give to it and its people no government or

such government as we please. Under this view the people of Porto Rico can be held in vassalage; they can be governed by a satrap or tyrant; they can be taxed without representation and denied any right that makes life dear. To hold distant possessions, to govern by military power, to have colonies and dependencies require standing armies, mighty navies, heavy taxation; the spirit of freedom is obscured; the equality of man before the law is ignored; social and other distinctions arise, and so imperialism advances.

Professor Sumner says:

The question of imperialism, then, is the question whether we are going to give the lie to the origin of our own national existence by establishing a colonial system of the old Spanish type, even if we have to sacrifice our own existing civil and political system to do it. I submit that it is a strange incongruity to utter grand platitudes about the blessings of liberty, etc., which we are going to impart to these people, and to begin by refusing to extend the Constitution over them, and still more, by throwing the Constitution into the gutter here at home. If you take away the Constitution, what is the American liberty and all the rest? Nothing but a lot of phrases.

After reciting the treatment accorded to her colonies by Spain, the same author proceeds:

We now hear it argued that she is well rid of her colonies, and that if she will devote her energies to her internal development and rid her politics of the corruption of colonial officials and interests she may be regenerated. That is a rational opinion. It is the best diagnosis of her condition and the best prescription of a remedy which the occasion has called forth. But what then will happen to the state which has taken over her colonies? I can see no answer except that that nation, with them, has taken over the disease, and that it now is to be corrupted by exploiting dependent communities, just as she has been. That it stands exposed to this danger is undeniable.

To the impious crime already committed by this Administration of assaulting our fundamental law the sin of cant and hypocrisy is added. Republicans, adopting the same pretexts and excuses ever offered by land grabbers, imperialists, and tyrants, piously assert that "benevolent assimilation"—the uplifting and civilizing of the ignorant, the restoration of law, and the bequeathment of liberty—is our mission and purpose.

King George III of England suggested this as justification for resisting the Revolutionary fathers:

I am desirous of restoring to them the blessings of law and liberty equally enjoyed by every British subject, which they have fatally and desperately exchanged for the calamities of war and the arbitrary tyranny of their chiefs.

Lincoln answered this position as follows:

Those arguments that are made, that the inferior race are to be treated with as much allowance as they are capable of enjoying; that as much as can be done for them as their condition will allow—what are these arguments? They are the arguments that kings have made for enslaving the people in all ages of the world. You will find that all the arguments in favor of king's craft were of this class. They always bestride the necks of the people, not that they wanted to do it, but because the people were better off for being ridden. That is their argument, and this argument of the judge (Douglas) is the same old serpent that says you work and I eat; you toil and I will enjoy the fruits of it.

Turn it in whatever way you will, whether it came from the mouth of the king as excuse for the enslaving of the people of his country or from the mouth of men of one race as a reason for enslaving the men of another race, it is all the same old serpent; and I hold if that course of argumentation, which is made for the purpose of convincing the public mind that we should not care about this, should be granted, it does not stop with the negro. I should like to know if, taking the old Declaration of Independence, which declares that all men are created equal upon principle, and making exceptions to it, when will it stop? If one man says it does not mean a negro, why not another say it does mean some other man? If that declaration is not the truth, let us get the statute book in which we find it and tear it out. Who is so bold as to do it? If it is not true, let us tear it out. [Cries of "No!" "No!"] Let us stick to it then; let us stand firmly by it then.

The Washington Post, an able and influential paper, courageously and honestly shows the bathos and insincerity of Republican pretensions upon this matter. In an editorial, January 14, 1900, it speaks as follows:

LET US BE HONEST!

Why can not we be honest in our utterances touching the territories we have recently acquired? Really, it would save time and trouble, to say nothing of life and treasure, to come out frankly with the announcement that we have annexed these possessions in cold blood, and that we intend to utilize them to our profit and advantage. All this talk about benevolent assimilation; all this hypocritical pretense of anxiety for the moral, social, and intellectual exaltation of the natives; all this transparent parade of responsibility and deep-seated purpose; all this deceives nobody, avails nothing, helps us not an inch in the direction of profit, dignity, and honor.

We all know down in our hearts that these islands, groups, etc., are important to us only in the ratio of their practical possibilities. We value them by the standard of their commercial usefulness, and by no other. All this gabble about civilizing and uplifting the benighted barbarians of Cuba and Luzon is mere sound and fury, signifying nothing. Foolishly or wisely, we want these newly acquired territories, not for any missionary or altruistic purposes, but for the trade, the commerce, the power, and the money there are in them. Why beat about the bush and promise and protest all sorts of things? Why not be honest? It will pay.

As a matter of fact, we are not concerned in the ethical or religious uplifting of the Filipinos. After all, the difference between a breechclout and a starched shirt front is a mere matter of climate and personal opinion. Dishonesty, untruth, crime, and general wickedness are here in our midst—present with us as part of our daily life and growing with our growth. We need not go to the West Indies or the Philippines in search of material for moral rescue. Our own slums abound with opportunities for missionary zeal.

Why not tell the truth and say—what is the fact—that we want Cuba, Porto Rico, Hawaii, and Luzon, together with any other islands in either ocean that may hereafter commend themselves to our appetite, because we believe they will add to our national strength, and because we hope they will some day become purchasers at our bargain counters? We might as well throw off the pious mask and indulge ourselves in a little honest candor. It will cost us nothing, and it may profit much. At any rate, we shall have the comfort and satisfaction of being honest with ourselves and the privilege of looking into the mirror without blushing.

Mr. Speaker, the record of the Republican party during the last three years is perfidious in the extreme, a shameful betrayal of the people, an unbroken line of violated promises and unredeemed pledges. Republicanism is the impersonation of the evil forces and tendencies of the times. It stands for the destructive forces in our nation; for high taxes; oppressive burdens upon the poor; governmental favoritism; militarism, with the concomitants of mighty armies and unequaled navies; lust for power and greed for conquest; imperialism, with its tyrannies and inequalities, its exaltation of the powerful and its degradation and oppression and enslavement of the weak; for jingoism and rapacity; for Hannaism and the view that money is supreme, even to the destruction of patriotism or party fealty or love of country.

With a record so foul and unclean, it impudently asks the indorsement of the country and insolently demands a retention of power.

Six months ago the Congress convened, the Republicans having control of all branches of the Government. What have they done to answer the demands of the people for legislation to protect them from the tyrannies of the trusts? Though numerous measures have been offered by Democratic members of the House, which if enacted into law would have proven of immeasurable advantage to the people, the Republican majority refused to report them for consideration.

But now, after a resolution has been adopted providing for the adjournment of the House within six days, and when appropriation bills and measures of the greatest importance are crowding for consideration, an amendment to the Constitution of the United States is submitted, together with a bill containing some meritorious features. The fraud and transparency of the trick is apparent to all. There is no hope or expectation of either the proposed amendment or the bill passing both Houses of Congress. Why was the presentation of this matter delayed until the closing hours of Congress? Here is a proposition to amend the great charter of our liberties, to commit to the Federal Government transcendent powers, and yet so momentous a question is thrust upon members without opportunity for consideration or full and fair discussion.

Gentlemen of the opposition, your proposition is a mere "bluff," a trick and a sham, as is privately confessed by many distinguished Republicans, offered for political purposes and party advantage. It is thought that the people will be satisfied with your explanation for failing to legislate against trusts, and this is offered to conceal the true situtation and with the ardent hope that Republican devotion to monopolistic combines and plutocracy may be hidden from the American people.

It is openly charged on the floor of the House that our Republican friends are indulging in a game of "buncombe" in submitting this proposed constitutional amendment.

The New York Sun, a Republican paper, and a powerful ally of the Administration, supports this view in a strong and trenchant editorial found in to-day's issue.

Mr. RAY of New York. What kind of a paper did you call it?

Mr. KING. I called it a Republican paper.

Mr. RAY of New York. It never has been a Republican paper.

Mr. KING. My friend knows that it is a Republican paper. He knows that it has been charged on the floor of this House repeatedly that it is under the domination of the senior Senator from New York.

Mr. RAY of New York. Well, I know that it is not a Republican paper and never has been. It was formerly a "fool" Democratic paper.

Mr. KING. Well, it would need something more than my friend's statement, veracious as he is, to convince the members of this House that it is not a Republican paper. It is supporting Mr. McKinley; it is supporting the Administration; it is supporting most of the follies and foibles and sins of the Republican party in this House. That makes it a pretty good Republican paper. It supported my friend and his party in the Porto Rican matter.

A MEMBER. And the Cuban steal.

Mr. KING. Yes; that is a part of the trust that the Republican party believe in. They believe in the Neely trust and the Rathbone trust. They believe in exploiting the Philippines and holding them for the purpose of sending trustees over them—trustees, not in the hands of Providence, as one of the Senators said, but trustees in the hands of the Republican party, to steal all they can and hold all they steal. The editorial is in part as follows:

THE ANTI-TRUST AMENDMENT—DISHONESTY THE WORST POLICY.

The Jenkins joint resolution proposing a sixteenth amendment to the Constitution to enable Congress to deal with trusts reads as follows, after having been amended by the House Committee on the Judiciary:

"That the following article be proposed to the legislatures of the several States as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

ARTICLE XVI.

"SECTION 1. All powers conferred by this article shall extend to the several States, the Territories, the District of Columbia, and all territory under the sovereignty and subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

"SEC. 2. Congress shall have power to define, regulate, control, prohibit, or dissolve trusts, monopolies, or combinations, whether existing in the form of a corporation or otherwise.

"The several States may continue to exercise such power in any manner not in conflict with the laws of the United States.

"SEC. 3. Congress shall have power to enforce the provisions of this article by appropriate legislation."

When we say plainly that this is the most dishonest, and therefore the most discreditable, piece of work achieved during the present session by the leaders of Republican policy in the House, we are not speaking of the merits of the proposed amendment. Its revolutionary character, the sweeping change it would effect in the entire system of our institutions, the bestowal upon Congress of an unlimited and arbitrary power over all private business in all the States and without regard to State lines or State rights, need not be discussed. There is no more prospect of its adoption by a two-thirds vote of both House and Senate and of its ratification by the legislatures of three-forths of the forty-five States than there is of the adoption of a constitutional amendment vesting in the Federal Government the direct management of all the myriad industries of this land.

The dishonesty of the performance lies in the fact that there was no expectation on the part of the author of this resolution, or of the Republicans on the Judiciary Committee who favorably reported it, or of the Republicans in the House who were willing to vote for it, that the proposed sixteenth amendment will ever amount to more than a campaign trick of the cheapest and unworthiest description. * * *

With cynical indifference to every consideration except the desire to "put the Democrats in a hole" on the trust issue, this farce has been allowed to proceed to the point which it reached in the House yesterday. As a mere trick for temporary advantage on the eve of the national conventions and the Presidential canvass it has proved successful. The Democratic caucus of the House has been forced into an attitude of opposition to a Republican measure professing to aim at the suppression of trusts. * * *

To such satisfaction as this triumph of ingenuity brings to the souls of the Republican statesmen who chuckled and winked at each other and nudged each other under the ribs when Mr. RAY of New York first reported the Jenkins resolution, on May 15, they are unquestionably entitled.

Mr. Speaker, this editorial, it seems to me, conclusively demonstrates the hypocracy of the Republican party in presenting this resolution. They do not intend to pass it, they never intended to, but designed it as a campaign trick; but the people will see through the pretense of Republicans and when November comes they will relegate that party to the rear and advance into power the party that is worthy the suffrages and confidence of the people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Speaker, the conduct of the majority in relation to the consideration of this question is arbitrary and so utterly partisan as to be outrageous. It is known to all that no legislation was desired by the majority in Congress to further curb and control the trusts, and that during this entire session the Democratic minority has earnestly sought the people's welfare, and demanded that the Republican majority release itself from the domination of corporate influences and enact appropriate legislation upon this question. When driven to bay, and having prevented the consideration of the subject until this late hour, they now, with Falstaffian courage and tragic voice, cry out, "Where are the trusts!"

To prevent a thorough analysis and discussion of the question the majority fixed the time of adjournment for the 6th instant, and then, under the plea of want of time, they abrogate the rules of the House and prevent the Democrats from offering the slightest amendment to the resolution submitted, by bringing in and passing a special rule. Under this but a few hours' debate is permitted, and members are then compelled to vote upon a proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States. This high-handed course will not meet with the approval of the intelligent and patriotic people of the country. No matter what defects may be pointed out or what obnoxious features may be exhibited, this rule compels us to-morrow, without having an opportunity to suggest and vote upon an amendment to the resolution, to vote for or against it.

One not familiar with Republican methods might suppose that when so serious a matter as changing the fundamental law of our land was under consideration the combined wisdom of all would be sought. "This is our measure," gentlemen say, "and you must take it, whether it is good or bad, without chance to cross a 't' or dot an 'i.'"

And so, under Republican rules, do politics and partisanship rise above statecraft and patriotism. If the proposed amendment shall pass the House, gentlemen know its passage can not be secured in the Senate. Still, in harmony with the purpose to reap party advantage, Republicans will in the coming campaign say to the people: "We will pass it in December; time was too limited during the session." And to the trusts they will say: "Of course we knew it would meet defeat in the Senate; such was intended. It was merely for campaign purposes."

Mr. Speaker, the Republican party is led by adroit politicians. Its great leader is masterful. No cause so sacred or question so lofty that will not be made to subserve if possible the cause of the Republican party.

But, Mr. Speaker, I desire to briefly consider the resolution under discussion, and submit some reasons why I can not support it.

The first question to be considered when it is proposed to change the Constitution is, "Is it necessary?" Republicans contend, at least for campaign purposes, that trusts can not be suppressed without a further grant of power to Congress. This position is paradoxical, to say the least, when simultaneous with the presentation of the resolution to amend the Constitution, a bill (H. R. 10539) is offered amending the anti-trust law of 1890.

It is argued by gentlemen on the other side that Congress is powerless to afford the people relief; that unless the Constitution is amended nothing can be accomplished looking to the suppression of monopolistic conspiracies. Yet they confess the falsity of this position by offering a bill which, if enacted into law, will materially strengthen the hands of honest Federal officials in their efforts to control the evils complained of. This bill is a confession that a majority of the members of the Judiciary Committee are of the opinion that the power of Congress to deal with monopolies and trusts was not exhausted by the Sherman Act of 1890.

The amendment of the Constitution is so serious a matter that it should be approached with grave and deep concern. Nothing but the conviction of an overwhelming necessity for changing it will justify even the suggestion of amending it; but it is palpable that this proposed amendment is not offered in good faith. As stated, the matter is left until the closing hours of the session, when, even if favorable action were had in the House, the resolution would fail in the Senate. The proposed amendment offered by the majority is as follows:

ARTICLE XVI.

SECTION 1. All powers conferred by this article shall extend to the several States, the Territories, the District of Columbia, and all territory under the sovereignty and subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

SEC. 2. Congress shall have power to define, regulate, prohibit, or dissolve trusts, monopolies, or combinations, whether existing in the form of a corporation or otherwise.

The several States may continue to exercise such power in any manner not in conflict with the laws of the United States.

SEC. 3. Congress shall have power to enforce the provisions of this article by appropriate legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans have offered this resolution in extenuation of their omission to execute the existing law and to excuse their party for failing to enact such legislation as is authorized under the Constitution as it now exists to destroy monopolies in restraint of trade. They will contend, doubtless, in the coming campaign that there has been no movement by them against trusts because of a lack of power and that until the Constitution is amended the people are without relief from their oppressions. If the Democrats vote against this resolution, Republicans will, with pretended seriousness, claim that the minority is responsible for the continuance of trusts. If we vote for it, they will joyfully declare that the Democrats conceded that there can be no abatement of monopolistic tyranny without change in the organic law.

They well know that, even if the Democrats in the House should join with them and pass this resolution, giving the requisite two-thirds vote, it will never be incorporated into our Constitution; they know the Republicans in the Senate would not pass it; they know that, even if its passage were effected, three-fourths of the States of this nation would never ratify it; they know that through the stormy scenes of a century, with the mutations through which our Government has passed, no amendment has been possible except those growing out of a sanguinary civil conflict; they know that by confessing a want of power in the Federal Government to suppress trusts, which the passage of this resolution would be tantamount to, monopolies and conspiracies in restraint of trade would be pleased, as it would continue their existence and increase their power.

To vote for this proposed amendment is a declaration in favor of trusts and their continuance. It is an open alliance with them. It is a vote for their protection and perpetuity. Gentlemen upon the other side know that if this resolution went to the States for their approval, even if the trusts and the representatives of wealth failed by corrupt and improper means to withhold the support of eleven of the States, there would be many more than that number that would never ratify it because of its inherent vices and the monstrous propositions which it embodies. So we see that this resolution is not offered in good faith with the hope or expectation of its passage or ratification by the States. It is clear that it was offered only to meet the exigencies of the campaign and for the protection, if possible, of Republicans from the just condemnation of a patient but outraged people.

Mr. Speaker, powerful as trusts are, their destruction can be accomplished, in my opinion, if Congress will exercise the authority possessed by it under the Constitution. Indeed, it is not certain but what the present law, if enforced by faithful officials, could not be effective to that end. But before discussing that question I desire to point out some of the objections to this proposed amendment which I have just read in full.

The first section of this proposed sixteenth amendment to the Federal Constitution is an anomaly. It has always been an accepted doctrine of this Republic that the Constitution extended ex propria vigore to every part of the domain under the flag; that

wherever the Constitution went, the flag went. The Supreme Court over and over again have declared that "the personal and civil rights of the inhabitants of the Territories are secured to them and to their citizens by the price of constitutional liberty, which restrained all agencies of the Government, State and national;" and in numerous other decisions they have determined that whenever territory was acquired by the Government, whether by cession, or treaty, or discovery, or conquest, it was held subject to the Constitution, and its inhabitants entitled to all the immunities and protection prescribed by that immortal instrument.

Section 1 of this proposed article is obnoxious to every view heretofore entertained upon this point and is in direct contradiction of the many utterances of the Supreme Court upon this important question. It has been so fashionable with this Administration to violate the Constitution that gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber find no difficulty in continuing their assaults. A vote for this measure is a vote for militarism, for the colonial system; and is an indorsement of the great national apostacy led by the sugar and tobacco trusts and the Republican party; it is a vote to indorse the declaration that the Constitution and the flag are separable; that the people of Arizona and New Mexico, as well as the inhabitants of other territory under the jurisdiction of the United States, are outside of the protection of the Constitution, and can be governed by military power or as Spain governed her colonies.

In other words, this proposed amendment declares that this is no longer a Republic constitutionally governed, and that to show to the world that we are advancing toward a monarchical form of government we write in the Constitution that the inhabitants of the territory belonging to the United States are no longer citizens of the United States, but are subjects and vassals, and are to be treated as such by Congress. That this is the correct interpretation of section 1 is admitted by its proponents. The chairman of the Judiciary Committee [Mr. RAY], in reporting this measure, and the Republicans who have spoken confessed that its purpose is to crystallize the Republican view as expressed upon the Porto Rican question and to declare that the Constitution, with all of its blessings and benefits, can only go where Congress allows.

Ex-Senator Edmunds, in a letter written to Senator PROCTOR on the 21st of March of this year, when this new, dangerous, and destructive doctrine was being urged by the Republicans, shows its infamy, as well as its unconstitutionality. In his letter he uses the following language:

MY DEAR SIR: I have yours of the 20th instant, and, both as an American citizen and an original and constant Republican, am very glad to learn that you are opposed to legislation having the effect of imposing on the people of Porto Rico (whether we call them citizens or subjects of the United States) any kind of revenue burden or benefit that is not common to the whole people of the United States. Any such measure, if enacted, will, I believe, be unique in our whole history. It will imitate and parallel the acts of the British Parliament which forced our fathers to just resistance and revolution, and led them to establish a Constitution which in studied and explicit terms forbade any such discrimination.

I know there are many gentlemen engaged in public affairs whose intelligence and patriotism are above question who believe that our Constitution does not embrace the Territories, and that as to them the President and Congress possess the same omnipotent powers that the British Crown and Parliament have always possessed over their possessions. While I think that position is untenable as a matter of law, I believe the proposed action is still less defensible viewed in the light of those principles of liberty, justice, and equality of rights we all profess to believe in, and which, whether we believe in and practice or not, are still living and will live and bear fruits more and more among men, in spite of all the tyrants—well-meaning or otherwise—in the world.

I need not weary you by referring to the often-stated arguments on the general subject, but I will mention one aspect of it which, so far as I have noticed, has not been particularly adverted to. Congress is the creature of the Constitution and not the reverse. A law passed by Congress is its creation, a mere expression of its will, which it may repeal or change at pleasure. If, therefore (assuming that the Constitution does not exist in Porto Rico), Congress were to enact a statute declaring that the present Constitution shall be extended over and be in force in that island, the Constitution gets its only force there by the virtue of the statute. It is a statutory constitution and nothing else, and a repeal of the statute would extinguish it.

But the Constitution as such, I suppose all admit, is not subject to the control of Congress, either to enlarge or diminish, to expand or contract, or to be applied to or withdrawn from any people or place. It is not a movable thing, like the Ark of the Covenant of the Israelites, to be set up and moved here or there, as the tribes might wander. It is the actual event and condition, and not the legislative or executive will that must in the nature of things determine the status of a man or a country under it.

The instances in which Congress has declared in statutes organizing Territories that the Constitution and laws should be in force there are no evidence that they were not already there, for Congress and all legislative bodies have often made enactments that in effect merely declared existing law. In such cases they declare a preexisting truth to ease the doubts of casuists. Porto Rico and its people came under the sovereignty of the United States by force of the treaty with Spain, and I think all will agree that if any part of the people of the island levied war against the United States or adhered to our enemies, etc., they would be guilty of treason. But treason is an exclusively defined constitutional crime, and it can not exist on the island unless the Constitution that defines it is in force there.

Mr. Speaker, I shall adhere to the good old faith of the fathers, and maintain, so far as within me lies, our Constitution in all its beauty and power. I shall not vote for a proposition declaring that the Stars and Stripes can or will float over an enslaved people. I shall not give my support to this dangerous heresy that the President of the United States is above the law and beyond the Constitution; that Congress, the creation of the Constitution, can rise above it, and that the President or Congress can govern despotically and tyrannously, and without constitutional limitations, millions of people and unlimited territory, floating the flag as the symbol of their authority, but with no restrictions to arbitrary power or unbridled ambition.

Mr. Speaker, insuperable objections exist to paragraph 1, section 2, of this proposed amendment. Its language is as follows:

SEC. 2. Congress shall have power to define, regulate, prohibit, or dissolve trusts, monopolies, or combinations, whether existing in the form of a corporation or otherwise.

In the act of 1890 the combinations, trusts, and conspiracies denounced were those "in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States," etc. Notwithstanding this limitation imposed by the words "in restraint of trade and commerce," it is well known that the Federal courts have regarded that act as a weapon with which to punish labor organizations. In the celebrated Debs case the act referred to was employed for the purpose of punishing combinations of workingmen. The circuit judge, in disposing of the case, directly held that the act covered organizations of workingmen, and that their acts when seeking to redress their grievances might amount to a conspiracy "in restraint of trade."

I doubt whether any person, at the time of the passage of the Sherman anti-trust law, conceived that it ever could be invoked against the toiling masses of the United States who, for the redress of grievances, either real or imaginary, might effect organizations. If the act of 1890, which contains words of limitation with respect to combinations, trusts, and conspiracies—namely, that to be illegal they must be "in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States"—is employed by the courts to suppress labor organizations and to punish those participating therein, can there be any question as to what the same courts would do under the power conferred by this proposed amendment? It will be observed that the proposition here is to give Congress power to "define, regulate, control, prohibit, or dissolve trusts, monopolies, or combinations, whether existing in the form of a corporation or otherwise."

They need not be engaged in interstate commerce, nor need their objects be to "restrain trade between States or foreign nations." Every combination is denounced by the amendment, and the Federal Government is empowered to regulate or prohibit it. It is not necessary to submit authorities in support of the proposition that the power to regulate, control, and prohibit carries full authority to impose penalties upon those in any manner connected with the subject or combination legislated against.

Therefore, under the proposed amendment every organization of labor, every association of people for mutual protection, every honest and legitimate combination to remonstrate against grievances or wrongs, can be punished, and that, too, even though the organization, combination, or association, and all the members thereof, were limited in their operations to a single State.

The evil to be suppressed is of an *interstate* character. Monopolies and criminal combinations to restrain trade and commerce, to destroy legitimate competition, and to place in the hands of a few the avenues of trade and production—these are the enemies whose destruction should be sought. Why did not the Republicans upon the Judiciary Committee, when they prepared this proposed amendment, if they were sincerely the friends of the people and desired to strike at the source of the trouble, limit this section to the combinations and conspiracies against whose usurpations the people are contending? Why did they omit from the section the words "in restraint of trade and commerce?"

I have no desire to inveigh against the Federal judiciary, but recent events warrant the apprehension, so often expressed by Jefferson, of the insidious usurpation of the Federal courts.

Generally speaking, they are unfriendly to labor and are ever ready to support the rich and the powerful, the strong and the mighty, in the unequal contest that our present civilization and modern economics and industrial condition present. Can it be doubted that, with a constitutional amendment such as is proposed, hostile legislation would be leveled against organizations that are legitimate, and the judicial machinery of the Government employed, at the instigation of capital, against those who in self-defense were resisting its aggressions?

Why do not the majority permit us to amend the section so as to remove the objection suggested? The fixed determination to prevent even the offering of an amendment confirms the charge that the Republicans are hostile to labor interests. If the proposed amendment should be adopted, Congress would have the power to declare strikes and remonstrances by laboring men, and petitions for increase of wages, and associations to secure better treatment at the hands of employers, illegal, and make criminals and punish, all laborers connected therewith.

No man who appreciates the value of labor and has regard for the great forces that produce our wealth and glorify our country, can give assent to such legislation.

If there were no other reasons, Mr. Speaker, than the one just suggested, this proposed amendment would not command my support. While there may be just criticism against some individuals who have employed labor organizations improperly, still when we see what has been accomplished in the direction of ameliorating the condition of millions of earth's toilers, through organizations and agitation for the repeal of obnoxious laws, for a fair wage and honest treatment, we can not but regard such organizations as wholesome factors in our industrial organism and body politic.

If, as gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber contend, Congress has not sufficient power to control trusts, and therefore a constitutional amendment is necessary, why do they not, conceding, as they are compelled to do, that the combinations, monopolies, and trusts that are menacing the people are interstate and are carrying their products to and conducting their business in various States, accept what the gentleman from Texas would have offered as an amendment, if an arbitrary rule had not prevented, which provides that the power to "define," "regulate," "prohibit," or "dissolve" monopolies and combinations, which is conferred upon Congress, shall be limited to such organizations as are engaged in interstate commerce and are formed in *restraint of trade and commerce*.

Do gentlemen think that the States are going to willingly grant to the Federal Government powers which they have reserved? All of the amendments to the Constitution, except those born of the civil war, were restrictions upon the General Government and not concessions of power.

Has the spirit of imperialism so inoculated Republicans that they desire to rob the States of their sovereign powers?

Under this proposed amendment the Federal Government can reach into each State, control every corporation therein (though it is a State corporation and limits its business exclusively to the State creating it), dissolve such corporate body, and punish the members thereof; it can seize the farmers of Illinois or Utah who agree to hold their wheat or corn until a fair price is paid, and confiscate their property and impose fines and imprisonment upon them. The most harmless organizations of individuals Congress would have the power to declare illegal combinations, and visit pains and penalties upon all connected therewith.

The States now have the right to define trusts, combinations, and monopolies, and to punish, dissolve, and prohibit such as are confined in their operations within their respective States. They control their own corporations and organizations. This power, I am sure, they will not surrender to the Federal Government. Therefore the sixteenth amendment, in its present form, will never receive the approval of the people of the Commonwealths.

Section 2, as proposed, confers the exclusive power upon Congress to "*define*" trusts, monopolies, or combinations; not only such as are engaged in business outside of the State in which they are organized, but such as are purely local. With the definition supplied by Congress the States would be bound.

A most obnoxious monopoly might spread itself like an *octopus* over the State, and yet if it was not embraced within the description enacted by Congress the former would be powerless to control or destroy it. With the States thus shorn of power to define trusts, except to adopt the definition of Congress, can there be any doubt what the result would be? If so, note the victories of the railroad companies.

For years efforts have been made to repair the imperfections in the interstate-commerce law so as to prevent discriminations and to protect the people. It is unnecessary to state that the railroads have circumvented the demands of the people, the arm of right has been paralyzed, and the great legislative branch of the Government has not overcome the obstacles interposed to the wholesome and necessary legislation desired.

Besides depriving the States, as suggested, of power to control their own domestic affairs, section 2 deprives them of the right to extirpate conspiracies and monopolies by conferring upon Congress this extraordinary grant of power. It is evident that if Congress can declare that certain acts constitute a combination or conspiracy, no State would have the right, under the proposed amendment, to declare that certain other acts constituted a conspiracy or monopoly. If Congress should control or regulate any organization or association, no matter how harmful or harmless it might be, as a *monopoly* or *combination*, no State law could contravene it. It must be admitted, then, that if Congress should define innocent acts to be a combination or conspiracy no State could declare any other acts, no matter how vicious or harmful, to be a combination or conspiracy.

Many States have already enacted wise and salutary laws against monopolies, which are being vigilantly enforced, to the terror of the trusts and the benefit of the people. Texas presents a striking example of what can be done by the States to suppress the trusts. The Standard Oil Company has been driven from its borders, and insurance companies are supplicating for permission to enter the State and transact business. If this resolution were to become a part of the Constitution, every State would be at the mercy of Congress in its legislation upon the trust question.

These wholesome State laws now in force unquestionably would not harmonize with Congressional enactments in many details. They would, therefore, be nugatory. Congress might validate that which the people of some States might regard as a menacing combination, or condemn that which was regarded by the people of many States as legitimate and beneficial. In either case the paramountcy of Congress would be recognized. State laws would be overthrown. The power of States to control their own people and combinations and organizations would be gone. They would, Sampson-like, be shorn of their strength and become the puppets and playthings of the Federal Government.

They might authorize individuals to engage in most desirable enterprises, wholly within the State and purely for the advantage of the people of the State. Congress having full power, pursuant to this proposed amendment, over the whole subject of organizations and combinations, no matter their purpose or situs or form, could so define trusts and combinations as to include such enterprises, and thenceforth they would be illegal. The charter of the State, the seal of the people's approval, would afford no protection.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a question of "State's rights," as is asserted by some who are seeking to arouse ancient prejudices. The point at issue is whether our dual form of government shall be maintained.

The people are the repository of all power; they have confided a portion to the States and have made the General Government the custodian of a part of the residue.

It has been wisely determined that local and domestic concerns shall be directly controlled by that government which is nearer to the people, one with which they are in constant association. Despoil the States of this authority and the equipoise of our Government is gone. Transfer the control of local affairs to the parent Government and the States serve no purpose; the Union becomes an empire.

The power to define or control a combination, without limiting in any manner this authority, would be the most serious assault ever made upon the Constitution, except, perhaps, such as attended our civil conflict.

A combination is the act or process of combining or uniting persons or things; is association, alliance, union, confederation. The union of States is a combination. Every success of life, every triumphant victory is the fruit of combination. Yet Republicans can offer only one remedy for illegal and criminal conspiracies, which aim at the destruction of lawful trade and commerce, and that to deprive the people of the power to control domestic institutions and vest in Congress the authority to pass the most odious laws and supervise the details of private affairs and local organizations.

Under this proposed amendment Congress has the power to "define" trusts, "regulate" monopolies, etc. Is not this an exclusive grant of power, which prohibits State legislation against any form of combination?

Unquestionably if Congress "defines" a trust, or prescribes a "regulation," no State law could contravene it. If this great power were delegated to Congress who can doubt but that every illegal combination would concentrate all power to control Federal legislation? If successful, the States would be stripped of authority to destroy the trusts, and their nefarious proceedings would continue.

Congress, under the suggested amendment, could license trusts, or impose such limited restrictions as to permit their continuance. No matter what State laws were enacted they would be invalid.

Mr. Speaker, no amendment to the Federal Constitution is necessary to destroy trusts, but so earnest are gentlemen on this side of the Chamber to prevent further extortions and destruction by these voracious organizations that they would forego any convictions regarding an amendment, and support a properly prepared and honest one, one which could not be employed against organized labor, legitimate association and union, or deprive Commonwealths of the right of local sovereignty and the power to control their domestic institutions.

I have given, though imperfectly, some of the objections which I entertain to the proposed amendment.

There is still another, and a cogent one, namely, that no necessity for the amendment exists.

Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States provides that Congress shall have power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes."

It is unnecessary to say that the States have plenary and ample power to control their domestic affairs, and to regulate and destroy all trusts, conspiracies, and combinations organized and confined in their business operations within the States. The monopolies and conspiracies that are to be conquered are carrying on commerce between States. This distinction must be kept in view in

considering this question. All instrumentalities and organizations not criminal, employed as instruments of trade or commerce between the States or foreign nations, are subject to control by Congress alone; but where the combination is illegal and is a monopoly in restraint of trade, not only can Congress denounce and punish it, but its products and articles of commerce become subject to the control of the States under their police powers.

In the Rahrer Case (140 U. S., 545) the court say:

> The power of the State to impose restraints and burdens upon persons and property in conservation and promotion of the public health, good order, and prosperity is a power originally and always belonging to the States, not surrendered by them to the General Government, nor directly restrained by the Constitution of the United States, and essentially exclusive. And this court has uniformly recognized State legislation, legitimately for police purposes, as not in the sense of the Constitution necessarily infringing upon any right which has been confined, expressly or by implication, to the National Government.

The question suggests itself, What may Congress do under the section of the Constitution just referred to?

The Republican members of the Judiciary Committee, in reporting the proposed constitutional amendment, strongly urge as a reason for it that Congress has no power "to repress or control monopolies of any kind * * * unless it be a monopoly to control interstate commerce." They admit that all corporations engaged in interstate commerce may be controlled and dissolved by Congress, but contend that the Supreme Court has decided that over manufacture and production no Federal authority to regulate can extend, even though the monopoly in manufacture or production seriously affects and cripples interstate commerce.

It is true that in the Knight Case (156 U. S., 1) the court held that the power of Congress under the interstate-commerce clause limited its legislation and control to interstate commerce, and that a monopoly formed to control manufacture or production was not subject to the control of the Federal Government, nevertheless the moment that the fruits or products of the monopoly seek to pass from one State to another such monopoly is engaged in "interstate commerce," and it can be "regulated" by Congress. The manufactured goods, the production of the monopolistic organization, pass under the control and jurisdiction of Congress and may be confiscated or treated in such manner as Congress may determine.

No matter how odious a conspiracy to monopolize all the manufacturing plants in a State may be, the combination is a monster without teeth until it begins shipping and vending its products. When this occurs and these products go into the channels of trade between the States the jurisdiction of Congress attaches, and all persons contracting in any manner respecting the products, as well as the contracts, over the articles so manufactured, become the subjects of national concern, and are subject to such *regulations* as Congress may prescribe.

If a criminal monopoly is confined in its operations to a State, the State will quickly destroy it. If a monopoly be one to control manufacture it is not harmful—speaking nationally in contradistinction to locally—until it reaches out to place its articles of production upon the market.

If, as stated, its field of operations is limited to a single State, it will quickly be crushed by the State; it can only be a peril or wrong to the people outside of such State when and as it seeks to intrude its productions into the markets of other States. That moment, though it be a monopoly to control manufacture, it ceases to be a local evil or State monopoly and is dominated by the Federal Government as a combination or instrumentality interstate in character. As stated by Chief Justice Fuller in the Knight case:

> The power to regulate commerce is the power to prescribe the rule by which commerce shall be governed, and is a power independent of the power to suppress monopoly. But it may operate in repression of monopoly whenever that comes within the rules by which commerce is governed or whenever the transaction is itself a monopoly of commerce.

Under the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution Congress passed the act of 1890, declaring that any monopoly or an attempt to monopolize "any part of the trade or commerce among the several States or with foreign nations" constituted an offense, and also that "every contract, combination in form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy in restraint of trade or commerce" * * * between States was illegal, and that those connected therewith should be subject to punishment. This law has been reviewed upon a number of occasions by the Supreme Court of the United States, and its provisions upheld.

Under this statute proceedings were instituted to perpetually enjoin six corporations, engaged in the manufacture, sale, and transportation of iron pipe, from further acting under or carrying on the combination alleged to have been formed. The Supreme Court upheld the law and enjoined the defendants from carrying on under the combination interstate business.

Discussing the law, the court uses the following language:

> Under this grant of power to Congress that body, in our judgment, may enact such legislation as shall declare void and prohibit the performance of any contract between individuals or corporations where the natural and direct effect of such a contract will be, when carried out, to directly and not as a mere incident to other and innocent purposes regulate to any substantial extent interstate commerce. (And when we speak of interstate we also include in our meaning foreign commerce.) We do not assent to the correctness of the proposition that the constitutional guaranty of liberty to the individual to enter into private contracts limits the power of Congress and prevents it from legislating upon the subject of contracts of the class mentioned.
>
> The power to regulate interstate commerce is, as stated by Chief Justice Marshall, full and complete in Congress, and there is no limitation in the grant of the power which excludes private contracts of the nature in question from the jurisdiction of that body. Nor is any such limitation contained in that other clause of the Constitution which provides that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. It has been held that the word liberty, as used in the Constitution, was not to be confined to the mere liberty of person, but included, among others, a right to enter into certain classes of contracts for the purpose of enabling the citizen to carry on his business. (Allgeyer *vs.* Louisiana, 165 U. S., 578; United States *vs.* Joint Traffic Association, 171 id., 505, 572.) But it has never been, and in our opinion ought not to be, held that the word included the right of an individual to enter into private contracts upon all subjects, no matter what their nature, and wholly irrespective (among other things) of the fact that they would, if performed, result in the regulation of interstate commerce and in the violation of an act of Congress upon that subject.
>
> The provision in the Constitution does not, as we believe, exclude Congress from legislating with regard to contracts of the above nature while in the exercise of its constitutional right to regulate commerce among the States. On the contrary, we think the provision regarding the liberty of the citizen is, to some extent, limited by the commerce clause of the Constitution, and that the power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce comprises the right to enact a law prohibiting the citizen from entering into those private contracts which directly and substantially, and not merely indirectly, remotely, incidentally, and collaterally, regulate to a greater or less degree commerce among the States.
>
> We have no doubt that where the direct and immediate effect of a contract or combination among particular dealers in a commodity is to destroy competition between them and others, so that the parties to the contract or combination may obtain increased prices for themselves, such contract or combination amounts to a restraint of trade in the commodity, even though contracts to buy such a commodity at the enhanced price are continually being made. Total suppression of the trade in the commodity is not necessary in order to render the combination one in restraint of trade. It is the effect of the combination in limiting and restricting the right of each of the members to transact business in the ordinary way, as well as its effect upon the volume or extent of the dealing in the commodity, that is regarded. All the facts and circumstances are, however, to be considered in order to determine the fundamental question—whether the necessary effect of the combination is to restrain interstate commerce.
>
> If iron pipe cost $100 a ton instead of the prices which the record shows were paid for it, no one, we think, would contend that the trade in it would amount to as much as if the lower prices prevailed. The higher price would operate as a direct restraint upon the trade, and therefore any contract or combination which enhanced the price might in some degree restrain the trade in the article. It is not material that the combination did not prevent the letting of any particular contract. Such was not its purpose. On the contrary, the more contracts to be let the better for the combination.
>
> It was formed not for the object of preventing the letting of contracts, but to restrain the parties to it from competing for contracts and thereby to enhance the prices to be obtained for the pipe dealt in by those parties. And when by reason of the combination a particular contract may have been obtained for one of the parties thereto, but at a higher price than would otherwise have been paid, the charge that the combination was one in restraint of trade is not answered by the statement that the particular contract was in truth obtained and not prevented. The parties to such a combination might realize more profit by the higher prices they would secure than they could earn by doing more work at a much less price. The question is as to the effect of such combination upon the trade in the article, and if that effect be to destroy competition and thus advance the price, the combination is one in restraint of trade.
>
> Decisions regarding the validity of taxation by or under State authority, involving sometimes the question of the point of time that an article intended for transportation beyond the State ceases to be governed exclusively by the domestic law and begins to be governed and protected by the national law of commercial regulation, are not of very close application here. The commodity may not have commenced its journey and so may still be completely within the jurisdiction of the State for purposes of State taxation, and yet at that same time the commodity may have been sold for delivery in another State. Any combination among dealers in that kind of commodity which in its direct and immediate effect forecloses all competition and enhances the purchase price for which such commodity would otherwise be delivered at its destination in another State, would, in our opinion, be one in restraint of trade or commerce among the States, even though the article to be transported and delivered in another State were still taxable at its place of manufacture. (Addyston Pipe and Steel Company et al. *vs.* United States, 172 U. S. —.)

Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt as to the power of Congress to destroy trusts and combinations in restraint of trade. The equity power of the Federal courts can be invoked to dissolve corporations engaged in monopolies, or to grant perpetual injunctions restraining them as well as individuals, from engaging in combinations to restrain trade and commerce. The criminal law may also be resorted to, and fines and punishments imposed upon all engaged in the forbidden pursuits.

Under the common law monopolies in restraint of trade are offenses. Why is it not within the power of the States to punish those who are engaged in combinations and conspiracies in restraint of trade who come within their borders? It is the duty of the State to protect its residents in their life and property and pursuits. If their lawful business pursuits are destroyed by the conspiracies and unlawful monopolies of those who may be engaged in interstate commerce, it would seem that the power rests in the State to afford protection.

If not, why not? The power granted the Federal Government is to "regulate *commerce* between the States," etc. At the time the Constitution was adopted monopolies and contracts in restraint of trade were denominated "crimes against trade." These crimes were not legalized by the Constitution, and were not, by the commerce clause, metamorphosed into "commerce."

It is not a "regulation of commerce" to pass an act punishing crimes in restraint of trade. Therefore it would seem that if a corporation, engaged in commerce between the States, violated the common law and the State law of either of the States in which it was doing business, and combined and conspired to restrain trade, to create trusts and monopolies, that the State could, under its sovereign power and its duty and authority to protect its citizens, resort to its criminal courts and punish those who violated its laws and injured its people. It would also seem that it possessed power to prevent those engaged in such criminal pursuits from engaging in business within its borders, or contracting with respect to the articles produced for such illegal and unlawful purpose.

It is the duty of the State to protect its inhabitants against fraud and oppression, conspiracy and criminal organizations designed to destroy their business; and if persons engaged in world-wide commerce conspire against the people of such State to form monopolies and restrain trade and destroy their business, what "regulation of commerce" or authority of Congress to "regulate commerce with foreign nations or among the several States" is violated or trenched upon?

It must be apparent that if this differentiation is sound the trust problem can speedily be solved. With the States enforcing the criminal provisions of the common law, just adverted to, or similar or more drastic statutory ones, against monopolies and trusts, and those connected therewith, they and their evils would soon be overthrown. This view finds support in the recent case of Austin *vs.* State (101 Tenn., 564).

Tennessee passed a law making it a misdemeanor to sell or bring into the State for the purpose of selling or giving away any cigarettes, etc. The validity of the statute was questioned, because, as the defendant contended, it interferred with interstate commerce. The court held that "Every State has the right under its reserved police power to prohibit the importation and sale of all articles inherently unworthy of commerce" * * *; that cigarettes not being legitimate articles of commerce, the provision of the Constitution invoked afforded no protection.

If certain acts constitute a crime, and pursuant to that crime certain articles are produced to be sold in furtherance of the offense, and to fully accomplish the unlawful act entered upon, why should not the States under their police powers protect the people from the effects of such crime?

When articles and commodities are outlawed—that is, are produced by unlawful combinations—they cease to be legitimate commerce. They are not, in the language of the Supreme Court of the United States, "merchantable." Therefore I contend that on principle the law is that "The self-protecting power of each State may be rightfully exerted against their introduction, and such exercise of power can not be considered regulation of commerce prohibited by the Constitution."

I do not question the doctrine so strongly intrenched in the announcements of our highest judicial tribunal, that legitimate interstate commerce can only be affected by State legislation which is permitted under the exercise of the police power of the State. (Bowman *vs.* Chicago Railway Company, 125 U. S., 465.)

But, waiving this point, the States can punish those engaged in interstate-commerce trusts, and can crush monopolies and combinations, if Congress will pass a law analogous to the act of Congress passed August 8, 1890, commonly known as the "Wilson Act."

By the terms of this law all intoxicating liquors transported into any State or Territory are made subject to the operations of the local law enacted under the police power of the State. Accordingly it was held that where liquor was shipped from California into South Carolina it could not be sold, being subject to the law of the State, which prohibited sales except by the officials of the State under its dispensary enactment.

When Congress outlaws the productions of combinations and declares them noncommercial, then the power of the State to control the articles and forbid their sale and punish those within its jurisdiction who are in any manner connected with their production can not be doubted.

It will thus be seen that with the States fully empowered to control and dissolve all purely State monopolies and combinations, and also in the exercise of their police power to protect the life, health, safety, and comfort of their people, as well as the safety of their property, and to that end to outlaw the products of criminal organizations, the same being noncommercial, and Congress under the interstate-commerce clause having unbounded power to regulate and dissolve all operations engaged in interstate commerce, and for that purpose to confiscate their property and prevent, by pains and penalties and the injunctive power of the court, the transportation on the articles produced by them—that trusts can be destroyed and monopolies in restraint of trade extirpated.

But, Mr. Speaker, gentlemen upon the other side of the Chamber have confessed, as before stated, that emendations can be made to the present anti-trust law without exhausting the power of Congress over the subject. The penalties of the present law are increased and additional sections are added in the measure reported by the Judiciary Committee and known as the Littlefield bill.

While I approve of such amendments, and shall vote for the measure, I would very much prefer to support the bill offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY] in behalf of the minority of the Judiciary Committee. Some of the provisions of the Terry bill will do much, if adopted, to remove the perils to which the people are subjected from illegal combinations. We invite the Republican members of the House, if they desire to (as they pretend) destroy trusts, to support the Terry bill; but we are already assured that the salutary and wise provisions embodied therein will not receive the indorsement of gentlemen upon the other side of the Chamber.

The Terry bill contains many excellent provisions and I desire to incorporate as a part of my remarks a few of the sections:

SEC. 9. That every corporation, association, joint stock company, or partnership formed or made, or managing or carrying on its business, in whole or in part, for the purpose of controlling or monopolizing, *or in such manner as to control or monopolize, or tend to control or monopolize*, the manufacture, production, or sale of any article of commerce or merchandise, *intended for interstate commerce or commerce with foreign countries*, or for the purpose of controlling or increasing or decreasing the cost or price of the same to the purchaser, user, or consumer thereof, for the purpose of preventing, *or in such manner as to prevent*, competition, or of preventing competition in the manufacture, production, or sale thereof, is, for the purposes of this act, hereby declared to be illegal *and a monopoly; and all such corporations, associations, joint-stock companies, and partnerships, and their officers, agents, managers, and attorneys are hereby forbidden and prohibited from shipping or putting in transit any such article of commerce or merchandise to any State, Territory, foreign country, or place, outside the State, Territory, or place in which it was manufactured or produced, and from selling or offering to sell any such article or merchandise to be so shipped or put into any such transit, unless for the private or personal use of the consignee; and for any violation of this provision shall be deemed guilty of an offense against the United States, and on conviction shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 nor more than $5,000, and by imprisonment not less than thirty days nor more than six months.*

All such corporations, associations, joint-stock companies, and partnerships as above declared illegal shall be, and hereby are, forbidden and prohibited the use of the United States mail in aid or furtherance of any such business or purposes, and all laws now in force for the prevention of the fraudulent use of the mails, so far as the same may be applicable, shall apply in the execution of such prohibition.

Any such corporation, association, joint-stock company, or partnership may be proceeded against at the suit of any person or persons, or corporation or association, or by and in behalf of the United States, and perpetually enjoined and restrained from doing or carrying on any interstate or foreign commerce whatever, either with the States or the Territories of the United States or the District of Columbia, or any foreign country; and no article of commerce produced or manufactured or owned and dealt in by any such corporation, association, joint-stock company, or partnership so organized, formed, managed, or carrying on business shall be transported or carried without the State or Territory in which produced or manufactured, or in which same may be, or without the District of Columbia if produced, manufactured, or found therein, by any individual, corporation, or common carrier, in any manner whatever.

All such articles of commerce shipped in violation of the provisions of this act shall be forfeited to the United States, and may be seized by any marshal or deputy marshal of the United States, or by any person duly authorized by law to make such seizure, and when so seized shall be condemned by like proceedings as those provided by law for the forfeiture, seizure, and condemnation of property imported into the United States contrary to law.

SEC. 11. That every contract, combine, device, trust, or combination in the form of trust, or otherwise, or conspiracy, tending to create a monopoly in the manufacture, production, sale, exchange, transportation, or dealing in any article of commerce or merchandise, entering into trade or commerce among the States or with foreign countries, or designed to create impediments to, or resulting in restrictions to, such trade or commerce or aids to commerce, or to limit or control the manufacture or production of such articles or merchandise, for the purpose of increasing or decreasing, or operating in such manner, or with such result, as to increase or decrease the price of such article or merchandise to the user or consumer, for the purpose of preventing competition in the manufacture, production, sale, exchange, transportation, or dealing in such articles or merchandise, or to give power to charge unreasonable prices for merchandise or articles produced or manufactured to be bought, sold, exchanged, dealt in, or transported in such trade or commerce, or for the purpose of imposing, or in such manner as to impose, unjust or onerous restrictions upon, or impediments to, the lawful business of any person, company, or corporation engaged in the production or manufacture of such merchandise or articles, is hereby declared to be illegal and a monopoly within the meaning of this act, and every person who shall make, or enter into, or engage in, any such contract, combine, device, trust, or combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, or shall be a promoter thereof or officer or agent therein, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 and not exceeding $5,000 and by imprisonment not less than six months and not exceeding one year.

SEC. 12. That whenever the President of the United States shall be satisfied that the price of any commodity or article of merchandise has been enhanced in consequence of any monopoly as defined in this act, he shall issue his proclamation suspending the collection of all customs duties or import taxes on like articles of merchandise or commodities brought from foreign countries. Such suspensions shall continue as long as such enhancement in price of such commodity or article of merchandise exists, and until revoked by the proclamation of the President.

SEC. 13. That wherever any State or Territory shall, in any law against trusts, combines, combinations, or monopolies, provide that no foreign corporation, association, joint-stock company, or partnership, or stockholder, member, or officer belonging to or interested in any such trust, combine, monopoly, or combination of any kind, shall be permitted to carry on or do any business, or have any office or place of business, in such State, or shall make provision to regulate or suppress the business of any such corporation, association, or partnership, or prohibit the sale or offering for sale in such State of any article or merchandise produced by it, every such corporation, association, or partnership carrying on, or attempting to carry on, or do any business or have any office or place of business therein, and all its articles or

merchandise carried thereto, shall be subject to the operation and effect of such law, to the same extent and in the same manner as though it had been incorporated, organized, or formed in such State and such articles or merchandise had been made and not brought therein; and no such law shall be regarded as in any way trenching upon the power of Congress to regulate commerce among the States or with foreign nations: *Provided, however*, That such articles or merchandise may be shipped and transported into any such State or Territory for the personal and private use of the consignee.

SEC. 14. That every corporation, association, joint stock company, or partnership in the United States, or any Territory thereof, or in the District of Columbia, whether organized or formed under and pursuant to the laws of the United States or of a State or of a Territory, owning or controlling any plant or business, or a majority of the stock in any plant or business, similar to its own, in any other State, Territory, or place outside of the one in which it was first chartered, organized, or formed, shall, before being permitted to ship, consign, take, carry, or transport, or sell or deliver for shipment, to any other State or Territory, or into or from the District of Columbia, or any foreign country, any article of commerce or merchandise of its own production or manufacture, or receive consignments or shipments of articles of commerce or merchandise, manufactured or produced in any other State or Territory, or in the District of Columbia, or any foreign country, file in the office of the Secretary of State of the United States a certified copy of its articles of incorporation, association, or partnership, together with a duly verified statement showing the article or articles or merchandise manufactured, produced, or dealt in by it or intended to be manufactured, produced, or dealt in by it; a copy of its by-laws, rules and regulations; the names and places of residence of its officers and stockholders; the amount of its capital stock and the amount thereof actually issued; the amount thereof actually paid in in cash; the nature and value of the property owned by it, and also a full statement of all its debts and liabilities; the number of its employees and wages paid; the dividends paid, if any; the amount of its surplus, if any; the character of additions and improvements made each year and the cost thereof, and a statement of its operating and other expenses, together with a balance sheet showing its profits and losses; and shall annually thereafter file in said office a report, verified by a majority of the directors of a corporation, or by a majority of the members of an association, joint stock company, or partnership, showing the same facts as then existing, and shall, before shipping, or offering or attempting to ship, or sell or deliver for shipment, or put in the way for transit, to any other State or Territory, or the District of Columbia, or any foreign country, any article of commerce or merchandise manufactured, produced, or dealt in by it, plainly and conspicuously stamp thereon, when susceptible of being so stamped, and also on the outside of packages, boxes, or tanks containing the same, the name of the article or merchandise, and the name of the corporation, association, joint stock company, or partnership manufacturing, producing, or dealing in the same, and the place from and to which it is to be shipped or transported.

Every such corporation, association, or partnership as referred to in this section, and every officer, agent, or attorney thereof, that shall ship, or offer or attempt to ship, or sell or deliver for shipment, or put in the way of transit, to any other State or Territory, or to the District of Columbia, or to any foreign country, any article or merchandise dealt in, manufactured, or produced by it, or shall violate or fail to comply with any of the provisions of this section, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 and not exceeding $5,000, and by imprisonment of not less than six months and not more than one year.

There is no question, Mr. Speaker, but what a denial of the use of the mails to these criminal combinations would seriously cripple their operations, if not prevent their continuance in business. Suppose the law prevented them from sending any letter or paper in any manner connected with their business, and also prevented the transmission through the mails of any newspaper containing advertisements of any monopoly; it can easily be foreseen what the result would be.

In this marvelous age of activity and strenuous effort no business could continue that was extensive and found lodgment in the States or foreign countries without the use of the mails. That Congress has the power to enact this measure is not controverted. The Louisiana Lottery was destroyed when access to the mails was denied it, and evidences are of daily occurrence where fraudulent organizations are driven from business by closing the mails to their communications and advertisements.

The confiscation of all articles produced by monopolies in restraint of trade and carrying on interstate-commerce business would be a powerful blow against them. If, for instance, the binding twine trust knew that whenever it loaded a car with binding twine and shipped it beyond the State in which it was manufactured, it was subject to seizure by the Government, who can doubt but what this trust would hesitate long before undertaking so great a risk? And can there be any doubt but what a few seizures would result in the dissolution of the trust?

Another potent provision is offered to suppress monopolies. It is shown in section 12 of the Terry bill.

It is known to all that the Dingley tariff law has been a prolific breeder of trusts. Instead of being a bill to raise revenue by tariff duties, it is a measure to increase internal taxation and to prohibit importations in order to foster monopolies and permit the home manufacturer to absolutely control the market.

A few years ago the duty collected upon imported articles was equivalent to from four to five dollars per capita; now it is less than $2 per capita. Taking advantage of these prohibitive tariff duties, manufacturers in the United States have combined to create grinding monopolies. If the President were directed to suspend the tariff laws with respect to articles controlled by these unlawful combinations, it would be a long step in the direction of breaking down the trusts. That such legislation is constitutional is conceded. Under Republican laws the President is authorized to order a suspension of tariff duties, in his efforts to promote free trade or reciprocity between the United States and other nations.

The Federal Government is not limited in its power to prevent combinations in restraint of trade to the interstate-commerce clause or the clause under which it controls the postal affairs of the Government. It possesses the taxing power, which, as Chief Justice Marshall said, "is the power to destroy." Congress has resorted to it upon numerous occasions. All are familiar with what is considered by many the arbitrary manner in which it was exercised to destroy State banks.

Congress has the power to tax corporations and business pursuits. It taxes those who are engaged in the manufacture of oleomargarine, and a bill is now pending to impose a tax of 10 cents per pound upon all oleomargarine manufactured in the United States. Suppose that under this taxing power the products of every trust and monopoly were heavily taxed, can anyone doubt what the result would be?

Under the taxing power, Congress can impose a graduated occupation tax upon corporations engaged in interstate commerce. It could be so levied with reference to the capital employed as to render unprofitable the formation of gigantic trusts or combinations and monopolies.

It has also been suggested during this discussion that the patent laws, which protect the use of inventions for a term of years, be so amended as to provide that whenever any trust acquires the use or control of an invention the benefit of the law be denied. When it is remembered that many trusts are aided materially by the exclusive use of some device or article or invention, it will be clear to all that if the use of such invention were accorded to all, without limitations, it would seriously affect trusts.

These and many other remedies can be provided against the peril of monopolies, regarded as so ominous. The power is ample to absolutely destroy every trust and monopoly in the land. The trouble is that the forces of wealth are so strongly intrenched, the influences of the plutocrat and monopolist are so extensive, and their control over public affairs and public men is so great that legislation which will accomplish the desired result is not enacted.

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic party is fighting the battle of the people and to preserve civilization and liberty in the earth. It seeks a return to fundamental principles, and the overthrow of the pernicious policies prevailing in the land.

The Republican party, dominated by the selfish and sordid commercialism of the hour, has been untrue to the interests of the people.

In the coming contest the Democratic party will confidently appeal to the patriotism of the American people, believing that the party which is fighting their battles and strenuously contending for the preservation of the Republic and the liberties of the people will be rewarded with victory.

North Carolina Suffrage—The Proposed Amendment to the Constitution of the State.

There is only one course open for the white men of North Carolina to pursue. Let them stand by their homes; let them preserve the civilization of their fathers and solemnly resolve to maintain the supremacy of the race who founded this Republic and have preserved its institutions. Thus will contentment, good government, and prosperity prevail and the happiness of all her people be conserved.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN H. SMALL,

OF NORTH CAROLINA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, May 3, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 11212) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes—

Mr. SMALL said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I dislike to obtrude upon the House any remarks upon the administration of the internal affairs in my State, but the circumstances seem to demand it. The people of North Carolina are conservative in the management of their own internal affairs, and they are patriotic in their relations to the Government of the United States. They are quiet, unobtrusive, patient, and long-suffering, and yet, when they are aroused to action against injustice, misgovernment, and internal disorders, they are determined, persistent, and irresistible. Since the adoption of the fifteenth amendment and the assumption of their relations with the Union they have at all times shown a disposition to accept the new conditions and have always accorded full justice to the negro race. The negro has been protected in his civil and political rights, and her courts have at all times been open to him to redress any invasion upon his rights of person or property. As burdensome as was

the duty, her people with open-handed generosity have provided for the unfortunate of that race, as is evidenced by the splendid asylums which have been constructed and maintained for the deaf and dumb and blind and insane within her borders.

Schoolhouses have been built and teachers have been employed for the education of the children of that race, and such advancement as they have made since the days of slavery is due to the generosity and justice of the white man alone. Only a pittance of the vast sums which have been expended for the benefit of the negro in North Carolina during the last thirty-five years has been contributed by the negro himself. While entertaining the opinion that the conferring of the franchise upon the negro by virtue of the provisions of the fifteenth amendment was a mistake and a crime against civilization, yet they have accepted the inevitable with patience and forbearance. If the negro had been fitted to exercise the responsibilities of citizenship or if he had shown capability of appreciating his new relations with the white people of the State, it is not probable that there would have been any race issue presented as a source of constant friction for determination. He was not content to vote in solid mass with one political party, but whenever the opportunity presented he insisted either upon electing to office the worst representatives of that party or in aspiring to office himself, either one of which courses has always resulted in local misgovernment, debauchery, or corruption.

There are in many counties good Republicans, but they were in a hopeless minority and were powerless to check the results of negro domination. The result has been that the dominant element which controls the vote of the negroes has always brought bad government to the State, counties, or the towns whenever they have exercised control. This state of affairs could not continue indefinitely, and it reached its climax after the general elections in North Carolina in 1896. In 1898 a legislature was elected not only representative of the best element of the white people of the State, but the individual members of that body constituted the very flower of North Carolina manhood. When this body met in January, 1899, they conferred with serious and patriotic deliberation upon the conditions which had prevailed, and in response to a well-grounded sentiment they drafted an amendment to the State constitution regulating the exercise of the suffrage. This amendment was not adopted in a convention removed from the immediate supervision of the people, but has been submitted to the popular vote at an election to be held in August next. There will be a full discussion of its provisions, and the people will have an opportunity to pass upon it at the polls.

THE PEOPLE OF NORTH CAROLINA ARE CAPABLE OF DECIDING THIS QUESTION.

It would have been most appropriate if the people of the State had been permitted to discuss and decide this question without outside interference. Each State in its sovereign capacity has the right to fix the qualifications for the exercise of suffrage by its citizens, subject only to the limitation that such provision shall not contravene the Constitution of the United States. Congress can exercise no judicial functions, and no question has been presented to this Congress which would give it the right to pass either directly or indirectly upon the proposed amendment to our constitution. It will be time enough when the amendment is adopted to institute before the proper court any inquiry as to its constitutional features.

In the face of this condition the senior Senator from North Carolina, Senator PRITCHARD, saw fit to introduce a resolution in the United States Senate during the early days of this session attempting to have that body pass quasi judgment upon the proposed amendment. The resolution was not introduced with any idea that it would be considered by the Senate, but with the purpose of discussing it before the country and with a view of influencing the voters of the State. The Senate is largely Republican, and if they had desired to do so, or had the right to do so, they could have passed this resolution at any moment. The junior Senator from my State, Senator BUTLER, who was elected as a Populist, although by fusion with the Republicans, also submitted some remarks in the Senate based upon the resolution of his colleague, and sought to inveigh against the proposed amendment and the people of his State. He has taken this position, although the large majority of the Populists in the State are zealously supporting the amendment, and in the face of the fact that the State Populist convention, which recently met in Raleigh, declined to declare against it and left it to the decision of the individual voter.

This House has also been edified by some remarks upon this question by the member from the Eighth district [Mr. LINNEY], who chose not only to make an inconsistent tirade against the amendment, but he professes to find in the election laws of the State much to make him unhappy. His panegyric upon fair elections will deceive no member of this House and will be correctly interpreted by his constituents in his district. I am tempted at this stage to make reference to the variegated political opinions and the assumed indignation of the gentleman from the Eighth district [Mr. LINNEY]. He has professed allegiance to all political parties and been an extremist in each. How ridiculous that the gentleman should pose as the exponent of fair election methods! By what right does he essay to deliver a moral lecture to the people of North Carolina as to the manner of their elections? Certainly he does not obtain such authority by virtue of his present allegiance to the Republican party. Certainly he can not claim the right to teach the best people of the State their duty in elections by virtue of his own past record, if I have read correctly the political biography of the gentleman who claims no other criterion in political morals than the demands of political necessity.

One need go no further back than the record of the gentleman in the recent contest before this House of Pearson *vs.* Crawford and wherein he played the leading rôle in the disfranchisement of more than 19,000 voters in the Ninth district of North Carolina. It would be gratifying to the country to have the opinion of these sturdy mountaineers, whose ballots have been nullified and whose good name has been traduced, as to the political morality of this modern apostle of honest elections. And this opinion will be pronounced in no uncertain terms, not only by the men whose votes have been cast aside, but their brethren all over the State will join in resentment of this high-handed outrage. The colleague of the gentleman from the Eighth district [Mr. WHITE] has also essayed to express his opinion of the white men of North Carolina and of their attempt to guard the exercise of the franchise. It may also be gratifying to the member from the Second district to know that it was his vote that made possible the unseating of Crawford and the seating of PEARSON. However satisfactory to some persons this fact may appear, it will hardly tend to alleviate the righteous indignation of the men of the mountain district at the crime which has been committed against them. Mr. Chairman, such speeches and representations in this Congress have made it appropriate that some comments should be submitted in defense of the people whom I have the honor in part to represent.

THE RACE QUESTION IN NORTH CAROLINA.

There exists a deep-seated reason for the submission of this amendment in my State. The whole number of electors in the State are probably not more than 340,000, but certainly not to exceed 360,000, and of this number at least one-third, or 120,000, are negroes. If you take 65,000 from the 240,000 white voters and add these to the 120,000 colored voters you have a majority of 5,000 over the remaining white voters in the State. The senior Senator from North Carolina admits that there are twelve counties in the State which have a majority of negroes. In connection with these facts, if you will consider the further fact that these twelve counties are situated in the eastern part of the State and that most of the negroes in the other counties are similarly situated, it will be apparent that the situation is very much complicated.

That we have had negro domination in North Carolina can not be questioned by anyone familiar with the conditions, and the situation has appealed for some appropriate solution. I have been very much relieved upon this point by the able and painstaking speech of my colleague, Mr. KITCHIN, who has submitted facts and illustrations which must have convinced the most skeptical of the truthfulness of this statement. I shall not repeat the statement of fact which he has given, but will state that I believe all of the representations made by my colleague are absolutely correct and have not in the least exaggerated the prevailing conditions. I desire, however, to call attention to a statement made by Senator PRITCHARD, interpolated by him in the speech of Senator H. D. MONEY of Mississippi, while discussing the question of suffrage in North Carolina. Senator MONEY had just read the affidavit of Hon. J. D. BELLAMY with reference to the condition of affairs in Wilmington, N. C. I will now read an extract from the RECORD:

Mr. MONEY. But certainly the Senator will not deny the statement made by Mr. BELLAMY under oath, that forty of the magistrates were negroes, and that many other officers of that city and county were also negroes, and the condition of things which existed there during the time of that canvass.

Mr. PRITCHARD. I am not prepared to deny what Mr. BELLAMY has said about the matter, but I am prepared to show that there is not a single instance wherein one of the colored justices of the peace to whom my distinguished friend refers ever attempted to exercise jurisdiction in a case wherein a white man was concerned or interested, either in property or otherwise.

Mr. MONEY. That may be true.

Mr. PRITCHARD. That is absolutely true.

Mr. MONEY. I do not doubt but that you think so; but it is a very queer magistrate who discards jurisdiction because of the color of the man who comes before him—a very queer sort of a magistrate.

Now, this condition of things exists in a part of North Carolina. There is not a particle of doubt about it, and the legislature has sought to put an end to it.

It is fair to presume that the honorable Senator from North Carolina intended to make the statement that there was not a single instance in the entire State where any colored justices of the peace attempted to exercise jurisdiction as to the property or personal rights of white persons. If he knew of such an instance he ought to have admitted it, and I have no reason to believe that he would have denied it. It is therefore the charitable view to take that the Senator had no knowledge of any such instance.

After the publication of the speech of Senator MONEY and of this colloquy, and the matter had been called to the attention of the citizens of Newbern, N. C., evidence was formulated and intended to be submitted to Senator MONEY. I will now read an affidavit by Hon. L. J. Moore, of Newbern, N. C., who is a distinguished lawyer of many years' practice, and was for years a prominent Republican. He now holds the position of referee in bankruptcy in the eastern district in North Carolina. His statement is verified before Romulus A. Nunn, a notary public. The facts contained in the statement by Mr. Moore are also sworn to by J. J. Baxter, S. R. Street, a notary public and justice of the peace, M. W. Watson, clerk of the superior court, and F. T. Patterson, the present mayor of the city of Newbern:

NEWBERN, N. C., *February 28, 1900.*

Hon. H. D. MONEY,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I see from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that Senator PRITCHARD would lead the Senate to believe that negro justices of the peace in North Carolina had not issued any process against white persons, and had not exercised jurisdiction over the rights of person and property of whites.

I can not see what moved the Senator to make such statements.

I am a practicing attorney of thirty years' experience and upward and resident in Newbern, and have been known by Senator PRITCHARD for about thirty years, and have no interest in the matter except to let the truth be known.

The following facts are of my own knowledge: In 1896 I was called upon to defend Mrs. George W. Gaskill, wife of a druggist, and a white lady of high character and standing, on a charge of abducting a negro girl made in a warrant issued by H. H. Green, a negro justice of the peace, and placed in the hands of a negro constable to be served on the complaint of a negro, and returnable in the barber shop of said justice, situate in the negro quarter of this city and patronized exclusively by negroes. The attorney representing the prosecutor was also colored. My client did not care to appear in said court under all the attractions presented and I desired to waive examination and give bond to appear in the higher court. The justice and prosecuting attorney insisted on the defendant's presence, and not until the threat of the rising of the white people and the intervention of J. P. Stanly, the negro constable of the city, used his good offices, did the court waive the presence of the defendant. There was absolutely no pretense of a foundation for the charge, and the action was dismissed in the higher court.

In the spring of 1896 the same justice of the peace, on the complaint of a negress, issued a warrant against a white woman, who was arrested under it and taken to said barber shop, prosecuted by a colored lawyer, and bound over to court. The only white persons present were my client, Mr. D. L. Ward, my associate counsel, and myself. The balance of those present consisted of about 150 negroes.

Only a few weeks ago M. W. Chapman, a negro justice of the peace, issued process against H. W. Steinhilper, a highly respected citizen, who came here some years ago from Pennsylvania and was then a Republican.

There have been a great many cases in this county since 1895 in which negro justices exercised their official functions over the personal and property rights of whites, and in fact it has been a matter of frequent occurrence.

The constable of this township has been J. P. Stanly, colored, and he has served criminal and civil process on hundreds and perhaps thousands of white persons.

The colored deputy sheriffs have, during the same time, likewise arrested and served other process on a great many white people.

Truly,

L. J. MOORE.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 28th day of February, 1900.
ROMULUS A. NUNN, *Notary Public.*

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA, *Craven County:*

J. J. Baxter; S. R. Street notary public and justice of the peace; W. M. Watson, clerk superior court; F. T. Patterson, mayor of Newbern, N. C., being duly sworn, say they are citizens of Newbern and have actual knowledge and such information that they are satisfied that the foregoing statements are true.

J. J. BAXTER,
Merchant.
S. R. STREET,
Notary Public and Justice of the Peace.
W. M. WATSON,
Clerk Superior Court.
F. T. PATTERSON,
Mayor.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 28th day of February, 1900.
ROMULUS A. NUNN, *Notary Public.*

The above does not constitute an isolated instance. Certain interested gentlemen, who should know better, have endeavored to ridicule the statement that there has been negro domination in North Carolina; but they nevertheless know that they have misrepresented the facts, or, like the honorable Senator, they must plead ignorance for their statement.

Such were the conditions which prevailed in North Carolina, and so numerous were the offices held by negroes that it was beginning to be considered an ideal location for negroes to hold office, and these facts were generally recognized by the race outside of the State. In the Independent, which, as I understand, is a paper published for the colored race in the city of Washington, D. C., there appeared in the early part of 1898 an editorial referring to North Carolina, which was entitled "The best State for negroes." The editorial is as follows:

[From the Independent.]

BEST STATE FOR NEGROES.

North Carolina is, probably, the best State now for the negro. He is recognized politically, and is allowed to speak for himself. There is also far less conflict between him and the whites, especially the people of the mountains, than in Georgia and Tennessee. A colored Representative has been sent from North Carolina to nearly every Congress since the war, and one man held his district for seven sessions. South Carolina, Louisiana, Georgia, Virginia, Mississippi, Florida, and Alabama have all sent colored members, and at one time there were seven negroes in the House. At present we have but one, the Hon. GEORGE H. WHITE, of North Carolina. A graduate of Howard University, he has long had his home in Washington, and is well known among the colored people here. He is a man of tact, as well as judgment, for he has succeeded in appointing, without difficulty, forty colored postmasters in his district. When we remember the horrible tragedy in South Carolina a few weeks ago over such an appointment, this is remarkable and encouraging.

I direct attention to the fact that not only were negroes holding offices under the State, but according to this statement, Congressman WHITE, the only negro Representative in the House, had succeeded in having 40 colored postmasters appointed in his district. It is true that many of these have since been found incompetent and have been charged with defalcation in office and have been convicted and punished, but this does not affect the conditions which I have attempted to portray.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY FAVORS THE APPOINTMENT OF NEGROES TO OFFICE.

It has frequently been charged by the white men of the South that the Republican party favored the appointment of negroes to office, and they have often complained of this policy of that party.

They have submitted time and again the reasonable statement that negroes should not hold office which brought them in contact with white people and which thus enabled negro officeholders to conduct themselves offensively toward the white people of the South. This statement has often been denied by local Republicans in North Carolina, particularly during the campaigns, and they have endeavored to persuade white voters that the success of that party did not carry with it the appointment of negro officeholders. That such is the fact, however, is well known, and in corroboration I am glad to be able to quote such high authority as Hon. CHARLES H. GROSVENOR, the distinguished member of this House from the State of Ohio. He modestly disclaims being the representative of the present Administration, but nevertheless he is recognized as occupying a very high place in the estimation of the President and in the councils of his party.

General GROSVENOR has just made a speech in the House from which I quote:

I can not let pass this opportunity, at the close of a long session of this Congress and at the end of three years of this Administration, without putting into permanent form for a record to enlighten future generations the history of the part which the colored citizen has had in the stirring events of this remarkable period.

The speaker then proceeds to narrate the part which the negro played in the recent war with Spain and the number of officers and enlisted men which participated. I again quote:

In the civil service of the Government the colored man has participated more fully than ever before. President McKinley, who has always shown a disposition to honor the race and to grant it a fair and just share of the honors he had the power to bestow, has called the colored man to many positions of honor, to a larger number than any other President in the history of the country. * * *

Now let us consider the financial side of the question. The colored citizens had during the war 206 officers, approximated, and a fair average of salaries, at $1,600, $425,600; 14,784 privates, at $208, $3,075,472; 5,000 men employed as drivers, cooks, servants, laborers, etc., at $250 per year, $1,250,000. Total, $4,751,072.

Add to this the honor attached to the following names and positions: Col. J. R. Marshall, of Illinois; Col. James Young, of North Carolina; Col. J. M. Brown, of Kansas; Lieutenant-Colonel Taylor, of North Carolina; Maj. John R. Lynch, of Mississippi; Maj. R. R. Wright, of Georgia; Maj. Charles Young, of Ohio; Major Haywood, of North Carolina; Major Walker, of North Carolina.

Below follow other figures kindly furnished by the respective Departments:

POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

1 at	$2,500		$2,500
1 at	1,200		1,200
1 at	1,000		1,000
2 at	900		1,800
1 at	840		840
6 at	720		4,320
17 at	660		11,220
2 at	480		960
1 at	360		360
2 at	240		480
34			24,680

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT.

Secretary's office:

1 at	$1,400		1,400
3 at	840		2,520
4 at	720		2,880
8 at	660		5,280
1 at	480		480
1 at	240		240
18			12,800

General Land Office:

1 at	$3,000		3,000
1 at	2,778		2,778
1 at	2,222		2,222
1 at	1,986		1,986
1 at	1,600		1,600
2 at	1,400		2,800
4 at	1,200		4,800
2 at	900		1,800
8 at	660		5,280
21			26,264

STATE DEPARTMENT.

Consular service:		
1 at $5,000		$5,000
1 at 4,000		4,000
2 at 2,500		5,000
2 at 2,000		4,000
4 at 1,500		6,000
1 at 1,000		1,000
11		25,000

INDIAN AFFAIRS.

1 at $1,000		1,000
1 at 840		840
1 at 720		720
1 at 660		660
2 at 240		480
6		3,700

PENSION OFFICE.

1 at $2,000		2,000
7 at 1,400		9,800
2 at 1,300		2,600
21 at 1,200		25,200
31 at 1,000		31,000
7 at 900		6,300
4 at 840		3,360
1 at 720		720
8 at 660		5,280
4 at 400		1,600
3 at 240		720
89		87,740

PATENT OFFICE.

1 at $1,400		1,400
3 at 800		2,400
7 at 720		5,040
9 at 600		5,400
15 at 480		7,200
3 at 360		1,080
56		22,520

Geological Survey:

1 at $720		720
8 at 600		4,800
1 at 520		520
1 at 480		480
4 at 180		720
15		7,240

Miscellaneous:

1 at $3,000		3,000
1 at 900		900
1 at 720		720
1 at 480		480
1 at 400		400
1 at 360		360
6		5,860

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE.

168 men, at an average salary of $700 per annum	117,600

RECORDER OF DEEDS OFFICE.

1 at $4,000		4,000
2 at 1,200		2,400
1 at 900		900
16 at 400		6,400
1 at 240		240
1 at 120		120
22		14,060

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

District building, 10 at $720		7,200
District courts, 15 at 600		9,000
Miscellaneous, 50 at 500		25,000
75		41,200

Add to these figures the following reasonable estimates: State Department, $20,000; Navy Department, $20,000; War Department, $30,000; Treasury Department, $200,000; Agricultural and Executive Departments, $25,000, and we have the following:

RECAPITULATION.

Army	$4,751,072
Post-Office Department	24,680
Interior Department	271,000
Printing Office	117,600
District of Columbia	55,260
Consular Service	25,000
State Department (estimated)	20,000
Navy Department	20,000
War Department	30,000
Treasury Department	200,000
Agricultural and Executive Departments	25,000
Total	5,530,612

Then, when we shall have added the salaries of the hundreds of postmasters, deputy postmasters, collectors of customs, collectors of internal revenue, with their thousands of deputies, the numerous watchmen, custodians of public buildings in many States, three supervisors of census, and at least 150 enumerators with an average pay of $50 each, we can readily figure the enormous sum of $6,000,000 salary drawn by the negro under the open-handed and generous Administration of William McKinley!

PROMINENT COLORED MEN IN THE COUNTRY'S SERVICE.

The following is a partial list of colored men and women in the service of the country, appointed in every instance by President McKinley or those acting under his instructions. And here it is proper to say that while Mr. McKinley has been deeply engrossed with the most intricate problems of statecraft, he has not been unmindful of the just claims of the race. He has distributed the official rewards with rare tact and judgment, and no element which assisted in the masterful triumph of 1896 is without representation. The negro vote has fared handsomely at his hands. Colored men of intelligence and character have been selected from every section of the country to fill positions of trust and profit under the Administration, and the instance has yet to be recorded where the honor has been bestowed unworthily.

Indeed, while it is a fact of great significance that the President has within nineteen months appointed fully twice as many negroes as any previous Administration, developments are now being so shaped by him, through a revision of the civil-service regulations, that the number of negro officeholders will be increased fourfold. Not only this, but the constitutional rights of the negro will continue to be sacredly regarded and his future in the new possessions will be surrounded by every guaranty calculated to insure his peace and material well-being. The great work which the Administration has done in the line of negro recognition is graphically illustrated by the subjoined roster, which gives some of the more important positions to which eminent negroes have been assigned since the advent of the present régime. From this roster is omitted dozens of Army appointments, scores of civil-service appointments, promotions, and retentions, State recognition, and hundreds of minor departmental positions, which are the legitimate fruits of the great victory of 1896, and which should be placed to the credit of the Administration.

FEDERAL APPOINTMENTS GIVEN TO COLORED MEN.

J. W. Lyons, Register of the Treasury.
H. A. Rucker, collector internal revenue, Atlanta, Ga.
J. H. Deveaux, collector of customs, Savannah, Ga.
C. C. Wimbish, collector of port, Atlanta, Ga.
I. J. McCottrie, collector of port, Georgetown, S. C.
Budd Coffee, St. Marys, Ga.
R. R. Wright, paymaster in Army.
Rev. C. T. Walker, chaplain in Army.
Dr. George C. Stoney, surgeon in Army.
E. R. Belcher, deputy collector customs, Brunswick, Ga.
M. P. Morton, postmaster, Athens, Ga.
I. H. Lofton, postmaster, Hogansville, Ga.
J. T. Jackson, postmaster, Darien, Ga.
Mrs. E. L. Bamfield, postmistress, Beaufort, S. C.
Dr. A. M. Curtis, surgeon in chief, Freedmen's Hospital.
Rev. B. W. Arnett, jr., chaplain in Army.
John R. Lynch, paymaster in Army.
James Hill, register of lands, Jackson, Miss.
Frank P. Brinson, postmaster, Duncansville, Miss.
Thomas Keys, postmaster, Ocean Springs, Miss.
H. P. Cheatham, recorder of deeds, District of Columbia.
John C. Dancy, collector of port, Wilmington, N. C.
Dr. J. E. Shepard, Internal-Revenue Service, North Carolina.
Rev. O. L. W. Smith, minister to Liberia.
John T. Williams, consul, Sierra Leone, Africa.
Mrs. S. E. Jones, postmistress, Bladen County, N. C.
Colin Anthony, postmaster, Scotland Neck, N. C.
Joseph E. Lee, collector of internal revenue, Florida.
D. N. Pappy, collector of port, St. Augustine, Fla.
Dr. L. W. Livingston, consul, Cape Haitien, Haiti.
W. F. Powell, minister to Haiti.
Robert Pelham, special Indian agent.
J. C. Leftwich, receiver of public money, Montgomery, Ala.
H. V. Cashin, receiver of public money, Huntsville, Ala.
R. A. Parker, Internal-Revenue Service, Alabama.
Dr. A. M. Brown, surgeon in Army,
Rev. I. Dawson, postmaster, Eutaw, Ala.
M. W. Gibbs, consul, Tamatave, Madagascar.
J. E. Bush, receiver of public money, Little Rock, Ark.
Fred. Havis, postmaster, Pine Bluff, Ark.
M. B. Van Horn, consul, St. Thomas, Danish West Indies.
Dr. George H. Jackson, consul, La Rochelle, France.
John P. Green, superintendent of stamp division, Post-Office Department.
C. L. Maxwell, consul, Santo Domingo.
W. T. Anderson, a Regular Army chaplain.
H. Y. Arnett, comparer, office of recorder of deeds, District of Columbia.
E. P. McCabe, Oklahoma.
N. T. Velar, postmaster, Brinton, Pa.
J. H. Jackson, postmaster, Pennsylvania.
J. N. Ruffin, consul, Asuncion, Paraguay.
Gen. Robert Smalls, collector of port, Beaufort, S. C.
F. J. Baker, postmaster, Lake City, S. C.
J. E. Wilson, postmaster, Florence, S. C.
T. C. Walker, collector of port, Tappahannock, Va.
R. T. Greener, consul, Vladivostock, Russia.
Dr. H. W. Furniss, consul, Bahia, Brazil.
W. A. Gaines, Internal-Revenue Service, Kentucky.
Dr. J. O. Holmes, pension examiner, Kentucky.
J. R. Spurgeon, secretary legation, Liberia.
Henry Demas, naval officer, New Orleans, La.
James Lewis, surveyor-general, Louisiana.
Mrs. V. E. Bahn, postmistress, Madisonville, La.
E. L. Simon, postmaster, South Atlanta, Ga.

It will be observed from the reading of the above panegyric upon the President and his Administration that in the list of Federal appointments given to colored men and located in the United States all except two are located in the South, the two exceptions being the postmasters located in Pennsylvania. After a careful search I am unable to find the name of one negro appointed to office in the State of Ohio or in the great States of the Northwest. Why this discrimination? Certainly there are some negroes in Ohio, and certainly they would accept office. This speech was evidently intended to influence the negro vote in Ohio and other Northern and Western States. Why has not this liberal policy toward the race been exemplified in the President's own State? The people of the South will consider these questions very pertinent.

ANOTHER WITNESS.

In the light of the above record made by the present Administration of the Republican party I recur to an extract from a speech made by the Hon. GEORGE H. WHITE, Republican member of Congress from the Second district of North Carolina, the only negro member of Congress in the United States. He was addressing, in 1898, the Republican State convention in Raleigh, and he has been frequently quoted as using these words:

I am not the only negro who holds office; there are others. There are plenty more being made to order to hold offices. We do not hold as many as we will. The Democrats talk about the color line and the negro holding office. I invite the issue.

The newspapers reported that these sentiments were loudly applauded.

THE NEGRO HAS NOT EXHIBITED CAPACITY FOR SELF-GOVERNMENT.

The best sentiment of the people of this country now recognizes the fact that the fifteenth amendment was a monumental mistake. Even the honorable Senator, Mr. PRITCHARD, said in his speech before the Senate:

I do not propose to discuss the question as to whether or not the adoption of the fifteenth amendment was the particular course to pursue at that time.

The junior Senator from North Carolina, Mr. BUTLER, in his speech before the Senate said:

I believe that the majority of the voters of this State would to-morrow, if the question were before them, vote to repeal or amend the fifteenth amendment.

At the session of that voluntary convention which recently met in Montgomery, Ala., to discuss the question of negro suffrage, it was contended by speakers from the North and the South that this amendment was a mistake and that it was a blow at the civilization and progress of the Southern States. There are various eminent Republicans throughout the country who do not hesitate in private conversation to make the same admission. I do not intend to speak unkindly in making the statement that the negroes have not measured up to the expectation of many of their best friends in the North in the discharge of their duties as citizens and voters. As a race they do not exhibit the capacity to appreciate their condition or their limitations. They have not shown the capacity to govern nor do they seem to possess the other equally important faculty of submission to wise leadership.

One would suppose that they would take note of the discussions which have proceeded for many years concerning their status as citizens and voters and recognize their incapacity, and under wise counsel would endeavor to fit themselves for their proper station. The white people of the South do not feel unkindly toward them; in fact, eliminating their fruitless ambition to hold office and institute bad government, the white people are their best friends and their wisest counselors. They must know how futile it would be to meet the efforts of the white people of the South to elevate the franchise by exhibitions of force and violence, and yet some foolish leader of their race occasionally advises them to that effect. One of their reputed leaders, T. Thomas Fortune, an editor, of New York, recently made a speech in Brooklyn, an extract from which was recently published as a part of an editorial in the Washington Post, from which I quote:

SPECIMEN NEGRO LEADERS.

In significant contrast with the tone of the Montgomery conference (composed of white men) we find the New York Sun's account of a negro—we beg pardon, an Afro-American—meeting held in Brooklyn last Sunday evening, and of the temper of the address delivered on that halcyon occasion. The chief orators were T. Thomas Fortune, who seems to be an editor, and a Mr. W. O. Murphy, of whom we have not had the privilege of hearing until now, and whom, therefore, we can not accurately identify. It will be seen from the utterances, however, that they are both men of great force and wisdom and just the kind of leaders that a lot of fools, looking for trouble, would naturally select.

We give a few samples of Mr. T. Thomas Fortune's interesting froth:

"It cost tons of blood to put the fifteenth amendment into the Constitution, and it will cost tens of tons to put it out. You must organize and keep your powder dry in order to demand an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth in the great crisis which will soon be upon the negro, in which much blood may be spilled. The first gun of the fight was fired at the Montgomery conference.

* * * * * * *

"If the negro wants his rights in the South, he must fight for them, or he must leave the South. I have formerly opposed Bishop Turner in his appeal to the negroes to leave the South, but I shall myself start a crusade to have all the negroes leave the South and come North, or go elsewhere where they can be men.

"There is no use living in the South and crying, 'Peace, peace!' when there is no peace. I believe in law and order, but when the law does not protect you, you should fight and die, if need be. You should demand an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. The negro will never command respect until he shall strike a blow that will win for himself the respect of the world, for even God has no respect for a coward. The negro should be brave and follow his leaders, whether they lead to Calvary or to a scaffold in West Virginia. There is coming a great crisis for the negro, and the first gun was fired at Montgomery, Ala., when it was proposed that the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution should be repealed. But there can be no settling of the negro problem with the negro out of it, it matters not how many conferences of white men are held.

"There are now 10,000,000 of us, with 2,000,000 fighting men, and in some great crisis in this country these 2,000,000 negroes will get at the throats of the white men who have wronged and outraged their citizenship."

It was hardly kind on the part of the Sun to reproduce this lamentable paroxysm so literally. It puts Mr. Fortune in a very ridiculous position. Haranguing an ignorant and excitable crowd for purposes of mere temporary popularity is one thing. To have the pestiferous drivel put in cold type for the perusal of intelligent and responsible people is quite another thing. Normally, Mr. Fortune is not the stupid incendiary indicated by his Brooklyn speech. He is well educated, a good and forcible writer, and, under ordinary circumstances, a very sensible and well-meaning person. We wonder whether he realizes that in this frantic outburst he has illustrated the most pessimistic estimate of the negro character—the proposition, for example, that no amount of scholastic training or contact with Caucasian civilization will ever eradicate the savage instincts of his race.

With rare exceptions it would appear that the so-called leaders of the race are wonderfully adept in giving bad advice to their followers. They do not seem able to withstand prosperity, and slight elevation renders them utterly unfit for the exercise of common sense and patriotic judgment. The situation has been so well portrayed by the recent editorial in the Philadelphia Record that it is worth quoting. It illustrates the statement just made that this race question is one which agitates the whole country and is to be considered and solved in a spirit of justice and with due regard to our future civilization and progress. I quote this editorial as follows:

NEGRO SUFFRAGE.

[Philadelphia Record.]

There is very little difference of opinion among those persons who have given the question of negro suffrage dispassionate investigation that the unqualified extension of the elective franchise to the negro race, on the same terms upon which it has been exercised by whites, has resulted in practical failure. It was a terrible mistake to add such a large element of incapacity and ignorance to the body of the electorate. But, having made the negro a voter, and having fastened the suffrage upon him by constitutional provision, what remedy is possible? We can not deport the negro, nor stop the increase of the negro population. We can not deprive him of the full citizenship bestowed upon him. Unless we can bring him up to the measure of intelligence necessary to safe participation in the duties of self-government, we shall have imperiled our own without improving his position.

The people of the Southern States are taking the only practical way toward a remedy by making the right to vote subject to certain qualifications. The voter must either be able to read and write, or must be the owner of a certain amount of property. * * *

The negro in the United States is the white man's burden. He is becoming more and more a peril in the Northern as well as in the Southern States as a helper in debauching the suffrage. He must be lifted up to a higher plane of life and living or he will pull us down nearer his level. The way to elevate him is to draw the line around the ballot box so that the approach to it shall come through the schoolhouse. This is an immediate question in Virginia, where the people have voted for a revision of the State constitution; but it is hardly less important in Pennsylvania.

WHAT SAY THE WHITE MEN OF NORTH CAROLINA?

In the face of the almost universal sentiment which prevails upon this question of negro suffrage; in the face of the fact that unqualified suffrage for the negro has brought upon the State so many instances of misgovernment, misrule, peculation, and other evils, What shall be the course of the white man in the South—of the white men of North Carolina—in the face of the proposition which is submitted, the object of which is to remedy in part the evils which have resulted? This question must be settled by the white man. The negro has never yet risen to an appreciation of his true position and he may be expected to solidly oppose any efforts to elevate suffrage. No friend of his race, no wellwisher of his kind can hesitate as to his plain duty in the emergency which is presented.

IS THE AMENDMENT CONSTITUTIONAL?

I shall not submit the argument which I have prepared upon this point, both for lack of time and because the question has already been so ably considered by many eminent lawyers. Many of the most learned lawyers in North Carolina have studied this question and have over their own signatures submitted briefs upon the same and have, in their opinion, said that it was not in conflict with the Constitution of the United States. Among others I might mention the names of such well-known lawyers as Hon. George Rountree, of Wilmington; Hon. James H. Merrimon, of Asheville; Hon. F. H. Busbee, Hon. James E. Shepherd, of Raleigh; Hon. T. M. Argo, of Raleigh; Hon. Thomas Settle, of Asheville (the last two prominent Republicans); Hon. W. A. Guthrie, of Durham (a prominent Populist); Hon. William Shepard Bryan, of Baltimore; Hon. W. W. KITCHIN, a member of this House, and Hon. H. G. Connor, of Wilson, and others.

There is no more distinguished lawyer in the State than Hon. J. E. Shepherd, until recently chief justice of the supreme court. His opinion was largely upon the question as to whether, if any part of the amendment were declared unconstitutional, such part would be eliminated or the whole would fail, in which he ably sustained the latter contention. I will simply quote his brief statement upon the constitutionality of the amendment as a whole:

I do not understand that in reference to your first question—that is, as to the constitutionality of the proposed amendment of our State constitution—you expect me to write an opinion. I am glad of this, as the ground is so completely covered by the able arguments of Judges Merrimon and Connor, Representatives Rountree and Winston (whom I think were in charge of the bill), Major Guthrie, Mr. Busbee, Mr. Simmons, and other prominent gentlemen both in and outside the legislature, that anything I might say would be a needless repetition. I will therefore merely express my concurrence in the conclusion they have reached that the amendment is not in conflict with the Federal Constitution and the amendments thereto.

The Republicans in the State should entertain some confidence in its constitutionality because of the opinions of Hon. Thomas Settle, former Representative in Congress, and Hon. T. M. Argo,

Hon. H. R. Starbuck, Hon. E. V. Cox, and Hon. A. W. Shaffer, all of whom are eminent Republicans. Populists should have at least confidence in its constitutionality, because the ablest lawyer in their party, and who was their candidate for governor in 1896, Hon. W. A. Guthrie, of Durham, has written a most able and instructive argument to the effect that the amendment is clearly constitutional. A copy of the amendment as recently amended at the adjourned session of the general assembly of North Carolina will be appended as a part of my remarks.

If further legal advice were necessary, I will state that a large number of the leading lawyers of North Carolina have generally signed an opinion concurring in the conclusion that the amendment is not in violation of the Constitution of the United States. It must be borne in mind that since this opinion was written and signed the general assembly has met and consolidated sections 4 and 5. As amended, it also contains a provision that all the sections shall be considered indivisible, making clear that the intent of the legislature was that the several sections should stand or fall as a whole. I submit the opinion, as follows:

The undersigned lawyers, members of the North Carolina bar, after having examined and considered the provisions of the proposed amendment to the Constitution submitted by the legislature of 1899 to the people for ratification, give it as our opinion that the said amendment is not in conflict either with the State or Federal Constitution.

We further give it as our opinion that the fourth and fifth sections of said amendment are so connected in subject-matter, each so clearly dependent and conditioned upon the other, that both must stand or fall together, and that it is too clear to admit of a doubt that the fourth section can not stand if the fifth section should be declared unconstitutional.

It is clear this amendment, if ratified, will not disfranchise, either now or hereafter, any person who was himself entitled to vote at any time prior to 1867, or whose ancestors were entitled to vote at any time prior to 1867, either in this State or any State in the United States in which he then resided, provided he registers once before 1908 and does not thereafter become disqualified by crime.

James C. MacRae, Theo. F. Kluttz, G. W. Ward, Edwin C. Gregory, Sinclair & Eanes, Marsden Bellamy, D. E. Hudgins, Iredell Mears, Justice & Pless, Rountree & Carr, A. W. Graham, Herbert McClammy, A. A. Hicks, Junius Davis, John W. Hays, McNeill & Bryan, H. M. Shaw, Bellamy & Peschau, W. A. Devin, Edward W. Pou, B. S. Royster, Jas. A. Narron, F. P. Hobgood, jr., W. S. Stevens, W. L. Thorpe, Jas. A. Wellons, Jacob Battle, Jas. A. Lockhart, T. T. Thorne, T. E. Gilman, W. W. Zachary, E. M. Koonce, W. D. Pruden, Frank Thompson, C. S. Vann, Walter E. Trimster, W. M. Bond, Geo. McCorkle, T. G. Skinner, W. B. Gaither, Chas. Whedbee, M. E. Lawrence, W. C. Fields, E. S. Martin, Swift Galloway, J. M. Brown, M. H. Justice, R. L. Smith, Maxey J. John, R. E. Austin, Walter H. Neal, P. H. Williams, John H. Cook, E. N. Aydlett, John D. Shaw, jr., J. H. Sawyer, I. F. Dortch, Roscue W. Turner, F. A. Daniel, J. B. Leigh, W. C. Monroe, Geo. W. Bower, W. R. Allen, Todd & Pell, Benj. F. Long, G. L. Park, Frances D. Winston, J. B. Connell, St. Leon Scull, W. W. Barber, Oscar F. Mason, H. L. Greene, J. A. Spence, M. V. Lanier, Blair & Luther, M. F. Carter, Walter E. Moore, S. P. Graves, Coleman C. Cowan, D. H. McLean, Henry G. Robertson, J. C. Clifford, S. V. Pickens, King & Kimball, Charles F. Toms, Jas. T. Morehead, McD. Ray, Chas. M. Stedman, A. E. Posey, John A. Barringer, W. A. Dunn, L. M. Scott, Chas. L. Abernethy, Z. V. Taylor, Thos. D. Warren, A. M. Scales, Wm. H. Ruffin, Walter W. King, Thos. B. Wilder, Walter E. Daniel, C. M. Cooke, W. B. Shaw, B. B. Massenburg, J. H. Bridges, W. H. Yarborough, jr., R. H. Hayes, H. A. London, F. S. Spruill, Robert L. Ryburn, T. W. Bickett, Samuel E. Gidney, John D. Kerr, Harold Hall, E. W. Kerr, J. A. Anthony, R. W. Cooper, Clyde R. Hoey, H. L. Cook, Jas. L. Webb, J. G. Shaw, E. Y. Webb, H. McD. Robinson, R. A. Doughton, D. T. Oates, C. M. Busbee, E. R. McKethan, T. M. Argo, R. B. Peebles, Jas. E. Shepherd, B. S. Gay, Robt. T. Gray, F. R. Harris, S. G. Ryan, C. G. Peebles, Armstead Jones, S. J. Calvert, G. W. Ward, Garland Midgett, H. C. Jones, A. M. Waddell, Armstead Buswell, M. D. W. Stevenson, Herriot Clarkson, D. L. Ward, Hugh W. Harris, L. J. Moore, E. T. Cansler, A. D. Ward, Chas. W. Tillet, W. D. McIver, W. M. Smith, H. C. Whitehurst, F. M. Shannonhouse, C. C. Lyon, J. D. McCall, C. M. McLean, T. C. Guthrie, H. A. Boyd, B. B. Nicholson, John H. Kerr, W. B. Rodman, Lee S. Overman, Stephen C. Bragaw, John G. Henderson, Small & McLean, T. C. Linn, W. S. Pendleton, R. Lee Wright.

Of course it is understood that those who contend that it is unconstitutional take the position that it violates the fifteenth amendment to the United States Constitution, which reads as follows:

The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

The honorable Senator, Mr. PRITCHARD, who is an acknowledged Republican leader in North Carolina, has made several speeches in the State, and, as I am informed, has argued that the effect of the amendment would be to disfranchise poor white men as well as negroes, and that the plain provision of the amendment in favor of the illiterate white would prove ineffectual. However that may be, yet Senator PRITCHARD in his speech before the Senate admitted that the amendment would not prevent illiterate white men from voting who registered prior to 1908. I will quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that part of the speech of the Senator containing the colloquy between the Senator, Senator CHANDLER, and Senator MASON:

Mr. PRITCHARD. It is plain that it is an attempt to deprive the colored race of the right to vote, which is now guaranteed them by the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. CHANDLER. I will ask the Senator if he knows why the date January 1, 1867, was fixed?

Mr. PRITCHARD. It was fixed, I understand, with a view of caring for the white men of the State who were entitled to vote at that time.

Mr. CHANDLER. That being the date of the reconstruction acts of Congress which gave the right to the colored people to vote?

Mr. PRITCHARD. Yes, sir. You will remember that the fifteenth amendment was not ratified by the several States and the result announced until about the 20th of March, 1870, I believe it was. In 1867 they were not entitled to vote.

Mr. MASON. That is, the ancestor of the black man was not entitled to vote.

Mr. PRITCHARD. No, sir.

Mr. MASON. But the ancestor of the white man was?

Mr. PRITCHARD. Yes.

Mr. MASON. Regardless of any qualifications?

Mr. PRITCHARD. Yes.

Mr. MONEY. Will the Senator from North Carolina permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. PRITCHARD. Yes, sir.

Mr. MONEY. I did not intend to do so but for the two questions put by the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Illinois. I understood the Senator from North Carolina to say that the descendants of those who could vote in 1867 were entitled to vote under the proposed amendment. That is your proposition?

Mr. PRITCHARD. That is what the proposed amendment provides.

Mr. MONEY. They are not compelled to comply with the requirements of section 4 of the proposed amendment?

Mr. PRITCHARD. The way the constitutional amendment was read at the desk was that those who voted at that time——

Mr. MONEY. Or prior to that time.

Mr. PRITCHARD. Yes.

Mr. MONEY. Either in North Carolina or in any other State.

Mr. PRITCHARD. Yes.

Mr. MONEY. Does not the Senator from North Carolina know that up to 1835 the colored people did vote and there must be in that State a great many descendants of such people; and is it not quite likely that many colored people under the amendment will be able to vote? I only ask that question in view of the two questions which have been asked.

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator from North Carolina will allow me, I will ask a question so that he can answer it with the question of the Senator from Mississippi. The question is whether that language was not intended by the framers to mean white people alone?

Mr. PRITCHARD. I so understand it.

I will also quote from the same speech a question to the Senator by Senator CAFFERY, and his answer thereto:

Mr. CAFFERY. Will the Senator from North Carolina permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. PRITCHARD. Certainly.

Mr. CAFFERY. The fifth section of the amendment proposed for adoption by the people of North Carolina provides virtually that all white men who could vote on or before the 1st of January, 1867, their sons and grandsons, shall be entitled to vote under the suffrage amendment, notwithstanding that they do not possess the qualifications required by the fourth section. Now, would not that qualify the illiterate white people whom he says this ordinance would deprive of the right of suffrage?

Mr. PRITCHARD. It would, provided the Supreme Court of the United States should decide that section 5 is constitutional. I will discuss that phase of the question later on.

Now, I submit that the distinguished Senator should take either one horn or the other of the dilemma. Having admitted in the Senate that the amendment will discriminate against the negro and that the object of the amendment is not to disfranchise a single white man, we must insist that he shall maintain the same position in his speeches before the people of North Carolina or else publicly retract his declarations made in the Senate. Perhaps the distinguished Senator may decide to stand by his construction of the amendment as announced in the Senate. Hence these tears.

LOUISIANA AND ITS CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.

In 1898 the people of Louisiana adopted an amendment to the constitution of that State substantially similar to that proposed to be adopted in North Carolina, except that the North Carolina amendment does not contain a property qualification. If the results of the operations of this amendment have been satisfactory to the people of that State, if it has brought contentment to her people, honest State and local government, and has contributed to her material progress, such results would necessarily be influential with the voters of North Carolina in determining their course in the coming election. Fortunately there is abundant evidence, which can not be contradicted, as to the favorable results which have been attained in our sister State.

Hon. Josephus Daniels, the able and versatile editor of the News and Observer, an influential paper published at Raleigh, N. C., recently made an extended trip through Louisiana. The results of his observations have been published in his paper and circulated among the people of the State. The testimony of the best people of Louisiana, composed of professional men, active politicians, prominent farmers, and representatives of various business interests all concurred in the statement that the operation of the amendment had been entirely satisfactory, that her people were never more contented, that honest and peaceable elections had been assured, and that a stable and progressive government thereunder would be maintained in all the future for that State.

Recently Louisiana has had her first general election under the operation of her amendment. The members of Congress from that State were present during the campaign which preceded the election, and they bear willing testimony to the truth of the observations which have been above outlined.

I shall now read a letter from Hon. ADOLPH MEYER, Member

from the First district, and Hon. R. C. DAVEY, Member of Congress from the Second district of Louisiana, and also a letter from Hon. JOSEPH E. RANSDELL, Member of Congress from the Fifth district of Louisiana:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., May 2, 1900.

DEAR SIR: At your request, we, the undersigned, members of Congress from the State of Louisiana, submit the following statement in regard to the constitutional amendment adopted in the State of Louisiana in 1898: This amendment is substantially similar to the proposed amendment for North Carolina. We have just held in Louisiana our first general and State election since the adoption of this amendment, and we had an opportunity to observe the working of the same. We had the most quiet and satisfactory election which has been held for years, and the election was conducted with absolute fairness and with entire satisfaction to the white people of the State.

Every white man who could vote prior to 1867, or whose ancestors could vote, has had an opportunity to register and vote in the State, and no white man has been disfranchised.

The white people of the State are satisfied with the conditions existing under the amended constitution, and would not repeal the amendment if they had an opportunity to do so.

The best lawyers in the State of Louisiana who have examined the question believe that the amendments which have been adopted are not in conflict with the Constitution of the United States, and we have heard of no one in the State who intends or threatens to contest the constitutionality of same. Not only has our first election under the amended constitution been peaceable and orderly and fair, but we expect to have a continuance of good government and contentment and progress in Louisiana for all time to come, because the government of the State has now been placed in the hands of the white people.

Very respectfully,

ADOLPH MEYER,
Member of Congress from the First District of Louisiana.

R. C. DAVEY,
Member of Congress from the Second District of Louisiana.

Hon. JOHN H. SMALL,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., May 2, 1900.

DEAR SIR: In response to your inquiry about the practical workings of the suffrage clauses of the Louisiana constitution of 1898, I desire to say that the people of my State are very much pleased with same. Under its provisions we have held municipal elections in many of the towns of the State and in the city of New Orleans, one special election to fill a vacancy in Congress caused by death, and a general State election for all offices from governor to constable. The New Orleans election in December, 1899, and the State election last April were very hotly contested by rival white factions and the law had a thorough and complete test. It was demonstrated beyond any question that the negro has ceased to be an important factor in Louisiana politics, and that every white man who could vote anywhere in the Union prior to January 1, 1867, or whose ancestors were legal voters then, can now register and vote in Louisiana. These elections were perfectly fair in every respect, and their results were cheerfully accepted by all.

In the great "black belt" where I live there are about nine negroes to one white man, but the registration books showed fully ten times as many whites registered as negroes, and there were so few of the latter entitled to vote that they took no interest whatever in the election. It was, for the first time in many years, a white man's election. I believe the negroes are well satisfied with the law. If there was any complaint or dissatisfaction among them because of it, I have yet to hear of same.

When the convention was in session the constitutionality of this law—the so-called grandfather clause—was thoroughly examined by the entire bar of the State and agreed to with practical unanimity. Further investigation has strengthened the conclusion then formed, and the best lawyers of the State agree that it does not violate the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

Respectfully, yours,

JOS. E. RANSDELL, M. C.,
Fifth District of Louisiana.

Hon. JOHN H. SMALL,
Washington, D. C.

When the amendment to the Louisiana constitution was being canvassed among her people, the same arguments were adduced against it as are now being urged in North Carolina. It was said to be unconstitutional by its opponents, and yet, although it has been in operation two years, and although the courts have been open to any citizen who might desire to test its constitutionality, no one during that time has instituted any such suit, and, according to uncontradicted testimony, no citizen in Louisiana has announced any intention of doing so.

I call upon some of the newly developed constitutional lawyers in North Carolina to kindly explain why an amendment so clearly unconstitutional, as they allege, has been permitted to stand unchallenged in another Southern State for two years.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY AND THE SUFFRAGE.

It would appear that our friends of the Republican party have not pursued an entirely consistent course upon the question of suffrage. While protesting with pious indignation against the sovereign right of the States of the South to prescribe the qualifications of electors and to regulate the exercise of the franchise along constitutional lines, that party has not applied the same standard in framing the laws governing suffrage in some of our newly acquired territories.

In the bill to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii, and which passed the United States Senate, and was favorably reported to the House by the unanimous report of the committee, the following qualifications of electors were set forth. Section 60 of said bill provides as follows:

That in order to be qualified to vote for representatives, a person shall—
First. Be an actual citizen of the United States.
Second. Have resided in the Territory not less than one year preceding, and in the representative district in which he offers to register not less than three months immediately preceding the time at which he offers to register.
Third. Have attained an age of 21 years.
Fourth. Prior to each regular election, during the time prescribed by law for registration, have caused his name to be entered on the register of voters for representatives for his district.
Fifth. Prior to such registration have paid on or before the 1st day of March next preceding the date of registration all taxes due by him to the government.
Sixth. To be able to speak, read, and write the English or Hawaiian language.

SEC. 62. Provided the qualifications of voters for senators as follows: That in order to be qualified to vote for senators a person must possess all of the qualifications and be subject to all of the conditions required by this act of voters for representatives, and in addition thereto he shall own and be possessed in his own right of real property in the Territory of the value of not less than $1,000, and upon which local taxes shall have been paid on that valuation for the year next preceding the one in which such person offers to register; or shall have actually received a money income of not less than $600 during the year next preceding the 1st day of April next preceding the date of each registration.

The above provisions for qualifications of voters were retained in the bill as it passed the Senate and came over to the House, and was referred to the Committee on Territories, who reported the bill with substantially similar provisions. In lieu of the fifth qualification in the recital of qualifications for voters for representatives the House committee substituted these words:

Fifth. Prior to such registration have paid a poll tax of $1 for the current year, due by him to the government.

When this bill was before the House in Committee of the Whole, Mr. WHITE, member from North Carolina, moved to strike out the fifth provision of section 60, and, after debate, his motion was rejected.

Our friends the Republicans were twitted so frequently upon these provisions that subsequently, in committee of conference, the provision for the payment of taxes was stricken out of the bill, and also the property qualifications in section 62, providing qualifications for the election of senators.

The law as it finally passed Congress contains the same provisions as above cited, except that the fifth clause of the qualifications of voters for representatives was stricken out, and the property qualifications of voters for senators was also stricken out.

THE ISLAND OF PORTO RICO.

Section 29 of the act of Congress approved April 12, 1900, being "An act to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," provides certain qualifications for voters for the election of delegates by the people of the island. I quote the following language from said section:

At such elections all citizens of Porto Rico shall be allowed to vote who have been bona fide residents for one year and who possess the other qualifications of voters under the laws and military orders in force on the 1st day of March, 1900, subject to such modifications and additional qualifications as to registration as may be prescribed by the executive council.

By the courtesy of the Secretary of War, I am enabled to present extracts from certain military orders in force in that island on the 1st day of March, 1900. General Orders, No. 112, promulgated by General Davis on August 7, 1899, contains these provisions:

4. The qualifications of the voter are that he must be a bona fide male resident of the municipality; he must be over 21 years of age; a taxpayer of record at the date of this order, or he must be able to read and write.

General Orders, No. 160, promulgated by General Davis on October 12, 1899, contains additional provisions, setting forth the qualifications of electors in municipal elections in that island. I quote from section 8:

An elector to vote at such elections shall possess the following qualifications:
(*a*) He must be a bona fide male resident of the municipality.
(*b*) He must be over 21 years of age on the date of the election.
(*c*) He must be a taxpayer of record in the municipality in which he votes at the date of this order, or he must be able to read and write.
(*d*) He must have resided in Porto Rico two years next preceding the date of his registration, and for the last six months of the two years within the municipality in which the election is held.
9. All candidates for office shall be able to read and write.
10. In determining the ability of voters to read and write any book or newspaper may be used, the voter being required to write one or more phrases from dictation, as may be required by the president of the board of supervisors.

To those who are acquainted with the condition of the people who inhabit the island of Porto Rico it will be perfectly apparent that in any elections held under the above laws regulating suffrage only a very small proportion of the male citizens of Porto Rico could vote. This fact was well known to General Davis, in command, and was well known in Congress when the act was passed providing a civil government for the people of that island.

Why will our Republican friends be inconsistent? Why do they desire to prevent the several States of the South from regulating the exercise of the franchise along constitutional lines? And why do they oppose their efforts to limit the exercise of the franchise to those of their citizens who are best qualified to exercise it?

SUFFRAGE UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONS OF SOME OF THE STATES OF THE NORTH.

It is known that the provisions of the constitutions of many of the States of the North provide rigid qualifications for the exercise

of the suffrage. I have examined two volumes, entitled American Constitutions, containing copies of the constitutions of the several States of the Union which were in force on January 1, 1894, and I obtain my information from these volumes. I presume that the constitutions of none of the States to which I shall advert have been altered or amended since that date; at least I have no knowledge of such.

CONSTITUTION OF CONNECTICUT.

I quote from the constitution of Connecticut, touching the provisions as to suffrage:

ART. VIII. Every white male citizen of the United States who shall have attained the age of 21 years, who shall have resided in this State for a term of one year next preceding, and in the town in which he may offer himself to be admitted to the privileges of the elector at least six months next preceding the time he may so offer himself, and shall sustain a good moral character, shall, on his taking such oath as may be prescribed by law, be an elector.

The above article was adopted in 1845.

Article II, adopted October, 1855:

Every person shall be able to read any article of the Constitution or any section of the statutes of this State before being admitted an elector.

Article XXIII, adopted October, 1876:

That Article VIII of the amendments to the Constitution be amended by erasing the word "white" from the first line.

It will be observed that, according to the constitution of Connecticut, only white male citizens were entitled to vote until 1876:

CONSTITUTION OF MASSACHUSETTS.

ART. III. Every male citizen of 21 years of age and upward, excepting paupers and persons under guardianship, who shall have resided within the Commonwealth one year, and within the town or district in which he may claim a right to vote, six calendar months next preceding the election of governor, lieutenant-governor, Senators, or Representatives, shall have a right to vote in such election of governor, lieutenant-governor, Senators, and Representatives, and no other person shall be entitled to vote in such elections.

ART. XX. No person shall have the right to vote, or be eligible to office under the constitution of this Commonwealth, who shall not be able to read the Constitution in the English language, and write his name: *Provided, however*, That the provisions of this amendment shall not apply to any person prevented by a physical disability from complying with its requisitions, nor to any person who now has the right to vote, nor to any person who shall be 60 years of age or upward at the time this amendment shall take effect.

ART. XXVIII. No person having served in the Army or Navy of the United States in time of war, and having been honorably discharged from such service, if otherwise qualified to vote, shall be disqualified therefor on account of being a pauper; or if a pauper, because of the nonpayment of a poll tax.

ART. XXX. No person otherwise qualified to vote in elections for governor, lieutenant-governor, Senators, and Representatives shall, by reason of a change of residence within the Commonwealth, be disqualified from voting for said officers in the city or town from which he has removed his residence until the expiration of six calendar months from the time of such removal.

CONSTITUTION OF PENNSYLVANIA.

ARTICLE VIII.—*Suffrage and elections.*

SECTION 1. Every male citizen 21 years of age, possessing the following qualifications, shall be entitled to vote at all elections:

First. He shall have been a citizen of the United States at least one month.

Second. He shall have resided in the State one year (or if, having previously been a qualified elector or native-born citizen of the State, he shall have removed therefrom and returned, then six months) immediately preceding the election.

Third. He shall have resided in the election district where he shall have offered to vote at least two months immediately preceding the election.

Fourth. If 22 years of age or upward, he shall have paid within two years a State or county tax, which shall have been assessed at least two months and paid at least one month before election.

CONSTITUTION OF RHODE ISLAND.

ARTICLE II.—*Qualifications of electors.*

SECTION 1. Every male citizen of the United States, of the age of 21 years, who has had his residence and home in this State for one year, and in the town or city in which he may claim the right to vote six months next preceding the time of voting, and who is really and truly possessed in his own right of real estate in such town or city of the value of $134 over and above all incumbrances, or which shall rent for $7 per annum over and above any rent reserved or the interest of any incumbrances thereon, being an estate in fee simple, fee tail, for the life of any person, or an estate in reversion or remainder, which qualifies no other person to vote, the conveyance of which estate, if by deed, shall have been recorded at least ninety days, shall thereafter have a right to vote in the election of all civil officers and on all questions in all legal town or ward meetings so long as he continues so qualified.

CONSTITUTION OF VERMONT.

CHAPTER II.

SEC. 21. Every man of the full age of 21 years, having resided in this State for the space of one whole year next before the election of representatives, and is of a quiet and peaceable behavior, and will take the following oath or affirmation, shall be entitled to all the privileges of a freeman of this State:

"You solemnly swear (or affirm) that whenever you give your vote or suffrage touching any matter that concerns the State of Vermont, you will do it so as in your conscience you shall judge will most conduce to the best good of the same, as established by the constitution, without fear or favor of any man."

CONCLUSION.

It must be apparent to all disinterested persons, to all whose judgment has not been blinded by self-interest or partisan prejudice, that a necessity exists in North Carolina for an amendment to the organic law regulating the right of suffrage. It is equally apparent that the weight of opinion is in favor of the conclusion that such an amendment as is proposed is not in violation of the Constitution of the United States and that the contrary argument is only made for the purpose of influencing and intimidating white men against voting for this amendment.

It has been shown that the argument of the two distinguished Senators from North Carolina and other opponents is inconsistent. They endeavor to show to the country that the effect of the proposed amendment would only be to disfranchise negroes and not to disfranchise a single white man, and therefore that the proposed amendment discriminates against negroes and is unconstitutional; and yet when they appear before the people of North Carolina they take the position that the effect of the amendment would be to disfranchise both negroes and white men. They should endeavor to be consistent. It has been shown that the record of the Republican party upon this question of suffrage has also been inconsistent. They antagonize the efforts of the Southern States to elevate suffrage by eliminating the ignorant, vicious voter, and yet when that same party frames laws for the government of Territories, they enact even more drastic provisions qualifying the suffrage, and for the same reasons which are actuating the people of North Carolina.

Are the leaders of the Republican party possessed of such prejudice against the Southern people that they can not consider impartially the very serious problems which confront the Southern States? It has been shown that the constitutions of some of the States of the North contained provisions substantially similar and even more comprehensive in their limitations, and yet the representatives of the party in some of those States appear utterly unable to make application of the golden rule. There is only one course open for the white men of North Carolina to pursue. Let them stand by their homes; let them preserve the civilization of their fathers, and solemnly resolve to maintain the supremacy of the race who founded this Republic and have preserved its institutions. Thus will contentment, good government, and prosperity prevail, and the happiness of all her people be conserved.

APPENDIX.

An act supplemental to an act entitled "An act to amend the constitution of North Carolina," ratified February 21, 1899, the same being chapter 218 of the Public Laws of 1899.

The general assembly of North Carolina do enact:

SECTION 1. That chapter 218, Public Laws of 1899, entitled "An act to amend the constitution of North Carolina," be amended so as to make said act read as follows:

That Article VI of the constitution of North Carolina be, and the same is hereby, abrogated, and in lieu thereof shall be substituted the following article of said constitution, as an entire and indivisible plan of suffrage:

ARTICLE VI.—*Suffrage and eligibility to office.*

SECTION 1. Every male person born in the United States, and every male person who has been naturalized, 21 years of age, and possessing the qualifications set out in this article, shall be entitled to vote at any election by the people in the State, except as herein otherwise provided.

SEC. 2. He shall have resided in the State of North Carolina for two years, in the county six months, and in the precinct, ward, or other election district in which he offers to vote, four months next preceding the election: *Provided*, That removal from one precinct, ward, or other election district to another in the same county shall not operate to deprive any person of the right to vote in the precinct, ward, or other election district from which he has removed until four months after such removal. No person who has been convicted, or who has confessed his guilt in open court upon indictment, of any crime, the punishment of which now is, or may hereafter be, imprisonment in the State's prison, shall be permitted to vote unless the said person shall be first restored to citizenship in the manner prescribed by law.

SEC. 3. Every person offering to vote shall be at the time a legally registered voter as herein prescribed and in the manner hereafter provided by law, and the general assembly of North Carolina shall enact general registration laws to carry into effect the provisions of this article.

SEC. 4. Every person presenting himself for registration shall be able to read and write any section of the constitution in the English language; and before he shall be entitled to vote he shall have paid, on or before the 1st day of May of the year in which he proposes to vote, his poll tax for the previous year, as prescribed by Article V, section 1, of the constitution. But no male person who was, on January 1, 1867, or at any time prior thereto, entitled to vote under the laws of any State in the United States wherein he then resided, and no lineal descendant of any such person, shall be denied the right to register and vote at any election in this State by reason of his failure to possess the educational qualifications herein prescribed: *Provided*, He shall have registered in accordance with the terms of this section prior to December 1, 1908.

The general assembly shall provide for the registration of all persons entitled to vote without the educational qualifications herein prescribed, and shall, on or before November 1, 1908, provide for the making of a permanent record of such registration, and all persons so registered shall forever thereafter have the right to vote in all elections by the people in this State, unless disqualified under section 2 of this article: *Provided*, Such person shall have paid his poll tax as above required.

SEC. 5. That this amendment to the constitution is presented and adopted as one indivisible plan for the regulation of the suffrage, with the intent and purpose to so connect the different parts and to make them so dependent upon each other that the whole shall stand or fall together.

SEC. 6. All elections by the people shall be by ballot, and all elections by the general assembly shall be viva voce.

SEC. 7. Every voter in North Carolina, except as in this article disqualified, shall be eligible to office, but before entering upon the duties of the office he shall take and subscribe the following oath:

"I, ——— ———, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and maintain the Constitution and laws of the United States and the constitution and laws of North Carolina not inconsistent therewith, and that I will faithfully discharge the duties of my office as ———. So help me God."

(SEC. 8.) The following classes of persons shall be disqualified for office: First, all persons who shall deny the being of Almighty God; second, all persons who shall have been convicted, or confessed their guilt on indictment pending, and whether sentenced or not, or under judgment suspended, of any treason or felony, or of any other crime, for which the punishment may be imprisonment in the penitentiary, since becoming citizens of the United States, or of corruption or malpractice in office, unless such person shall be restored to the rights of citizenship in a manner prescribed by law.

(SEC. 9.) That this amendment to the constitution shall go into effect on the 1st day of July, 1902, if a majority of votes cast at the next general election shall be cast in favor of this suffrage amendment.

SEC. 2. This amendment to the constitution shall be submitted at the next general election to the qualified voters of the State, in the same manner and under the same rules and regulations as is provided in the law regulating general elections in this State, and at said elections those persons desiring to vote for such amendment shall cast a written or printed ballot with the words "For suffrage amendment" thereon; and those with a contrary opinion shall cast a written or printed ballot with the words "Against suffrage amendment" thereon.

SEC. 3. The votes cast at said election shall be counted, compared, returned, and canvassed, and the result announced and declared under the same rules and regulations and in the same manner as the vote for governor, and if a majority of the votes cast are in favor of the said amendment, it shall be the duty of the governor of the State, upon being notified of the result of said election, to certify said amendment under the seal of the State, to the secretary of State, who shall enroll the said amendment, so certified, among the permanent records of his office.

SEC. 4. That this act shall be in force from and after its ratification.

In the general assembly read three times, and ratified this 13th day of June, 1900.

C. A. REYNOLDS,
President of the Senate.

H. G. CONNOR,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Cyrus Thompson, secretary of state of the State of North Carolina, do hereby certify the foregoing and attached four sheets to be a true copy from the records of this office.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal.

Done in office at Raleigh this the 15th day of June, in the year of our Lord 1900.

[SEAL.]

CYRUS THOMPSON,
Secretary of State.

Trusts and Their Tools—The Public Officials.

If the trusts elect McKinley in November, constitutional amendment or no amendment, the trusts will do business at the old stand for four years more. If the people elect William Jennings Bryan, no amendment will be necessary, and after the 4th of next March we shall have an Attorney-General who will not go on sleeping while the trusts go on fattening.

"Can it be believed that democracy, which has overthrown the feudal system and vanquished kings, will retreat before tradesmen and capitalists?"—*De Toqueville.*

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN J. LENTZ,

OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, June 1, 1900.

The House having under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 138) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States—

Mr. LENTZ said:

Mr. SPEAKER: It was exceedingly pleasant to hear the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] apologize for the third time for the treatment that the Republican party has given Attorney-General Monnett. Mr. Monnett prosecuted one trust vigorously, honestly, beyond the temptation of a bribe of $400,000; beyond the browbeating of the press of the State, beyond the cold shoulder of every leader in the Republican party. He stood incorruptible, he stood unyielding, on the Republican State platform of 1895 against trusts, a platform more radical than that adopted in the State of Ohio a few weeks ago by the Republicans, and more radical against trusts than the platform will be which they will adopt at Philadelphia in two weeks.

But I propose to let Mr. Monnett speak for himself as to how he has been treated in the State of Ohio. I send to the Clerk, to be read from the desk, an interview given on the 19th of May by Mr. Monnett, as reported in the Columbus Citizen and reproduced in the Lancaster Democrat, telling what he thinks of the Republican party and its course in that State, not only with reference to himself, but particularly with reference to the trusts.

The Clerk read as follows:

PUNISHMENT FOR REPUBLICAN PARTY SEEMS CERTAIN, SAYS MONNETT, WHO THINKS IT IS LIKELY TO BE GIVEN BY THE PEOPLE THIS FALL.

Ex-Attorney-General Frank S. Monnett has returned from Toledo and says that he was not present at the conference of Silver Republicans and anti-trust leaders. Mr. Monnett, however, says that he met Mr. Charles Towne and had a very pleasant chat with him, and also with others who were there attending the conference.

Answering the question regarding his position on the trust question during the coming campaign, Mr. Monnett said that he was the Ohio member of the National Anti-Trust Association and as such would do his duty to the organization.

"There will be no compromise with the trusts. They are a social, commercial, and political evil, with which there can be no compromise. I fancy that there will be a great effort to win votes from our party on this question the coming campaign. I do not see how we can escape punishment either. When a party breaks its pledges it is usually punished by the people. At the national convention at St. Louis, when President McKinley was nominated, Senator THURSTON, who presided as chairman of that meeting, declared that 'the American people will return the Republican party to power because they know that its administration will mean the protection of the public from all unlawful combinations and unjust exactions of aggregated capital.'

"He went further and declared that the party must do this to retain the confidence of the American people.

"The platform of the Republican party in Ohio strongly condemned the trusts and their unlawful methods. I was elected as the attorney-general of Ohio on such a platform, and as the officer of the State and the representative of the party I carried out, as best I could, the platform of the party. Yet I was not supported in this by many of the leaders, and the party organs criticised me for doing just what the platform of my party pledged me to do. Newspapers of the State, about 110 of them, printed paid articles criticising my actions, and they, too, party newspapers.

"This is not all. The legislature which has just adjourned killed the Russell bill and the maximum freight bill, and that, too, by almost a strict party vote. Will not the people punish the party for such actions upon the part of its servants? The party as such is not in sympathy with such methods. Although the Russell bill was bill No. 10, it was side tracked by the trust lobbyists and held back until near the adjournment and then, over the protest of some of the best men of the party, and almost all of the Democratic members, it was defeated. This was a repudiation of the party platform and the sentiment of the party.

I can not believe that we will escape punishment, and I believe it will come this fall. Why should the party not be punished when the men who control its actions disregard the will of the people? Why should the people, who believe in the enforcement of law and believe that party platforms and principles are more than men, not punish the party, and do it this fall? I know no reason.

I can hardly talk on this question with propriety. I am not in politics or public life. I am practicing law and should not take part in such matters, but I will say that there will be no compromise with the trusts, and personally I will not discontinue my efforts to bring about a better condition of trade and honest competition.

Mr. LENTZ. I doubly appreciate the gentleman's [Mr. GROSVENOR'S] certificate of character and Republicanism which he has just given Mr. Monnett, because Mr. Monnett says that as a just penalty on his own party it ought to be defeated in the State of Ohio this fall for its repudiation of its pledges against the trusts.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. LENTZ. Yes.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The gentleman will note that Mr. Monnett does not claim that he was turned down for attorney-general.

Mr. GAINES. You did not indorse his administration.

Mr. LENTZ. I note that the gentleman now says Mr. Monnett did not say that he was turned down, but I will give the gentleman from Ohio a little history from the convention of last summer. You know and everybody in Ohio knows that Mr. Monnett's name was mentioned throughout the State by the Republicans who are honestly opposed to trusts as a candidate for governor, and out of the 813 delegates that went to the State convention not a single delegate dared to lift his voice for Frank S. Monnett for governor, although he was the champion of the people against the trusts. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

You know another thing, sir, that the trusts went with their corruption funds into Mr. Monnett's own county and prevented him from securing even the few delegates of his own county for renomination for attorney-general. You know that no man in the United States has made as loyal, as intelligent, as honest, as persistent a fight against the trusts as Frank Monnett, and notwithstanding the fact that he has demonstrated to the people of the State of Ohio and of the United States that he is the best qualified man in the country to fight the trusts, yet your party repudiated him and turned him out of office before he could finish his litigation against the Standard Oil trust.

You talk about two terms. The people of Ohio did not apply the two-term rule to you. The people of Ohio did not apply the two-term rule to McKinley, nor to Garfield, nor to Hayes, nor to many others in State and national service. Mr. Monnett had carried into execution your promises to the people in your platform of 1895, and yet you repudiated him, and when he did come before the State convention for renomination, not as attorney-general alone, but as the lawyer to prosecute the trusts in that State, he got only 28 votes for attorney-general and not one for governor.

Now, you have the reputation of being "Old Figgers." [Laughter.] I should like to have you figure for us. If Mr. Monnett, after fighting the trusts faithfully and honestly—aye, after fighting only one trust—could not get one vote for governor, how many would he have gotten had he fought all the trusts? Or solve this problem by the simple rule of three: If he got only 28 votes for attorney-general out of 813 votes, how many votes would he have gotten for renomination as attorney-general if he had been fighting all of the trusts? Solve those problems, if you please. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

If Mr. Monnett, after fighting the trusts for four years as a Republican, could not get one delegate out of 813 for governor, how many years will he have to fight all of the trusts before you nominate him for that position? [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] After you have answered those questions, and your pencil and your figures are worn out, answer these questions:

If Mr. Monnett is to be repudiated because he has honestly fought the trusts; if Mr. Monnett is to be repudiated in Ohio for fighting the greatest monster that is before the people to-day; if

Mr. Monnett was the champion of the cause of the people, a cause which you hypocritically come in here now and say requires an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, why did you not keep Mr. Monnett in the public service, helping you fight these trusts, if you were honest about it. You need such a man as Monnett.

Ah, my friends, if you thought this constitutional amendment was a menace to the trusts, it would have gone to the wastebasket, just as Mr. Monnett has gone to the political wastebasket. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Oh, do not undertake to fool the people. Mr. Lincoln told you that you could fool all of them a part of the time and a part of them all of the time, but that you can not fool all of them all the time. I invite you into my district and challenge you to discuss your amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. McPHERSON. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. LENTZ. Not now. The gentleman from Iowa does not know anything about our Ohio politics.

Mr. McPHERSON. I think I do, and that is the reason I want to ask a question.

Mr. LENTZ. I do not yield now. If you can get my time extended, if you will give me some of your time, I will yield later. I want to go on with Mr. Monnett and read from a report made by him, as attorney-general of Ohio, a few months ago on retiring from the office, and here is what he says about trusts and about constitutional amendments:

> The potency of the State in controlling trusts we believe has been greatly enhanced by the passage of this act, and that the true source of relief to the small capitalists and the oppressed by the obnoxious workings of monopolies is vested in the state through the executive department, and that quo warranto is the true remedy to punish either domestic or foreign corporations when they violate the public policy of the State by monopolistic contracts, or when they openly defy the anti-trust laws or any other laws of the State.
>
> In this respect the State is more powerful than the Federal Government, because, as has been repeatedly enunciated by the Supreme Court of the United States, the Federal Government's power in this behalf is limited to corporations doing an interstate business, while the State is sovereign over its own corporate creatures as well as over the franchises of foreign corporations exercised in the State's domain.
>
> It is manifest that this evil of absorbing commercial interests by monopolistic combinations has had rapid growth in the last few years in this State as well as adjoining States, and that determined and concerted action of all the executive officers of State should be taken to protect the masses from the oppression incident thereto; and I beg leave to report to your honor that in the opinion of this department no backward step should be taken by the legislative or executive department in protecting the people from such aggression.

That, my colleagues, is the reason Frank Monnett was driven out of the office of attorney-general and retired to a political graveyard by the Republican party. The very fact that he said that the laws now on the statute books are sufficient to enable us to destroy the trusts made him objectionable to the 813 delegates in that convention, and they would not entertain his name for governor, nor could he get but 28 votes out of 813 for attorney-general. Facts speak louder than fancies.

This is what you have done with Frank Monnett. Not a man to speak a tender word in his behalf. My friend General GROSVENOR, the gentleman from Athens, alone has given him a certificate of character here which should go out to the country, because in Ohio the Republicans speak his name with the same contempt which once characterized the language of certain men against Abraham Lincoln. The Democratic party was not born in the woods, to be scared by a screech owl. We are not afraid of your talk about the constitutional amendment, because we will make the country know before Saturday night that you came here with hypocrisy in that amendment, and nothing else.

You know that Frank Monnett, the Republican attorney-general, and I would stand side by side, Republican and Democrat, telling the people of Ohio that we need no constitutional amendment to drive the trusts out of the State if we can only get the agents of the trusts, the Republican officeholders, out of the State. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Retire the Republican representatives of the trusts from the public offices, and at the same time while you count one, two, three, you will retire the trusts; in other words, both will go out together. You know that, and I know it; everybody knows it. We need no constitutional amendment in Ohio. What we need to liberate us from the trusts is to have the facts go to our people as they are going, and when we are liberated from the trust agents, the Republican legislators and executives and attorneys-general, we shall be liberated from the trusts.

Now, let us see whether you are against the trusts. You remember that we had an election in 1896. Trusts were known then. You called an extra session on the 15th day of March, 1897, ten days after you got into power. Did you legislate against trusts in 1897? You did not. Did you legislate against trusts in 1898? My friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] talks about demagogic party speeches against trusts and claims that you are going to give us practical legislation against trusts by proposing an amendment to the Constitution which you know will never be adopted, and you do not expect to be adopted.

Not only that. In 1898 we had a beef trust doing business, and it cost this country several hundred thousand dollars to whitewash the trust that was in the beef business, notwithstanding it murdered 4,800 of our young men. You against trusts! You have whitewashed the protector of trusts. We found by a court-martial that a man by the name of Eagan was unfit to wear the uniform of a soldier, but your trust-ridden President put him back on the pay roll at a pay which will cost the people of the United States $75,000 if he lives his natural expectancy, although he will never do another day's service for the country. Explain this if you dare!

Oh, yes; you are against trusts. You have taken care of this man because he had something that he could tell out of school. That is not all. We know something else. In the last week of the long session, just now, it dawns on you that we need an amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Why, the sugar trust——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TERRY. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. LENTZ. Now, we have the sugar trust. It was discovered when you passed the Dingley bill, that you called the extra session for the sole purpose of passing that bill, and you adjourned us from day to day and week to week, holding us here for four and a half months for no other purpose, and we all remember that when Havemeyer went on the witness stand some months ago he stated that the Dingley tariff is "the mother of trusts." But when the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] brings in an amendment, simply asking to strike off one article, that of paper, and putting it on the free list, you stand by the "trust mother," the Dingley tariff law, and continue to protect the trusts.

If we were to offer to put nails on the free list, you would stand by the "mother of trusts." If we were to ask you to put wire on the free list, or glass, or pottery, or any of the hundred commodities that go into the food, clothing, and shelter of the community, you would resist step by step every practical proposition to limit the evils of the trust.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I desire to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that there was an amendment proposed on this side of the House providing against the protection of articles if they became subjects of trusts, and that that was ruled out on a point of order made by the gentleman from Maine, the lamented Mr. Dingley.

Mr. LENTZ. Yes; we all remember that, and the Republicans will continue to rule out any and every restraint upon the trusts so long as the Republican party has a majority.

Now let me tell you another thing about these trusts. We have a President of the United States who told us of our "plain duty" to Porto Rico. Immediately a couple of trust magnates visited the city of Washington, and from the President of the United States down to the smallest member over there you changed your minds in a day and a night; and you never told anybody where or when you changed nor whether it was before or after midnight when you changed. Nor have you told who was present when you changed your minds. Oh, yes; you are against trusts, all of you. [Laughter.]

You are very anxious to amend the Constitution under which you established despotism in Porto Rico, the Constitution under which you established a trust of carpetbag thieves in Cuba [applause], under which you paid bribes and pensions to Mohammedans and polygamists in the Sulu Islands [laughter and applause], the Constitution under which you had power to shoot to death a congress of Christian people in Luzon who had fought, bled, and died for liberty and the right of self-government, and yet you now claim you have not power sufficient to stop the trusts from using the mail while they are fleecing the Republic of thousands, of hundreds of thousands, and millions of dollars.

You could prevent the lottery trust in New Orleans from using the mails, but your Constitution is too weak to prevent the wire and nail trust, or the sugar trust, or the tobacco trust from using the mails!

Who says the Constitution will allow postal laws to prevent obscene matter, but will not allow postal laws to prevent the trusts from robbing the people?

You know very well how you can reach the trusts. The best-informed man on this subject in your party, Mr. Monnett, told you how he would get rid of the trusts, and instantly you got rid of him. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Oh, yes; you are against the trusts! I will tell you how to get rid of the trusts. If the trusts elect McKinley in November, constitutional amendment or no amendment, the trusts will do business at the old stand for four years more. If the people elect William Jennings Bryan [applause], no amendment will be necessary, and after the 4th of next March we shall have an Attorney-

General who will not go on sleeping while the trusts go on fattening, for he will keep the trusts so busy that it will be hotter for them than any part of the tropical islands of our empire.

Let William Jennings Bryan give us an honest Attorney-General, not from the State of New Jersey [laughter] but from a State where they are not trust-ridden, and I assure you that if Mr. Bryan is elected we shall need no constitutional amendment. We will not go to the home of the trusts for an Attorney-General of the United States: we will not ask a governor, made such by the trusts of New York and the State of New Jersey, to come over to Washington and sit in the Cabinet and protect the trusts. We will do business under the law as it now exists, and trusts will depart from this land. [Long applause on the Democratic side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

* * * * * * *

Mr. LENTZ. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] undertakes to run under the cover of a man named Sheetz, whom nobody in the State of Ohio heard of as a lawyer or anything else until the trust representatives nominated him for attorney-general. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If he prosecutes the trusts with the same ability that Monnett did, he will not be renominated for attorney-general by the Republican party; he will be a disappointment to those who nominated him.

Now, my friend talks about the Porto Rican tariff. He says the chairman of the national Democratic committee introduced a bill providing for returning to the trusts this money. That is no worse than you did [addressing the Republican side].

Mr. GROSVENOR. The gentleman will allow me to explain. I did not say "a bill;" it was an amendment to the Porto Rican bill.

Mr. LENTZ. Yes, an amendment; but practically the same thing. Here is the proposition: You proposed in your bill a 25 per cent tariff, but after the magnates of the two trusts, tobacco and sugar, came to Washington, although you had been pretending to raise this money for schools and roads, you decided to turn back to the trusts 10 per cent of the 25 per cent and only put on a tax of 15 per cent.

Now, I do not wonder that Chairman JONES made a mistake. Chairman JONES was not as well acquainted with these gentlemen who are operating the trusts as are the gentlemen on the other side, and I believe he was innocent enough to think that the people down there would get the benefit of this money after it had been returned; but you men, being on the inside at the Arlington Hotel when you discussed this tariff, knew in an instant that Mr. JONES had made a mistake.

They knew in an instant that Mr. JONES did not understand who was to get the return of this tariff. He supposed the people of Porto Rico were to get it, and not the men who were making the bargain for the reduction from 25 per cent to 15. They, the trust agents, knew who was to get the 10 per cent and they instantly knew who would get the other 15.

Now, so far as the Porto Rican tariff is concerned, there is another element in it. They put it on for two years. Why? To depress those people, to humiliate those people, to keep them down in the mire of despondency until the trusts and the syndicates and the capitalists and the speculators of this country can option and buy up every valuable piece of property, and after they become the owners of it at the reduced price, by reason of this infernal tariff or taxation without representation, undoubtedly then the syndicates and the trusts will control the future legislation of this body, if it happens to have a Republican majority. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

That is what that means. If gentlemen on the other side are looking around for legislation and for a constitutional amendment, you might have noticed that the Supreme Court, by a vote of 5 to 4, had declared the income tax unconstitutional, strange to say, one of them having changed his mind one night. We do not know what time in the night nor who was present.

But notwithstanding that change, if you want to put an effective constitutional amendment on the statute books, for which you could probably get the vote of this side of the House in a very large number, and of the States, you have but to propose a graduated income tax upon the incomes of these very marauders of the land, these wholesale jobbers, these fancy Jesse Jameses, who live in the palaces and the castles of New York City, who are taking $3 out of every farmer's pocket every time he buys a hundred pounds of wire or a keg of nails.

Every time he buys a thousand pounds of wire they assess him $20. They might as well steal his watch. It is grand larceny instead of petty larceny. But you have not found any law that will reach that kind of a thief. Why? Because you expect him to contribute from now on until November. I can tell you how to limit the evil of the trusts. If you would propose it here this afternoon, we would vote for it.

Bring in a proposition to prevent any trust owner or any corporation stockholder or director from contributing more than $100 to a campaign fund; a bill that will prevent any one of your trust owners from contributing a corruption fund to come out in my district or any other district; a bill which will compel that corruption fund to be expended in the district where the contributor lives.

That will relieve this country of the evil of the trusts, by bringing more honest men into the legislative department of the Government of the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It will bring more men here who are not subservient to the trusts which pay out their money and buy seats for their agents on your side of the House.

Four years of Democratic rule! You say they wrangled on this floor. Yes; they wrangled on this floor, and they continued to wrangle until they met in July, 1896, at Chicago, when they settled the wrangle; and those who were here in Washington legislating and operating under the dictation and control of the money trust which now controls and operates you were thrown out of that Chicago convention; and the convention at Kansas City will nominate men who will not be the tools of the trusts.

The Wall street nomination of certain men during those four years did keep this Congress silent so far as trust legislation was concerned, and they want to continue to keep Congress silent and impotent, just as they have succeeded since they made the bargain in 1896 to run a man for President who for fourteen years had been advocating the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, and who undoubtedly promised that if nominated and elected to the Presidency he would be a single gold-standard man through to the finish—at least until he got his renomination. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LENTZ] to a fact which I think he will admit, and that is that Mr. Attorney-General Sheets overcame a Democratic majority of 5,000 in the judicial subdivision in which he was elected to the court of common pleas, just three or four years prior to his election as attorney-general.

Mr. LENTZ. He evidently had the trusts with him; and I wish to suggest to the gentleman from Ohio that Mr. Finck overcame 5,500 of your majority, and yet he did not come here either. He ran 5,500 ahead of his ticket in your district.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I beg the gentleman's pardon——

Mr. LENTZ. Mr. Finck ran 5,500 ahead of his ticket in your district, but that does not prove that you are a bad man.

Mr. GROSVENOR. He did not run 100 ahead of his ticket.

Mr. LENTZ. You got a majority of but 4,500 in a district that has a normal Republican majority of 10,000. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Why, the gentleman does not want to stand up here and make such a statement as that.

Mr. LENTZ. I will prove it.

Mr. GROSVENOR. My district gave me the first time I ran a little over 2,000 majority.

Mr. LENTZ. We are not talking about that.

Mr. GROSVENOR. And the highest it ever gave in its whole organization of ten years is less than or about 4,500.

Mr. LENTZ. I must say I will disprove that.

Mr. GROSVENOR. And Mr. Finck was beaten by myself clear up to the very top of the margin.

Mr. LENTZ. Do you say that in 1893, 1894, and 1895 your district gave no more than 4,500 majority?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I do say so. When a candidate for Congress was running.

Mr. LENTZ. You are mistaken.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Well, the gentleman's district sometimes goes 3,000 and sometimes 123.

Mr. LENTZ. It gave McKinley a majority of 248, and it gave D. K. Watson a majority of fifteen hundred and ninety-one. I came here, it is true, by a majority of 49, after you undertook to steal the seat and counted me out of 57 votes. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] The last time I carried the district by a majority 16 to 1 times as large as I did in 1896, and I am perfectly willing to go back now, notwithstanding the fact that you and HANNA and McKinley are credited with having the intention to dump the largest barrel you have got into that district. But I will be there all the time until the vote is counted.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The gentleman is dealing in slush.

Mr. LENTZ. No, I am not; I am dealing in facts.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The gentleman knows I have no more interest in his district than I have in any other district in the country.

Mr. LENTZ. The only slush in my district is put there by your campaign committee, and my boys get it. [Applause.]

But, leaving this subject, I turn my attention for a moment to disprove General GROSVENOR's statement that the highest Republican majority ever given in his district in its whole organization of ten years is less than or about 4,500, and I submit here the following facts and figures, together with tables, which speak for themselves.

ANNUAL REPUBLICAN MAJORITIES FOR THE HEAD OF THE TICKET IN MR. GROSVENOR'S DISTRICT FROM 1894 TO 1899, INCLUSIVE.

Each of these counties gave a Republican majority for the head of the ticket each and every year from 1894 to 1899, inclusive, except Hocking for the years 1896, 1897, 1898, and 1899, and Perry for the years 1896 and 1897, and the figures opposite each county for each year represent the Republican majorities in the respective counties, except in the six instances where the letter "D" is set before the figures to indicate a Democratic majority.

County.	1894, secretary of state, Taylor vs. Turner.	1895, governor, Bushnell vs. Campbell.	1896, President, McKinley vs. Bryan.	1897, governor, Bushnell vs. Chapman.	1898, secretary of state, Kinney vs. Guthrey.	1899, governor, Nash vs. McLean.
Athens	3,232	3,888	2,157	2,407	2,268	2,579
Hocking	332	184	D. 414	D. 236	D. 162	D. 156
Meigs	2,692	2,401	2,175	1,895	1,787	1,582
Perry	824	653	D. 103	D. 28	215	11
Ross	1,315	971	602	762	298	270
Vinton	586	719	223	177	445	448
Total	9,081	8,816	4,640	4,787	4,851	4,634

Mr. GROSVENOR'S majority in 1896 was 4,483 over William E. Finck, and in 1898 his majority was 3,372 over Charles E. Peoples. In other words, Mr. GROSVENOR'S majority in 1896 over Mr. Finck was about one-half the normal majority of the Republican head of the ticket over the Democratic head of the ticket in 1894 and 1895, and Mr. GROSVENOR'S popularity in his district did not stop with this decrease of one-half in the Republican majority of his district, but in 1898 he reduced his majority with great success to 3,372, leaving him, in round figures, but a little more than one-third of the normal Republican majority of his district for 1894 and 1895. Verily, verily, his people know their plain duty.

It will be seen by comparison that General GROSVENOR'S majority in his district is smaller than that ever received by any Republican at the head of the ticket from 1894 to 1899, inclusive; and while I did in the hurry of debate use the expression that Mr. Finck ran 5,500 ahead of his ticket in Mr. GROSVENOR'S district when it was only 4,500, yet I was not far wrong, because the normal majority of Mr. GROSVENOR'S district was 9,000 instead of 10,000, as I had often heard it stated, for 1894 and 1895. In 1896, the Presidential year, Mr. GROSVENOR, instead of increasing that majority, was able to hold together only half of the normal Republican majority for 1894 and 1895.

It is a well-known principle in politics that men who live in Republican districts should have increased majorities in Presidential years, because the majority usually increases in the same percentage as the total vote. The next time I state the figures I shall give the General credit for 1,000 votes and say that Mr. Finck only reduced the majority of the General's district from 9,000 to 4,500, running the General behind the normal majority only 4,500 instead of 5,500.

But to return to the subject of trusts. I do not believe I can do any greater service for the American people than to show them a letter which was written to me yesterday by Mr. Monnett; and in connection with this letter from Mr. Monnett I shall submit a letter from Mr. George Rice, of Marietta, Ohio, inclosing copies of letters passing between himself and the Attorney-General and the President of the United States, and without further comment I submit this correspondence, with the suggestion that if a Republican official in Ohio interferes with a trust his head goes off under the political guillotine; and I make the further suggestion that the correspondence between Mr. Rice and the Government at Washington demonstrates the absolute subserviency of the President and the Attorney-General to the Standard Oil trust, and this correspondence submitted by Mr. Rice throws additional light on the correspondence of the Standard Oil bank and Mr. Gage, Secretary of the Treasury. Think of the Rice correspondence ignored for nineteen months! What is the President's "plain duty" here?

Is there any monarch in Europe who would give such a deaf ear to the appeal of his humblest subject as was given by the President and the Attorney-General of the United States to the appeal for justice made by George Rice, one of the best Republicans and one of the ablest citizens of the State of Ohio? It occurs to me that in connection with this correspondence it is not amiss to suggest that the trust barons of America occupy the place of the feudal lords of mediæval Europe, and it also occurs to me that the contemptuous treatment given the appeal from George Rice by the President demonstrates that imperialism is well-nigh established in the land, and therefore I think it opportune and appropriate to incorporate in my speech in the following order the correspondence furnished by the Republican ex-attorney-general, Frank S. Monnett, of Ohio, and that of the lifelong Republican, George Rice; also the three speeches made by the three distinguished and lifelong Republicans of national fame, at a recent meeting held on the 24th of May, 1900, at Cooper Institute, New York City, I mean, and include herein the speeches of the Hon. Carl Schurz, of New York; ex-Governor Boutwell, of Massachusetts, and Captain O'Farrell, of Washington, D. C.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, *May 21, 1900.*

HON. JOHN J. LENTZ,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I have the honor to receive your esteemed favor of the 19th instant, making inquiry as to the present status of the litigation instituted against the trusts in the State of Ohio; inquiry also whether they were prosecuted under statute or under the common law powers vested in the courts; you also inquire what has been the disposition made by the court of the charges of bribery of the State officials on the part of the Standard Oil Trust, and as to what delay or hindrance, if any, has been interposed; also as to what has caused the delay and prevented a speedy action thereon on the part of the courts; also what further legislation is necessary to empower the State courts or the Federal courts to right these economic abuses.

First. As to the status of the litigation in Ohio against trusts and monopolies:

The State of Ohio on the relation of the Attorney-General filed an original petition against the Standard Oil Company as early as May 8, 1890, charging the Standard Oil Company of Ohio, and nineteen other constituent companies, of having unlawfully or illegally entered into a combination for the purpose of controlling the prices of crude petroleum and arbitrarily fixing the consumption price of the refined product. In that decision you are familiar with the results, the Supreme Court decided March 2, 1892, in a proceeding in quo warranto, that the entering into such a trust contract, whether by individual stockholders, directors, partnerships, or as individuals, formed an illegal combination, and that the Standard Oil Company of Ohio, participating therein, was exercising franchises contrary to and against the public policy of the State of Ohio, and on said date adjudged and decreed that said corporation be ousted from the privilege of making or entering into such an agreement or performing the same directly or indirectly, and from the power, franchise, or privilege of permitting said Standard Oil trustees to control in any way the affairs of said corporation.

From said March 2, 1892, until November 9, 1897, the Standard Oil Company of Ohio unlawfully disobeyed the decree of this court, as well as the other nineteen constituent companies, as I charged in my information in contempt on that day.

The trust certificates rose from par upward of $500 per share, notwithstanding a heavy quarterly dividend was repeatedly declared.

In this charge of contempt the Standard Oil Company attempted to justify by answer in compliance with an order from the supreme court to answer on or before the 15th day of January, 1898; that is, they were required to show cause why it and its stockholders and officers should not be punished as for contempt as charged in said information; to this the State replied and attached under and by virtue of our statutes twenty-six interrogatories addressed to John D. Rockefeller; part of these he answered and part he did not; thereupon we took the deposition of said John D. Rockefeller in New York; some of which questions he refused to answer, such as to produce books to corroborate his verbal and written statements.

Thereafter a special master was appointed, the Hon. Allen T. Brinsmade, of Cuyahoga County, and we proceeded to take the testimony under Brinsmade at various places.

Among the witnesses other than Rockefeller was the secretary, F. B. Squire, of the Standard Oil Company; the record I inclosed to you under separate cover. The witnesses were certainly in harmony with the other trust witnesses, namely, short on memory in those particulars that were vital to the State and long on memory for everything that would make a defense. But the most remarkable feature of the whole proceeding was under the direction of the court and under the direction of a referee to produce the records and books of the company of Ohio to show the distributions of their companies and other sources of income and the relationship between the Standard Oil Company of Ohio, and the trust certificates were all peremptorily refused and the witnesses have been certified over to the supreme court by the master, as well as the notary public, for contempt.

Also a special information in contempt was filed against the said secretary, F. B. Squire, which was filed directly in the supreme court, charging him with open defiance of the court's order. This proceeding in contempt has been pending since April, 1899, against the secretary and is still pending, and neither said company, its officers, or agents have ever produced the testimony required by this court, nor have they yet been punished for their refusal to do so.

This branch of the case was submitted last June to the court on briefs and had precedence over the hearing and main contempt originally filed, charging them with violating the decree of 1892. I say it had precedence over this main contempt for the reason that the evidence required of them by the court to show their conduct in reference to the original decree was refused and should have been determined before the merits of the case were heard. However, the company triumphed and the State was forced into a hearing on May 23, 1900, a second time, with only such testimony as the Standard Oil Company's officers chose to furnish the court, and without furnishing the testimony, evidence, and books required by the court, and have thus submitted their cause to the court after openly defying the court to produce the evidence demanded by the court.

To reiterate, the Standard Oil Company of Ohio as a company is charged with contempt, and the stockholders and officers are charged with contempt in violating the original decree of the court of 1892.

The State undertook to prove its allegations from the company's own books, and did prove the existence of the trust certificates amounting to millions of dollars, being raised by quarterly dividends, and showing that there was monopoly in the production, transportation, and distribution of petroleum in Ohio, and further professed to show from the books of the defendant company itself the source of revenue that was distributed to pay these dividends on the illegal trust certificates; and thereupon the defendant company refused to produce its books, records, or evidence, and the secretary refused to answer the questions, but undertook to give favorable extracts from their own records without producing the records; and then, after defying the court and asking the court and compelling the court to take their verbal extracts from the records, refused to corroborate the same with the original or substantive evidence in contempt in the supreme court, that they go to trial and submit their cause on this ex parte statement; all of which they have done.

If they are not guilty, on what evidence is the court going to determine?

If they are guilty, on what evidence is the court going to determine the extent or magnitude of the violation of the court's decree?

But they say that the evidence, if offered, would criminate them, and for that reason they rely upon the State and Federal constitution to protect them.

But this humiliating defense was an afterthought, for, under the well-known rule, the company and its president and secretary, after waiving their right in this behalf by giving a part of the records, can not remain silent as to the remainder of the admissions against interest. That is, they have waived their constitutional right to rely upon the defense of the common felon, and so, up to date, the stockholders, officers, and agents go acquit.

But, on the other hand, the court may apply the old common-law rule of presumption against concealment, falsification, and destruction of evidence, and punish them on the presumption that the incriminating evidence is all that the State claims for it. Notwithstanding the close and hot pursuit made by the State against the Standard Oil Trust (self-confessed criminals), we traced home to their door the destruction of twenty-six boxes of books and papers at Cleveland, Ohio, including ledgers, daybooks, and other important records, according to the sworn testimony given by the laborers that performed the services at the request of the company, and received pay therefor, after the court ordered such books brought into court.

Following all these disclosures made by the examination of John D. Rockefeller, and the evidence showing that the trust still existed, additional suits were at once filed against the Buckeye Pipe Line Company of Ohio; the Solar Refining Company, of Ohio; the Ohio Oil Company, of Ohio, charging them with the same offense that we originally charged against the Standard Oil Company, of Ohio, under the common law, charging them also with violating the anti-trust statute of the State of Ohio, and charging them with aiding and abetting the Standard Ooil Company, of Ohio, in defying the original decree of the court; and in the case of the Buckeye Pipe Line Company, charging them with exercising other franchises than those granted by their charter, to wit, that of a telegraph company carrying messages for hire and reward, and also charging these said companies with violating the Ohio statutes in actually removing their principal place of office from the State of Ohio to No. 26 Broadway, New York. The testimony showed that no bona fide office of any of these companies was kept in Ohio, and merely dummy stockholders' meetings were held with proxies and under a pretense claiming to have annual elections in the State, while in truth and fact the twenty constituent companies were all operating at the main office at Broadway, New York, and the trust is as continued and flourishing in 1900 as in 1892.

To each of these petitions against the constituent companies, interrogatories addressed to the officers of such companies have been filed, and under our statutes are required to be answered or demurred to within thirty days, although upwards of one and one-half years have elapsed, not a single interrogatory has yet been answered in these proceedings, and the companies exact a 200 per cent price for their commodities in open defiance of the original decree and wholly in default and neglect in complying with the statute in the constituent company cases.

One hundred and ten newspapers were shown to have been subsidized in the State of Ohio; space on editorial pages and columns of matter were purchased abusing the State officials who were pushing these cases; we were threatened with dire results—in case they were pushed to conclusion—such as capital would be withdrawn—and one would imagine the State of Ohio would be left a howling wilderness unless these plutocrats continued to plunder us and rob the oil fields in the future as they have in the past of their millions.

A like proceeding was instituted against eleven insurance companies in Ohio, charging them with being members of the insurance trust, but the combine, and among the witnesses who refused to produce the correspondence between the local insurance board and the insurance company, showing their connection, and who are cited in contempt in the supreme court, was Mr. A. I. Truesdale, of Cleveland, Ohio, who was not punished for his refusal, as the cases were dismissed because there was no proof; that the companies were never directly connected with the trust composed of the local trustees or agents, but that the trust was purely the acts of the agent and not of the companies. In other words, the attorney-general's department was powerless in itself to compel the secretary of the Cleveland board (Truesdale) to produce for the court the correspondence and contract directly connecting the company with the local board at Cleveland, for the reason that it would criminate Truesdale; and thereupon Truesdale was certified over to the supreme court for his refusal to answer the questions or produce the books and correspondence, all of which has been ignored by the court, and Truesdale has never been compelled to produce the correspondence, and the cases were dismissed because there was no connection between the companies and the agents. The only punishment that Truesdale has so far met with is the appointment, according to the public press, that he has been selected by the State administration for a responsible place in the insurance department, with a salary and fees amounting to about $4,000, and he has since resigned from the secretaryship of the Cleveland Board of Underwriters, the place he has so faithfully and worthily fulfilled for the trust.

The other suits pending against trusts in the State of Ohio are the Continental Tobacco Company, the Argand Refining Company, and the United Salt Company, in addition to several cases pending in the circuit court through prosecuting attorneys, under order of the attorney-general.

Lastly, in reference to the attempted bribery of Attorney-General Watson and myself, on the part of the Standard Oil trust, I herewith send you my annual report, which sets forth officially the transaction connected therewith, beginning on page 30, showing the charges made against the company, giving date and names of parties, and the dismissal of the case by the court and their reason therefor.

I call your attention to the records I have sent you, having the dates and the original actions, copies of the decrees, and all the accurate data that you inquire about, and for that reason I did not reproduce here.

I beg pardon for so abbreviating this as to almost make it unintelligible, but time forbids me to go into more details.

Respectfully submitted.

F. S. MONNETT.

MARIETTA, OHIO, *May 30, 1900.*

Hon. JOHN J. LENTZ, M. C., *Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: In accordance with your request I send you copies of the correspondence between myself and Attorney-General John W. Griggs, and with it I also include copies of the letters between myself and President McKinley on the same subject. You will observe that this correspondence began on November 5, 1898, and closed on the 20th of June, 1899, so far as the Attorney-General of the United States is concerned, and that all I have secured from the Department of Justice of the United States is summed up in three brief and indifferent letters from the Attorney-General and another equally brief and noncommittal from the President of the United States. You will observe that it is now more than a year and a half since I opened this correspondence, and in a few days it will be a year since I received any communication from the alleged Department of Justice.

I have been a Republican all my life, and supposed my party was faithful to its trust, but this correspondence with the Attorney-General and the President leads me to suspect that the Standard Oil trust and not the Republican party is running our National Government.

The execution of the Federal antitrust act devolves entirely upon the Attorney-General, and none of his seventy-six subordinates can prosecute a complaint without his sanction, so that he becomes wholly responsible. And I read in the New York Herald of March 22, 1899, what purported to be a copy of a letter from Attorney-General Griggs to Mr. J. C. Bowdaile, of 5010 Girard avenue, Philadelphia, in which the Attorney-General said:

"I have your letter of the 17th instant, and because it is evident that you are under serious misapprehensions as to the force and effect of the Federal law relating to trusts, called the Sherman Act, passed in 1890, I deem it proper to call your attention to some aspects of this matter, which you are obviously ignorant of.

"In the first place, the constitutionality of this matter was not affirmed last fall, but was affirmed almost immediately after the passage of the act, in the first case which arose, and has been regarded as settled, so far as the constitutionality is concerned, for many years.

"In the next place, the Sherman trust act does not give to the Federal courts jurisdiction over any combination constituting a restraint and monopoly of trade unless such trade is what is known as interstate or international trade and commerce. * * * This Department never hesitates to prosecute unlawful combinations which affect interstate commerce."

What Mr. Griggs has seen fit to say in his letter to Mr. Bowadaile hardly seems to be substantiated by his treatment of my appeal to him for relief. Is it possible for any sane human being, from President McKinley down to the humblest citizen in the land, to believe that either the Standard Oil trust or the Standard Oil Company is not engaged in interstate commerce?

Respectfully, yours,

GEORGE RICE.

MARIETTA, OHIO, *November 5, 1898.*

Attorney-General GRIGGS, *Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: As a citizen of this State and of the United States, I appeal to you, the head of the Department of Justice of the United States, not only for individual relief, but also in behalf of thousands of my confrères in the oil producing and refining business, who are sorely oppressed by the most gigantic and unlawful combination the world has ever known, embodied in the name, Standard Oil Trust.

Under the decision of the United States Supreme Court, March 22, 1897, in the Trans-Missouri Freight Association case, it was decided that—

"All combinations which are in restraint of trade or commerce are prohibited, whether in the form of trusts or in any other form whatever."

recently more specifically confirmed by the decision in the Joint Traffic Association case. Therefore, this, the greatest of all trusts and combinations, should be suppressed. Being a great sufferer by this trust, which has destroyed my business, I herewith enter my complaint and appeal to you, as the proper official, to institute the necessary proceedings to enjoin or prohibit this trust from doing further business.

I can furnish you abundant proof to verify and sustain my charge, that to-day it is the greatest monopoly and industrial trust "in restraint of trade," that the world has known, and it seems clear to me that it is your imperative duty to proceed at once as the Federal antitrust law directs, to break up this unlawful combination.

Respectfully, yours,

GEORGE RICE.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., November 15, 1898.

Mr. GEORGE RICE,
Proprietor Ohio Oil Works, Marietta, Ohio.

SIR: Replying to your letter of the 5th instant, I beg to say that the act of July 2, 1890, to whose provisions you appeal for protection, has reference only to that trade or commerce which exists, or may exist, among the several States or with foreign nations, and has no application whatever to any other trade or commerce.

It does not appear from your communication that either your own business or that of the alleged combination against which you complain is of an interstate character such as to give the courts of the United States jurisdiction under the statute mentioned.

JOHN K. RICHARDS,
Acting Attorney-General.

For abbreviation sake the following letter takes the place of my letter to Griggs of January 10, 1899, which he never acknowledged and which in substance was the same as the following:

MARIETTA, OHIO, *February 16, 1899.*

Hon. JOHN W. GRIGGS,
Attorney-General, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As a citizen of the United States of America, I am of the firm conviction that I should be thoroughly protected by my Government in life, liberty, and business pursuits, against the machinations of the Standard Oil Trust. In other words:

"So use your own as not to injure another's property."

It may be said that "all men are by nature free and independent and have certain inalienable rights, among which are the enjoyment of and defending life and liberty, acquiring and possessing and seeking and obtaining happiness and safety."

I herewith renew and again enter my decided protest and complaint against said trust, to you as the proper representative official, appointed by the President to safeguard the public interests as against unlawful trusts and combinations, as outlined in the Federal Anti-Trust Act, which act has been twice confirmed, as well as decided to be constitutional, by our highest court.

My complaint is against the present and continued unlawful existence, for about nine years past, of this, the greatest of all trusts in the destruction of lawful private interests and business.

I herewith submit the following facts, which plainly show that this trust has grossly violated the wise provisions of said act, in "restraint of trade," and that its general business is of an interstate character, as well as international, and that it should be rigidly and summarily dealt with—suppressed, as the law directs.

I will preface my remarks by saying that this particular trust is the greatest monopoly and industrial trust in "restraint of trade" in this or any other age. It has unlawfully and criminally succeeded in amassing untold wealth within a very brief space of time, in getting property without creating it, in enjoying wealth without earning it, through the grossest of the gross freight discriminations. Except for this there would not have been a Standard Oil monopoly nor a Standard Oil Trust.

The petroleum industry of this country is first in manufacture and fourth in magnitude of our general exports. There was exported in 1897 998,862,204 gallons, valued at $58,057,547.

This trust controls 95 per cent of this great industry, now about 150,000 barrels daily. This monopoly dictates to the producers of petroleum what they must take for their crude products, while the consumer is obliged to pay high prices for the refined product compared with the low price of crude, and take whatever quality of oil the trust choose to give, which is in "restraint of trade."

This trust dictates to the railroads the high tariff rates their competitors must pay, while its own freight is carried at normal figures—proof, my own case, per law reports of Ohio.

The law of supply and demand cuts no figure with this trust, for the great difference between the low price of crude and the comparative high price of the refined is growing wider and wider day by day. For example, taking the price of crude oil and of refined, on May 1 and November 1 (1898), shows that refined oil has advanced 62 per cent more than that of crude. Their general tactics are to advance temporarily the price of crude oil, in order to raise the price of refined, and soon thereafter put the price of crude back to its original position or lower,

and by the power of their monopoly maintain the price of refined at the advanced figures, which is in "restraint of trade and commerce."

The average price of petroleum, best grade (1897), was only 1¼ cents a gallon, and the second grade, 1½ cents. It only costs one-fourth of a cent a gallon to pipe it and three-eighths of a cent to refine it, or a total of 2¼ cents per gallon for the best refined grade, and 1¾ cents, second grade, of which latter more than one-third of total production is produced.

The general sale of the trusts' products throughout the United States is done through private firms and subagencies located in every town, which report to some particular division agency, circumscribed by certain defined limits of territory, and from the several division agencies go forward condensed subreports to the headquarters of one of the several constituent companies, which also has a certain defined limit of territory, and from the constituent companies there is sent general reports direct to the head center, the Standard Oil Trust, 26 Broadway, New York.

Here is a mammoth combination of properties, tied together by trust certificate issues of the Standard Oil Trust, which interests are protected and specially safeguarded from competitive intrusion by the combined power of the railways of the United States, through interested rail officials, by special secret rebates and other devices, thus enhancing the price of petroleum products, and of a poorer quality.

This is a conspiracy in "restraint of trade" in gross violation of the Federal anti-trust act, confirmed by decision of the Supreme Court, as follows:

"All combinations which are in restraint of trade or commerce are prohibited whether in the form of trusts or in any other form whatever."

This trust purchases 95 per cent of the crude petroleum produced in the United States and at the well of the producer, and delivers same, as common carriers, through its local pipe lines into its local iron storage tanks, and from thence it is distributed by its trunk lines of pipe, as common carriers, to interior manufacturing points, in different States, and to the seaboard, while the products thereof are redistributed into their own tank cars and other interstate cars, and carried over interstate railroads to consumers throughout the United States, as well by ocean steamers to foreign ports, and thence continued by European rail into foreign lands.

This trust now owns about one-half of the total production of petroleum in the United States, and transports same through its seven pipe-line corporations to the other manufacturing constituent companies in the trust in other States, and charges to them the full regular fixed transportation rates, thus making them common carriers of their own production.

The Standard Oil Trust recently reported the following twenty corporations as now in the trust (present Ohio proceedings).

Pipe lines.

National Transit Company, Pennsylvania	$25,455,200
The Buckeye Pipe Line Company, Ohio	10,000,000
New York Transit Company, New York	5,000,000
Southern Pipe Line Company, Pennsylvania	5,000,000
The Eureka Pipe Line Company, West Virginia	5,000,000
Northern Pipe Line Company, Pennsylvania	1,000,000
Indiana Pipe Line Company, Indiana	1,000,000
	52,455,200
Standard Oil Company, New Jersey	10,000,000
Standard Oil Company, New York	7,000,000
Standard Oil Company, Ohio	3,500,000
Standard Oil Company, Kentucky	1,000,000
Standard Oil Company, Indiana	1,000,000
The Atlantic Refining Company	5,000,000
The Solar Refining Company	500,000
Forest Oil Company	5,500,000
South Pennsylvania Oil Company	2,500,000
The Ohio Oil Company	2,500,000
Northwestern Ohio Natural Gas Company	3,278,500
Union Tank Line Company	8,500,000
The Anglo-American Oil Company	5,000,000
	102,233,700

The average market price of its trust certificates for the month of January, 1899, was $447 per share, on par of 100, which, based on their own reported capitalization of $102,233,700, amounts to a valuation of $456,984,639.

The nineteen home corporations of the Standard Oil Trust are organized in seven States of the Union, as follows, but its tentacles, through subagencies, reach out to every nook and hamlet in the land, which indirectly report to one of the several constituent companies:

Pennsylvania, 6 corporations, capitalized at	$44,455,200
Ohio, 5 corporations, capitalized at	19,278,500
New Jersey, 2 corporations, capitalized at	15,500,000
New York, 2 corporations, capitalized at	12,000,000
West Virginia, 1 corporation, capitalized at	5,000,000
Indiana, 2 corporations, capitalized at	2,000,000
Kentucky, 1 corporation, capitalized at	1,000,000
	97,233,700
The Anglo-American Oil Company of London	5,000,000
	102,233,700

These twenty corporations are intertwined and interlocked into a compact whole or body in one private association, tied together by trust certificate issues, which represent the appraised value of all the corporate stocks of these several corporations, which corporate stocks were transferred to the trustees of the trust, who hold them in trust as collateral security for trust certificate holders.

This trust owns 95 per cent of the petroleum pipe-line transportation of the United States, of which nine-tenths has been laid down in States that have enacted what are known as special "free-pipe bills," under rights of eminent domain for the condemnation of private lands, to lay down said pipes for public use, as common carriers. There are seven distinct pipe-line corporations in the trust, whose sole and only business is to pipe oil, with an aggregate capitalization of $52,455,200, or more than half the total capitalization of the trust, and at above average market price of trust certificates (447) represents a valuation in pipe lines of $234,474,744.

These seven pipe-line corporations, organized in different States, are jointly connected by trust certificate issues (as well to the other constituent members), and jointly or conjointly pipe the same oil through each other's connecting pipe lines the petroleum collected from producers' wells in different States, and transport same as common carriers, at certain fixed rates of transportation, to the manufacturing points in other States, and to the seaboard, and abroad, and thus do a business of "interstate character" as well as international, and therefore is—

COMMERCE AMONG THE SEVERAL STATES OR WITH THE FOREIGN NATIONS.

The following general points, more in detail, are submitted for your due consideration.

This trust collects, through its local pipe lines, from wells located in the oil-producing regions of Pennsylvania, New York, Ohio, and West Virginia, vast quantities of crude petroleum of the first class, or best grade, and delivers same into its local iron storage tanks, for which it makes a general transportation charge, and for years back, of 20 cents a barrel for such collecting and delivery. Besides, it retransports the same petroleum out of said tanks, through its trunk lines of pipe, to the manufacturing corporations in the trust, located at the ports of Baltimore, Philadelphia, and New York, where the same is manufactured, said corporations being charged the regular fixed local and whatever the joint railroad tariff trunk-line pipeage rates may be.

Thereafter, a portion of the products thereof is distributed through the trust's tank cars, and the box cars of the railroads, to consumers in the several Eastern States, while its tank steamers distribute a part to ports on the New England and Southern coasts.

Another part or portion, two-thirds, is mainly sent in bulk to foreign ports in the trust's tank steamers (and by barrel in other steamers and sailing vessels), at fixed transportation rates charged to its European corporations, and there delivered into its iron storage tanks at these several ports, and from thence continued and distributed in bulk by the trust's tank cars, and its tank wagons, and also by barrel, in the box cars of foreign railways, to its many agencies and consumers in European countries, for the sale and benefit of the trust's corporations abroad.

"The Anglo-American Oil Company," of London, capital $5,000,000, is one of the constituent members of the trust, while high authorities say this trust own, or are largely interested in and control, the Germany-American Petroleum Company, the Belgian-American Petroleum Company, the Danish-American Petroleum Company, French Refiners' Syndicate of Paris, 45 per cent of the stock of Nobel Brothers, Russian oil kings, and the oil industry of Canada.

Crude petroleum in its natural state is also sent by the trust, direct from the wells, by its own local and trunk lines of pipe, to its bulk ocean steamers and thence across the seas, and by foreign rail, to trust refineries located in France, Spain, Brazil, Mexico, etc.

A small part of the best grade crude is collected by local pipe from Pennsylvania producing fields at the regular fixed pipeage rates made by the trust—20 cents a barrel—and transported through the trust's connecting trunk lines of pipe at certain other fixed rates to one of the constituent members of the trust, "The Standard Oil Company" of Cleveland, Ohio, and there manufactured and its products distributed through the trust's tank cars, tank wagons, and the box cars of the railroads, to its many agencies and consumers in the several States of the Union.

This trust also collects petroleum, through its local pipes, from wells located in the oil-producing regions of northwestern Ohio and Indiana, and delivers same into its local iron storage tanks at the same general fixed transportation charge of 20 cents a barrel; a second class or inferior grade of crude petroleum, known as sulphur oil, and retransports same out of said local tanks, by trunk lines of pipe, at certain other fixed joint rail and trunk line pipeage rates to Chicago, and to Whiting, Ind., a suburb of Chicago on the lake shore, where it has the largest single oil refining plant in the world, from which the products thereof are distributed by its vessels to lake ports at certain fixed transportation rates, and by its tank cars and tank wagons and the box cars of the railroads to its many agencies located in the different States of the Union. The market price of this inferior grade crude is two-thirds that of the best grade crude, but owing to the monopolistic powers of this trust consumers are forced to pay the same price for its products as those from best grade, which is in "restraint of trade."

The independent refiner, except in a few extreme cases, purchases his crude petroleum on the oil exchanges through the trust's certificate storage issues (which are a joint part and parcel of the original association trust certificate issues), and in which is inserted a regular and general fixed transportation rate of 20 cents a barrel, which must be paid to the trust before removal of the oil, which pipeage rate does not cost to exceed 5 cents a barrel to collect, but the monopolistic powers of the trust enforce a transportation rate four times its cost, which is in "restraint of trade." When crude oil sells at 50 cents a barrel the trust exacts the same transportation rate, or 40 per cent on the cost of the crude; to-day it is about 20 per cent.

The Standard Oil trust and the railroads conspire and maintain the same trunk-line pipeage and rail rates from the oil-producing regions to the seaboard and elsewhere, and in proof thereof, there was a contract between a corporation of this trust, the National Transit Company, and the railroads, by which the railroads were guaranteed a certain fixed revenue, 26 per cent of the total pipe and rail shipments, if the railroads would maintain certain high tariff rates. This is in "restraint of trade," for it thus enhances the price of oil to consumers, much beyond its normal condition.

The railroads refuse to furnish tank cars to the independent shipper whereby he could save 25 per cent in freight on the weight of the barrel, while the roads make no charge to the trust for the return of its empty tank cylinders, to offset the extra weight of the barrel, while such cylinders are not adapted to bring back general freight, like a box car. This is a conspiracy in "restraint of trade."

Moreover, the rail lines allow railcage rates, and excessive at that, for return of the trust's empty tank cars. The mileage rates, both ways, on the trust's tank cars pay for themselves in a period of three years, and thus are paid for several times over.

The early innovation of the tank car for the transportation of petroleum in bulk is where the Standard Oil monopoly has made its vast sums of money through freight discriminations, which has been the sole cause of the creation of this monopoly and of the Standard Oil trust. That is to say, these full-loaded tank cars were carried by the lump sum at inconceivably low rates of freight, regardless of their weight or capacity, exclusively for this monopoly and trust, without knowledge to the other shippers until exposed through public investigation, when the most astounding revelations came forth of 1600 per cent discrimination in favor of this monopoly over the New York Central and Hudson River Railroad Company.

This need not seem incredible, when the Hepburn State investigation committee of New York developed these facts, that through certain written contracts made by the trunk lines of road with the "South Improvement Company" (Standard Oil Company), the roads agreed to give to the Standard the same rebates on their competitors' shipments that they did on their own, which ranged from 40 cents to $1.06 per barrel on crude petroleum and 50 cents to $1.32 per barrel on refined. At the date of these contracts the Standard Oil Company only had 10 per cent (now 95) of the petroleum industry of this country, while its competitors had 90 per cent. Thus the Standard Oil Company received nine times as much for rebates on the shipment of its competitors as it did on its own. The resulting effects were to carry Standard Oil free and rob the treasuries of the roads out of other freight moneys in order to pay over the deficiencies.

To-day the same men are still at the helm of the petroleum industry, but with different, slicker, and more secret methods of procedure, and with many more kinds and devious ways to discriminate against their competitors which their combined ingenuity has concocted and devised, which the railroads readily accept and adopt; and thus it is this trust has become the greatest monopoly of the age and has extended its power and control over foreign countries, and the Russian oil fields, whose extent is greater than our own.

It was not long since that an expert accountant discovered that $7,000,000 in rebates has been paid by one road, the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Company, which would have paid 5 per cent interest on $140,000,000 of its securities. This sum was diverted from the lawful security holders into the unlawful hands of the trust shipper, and was an important factor in the bankruptcy of the road.

Railway receiverships are largely due to trust freight discrimination, which rob the people for the benefit of the few.

Recently (1897, authority, Interstate Commerce Commission), accidentally comes to light 110 per cent discriminations in favor of the Standard Oil trust, by the New York, New Haven and Hartford River Railroad Company, under the control at that time of the "Joint Traffic Association," which was the greatest combination and railway pool this country has known, and which had the power to enforce equal rates for all, but in the case of the Standard Oil trust made special exceptions of above character, conclusively establishing the fact what a legalized pool would mean controlled by such arch conspirators, rail and trust officials, who have here conspired to rob the public by the enforcement and payment of 110 per cent more for petroleum products than it should, because of this foul conspiracy. This is a criterion and vivid example of continued existing secret rebates, especially given to this trust, showing the immensity of its power over railways, regardless of the interstate-commerce act or any other act or law, moral or divine, by which it exacts and compels the railways to enforce high tariff rates on petroleum against its competitors, that it may the sooner destroy and ruin them and also get a higher price for its products, and of a poorer quality. This is simply an example and vivid portrayal of the power of this monopoly and trust in "restraint of trade."

Less than two months ago the receivers of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company, under the jurisdiction and direct orders of a United States court, wrote the Interstate Commerce Commission a most unique acknowledgment of their criminal acts, as follows:

"The receivers of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company will maintain on and after January 1, 1899, upon the lines operated by them, the rates, fares, and charges shown on the tariffs published and filed with the Commission as required by law."

And further said:

"We see no reason why the Commission should refuse its aid to the carriers in an effort to prevent competition from taking the form of illegal concessions through secret rates, drawbacks, rebates, and other devices."

That is to say, we admit doing these gross criminal acts and under an appointment as receivers of a railroad, but on a set day ahead we now give notice we propose to be honest and not further criminate ourselves by these atrocious acts, and if our neighboring lines continue to give further "illegal concessions through secret rates, drawbacks, rebates, and other devices" we will turn state's evidence, and "invoke the aid of the Commission to stop it." This is one of the prominent trunk lines of railway of our country, over which the Standard Oil trust ships large quantities of its manufactured products, and there can be no doubt whatever but that this trust still continues to receive from this road large rebates from its shipments regardless of this announcement. It is only a few years ago I proved that this line had discriminated against my shipments in favor of this trust, ranging from 50 to 162 per cent, which previously had been denied by the officials of this line over and over again.

This self-confessed, most bold, and extraordinary evidence from so high a source, and so recent, fully and completely convinces without any detailed evidence that railroads in general, through their officials, are daily committing the grossest of the gross unlawful criminal acts by giving large secret rebates to favored shippers, of which the Standard Oil trust is the most prominent, and which is in "restraint of trade," because of the enforced higher prices for this trust's product, in gross violation of the Federal anti-trust act.

These statements are officially confirmed by the last report of the Interstate Commerce Commission, as follows:

"There is probably no one thing to-day which does so much to force out the small operator, and to build up those trusts and monopolies against which law and public opinion alike beat in vain, as discrimination in freight rates."

The Union Tank Line Company, a New Jersey corporation, and one of the constituent corporations in the trust, with its several thousand tank cars and box cars, transports and distributes for the manufacturing companies in the trust their manufactured products, for the dealing members of the trust, direct to thousands of their local agencies located in all parts of the United States, which products emanate from a half dozen principal manufacturing points in that number of States.

Petroleum is only produced in special localities, and 95 per cent thereof in four States of the Union—Pennsylvania, Ohio, West Virginia, and New York; therefore it necessarily becomes a business of "interstate character," because of the natural enforced distribution of the products thereof to consumers throughout the other forty States and Territories.

Thus it seems plain to me that the general business of the Standard Oil trust is of such "interstate character" as to warrant your department to commence at once immediate proceedings to suppress this the greatest of all trusts in "restraint of trade or commerce among the several States and with foreign nations."

For years no new competitive refineries have been built; no new additions of consequence added to existing ones; no net earnings and no dividends for present competing refineries. They have become practically worthless, because this trust has and does conspire with the railroads to do these gross, unlawful acts.

But this trust pays annually over $30,000,000 in dividends, and has for many years.

The Standard Oil trust, from the enactment of the anti-trust act, almost nine years ago, has boldly and defiantly disregarded its wise provisions and has ridden roughshod over the rights and liberties of the people, and to such an extent as to destroy its competitors and virtually all competition, and is thus able to dictate to consumers the price of its products, and is thus in "restraint of trade."

In consequence of the existence of this great and unlawful combination and trust my business, which was of interstate character, has been ruined, my refinery is in a hopeless condition, shut down for almost three years, because I can not operate and do business against the unlawful acts of this trust, as herein narrated and complained of.

Therefore, to my Government I appeal and enter a decided and most emphatic protest and complaint against the existence of the Standard Oil trust, because of the ruination of my business through its conspiracy with the railroads. Therefore I appeal to you, as the proper official of the Government, to take such summary and decisive action as will the soonest and most effectually "prohibit" this trust from further doing business in any of the States of the United States.

For humanity's sake this Government went to war with Spain, with the loss of several hundred men by the bullet and disease, to relieve from bondage and oppression less than a million of foreign subjects, insurgents, who no doubt were unduly oppressed.

But this Government, false to the Declaration of Independence, and thus false to its people, purposely ignores and overlooks what should be the greater interest the greater welfare of its own 70,000,000 subjects at home, who are much more sorely and grievously oppressed by the great unlawful power exercised by the trusts, in conspiracy with the railroads, to obtain and receive from them, through underhanded means and criminal secrecy, the grossest of the gross freight discriminations in "restraint of trade and commerce" that the world has known.

Thus, within a few years nine-tenths of the commerce of this country has been lodged in the hands of the trusts—to the extent of $2,702,768,900; which can easily be accounted for by the conspiracy existing between trust and rail officials to divide a larger swag or revenues through higher freight rates, that greater discriminations may accrue, while high-salaried presidents of our leading lines of railways are trust-certificate holders, and thus directly participate in trusts' net earnings and larger dividends to accrue, besides the consequent increased valuation of their trust certificates. As proof thereof, Hugh J. Jewett, late president of the Erie Railway Company, who died in March last, left to his sons and daughters, in equal shares, his holdings in the trust certificates of the Standard Oil trust.

It might be well to state as a side issue and special favoritism that the railroads allow the Standard Oil trust the exclusive privilege to lay down its oil pipes in the roads' right of way and over passenger bridges, and also to cross under their tracks wherever they choose to go, and as often as they please, without remuneration, with infinitesimal cost of pipe distribution, robbing the roads of this immense and heavy tonnage, showing a most extraordinary state of affairs in modern railroading.

But, on the other hand, if a competing pipe line, which has secured fee-simple rights, as against railroad surface rights, makes an attempt to cross or lay their pipes under the tracks or roadbed of a railroad, then the road proceeds at once to drive them off their legal rights by force, and if not successful, then they get out injunctions, resort to all possible quibbles, technicalities, and delays to harass and annoy, to make it as expensive as possible to the competing line. This is in "restraint of trade."

I refer to the United States Pipe Line Company, who now and for years back have been trying to pipe oil from wells in the oil-producing regions to the seaboard—New York—as does the Standard Oil trust, so as to reap the same corresponding advantages of the trust—cheap pipeage rates, one-tenth the cost of present rail rates; but they are to-day blocked on New Jersey soil by the railroads working wholly in the interest of the Standard Oil trust to deprive them of similar rights already given to the trust, and without cost. Moreover, the combined power of the railroads and this trust have defeated all attempts of competing pipe lines from getting through the New Jersey legislature a free-pipe bill, as enacted by other States. This is in "restraint of trade."

In consequence of these fabulous railway freight discriminations and extra special privileges, the trustees and officials of the Standard Oil trust since 1872 have amassed one billion in wealth, and its results are that to-day they are presidents and directors in one-fifth of the total railway mileage of this country; proof, Poor's Manual.

The interstate-commerce act provides a penalty of $5,000 fine and two years in the penitentiary for each and every offense, and yet with about twelve years' trial of the act, with thousands upon thousands of daily aggressions and offenses committed by both rail and trust officials, both equally guilty under the act, not one of them has yet been landed in the penitentiary to atone for their gross criminal acts, and this is the sole cause and the reason why that the act is a dead letter, because of its nonobservance and enforcement.

Trust and rail officials are joint owners, copartners in each others' properties, bonds and stocks, and are devising, scheming, and conspiring with each other to what extent and how slick it may be done, through criminal secrecy under cover of the law, to rob the producer of the soil and mine out of his honest labor and toil through higher freight rates, that greater discriminations, unlawful gains and steals may flow like a river into the plethoric purses of these arch conspirators who are robbing the owners of the field, the forest, and the mine out of hundreds of millions of dollars through lessened prices of their products to the extent of these discriminations, while at the same time their personal and realty holdings are materially depreciated in value; and this is the cause of the great unrest, universal complaint, and discontent. The railroads are wholly responsible for this state of affairs of throwing the absolute control of production and distribution into the hands of the trusts.

These arch conspirators, trust and rail officials, because of the magnitude of their robberies and steals, the enormity and grossness of their crimes, through high-handed piratical assaults upon the internal commerce of the country through criminal secret rebates, have ruined individual industrial interests, the homes and firesides of a nation, and thus have become greater criminals than the pirates of the seas or the robbers of the Rhine.

Respectfully, yours,

GEORGE RICE.

SUPPLEMENTAL.

MARIETTA, OHIO, *February 16, 1900.*

Hon. JOHN W. GRIGGS,
Attorney-General, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On November 5 last I addressed you and entered a general complaint against the Standard Oil trust to prohibit it from further doing business in violation of the Federal anti-trust act, on which the Supreme Court, March 22, 1897, decided and confirmed, in the Trans-Missouri Freight Association case, that "All combinations which are in restraint of trade or commerce are prohibited, whether in the form of trusts or in any other form whatever."

I also said that "I can furnish you abundant proof to verify and sustain my charge that to day it is the greatest monopoly and industrial trust in restraint of trade that the world has known."

On November 15 you replied, in part, as follows:

"It does not appear from your communication that either your own business or that of the alleged combination against which you complain is of an interstate character such as to give the courts of the United States jurisdiction under the statute mentioned."

Upon receipt of this letter I went to work to establish the proof, and on January 10 I again wrote you submitting fully in detail most important and conclusive facts to sustain the general charge made, covering sixteen pages of typewritten matter, and up to the present time no acknowledgment of its receipt has come to hand—ignored, as it were.

I inclose a revision of my former complaint, and not only ask, but politely demand from you as a representative American citizen, whom you represent in your official capacity as an officer of the Government, of which I am an integral part, backed by many millions more, that it is your solemn and imperative duty, under section 4 of the Federal antitrust act, to institute the necessary proceedings against said trust, as there provided as follows:

"The several circuit courts of the United States are hereby invested with jurisdiction to prevent and restrain violations of this act; and it shall be the duty of the several district attorneys of the United States, in their respective districts, under the direction of the Attorney-General, to institute proceedings in equity to prevent and restrain such violations."

Said section also provides:

"And pending such petition and before final decree the court may at any time make such temporary restraining order or prohibition as shall be deemed just in the premises."

Section 6 of the act provides:

"Any property owned under any contract or by any combination, or pursuant to any conspiracy (and being the subject thereof) mentioned in section 1 of this act, and being in the course of transportation from one State to another, or to a foreign country, shall be forfeited to the United States, and may be seized and condemned by like proceedings as those provided by law for the forfeiture, seizure, and condemnation of property imported into the United States contrary to law."

Under the array of facts presented it seems to be incumbent upon you, for and on behalf of the Government and for the benefit of its subjects, of which you are the sworn servant, that you should at once direct your subordinates to go ahead and use such drastic measures as the act provides, that will the soonest and most

effectually wind up this trust, not only through the imprisonment of the violators thereof, but also to enjoin, forfeit, and condemn to the United States its several thousand tank cars and other cars, the seizure and condemnation of all oil in its passage through interstate trunk lines of pipe to interior points and to the seaboard, inclusive of all property in course of transportation to a foreign country, belonging to the Standard Oil trust, that it may be estopped and precluded from further doing business in the United States.

Recent Ohio proceedings have fully and clearly established the fact of the continued and present existence of the Standard Oil trust.

Some nine years ago, on the universal demand of the people, the Congress of the United States passed an enabling act, known as the Federal antitrust act, to relieve its subjects from then existing and constant formation of gigantic trusts and combinations by greedy and lawless freebooters, trust and rail officials, who lay their tribute on the internal commerce of a great nation and sequestrate it for their own private use and gains by reducing the price of production and increasing the price of consumption at their own sweet will, because not summarily dealt with as the act provides, and the resulting effects are that trusts have rapidly increased in numbers and capitalization, while to-day we are confronted by an epidemic of such formations, the result of nonenforcement of the act by our trusted lieutenants, Government officials, who have neglected their sworn duty to enforce the wise and stringent provisions of said act as specially and particularly delegated and required to do, and by such dereliction of duty the act becomes a nullity and practically void.

If it had been enforced with rigor at its incipiency the then existing trusts and combinations would long since have disappeared, others would not have been formed, the present epidemic of trusts unknown, and the great unrest and discontent that has long pervaded the land would long ere this have died out and passed away, peace and contentment would encompass the land, for private industrial interests would have had equality of rights, the independence and status of mankind raised to a higher level, with more respect for the flag.

There was a time when to be a Roman citizen was to be a king, but not so for Americans in these degenerate times.

The absolute power to quickly and most effectually wind up the Standard Oil Trust rests in your hands, except by command of the President, and the question of the hour is, Will you or will you not observe the mandate of Congress and of the Supreme Court?

Respectfully, yours,

GEO. RICE.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., March 14, 1899.

GEORGE RICE, Esq.,
Marietta, Ohio.

SIR: In your communication of November 5, 1898, after stating that you were engaged in the oil producing and refining business in Ohio, you requested the institution of proceedings by the United States against what you termed the Standard Oil Trust, to restrain further violations of the act of July 2, 1890, known as the anti-trust law.

On November 15, 1898, replying to your letter, I called your attention to the fact that the act of July 2, 1890, to whose provisions you appealed for protection, has reference only to that trade or commerce which exists, or may exist, among the several States or with foreign nations; and that it did not appear from your communication that either your own business or that of the alleged combination against which you complained, is of an interstate character such as to give the courts of the United States jurisdiction under the statute mentioned.

Your communications of January 10 and February 16, 1899, which assume to state the facts warranting a compliance with your original request, were duly received and are having proper consideration.

Respectfully,

JOHN W. GRIGGS,
Attorney-General.

MARIETTA, OHIO, *April 17, 1899.*

Hon. JOHN W. GRIGGS,
Attorney-General, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Yours of March 14 has come to hand, after two months of a delay, in answer to my communication of January 10, while another month has elapsed, making three months, while a total of five months' time has already been consumed since November 5, when I first entered complaint to your department against the Standard Oil Trust for gross violations of the Federal antitrust act of July, 1890, which violations have been continuous, unwarranted, and unchecked by your department for a period of almost nine years, through the extreme neglect of its chief officials to prosecute the violators thereof, as particularly and specifically set forth and required to do under section 4 of said act.

It seems to be that the Congress of the United States has delegated to you, and to you alone, its supreme power in the execution of said act, in its fullness and entirety, without fear or favor. There is nothing intricate in this case; it is about as plain and transparent as daylight, because of the briefness, simplicity, and directness of the statute. An ordinary layman can easily understand and digest it, and with the abundant proof in your hands further delay in the consideration of so plain a case is inexcusable and entirely unnecessary, and you can rest assured that the people will hold you and the Administration responsible for nonaction thereon.

Time is fast slipping by to take advantage of the usual meeting of courts and grand juries in the winter and early spring months, while summer vacation is near by, with additional unnecessary delay which should not be incurred and ought to be avoided so far as may be, and the offenders soon brought to book and summarily dealt with as the law directs.

I am ready to appear at any time before grand juries to substantiate the charges I have made.

My several communications have been treated lightly and with indifference, after I have taken great pains to formulate and transmit to you a plain and voluminous statement of facts, unquestioned and unanswered as to their accuracy and truthfulness, and which can not successfully be gainsaid, and yet no valid reason or excuse is given why general prosecution and summary measures should not ere this have been meted out to these offenders, and thus check this gigantic monster and unlawful trust in its mad career to levy its tribute exactions on an unwilling, persecuted, and exasperated people.

The Parliament of Great Britain undertook to put a tax of a penny a box on friction matches, which would have increased the revenue about half a million. The people of England revolted to such an extent that the Government dare not press it. The match was needed to light the petroleum lamp. What would be said in Great Britain if their Government would allow an unlawful trust and combination like the Standard Oil trust, through railroad conspiracy to dictate the tariff rate on petroleum, whereby they are enabled to lay a tribute of 333 per cent on the means of lighting both the poor man's house and the rich man's palace in England, and this I proved before the Interstate Commerce Commission as against my own shipments, and recently 110 per cent rebate or freight discrimination was accidently discovered in favor of this trust on the New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Company, which, of course, increases the price of petroleum consumption to this extent, and is manifestly in "restraint of trade."

Under the Government of Great Britain such exposures would not be borne, not an hour after it was known, and shall it be said that under the Government of the United States similar protection can not be had for its own citizens?

Shall it have to be said that the Standard Oil trust is stronger than the Government, in defiance of all laws; that under a republican form of government, where the people are represented in making the laws, such a monopoly shall obtain by which these men are allowed to continue their gross and criminal depredations upon the internal and foreign commerce of a great nation, wrecking and destroying millions upon millions of private industrial interests, making such fortunes as were never dreamed of since the days of the plundering of the world by the proconsuls of Rome?

The question of the hour is how soon will this most important matter for the public welfare reach a focus, and when will you direct your subordinates, the several district attorneys, 76 in number, to proceed to use the most drastic and extreme measures, as especially provided for in the act, to rid this country of the greatest monopoly and criminal trust that the world knows of in "restraint of trade?" Its agencies, both public and private, extend to, and reach every town and city in the land.

Respectfully, yours,

GEO. RICE.

MARIETTA, OHIO, *April 24, 1899.*

Hon. JOHN W. GRIGGS,
Attorney-General, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I again call your attention to the fact that five and a half months have elapsed since I entered complaint to your department against the unlawful monopoly of the Standard Oil trust, for the grossest of the gross violations of the Federal antitrust act, and yet I am not aware or advised that action has been taken thereon. I then stated that "I can furnish you abundant proof to verify and sustain my charge that to-day it is the greatest monopoly and industrial trust, in restraint of trade, that the world has known."

I have duly furnished you that abundant proof, on which you have not seen fit to take action, and in the expectation that further delay will occur I will transmit to you from time to time additional facts that may arise in my mind, showing more in detail the unlawfulness of this giant trust and monopoly.

In February, 1898, a high Standard official swore that this trust was composed of twenty corporations, with an aggregate capitalization of $102,233,700, which at the market price this day of 490 on par of 100 represents a valuation of $500,945,130, of which its pipe-line companies, seven in number, represent a capitalization of $52,455,200, more than half, and at 490 amounts to a valuation of $257,030,480, which does an interstate and international business of great magnitude by gathering up vast quantities of crude petroleum in the several oil-producing States of the Union and transporting same through trunk lines of pipe to the seaboard, where it is manufactured, two-thirds going abroad in the bulk tank steamers of the trust, while a small portion is consumed in the East.

In February last (Ohio investigation) I testified that the total expense to this trust of gathering up crude petroleum by local pipes in the oil-producing regions, inclusive of interest on the investment, did not cost to exceed five cents a barrel, and admitted by the trust because not cross-examined thereon, while the regular established charge is twenty cents a barrel, or four times as much, which charge could not be exacted and enforced, except through the extraordinary power of this monopoly to compel obedience to its dictation.

The average annual production of petroleum for the past two years, 1897-98, was 51,312,183 barrels, and at 10 cents a barrel the trust would make 100 per cent profit, which even at this figure is 50 per cent too much, but based on 10 cents a barrel, and 10 cents a barrel overcharge, the producers of petroleum are robbed out of their just dues to the extent of more than $5,000,000 per annum, and the consumer pays that much more for his oil, which is a monopoly "in restraint of trade."

At the same hearing, I testified that the total cost to pipe oil from the oil regions to the seaboard, through trunk lines of pipe, did not cost to exceed five cents a barrel, because of larger pumps and larger pipes, and much greater quantities transported through single pipes, with virtually same manual help, and my testimony, under cross-examination, was unshaken upon this point by the trust's counsel.

The present tariff rail rates on petroleum and its products from general points in the oil producing and manufacturing centers of the oil regions to the seaboard, New York, is 16½ cents per 100 pounds, and present pipeage rates are exactly the same, through a most foul, concerted conspiracy agreement between the railroads and the Standard Oil trust to maintain an equality of rates, 450 per cent greater than they should be, as subsequently shown.

To-day it costs the independent refiner 66 cents a barrel to transport a barrel of oil, 50 gallons in wooden packages of 400 pounds, no other means provided for him, from the oil regions to the seaboard, and a pro rata rate on a barrel of crude 42 gallons would cost 55 cents a barrel or eleven times more than it costs to pipe it. The pipe line charge should not be to exceed 10 cents a barrel, which would be a hundred per cent. profit, and with 45 cents a barrel overcharge is an excess of 450 per cent. unlawful pipe and rail freight discrimination, because of this unlawful, conspired monopoly. Two-thirds of total production is sent to the seaboard, or 34,208,122 barrels, average past two years, and at 45 cents a barrel overcharge amounts to the sum of $15,393,654 annually, interstate public highway robbery and steal, in the transportation of petroleum through the connivance and conspiracy of rail and trust officials, who are in command of our railways, and of this trust, who have acquired their great monopoly power by unlawful means, and exercise it to the extreme to capture and sequestrate unto themselves this great industry, which evidently is in gross violation of the Federal antitrust act and a huge monopoly "in restraint of trade."

The average annual production past two years of Lima oil, second-grade crude, and which sells at about one-third less than best grade, was 18,399,661 barrels, and it is supposed that at least one-half of this amount, or 9,199,830 barrels, is piped from the Lima oil fields to the trust's refineries located at Whiting, Ind., suburb of Chicago, on the lake. The rail rate is 10 cents per 100 pounds, or 40 cents a barrel, on 400 pounds, or at the rate of 33⅓ cents per barrel of 42 gallons of crude, and allowing 5 cents a barrel for pipage leaves 28⅓ cents per barrel overcharge, amounting to the sum of $2,631,151, and which is also a monopoly "in restraint of trade."

The Standard Oil trust, because of their unlawful monopoly, exacts and robs the producer out of 2 barrels of oil on each hundred, from actual measured quantity in the producers' tank, on the flimsy plea and pretext that at some future time said oil will shrink that much. The average annual production of petroleum for past two years, 1897-98, being 51,312,183 barrels, this deduction amounts to 1,026,243 barrels of oil on white sand and Trenton rock production, and at the average market price for both kinds of crude past two years, 73¾ cents per barrel of 42 gallons, or 1¾ cents per gallon, amounts to the sum of $756,845 that is annually robbed from the producer because unable to prevent it, and which is "in restraint of trade."

This makes a total sum of $23,781,650 that is filched from an unwilling people in higher-priced oils, because our Government officials are supine, do not execute the act as required, are responsible therefor, and yet let these marauders continue and extend their scope of action, to exact their unlawful gains from off an oppressed and downtrodden race; and oh, ye gods and goddesses, how much longer will the people stand such dereliction of official duty!

In this connection it might be well to state as an eye opener and for a sample, the enormous unlawful profits and the acquisition of untold wealth as represented

by the trust's business of last two years, 1897-98. As shown above, the average cost of the crude was 1¼ cents per gallon, pipage from wells to refineries one-fourth of a cent, and the trust can refine it for one-fourth of a cent a gallon, making a total of 2½ cents per gallon total cost in its manufactured state for all grades of refined, including those sold at extreme prices under fancy-brand names, so that the consumer can easily figure what the enormous percentage of profit this trust makes.

In continuation of the monopolistic powers exercised by this trust, it is common report in the oil regions, and is true, that they absolutely regulate the production of petroleum by the price they set on the crude through ownership of 95 per cent of the pipe lines and purchase of 95 per cent of all the crude oil produced. When they need more production, they commence gradually to raise the price, until their necessary wants are supplied, which is evidenced by the stability of net stocks of petroleum on hand, there being only 752,101 barrels of an increase, January 1, 1899, over January 1, 1898, and 1,239,069 barrels of an increase, January 1, 1898, over January 1, 1897. When their wants are oversupplied, then they commence to reduce the price of crude, but not on refined for home consumption, unless some radical emergency should arise, thus widening the differences between crude and refined, and thus largely increasing their unlawful profits through the power and force of monopoly, which is "in restraint of trade."

This trust has already entered into the monopoly and subsidization of the editorial columns of the newspapers of the country, and pay high prices for leading laudatory articles, written by trust agents, as recently exposed in the Ohio State investigations. This is quite praiseworthy for an association of such wealth and power to resort to such despicable means to influence public opinion in their favor.

I am anxiously awaiting your action upon the complaints produced, and hope same will not further be delayed on so grave and important a matter as this is.

Respectfully, yours,

GEO. RICE.

MARIETTA, OHIO, *May 1, 1899.*

Hon. JOHN W. GRIGGS,
Attorney-General, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I again call your attention to the fact that six months, less five days, have elapsed since I entered complaint to your Department for enforcement of the law against the unlawful existence of the Standard Oil trust, as a trust monopoly of the first magnitude "in restraint of trade," for the grossest of the gross and criminal violations of the Federal antitrust act, a continuation thereof for almost nine years, and yet I am not aware or advised that action has been taken thereon.

The question of the hour is how much longer the public will stand this oppression and these tyrannical exactions under a supposed free and enlightened government, which does not use its force and power to summarily stop these lawless freebooters from overriding the law and the land, but condescends to allow them to go on, continue in their mad career to dictate prices at their own sweet will to both producer and consumer, crush and destroy all competitive interests that may stand in their pathway, in the acquisition of sordid wealth, mainly acquired through collusion and conspiracy with the railroads, of which the officials of this trust have become copartners, large owners in their stock and bonds, through unlawful rebates, freight discriminations, and to-day are presidents and directors in one-fifth of the total railway mileage of this country, and last month came into the absolute possession of that great system of rail lines, the Baltimore and Ohio, all acquired and obtained in the brief space of twenty-seven years, Rothchilds eclipsed, a sad commentary on the decay and fall of Republican institutions.

There is no better illustration of recent date as to this collusion and conspiracy, and the monopoly power exercised by this trust over railroads is in the greatest combination and railway pool ever organized in the United States, the "Joint Traffic Association," by which this association excepted petroleum from the rate-making control of the board of managers, "to be subject to special contract," which undoubtedly means rebate or freight discriminations, which was subsequently carried out to the extent of 110 per cent, and which are as prevalent and potent to-day as ever, if not more so, and no doubt present organization of trust combinations are engineered and largely based upon this, the all-absorbing element and safety to investors, by which competitors and competition will be shut out and have no show. William H. Vanderbilt was a natural-born prophet when he prophesied in his testimony before the Hepburn committee August 27, 1879, regarding Standard officials:

Q. "You were disgusted with them a long while ago?

A. "I was, because I said if the thing kept on the oil people would own the roads instead of the roads owning them."

Apropos to this, in the first three years' operation of the interstate commerce act, the railroads criminally allowed to the Standard Oil trust, and to no one else, a new and specious kind of a rebate, the deduction from actual measured quantity and weight, 62 gallons of oil from off each tank car, or the carriage of 1¼ per cent of their by-products free. The officials of the rail lines never reported these villainous acts to the commission, as the law required, and only were they accidentally revealed through other investigations.

After paying enormous dividends of more than $30,000,000 per annum, its surplus, to a partial extent, many millions per annum, is used in the purchase and control of petroleum production of this country, about one-half now acquired, while press reports show them to be back of and behind many of the recent industrial trust combinations now being floated, iron, steel, copper, zinc, smelters, etc., for their money means seem to be unlimited.

This trust monopoly combination power of the Standard Oil trust is "in restraint of trade" for the reason that "it suppresses competition and arbitrarily fixes prices," as following show:

It enforces upon consumers of petroleum the inferior products, a poor quality of oil, made from low-grade crude, which are sold separately and mixed at the same price as products from best-grade crude, also in the sale of undertest oils, and in short measure.

There is no competition in the sale of vast quantities of lubricating oils used by the railroads; the trust gets it all at "arbitrarily fixed prices" most extraordinary, of which noncompetition bars quality.

In present contest before the English Parliament to increase the flash test of petroleum to a safety point, the London Star has this to say:

"The feast is illuminated by the lurid glare of the deadly low-flash oil of the Standard Oil trust. When the lamp hursts and death presides at the table, there is the coffin trust to bury its victims."

Justice Harlan, in his dissent from the opinion of the Supreme Court in the sugar trust case, which case differs widely from the facts presented by me in the matter of the Standard Oil trust, presents the matter forcibly when he says:

"We have before us the case of a combination which absolutely controls, or may, at its discretion, control, the price of all the refined sugar in this country. Suppose another combination, organized for private gain and to control prices, should obtain possession of all the large flour mills in the United States; another of all the grain elevators; another of all the oil territory; another of all the salt-producing regions; another of all the cotton mills, and another of all the great establishments for slaughtering animals and the preparation of meats. What power is competent to protect the people of the United States against such dangers except a national power—one that is capable of exerting its sovereign authority throughout every part of the territory and over all the people of the nation."

What his imagination pictured as possible in the line of monopoly has been more than surpassed during the brief period which has elapsed since he penned his vigorous protest.

The query is, what avail is a national power with its sovereign authority, if its officials fail to execute the law, allow such unlawful combinations to exist and continue, while many more are daily formed. The greatest commercial evil of the day is in the monopoly power of present formation of trust combinations through quantity carried that enables trust officials to criminally conspire and collude with rail officials to control absolutely and most effectually the arteries of commerce through high tariff and compulsory dictatorial freight rates that greater rebates may follow, of which the consumer pays the additional burden. A prominent promoter of trust combinations has just informed me that they only want to secure about three-fourths of an industry, which is significant, because it allows the plausible assertion of free and open competition, while the covert design by these cormorants is to gradually absorb and confiscate the balance of the competitive interests who would not go into the combination or could not sell their properties at actual worth, and subsequently ascertained their fatal mistake and now are obliged to succumb to the inevitable and freeze-out process, take what they can get under this modern and piratical method of unlawful warfare, of which conspiracy, bribery, and corruption are the dominant features.

As an American citizen whose business has been ruined by the trust monopoly power of the Standard Oil trust "in restraint of trade," and who has produced to you voluminous and incontrovertible facts to sustain the charge, I desire to know when summary proceedings will be commenced to oust this trust from further doing business in the United States of America. You have the full and exclusive power of the Government at your command to easily and quickly carry this ouster into effect, the act makes it imperative on you so to do, and the vital question of the hour is, How soon will this be carried into effect; and if not, why not? I await your reply.

Respectfully, yours,

GEO. RICE.

ASTOR HOUSE, NEW YORK, *May 5, 1899.*

President WM. MCKINLEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Being the Chief Executive of the nation, the President of the United States of America, elected by the people to safeguard the public interests, I appeal to you as one of its native born for justice and equality of rights to which I am entitled to as a freeborn American citizen. I enter my protest, and this a secondary complaint, to whom it should not have been necessary for me to have appealed, but force of circumstances compel me to do it, and so I call your attention to certain complaints and facts that warrant me in so doing. Six months ago I made general complaint to the Department of Justice, followed by several more detailed complaints of the unlawful existence of that well-known trust monopoly combination, the Standard Oil trust, that I was an acute sufferer thereby, my business being ruined, my refinery shut down for the past three years owing to the machinations of this unlawful trust monopoly and its collusive conspiracy with the rail lines to destroy my business, which it has done.

I refer you to the voluminous and incontrovertible facts that I have presented to the Attorney-General, fully and completely substantiating my charges that this unlawful trust combination is the greatest monopoly "in restraint of trade" that the world has known, which restraint has been continuous for almost nine years, in gross violation of the Federal antitrust act of July 2, 1890, and yet at this late day of my complaint I am not aware or advised that action has been taken thereon, and this is the reason that I appeal to you, and call your attention thereto, that further delay or leniency should not be allowed, that summary action long ere this should have been taken by the Government to rid this country of the baneful effects of this trust. I can not possibly conceive how the acquisition of such fabulous unlawful wealth should stand as a bar to the equality of rights and justice for one and all, without fear or favor, but if so, our Republican institutions are a failure.

In your inaugural address you uttered these memorable words:

"The declaration of the party now restored to power has been in the past that of opposition to all combinations of capital organized in trusts, or otherwise, to control arbitrarily the conditions of trade among our citizens."

I await your answer.

Respectfully, yours,

GEO. RICE.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, May 6, 1899.

DEAR SIR: The President directs me to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of recent date, and to inform you that it has been referred for the consideration of the Attorney-General.

Very truly, yours,

J. A. PORTER,
Secretary to the President.

Mr. GEO. RICE,
Marietta, Ohio.

MARIETTA, OHIO, *May 15, 1899.*

Hon. JOHN W. GRIGGS,
Attorney-General, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I again remind you of the fact that more than six months have passed since I entered general complaint to your Department, including several subsequent additional detailed complaints for the enforcement of the law against the unlawful existence of the well-known and well-defined trust monopoly combination—the Standard Oil trust—and yet at this late date I am not aware or advised that action has yet been taken to rid this country of its baneful effects, which can easily and quickly be done if summary measures are used, as specially provided for in the Federal anti-trust act. Shall it have to be said that the act has become nugatory simply because of its nonenforcement after these nine long years of gross evasions? Is the Government going to allow these offenders to continue their lawlessness indefinitely without check or limit? Are the people to suffer, deprived of relief, because their delegated Government official refuses to execute the law and relieve the country of this incubus? I ask from you the prompt enforcement of the act because my complaints to you are based on solid facts, unquestioned and unanswered, incontrovertible, and the question of the hour is, Will you enforce the law in this particular case as well as others; and if not, why not?

Respectfully, yours,

GEO. RICE.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 31, 1899.*

Hon. JOHN W. GRIGGS,
Attorney-General.

SIR: Mr. George Rice, of Marietta, Ohio, has sent to me the correspondence which he has had with the Department of Justice in regard to the requested enforcement against the Standard Oil trust of the act of Congress approved July 2, 1890, entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies."

The correspondence submitted to me consists of his letter of November 5, 1898, and the reply thereto under date of November 15, 1898, by Acting Attorney-

General Richards, No. 8247, 1898, S. G., also his letter of January 10, 1899; also his letter and supplemental letter of February 16, 1899; your reply of March 14, 1899; also his letters of April 17, April 24, May 1, and May 15, 1899, to which no reply has as yet been received, and also his letter to the President under date of May 5 instant, and the letter of the President to him under date of May 6, to the effect that that letter had been referred to your office for consideration.

In the letter of the Solicitor-General, under date of November 15, it was stated that it does not appear from the communication of Mr. Rice under date of November 5, 1898, that either his own business or that of the alleged combination against which he complained, was of an interstate character; in your communication of March 14 you repeat his suggestion, and so far as I can gather from the correspondence, no other objection seems to be raised by the Department to the prosecution of the complaint of Mr. Rice against what is generally known and universally believed to be an illegal combination engaged in open and audacious violations of the antitrust law in every district in the United States and in restraint of trade and commerce among the several States. This, as I say, is a matter of common knowledge, and so universally iterated and reiterated in the public press, that it has become a "matter of astonishment and concern" that the law officers of the Government have not already, of their own motion, made persistent inquiry into the facts and already demonstrated that the law would reach the injuries to trade and commerce perpetrated by this combination, which has been formed under a mutual contract organizing a successful conspiracy, or that the law is unable to reach and apply the remedy which was intended by the legislature.

I call your attention to the reports of the debates in Congress and the reports of Congressional committees, from which it appears that the aim of the legislation was to suppress such monopolies and the consequent injuries to trade, which had theretofore been practiced by the Standard Oil trust, and which had been practiced with an increased vigor since the law went into effect by that trust.

I may be permitted to suggest that even assuming that the law in question has not sufficient vitality to reach the injury here complained of, it would seem to be the duty of the law officers of the Government to show by judicial decision that Congress had failed in its attempt to legislate properly upon this subject, because so long as this statute remains upon the books, without adverse adjudication, another and plenary statute can not be passed.

But in view of the decisions of the Supreme Court, particularly in the cases of the Trans-Missouri and Joint Traffic associations, it can hardly be claimed that the law lacks the necessary vitality.

Heretofore I have discussed this question solely with reference to what I have esteemed to be the duty of the law officers of the Government to do of their own motion, but if I am wrong in this, with a view to secure prompt action, my client is prepared to prove:

1. That the Standard Oil trust exists under a contract, combining a very large percentage of all the oil producers and refiners in the United States; this contract has become a part of court record and is easily obtainable by the Department; it is all that it has so often been stated to be, a contract to control prices, annihilate rivals, and a mutual division of profits.

2. Said trust has been formed and is engaged in an injurious restraint of interstate trade; and proof can readily be obtained in regard to the control of the transportation of oil from the oil-producing regions to the seaboard, and I specify this one situation, although it is but one instance and by no means the most important one, showing the participation of this trust in interstate commerce; one of the contracting parties in the combination is the corporation known as "The Tide Water Pipe and Oil Company," another is "The Crescent Pipe Line and Oil Company" (which merged into the trust about four years since); another is "The Standard Pipe Line Company," also in the trust, and these three corporations are engaged in the interstate transportation of oil from Ohio, West Virginia, and other States, through the intervening States to the Eastern seaboard.

3. The Standard Oil trust, by its successful conspiracy, controls in the public market not only the prices of the crude oil, but also the prices of petroleum products. Under this charge I specify a fact which has come within my own personal knowledge—that recently the said trust has arbitrarily and successfully doubled the price of naphtha in the public market. To-day the price of naphtha is more than 100 per cent greater than it was on the 1st of January last, and this increase of price is due entirely to the manipulation of the Standard Oil trust. Under the recent letting in the city of Washington for the lighting of about 1,300 naphtha street lamps the increased cost to the city, on account of the raising of price, as above stated, amounts to more than $5,000 per annum, and I am credibly informed that under a recent letting in Chicago the increased cost in that line of business exceeds $15,000.

4. It is demonstrable from the records of the Interstate Commerce Commission that this gigantic monopoly has such a far-reaching power that it is able to effect discriminatory freight rates upon its interstate shipments.

I do not wish to be understood in making these specific charges, and offering proof thereof, that there are not other and more flagrant violations of the law, or other and more pertinent facts as to the matters and things necessary to bring this monopoly within the purview of the statute.

It is now several months since my client called the attention of the Department to his just cause of complaint, which you state, on March 14 last, was "having proper consideration." I assume, therefore, that it will not be long before a definitive answer will be returned, and I may be pardoned to suggest that the President considered the matter of the enforcement of the antitrust law to be of such paramount importance as to induce him to make a pledge for his Administration in regard to that enforcement at the time of his inauguration. This trust is the most harmful of all. I have the honor to be, very respectfully,

Your obedient servant,

A. G. SAFFORD,
Attorney for Geo. Rice.

1416 F STREET NW.,
Washington, D. C., June 19, 1899.

Hon. JOHN W. GRIGGS,
Attorney-General.

DEAR SIR: On the 31st of May last, I addressed you a letter with reference to the complaint of George Rice against the Standard Oil trust, to which I have received no reply. I will be pleased to know whether the letter was received and whether an answer, with reference to the contents of the letter, may be expected in the near future.

Yours, very truly,

A. G. SAFFORD, *Attorney.*

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., June 20, 1899.

A. G. SAFFORD, Esq.,
1416 F street NW., Washington, D. C.

SIR: Your letter of May 31 was duly received. The matter referred to has been heretofore in the charge of Solicitor-General Richards, who has had general charge of violations of the Sherman Act for this Department. Mr. Richards is at the present time out of the country, and I have not been able either to refer the matter to him or to confer with him relative to the subject, which, as you must be aware, is one requiring careful investigation and consideration.

Very respectfully,

JOHN W. GRIGGS, *Attorney-General.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 20, 1899.*

Hon. JOHN W. GRIGGS,
Attorney-General, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Referring to your favor of the 20th of June last, I have to say that the complaint of Mr. Rice has been before the Solicitor-General, Mr. Richards, since November 5, 1898.

I concede the importance of the questions involved and their demand for a careful investigation, but insist that the fact of their importance demands a prompt as well as a thorough investigation, and a proper consideration requires something other than an indefinite postponement.

I am constantly being requested by Mr. Rice to urge your office to take appropriate action, and I desire to know when I can assure him that its consideration will be entered upon and whether you desire any data from him.

Yours, very truly,

A. G. SAFFORD, *Attorney.*

I AM FIRMLY CONVINCED THAT IF THE QUESTION WERE SUBMITTED TO THEM ON A REASONABLY CLEAR ISSUE AN OVERWHELMING MAJORITY OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE WOULD SHOW THEMSELVES EAGER TO DEMONSTRATE THEIR MORAL SOUNDNESS BY WASHING THEIR HANDS OF THIS BLOODY INIQUITY, AND BY THUS MAKING IT MANIFEST TO ALL THE WORLD THAT THEY ARE AN HONEST AND A JUST PEOPLE, AND THAT THE REPUBLIC OF WASHINGTON AND LINCOLN STILL LIVES.

[Speech of Hon. Carl Schurz in Cooper Institute, May 24, 1900, as reported in New York Evening Post.]

I have long been, and am now, firmly convinced that if the facts and tendencies of the imperialistic policy carried on by our Government were well inquired into and fully understood by the American people, and then submitted to a popular vote on their own merits for approval, that policy would be indignantly spurned by the intelligence as well as the moral sense of an overwhelming majority of our citizenship. Its defenders, well aware of this, therefore make a special effort to mislead that intelligence and moral sense by the pretense that their opponents, the anti-imperialists, pusillanimously refuse to meet the responsibilities devolved upon us by the late Spanish war, and that those responsibilities can be discharged only by a virtual continuance of the present policy.

This I emphatically deny. Let us see what our true responsibilities are, and how they should be met. To this end we must first remember what has happened. In April, 1898, we went to war with Spain for the sole purpose, as Congress proclaimed to the world by a solemn resolution, of rescuing from oppressive misrule a population struggling for freedom and independence. Congress not only positively disclaimed any intention to annex to this Republic the territory inhabited by that population, but declared that the people of Cuba "are, and of right ought to be, free and independent"—in other words, that Spain, by her oppressive misrule, had not only morally but actually forfeited her sovereignty over that country. This was the affirmation of a principle.

Then came Dewey's victory in Manila Bay. The case of the Philippine Islands was in all essential respects identical with that of Cuba. Their people had also been struggling against Spanish oppression, like the Cubans, and if the Cubans, according to the declaration of Congress, "were, and of right ought to be, free and independent," so surely were the Philippine Islanders; and if Spain had, according to our proclaimed doctrine, morally and actually forfeited her sovereignty over Cuba, so she had forfeited her sovereignty over the Philippines.

But the claim of the Philippine Islanders as to their independence was in fact even much stronger than that of the Cubans. Dewey invited and brought the chief leader of the Philippine insurgents to the scene of action. With Dewey's aid and under his eyes that chief organized a Filipino army of 30,000 men; he proclaimed the Philippine republic, hoisted the flag of that republic on his armed vessels, and set up a civil government which, according to the imperialist Barrett's testimony, compared in some of its important parts favorably with that of Japan.

The Filipino army then, while our land forces were gradually arriving, quickly cleared the interior of the country of the Spaniards, taking many thousands of them prisoners, and so hemmed in on the land side the Spanish garrison of Manila that it could neither receive reenforcements nor escape into the interior. In other words, the Filipinos acted most efficiently as our allies, crippling the Spanish power as we could not have crippled it with our force then at hand; and they were practically recognized as our allies, even to the extent of having turned over to them Spanish prisoners taken in a common enterprise.

And while so profiting from their action as our allies, we—I do not say officially promised them their independence—but we did what morally amounted to the same thing; we permitted them to believe that in fighting on the same side with us they were fighting for their own independence; we permitted them to believe this until we had troops enough on the field to make us masters of the situation.

What happened then? We took Manila, summoning the Spanish commander to surrender on the very ground, among others, that he was hemmed in on the land side by the Filipinos. And then we proceeded to conclude a peace treaty with Spain. That treaty was to decide the fate of the Philippine Islanders. The Filipinos, our allies, whom we had permitted to believe that they were fighting for their independence, asked to be heard.

We slammed the door in their faces. And behind their backs we extorted or bought, as you like, from Spain, the common enemy, the sovereignty over our allies—the same sovereignty which, in the Cuba precedent, we had affirmed to have been forfeited by Spain and rightfully to belong to the people of the country. And now we recognize that sovereignty, as still possessed by Spain, the common enemy, although we knew that Spain could not deliver any part of it, having not only morally but actually lost it; and we performed this amazing act of treacherous self-stultification in order to make our late allies our subjects because we coveted their land.

Thus we deliberately turned our loudly vaunted war of liberation and humanity into a shameless war of conquest, which, to adopt President McKinley's own phrase, was in the extreme sense an act of "criminal aggression"—for there was no element of criminality lacking. We did not stop with the diplomatic betrayal. Weeks before that treaty with Spain acquired any color of legal force by the assent of the Senate President McKinley issued an order to our Army—the notorious "benevolent-assimilation order"—assuming that our sovereignty over the Philippines did actually exist, and directing the Army to enforce it all over the archipelago—as flagrant a usurpation of power as was ever committed.

That order was of so inflammatory a character, so clear a declaration of war against the Filipinos demanding freedom and independence, that General Otis, foreseeing with alarm the consequences it would bring on, tried to suppress it. But through a subordinate it became known to the Filipinos, and they understood it as it was—a declaration of war against them. Then the conflict wantonly provoked by the President's order came. We destroyed by force the government the Filipinos had set up—a very respectable government, as all competent witnesses testify—a far better government than the insurgent Cubans ever had.

We carried death and desolation into the towns and villages of our late allies. We killed many, many thousands of them, and still go on killing them at the rate of 1,000 to 1,500 a month for no other reason than that, as we call it, they refuse to submit to our sovereignty; but as it may in truth be called, for no other reason than that our former allies object to being sold and bought like a herd of cattle, and that they still demand that liberty and independence to which, by the principle we ourselves had affirmed in the case of Cuba, they are rightfully entitled.

Some time ago in a public speech I challenged the defenders of our Administration to point out in the whole history of the world a single act of perfidy ever committed by any republican government more infamous than that which has thus been committed by our Government against our Filipino allies. That challenge has remained unanswered to this day. I now renew it. I call upon them all—from the highest to the lowest—members of the Cabinet, and Senators and Representatives who tell us that the honor and best interests of the country demand us to approve and sustain such things; and the bishops to whom the moral aspects of the case should be of some consequence; and the laymen who listen to them—I call upon them all to show me in all the annals of mankind a similar instance of more knavish treachery. Let them answer me if they can. And then let them tell me what the responsibilities are growing from such conduct.

Is there any doubt about the facts? They are history. There has indeed been some quibbling as to whether the Filipinos were really our allies. That the Government did not give them the title of allies is true enough. But did we not use their services as those of allies so long as their services were of any advantage to us? Did we not practically treat them as allies during that time, even to the extent of recognizing them as entitled to the charge of prisoners taken from the common enemy by the aid of our arms? And did not our using them as our allies, and our profiting by their services as our allies, impose upon us the moral obligation to respect them as our allies? An unscrupulous pettifogger may dispute that, but a man of honor will not. Let the imperialists answer.

There has also been some quibbling as to our having promised them independence. That we did not in formal official declaration promise them independence is true enough. But did we not, while we were using them as allies, and profiting from their service as allies, know that they believed they were fighting for their own independence, and that they would not have fought on the same side with us against the common enemy if they had believed otherwise? And did we ever during that period honestly tell them that they were mistaken? And as we did not tell them this while using them as allies, was not that morally as good and binding a promise as if it had been written down, signed, sealed, and delivered? Again, an unscrupulous pettifogger may quibble about this, but an honest man, a gentleman, will not. Let the imperialists answer.

What, then, is our responsibility growing out of this state of facts? I may be told that this is an extreme and unpractical view of the case; that we must deal with things as they are; that we have got the Philippines now; that the only thing to be considered now is what to do with them; and that all that preceded our getting them is a mere "academic question," useless to discuss. An academic question, indeed! It may be a very inconvenient question to the imperialists, but that does not make it merely academic. It must be discussed to exhibit the moral aspect of the case. Let us look at it. In the first place, we have not got the Philippines yet. We are still fighting and killing people, our late allies, to get control of them. All we have got is, as I have shown, not a moral and rightful, but merely a technical title—such a title as an unscrupulous corporation wrecker may, by legal quirks and technicalities and treachery and force get to the property of the stockholders.

But suppose we had won actual possession of the Philippines. Would that alter the moral nature of the question? If we have them we are, in view of the way we got them, in possession of stolen goods—goods obtained by fraud, treachery, and brutal force. We know the goods are stolen goods, for we have stolen them ourselves. When we remind the imperialists of that fact, the answer is substantially this: "Spare us the useless discussion of that academic question. Suppose the goods are stolen. Then the possession of those goods devolves upon us new responsibilities which in the first place require us to keep the stolen goods."

Is this really the first demand of the new responsibility of the great American Republic? I have always believed that the Republic of Washington and Lincoln should and would always recognize it as the first and highest responsibility to give to the world an example of good faith and perfect justice in the recognition of the rights of others, be they ever so humble.

Unless I am altogether wrong in this belief, our true responsibilities in the case of the Philippines demands not that we regard it as a mere academic question how we got them, or that we should keep the stolen goods under the sanctimonious pretense of benevolent purposes, but that, as an honest and righteous people, we should restore them to their rightful owners, and to secure, so far as it is in our power, those owners in the possession of them.

A most startling attempt to justify the retention of the Philippines and the subjugation of their inhabitants has recently been made by Bishop Potter, when he said in a public speech on this matter: "If my son should come to me and say he proposed to marry a young Creole woman with seven children, I would call him a great ass. But if he had come to me and said he had already contracted such a marriage, I should still try to maintain intimate relations with him. What we have done in the Philippines has established just such a relation as that, and it would be a source of national mortification if we gave up our responsibilities because we find them difficult."

With due respect, be it said, no illustration would be more unhappy. It might fit if the creole woman with her seven children had run after our son entreating him to marry her, or if she had at least willingly consented to his proposal of marriage. But what is the truth? The poor woman is desperately struggling against our son's treacherous embrace, and our son is busy discharging his "responsibility" to the children by killing them at a rapid rate because they resist the shameful subjugation of their mother.

Not very long ago the bishop, keenly appreciating the moral and political tendencies of our imperialistic policy, told his flock that the main question was not what we would do with the "fruits of our victories," but rather what they would do with us. One of the first things they have already done with us, it seems, is so to benumb our moral sense and to confuse our moral principles as to make us capable of cheating our own consciences by putting aside the question of right or wrong in what we have done as a mere "academic question" no longer to be discussed, because it is done, and of readily accepting that which exists, however wrongful, degrading, and dangerous, simply because it exists.

I would humbly suggest that this is a rather serious thing for teachers of religion and morality to contemplate. They might earnestly consider whether, when we have done wrong, it is not our Christian duty to right the wrong to the utmost of our power; that this is inexorably demanded by our first responsibility as a nation, and that it would, in the bishop's words, indeed, be a "source of national mortification if we gave up that responsibility because we find it difficult." And this responsibility the imperialists have either not the will or not the courage to meet face to face.

How is that responsibility to be met? No sensible man can doubt that we should have had no war with the Filipinos, just as we have had no war with the Cubans, if we had, after defeating the Spaniards, simply applied to the Philippine Islands the same principles which we have applied to Cuba—that is, if we had frankly and sincerely at the start recognized the Philippine Islanders as entitled to their freedom and independence, and then gone about in good faith to aid them in setting up an independent government, and let the world know that we would not permit any other power to interfere with them, which would have been quite sufficient for their protection.

Nor will any sensible person doubt that if we, even to-day, after all that has happened, proclaimed it to be our sincere and fixed intention with regard to them to treat the Philippine Islanders on the same basis of right as that on which we have promised to treat the Cubans, the abominable slaughter would cease at once, and although much natural distrust would have to be overcome, friendly relations with the islanders could be established with substantially the same desirable results as we might have had more cheaply by honorable and statesmanlike conduct at the beginning. Who has the audacity to deny this? Is there any sound reason why this most righteous and rational policy should not be adopted?

By some it is said that the establishment of an independent government in the Philippines would at once be followed by bloody anarchy; that those people would forthwith begin to cut one another's throats, and that to prevent this we had to destroy the native government, which at the time was in a considerable portion of the country in peaceful operation, and that incidentally we had therefore to cut their throats ourselves. A more ghastly mockery than this objection can hardly be imagined. In the first place, this prediction of bloody anarchy is a mere guess, without any proof.

But even if it were well founded, will any imperialist have the hardihood to pretend that those people would in their internal broils have killed half as many, or one-tenth as many, as we have killed and are killing to subjugate them? Can we, who have been and are slaughtering them by the thousands with no end in prospect, can we presume to refuse to them independence on the ground that there may be disorders that may cost some of them their lives? Can hypocrisy be more impudent and disgusting?

It is also said that there are great difficulties in the way of their having an independent government, differences of tribes and the like, and that therefore they can not be left to govern themselves. Admiral Dewey, emphatically and repeatedly, from his knowledge of them, pronounced them far more capable of self-government than the Cubans. But if the Cubans are less capable than the Philippine Islanders, must we therefore give up our efforts to secure independent government to that island?

No doubt there are difficulties in the way; but I venture to say that at present the greatest of those difficulties is in ourselves. There are two ways to approach the solution of such a problem. One is to take the problem in hand with a sincere desire that it be solved. Then many of the difficulties which at first sight appeared most formidable will be found not to be insurmountable at all to an honest, intelligent, and persevering effort to overcome them. The other way to approach the problem is with no sincere desire to solve it, or even with the desire that it be not solved. Then difficulties are diligently looked for and magnified until they appear so great that the task of overcoming them seems hopeless.

Here is the trouble with our imperialists. Determined to make the Philippine Islanders our subjects, they find no end of reasons to show that those people can not be their own masters. Nothing would be easier than to convince anyone desiring to be so convinced that the Cubans, or the Mexicans, or the Chileans are incapable of maintaining decent independent governments, and that therefore we must rule them. Why, it might even be shown that the people of New York City, or of Philadelphia, or of Chicago, have proved themselves unable to govern themselves, and that the conduct of their municipal governments must therefore be intrusted to somebody else better fitted.

But let us once resolve with perfect good faith to aid the Philippine Islanders in constructing an independent government suitable to their conditions, and let us have men in power who are honestly determined to accomplish that end, and the difficulties will rapidly diminish. Of course, the Philippines will not have an ideal republican government. We have not, for that matter. But let us honestly try together, and they can get an independent government as good as that of Mexico, and better than those of most of the South American Republics. They would probably have such a government now had we not perfidiously drowned it in blood.

The fine pretense that we must subjugate them in order to teach and secure to them honest government is perhaps not as proudly insisted upon to-day as it was a month ago. It is not too much to say that the recent disclosures in Cuba have advertised our disgrace in that respect to the whole world more glaringly than it had ever been advertised before. Nor can we flatter ourselves with the belief that the Cuban instance is an isolated one. Some time ago General Otis issued an order against evil practices in our administration of things in the Philippines which clearly indicated that our service there was honeycombed with corruption.

Neither is this surprising. My official experience in the conduct of Indian affairs, as Secretary of the Interior, taught me some pertinent lessons. Why is it so especially difficult to prevent corrupt practices in the Indian agencies? For two reasons: First, because these officers are comparatively far removed from the observation of the Government and of the public; and secondly, because a good many of our people have very little regard for the rights and interests of so-called inferior races, and consider cheating and robbing such races as a privilege of the superior being.

To such men the Philippine Islander is only a "nigger," and the Cuban and Porto Rican but little better; and finding themselves in the transmarine dependencies, much farther away from governmental and public observation than even an Indian agent is, they will always be apt to regard these dependencies as fair fields for plundering operations. The idea that our colonial service will become a seminary of political virtue is, therefore, a highly grotesque one. Most of the rascalities practiced there we shall, on account of the distance, never know. But in all probability enough will become known to produce an incalculably mischievous effect upon the natives, and to expose this Republic to the ridicule and contempt of mankind.

It would require the strictest kind of civil-service system, covering all positions, and a most rigorous enforcement of it, to counteract such tendencies and temptations. How much of such a system we may expect from an Administration which, in spite of the solemn pledges and protestations of its party and of the President himself, has so much demoralized the system which already exists by opening all sorts of facilities in it to the invasion of spoils politics I leave you to judge.

On the whole, that pharisaical cant which was used to envelop this wicked and wanton war of "criminal aggression" against the Filipinos in the guise of humanitarian purpose has very much subsided. It could not stand against the facts in the case. The declaration of the Administration leader in the House of Representatives that we want to make all the money we can out of the Philippines, and the equally brutal appeals of greed put forth by the Denbys and Beveridges, are by this time generally taken to reveal the true spirit of the enterprise.

Now, I am myself very much in favor of the largest possible expansion of our commerce by legitimate means. But must we to that end repudiate the high principles, ideals, and traditions of the great American Republic, and commit the villainy of betraying our allies, and slaughter untold thousands

of innocent people who only stand up for the principles to which we ourselves owe our national existence?

I have time and again publicly challenged the imperialists to deny the fact that we might have had in the Philippines for the mere asking all the coaling stations and commercial facilities, and all the civilizing agencies, and all the so-called "footholds" for our Asiatic trade we may reasonably desire, if we had treated the Philippine Islanders justly as to their right to independence. No imperialist, to my knowledge, has ever denied this.

I ask them now whether there can be any doubt that we can have all these accommodations and facilities and privileges to-day without striking a further blow, if we stop the present iniquitous slaughter by honestly and effectually recognizing their right to independence. Who doubts this? Who, then, will deny that even from the legitimate commercial point of view our treatment of the Philippines is as uncalled for and wanton as it is cruel, treacherous, and disgraceful, and that we can still correct the colossal blunder we have made by doing justice as an honest nation if we only resolve to do so?

Indeed, there may be some persons expecting to make more money out of the Philippines if we subjugate them at the cost of ever so much blood and devastation, and then rule them by a substantially despotic sway. But who are they? Not the people at large, especially not the laboring masses, but a favored few. And here I invite the especial attention of our conservative fellow-citizens who are so much alarmed at the possibility that the political struggles in this democracy—a democracy working through universal suffrage—may develop into a struggle of the poor against the rich.

Have they considered how apt this kind of imperialistic policy will be to incite and hasten such a development? What was it that so powerfully aroused the masses of the American people about the law denying the Porto Ricans free trade with the United States? It was the sudden revelation of what imperialism really is—the arbitrary rule of one people over another; it was the breach of promise of freedom and prosperity we had given the Porto Ricans, who from the depth of their misery and despair vainly appealed to our sense of justice; it was the spectacle of the President and the Secretary of War abandoning for some reason their emphatic declarations of "plain duty."

It was, indeed, all this, but it was something more. It was the fact that this Porto Rican business appeared like the lifting of a curtain behind which the people saw the figures of a group of men trying to control, and to a large extent actually controlling, our Government to enrich themselves by manipulating our colonial policy. What impression do you think that such a scene must produce upon the popular mind at a time when "plutocracy" is a word in everybody's mouth?

Far more than any other kind of government does a democracy working through universal suffrage need the conservative influence of high principles and ideals of right and justice and of popular beliefs founded upon such principles and ideals; for when they disappear the evil passions of covetousness and of selfish ambition take their place and become the only motive power of action, there remaining nothing higher to appeal to. And that is the direction in which the imperialistic policy is driving us.

Nothing can be more dangerous in a democracy like ours than the prevalence of the notion that might is right—a notion involving the worst kind of anarchy, above and below. And that principle is preached and proclaimed every day by this imperialistic policy. Is it not high time that the American people, sobered from the debauching intoxication of victory, should rise up again to a just appreciation of the true responsibility of this great Republic? That true responsibility is its responsibility for the maintenance of the great principles upon which it was founded.

It is its responsibility for the great lesson it is to administer to mankind, that true Democracy means not only the assertion of one's own rights, but also a just respect for the rights of others, and that this Democracy of ours is able to resist the temptations which might seduce it from its fidelity to that high obligation. It is its responsibility for the fulfillment of the great promise expressed by Abraham Lincoln on the battlefield of Gettysburg, that "government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Who will deny that this responsibility—our true, our paramount responsibility—imperatively demands the abandonment of a policy to subjugate as subjects to our arbitrary rule another people aspiring to liberty and independence? That there are difficulties in the way of that abandonment is true. But those difficulties, as I have shown, do not consist in their setting up an independent government with our aid and assistance and in our protecting them against foreign interference.

The main difficulty—the only real difficulty—is in ourselves. It is the difficulty of baffling the greed of some persons who want to rule that country for exploitation; it is the difficulty of curbing our own vanity and false pride, which would persevere in an ambitious course, however wicked, because we have once entered upon it. These difficulties of meeting our true responsibility is great; but, to quote Bishop Potter's words again, it would indeed "be a source of national mortification if we gave up our responsibility because we find it difficult."

But if we do overcome those difficulties and fulfill the duty imposed upon us by our true responsibility, the American people will stand before the world in an attitude of moral greatness never surpassed in the annals of mankind; for we shall have shown that we can not only take cities and conquer hostile armies, but that, which is infinitely more glorious, we can, when we have done wrong, conquer ourselves.

I have been told on very good authority that many of the leading Republicans are heartily sick of the whole Philippine business, and that they sincerely wish we had never taken a foot of ground on the Philippines and were now rid of the whole concern. I have good reason for believing it. But why have they not the moral courage frankly and publicly to say so? Why do they not in the open light of day appeal to the President, and to Congress, and to their party to give up that accursed "criminal aggression," and to do that which is just and right and would be most honorable to the American people? Is their moral sense so enslaved by a wretched party spirit that it must humbly cower under a dictation which they can not but detest and be ashamed of? Surely they could do no better service to themselves and to their country than by emancipating their consciences like men.

You will have observed that in reciting the acts of our Government I said, "We have done this," and "We have done that." I used that form of expression for the sake of brevity. In justice to the American people it should be corrected. No; it was not the American people that instigated or even sanctioned by their assent the betrayal of American principles in the attempt to subjugate a foreign population and in ruthlessly destroying them. Those things have indeed been done in the name of the American people; but it may justly be said that the history of Machiavelian politics shows few instances of a more unscrupulous "confidence game" than that of which the American people have in this case been made the victim by means of an artful censorship of news, of sanctimonious cant disguising evil deeds, and of other equally unscrupulous contrivances.

What the American people really think, what understanding and appreciation they really have of their responsibilities, they will soon have the first opportunity for declaring; and, as I began by saying and now repeat, I am firmly convinced that if the question were submitted to them on a reasonably clear issue an overwhelming majority of the American people would show themselves eager to demonstrate their moral soundness by washing their hands of this bloody iniquity, and by thus making it manifest to all the world that they are an honest and a just people and that the Republic of Washington and Lincoln still lives.

SEES NO HOPE IN REPUBLICAN PARTY—WE ARE WRITING THE MOST DISGRACEFUL CHAPTER OF ALL MODERN HISTORY.

[Speech of Ex-Governor Boutwell in Cooper Institute, May 24, as reported in the National Watchman.]

I have set before myself the task of specifying some of the errors in which President McKinley and his administration have indulged in regard to the Constitution of the United States, and I shall then mention some of the pretexts that have been resorted to as apologies or excuses or shields for what has been done. There are indications that attempts are making to so construe the Constitution as to justify the policy of seizing, through war, foreign lands and alien peoples, and governing them as they might be governed if the Constitution of the United States did not exist. It is the manifest purpose of the Administration to seize and to hold countries and to govern races and communities outside of the jurisdiction of the Constitution. Thus is the Administration creating a power in the President and Congress independent of the Constitution, and over which the people can have no control. It is with that usurpation that I am now to deal. The question before the country is this: Republic or empire?

Of many propositions that may be laid down concerning the Constitution of the United States, no one can be more worthy of universal acceptance than this, namely: The Constitution can not, of its own force, apply to territory that is not of the United States.

A second proposition, which seems to justify itself without argument, is this: The Constitution by its own force applies equally and everywhere and always to every part of the United States.

THE JURISDICTION OF THE CONSTITUTION.

In elucidation and support of the first proposition, if that proposition is open to debate, it may be said that it was not in the power of the men who made the Constitution, nor of the people and States that ratified it, to have it applicable to Great Britain, to the Philippines, or to the island of Porto Rico, that was then under the dominion of Spain.

If, then, the first proposition must be accepted as an indisputable truth, it follows, inevitably, that the Constitution does not give power, and, in fine, that the Constitution could not have given power to Congress to legislate for territories and peoples that then were or that thereafter might be outside of the jurisdiction of the Constitution itself. The power of legislation which subsists in the Congress of the United States is a derived power, and it is subject to one inherent limitation—its powers can not exceed the powers possessed by the body of authority—in this case the Constitution—from which its own powers are derived. If upon argument this proposition might be open to debate, it remains to be said that the Constitution has fixed the limit of legislative power. As a declaration of a limitation of legislative power in Congress, the provision is superfluous, but its value is now to be appreciated in the enforcement of a manifest truth which otherwise, in these times, might be resisted stubbornly.

CONGRESS CAN NOT GO BEYOND CONSTITUTION.

Following the preamble to the Constitution, and standing at the head of all things and of all declarations else, are these words: "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives." Hence it follows that Congress must find authority in the Constitution for each and every of its legislative acts.

In vain will be the search for authority to legislate beyond the jurisdiction of the Constitution. No attempt has been made in the Constitution to give such authority, and such authority could not have been given. The limits of legislative powers in Congress have been fixed, by the Constitution, and they are fixed, irrevocably fixed, in the nature of things.

As a nation we are to obey the Constitution and to apply these truths. If Porto Rico is of the United States, then its ports are ports of the United States, and its inhabitants are citizens of the United States, and they are endowed already with all the rights and privileges of citizenship. If Porto Rico is not of the United States, then the attempt to exercise jurisdiction over the island through the law-making power is a gross usurpation abroad and a violation of duty at home, which can not be defended and which ought not to be tolerated.

President McKinley and his imperialistic supporters, through two steps in an argument, have deduced an erroneous conclusion from an admitted truth: (1) Our Government, in common with other sovereignties, has a right to acquire territory. (2) That right carries with it the right to govern territory so acquired. From these propositions they deduce the false conclusion that Congress may indulge in a full and free discretion in the government of territories so acquired Herein is the error, and herein is the usurpation. By their acquisition the territories have become a part of the United States. As a part of the United States the Constitution extends to them, and the privileges and guarantees of the Constitution are their possession, as they are the possession of the preexisting States and Territories. In these features of our system of government is the security that this nation can not at the same time play the part of Empire and of Republic.

We have the right to acquire territory, and we have the right to govern all territory acquired; but we must govern it under the Constitution, and in the exercise of those powers, and those only, which have been conferred upon Congress by the Constitution. Any attempt further is a criminal usurpation.

I do not now enter upon the inquiry whether, within the constitutional limits, as I have laid them down, Congress may or may not, in some particulars, make distinctions between States and Territories; but beyond question there can be no gradations, no exemptions in the matter of taxation, and the sin of a departure from this constitutional obligation can not be qualified by any conditions that may be found in the legislation of Congress. Whatever is within or is of the United States is entitled to the benefit of this provision: "All duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States." Whatever territory is not of the United States is not subject to taxation by us, and if, through the forms of legislation in Congress, we take money from any people who are not within the jurisdiction of our Constitution, the taking is an act of robbery for which neither justification nor excuse can be found. The act is not different in morals from piracy on the high seas.

And if, as is the admitted fact in the case of Porto Rico, upon the theory of the President as set forth in his message, we have taken moneys wrongfully from citizens of the United States who have imported products from that island, it is an odd form of recompense that an equivalent sum of money is now to be given to others who are destitute and starving, and who have been brought into poverty and misery by our wrong doing.

The claim that Congress may extend the Constitution to the new Territories is only a restatement of the claim that the Constitution does not apply of its own force to our newly acquired possessions, and that the power of Congress over such possessions is an unlimited power.

Congress is to obey the Constitution. It has no power to increase or diminish the scope of that instrument.

Whenever a Territory is acquired, either by purchase or conquest, the Constitution becomes immediately and by its own force the fundamental law of such acquired Territory, or it must remain forever outside the Constitution, and conse-

quently outside of the jurisdiction of Congress, inasmuch as Congress can not legislate beyond the jurisdiction of the Constitution, the source, and the sole source, of its legislative authority. The inquiry thus made leads to these conclusions, namely:

1. Whenever territory is acquired, whether by conquest or purchase, such Territory becomes subject to the Constitution, and that without the aid or agency of any branch or department of the Government of the United States.

2. The power of legislation by Congress over such Territory is fixed and limited by the Constitution.

3. That power is so limited that the "duties, imposts, and excises" must be the same in the newly acquired possessions as they may then be in preexisting States and Territories at the same periods of time.

4. The claim that Congress may govern territories and provinces that are not within the jurisdiction of the Constitution, or that Congress may extend the Constitution over Porto Rico, or the Philippines, or Japan, is an assumption of arbitrary power that must prove fatal to our Republican system. These conclusions are in harmony with the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, with the opinion of Chancellor Kent, with the decision after argument of an international tribunal in which the United States was a party, and in harmony with the opinion given recently by Judge Lochren. A dissenting opinion has been given by Whitelaw Reid. It may be inferred, however, from the accompanying remarks which he has submitted to the public, that if he were to be convinced of the error of his opinion, he would become an antiimperialist, as he can not accept Porto Rico, Cuba, and the Philippines as equal States in the American Union.

THE PERIL OF THE NATION.

I am now to consider some of the pretexts that are tendered in justification of the President's policy and doings in the Philippine Islands. If we pass by Shakespeare, Milton, and Pope, our own poet, Oliver Wendell Holmes, may be classed among the leading philosophical writers of the modern era in whatever relates to the passions and weaknesses of mankind. Holmes has named sin among the diseases that are catching. America has caught from England the disease of land grabbing, of thirst for the subjugation of inferior races, all tributary to empire building, the crowning sin of dead nations, and the peril of struggling nations that yet exist.

As criminals pass on to the prison, they pass through three or more stages. First, the crime; then falsehood as a means of concealment; and, at last, upon discovery, they resort to pretexts in which they seek to find and to furnish to others excuses for what they have done. It is the office of a pretext to accomplish by indirection what is accomplished directly by a falsehood. Its purpose is to mislead, and therefore its sphere of action is not limited to crimes and the protection of criminals. There is a resort to pretext whenever a private person falls into error, and it is the first and most inviting defense of public and official personages when they become responsible for a pernicious public policy, or whenever they mislead a country into an unjust or criminal war.

This last statement embodies the offense of which President McKinley is guilty. Whenever a public officer is called to meet a charge which asserts or assumes wrongdoing on the part of such officer, he should be able to present himself in one or two aspects. He should be able truthfully to deny the charge, or, accepting the truthfulness of the facts alleged, he should be ready to defend what has been done and upon the ground of right and justice.

PRETEXTS AND THE FACTS.

I am not disposed to think better of my countrymen even than I ought to think, but I venture to express this opinion: In every election the people of all parties have given their votes for measures and for policies which they then believed to be right and just, both upon ethical and legal grounds, and the advocates of measures and policies have so presented the issues when engaged in an attempt to mold and guide public opinion. The position taken by the President and the speeches made in Congress by his supporters portend a change in this time-honored policy, and indicate that the people are to be urged to sanction and support a war for whoose righteousness nobody has ventured to become responsible. Hence it is that we are called to encounter a long array of pretexts.

It was announced in the mouth of January that the war in the Philippines was ended, and that civil rule was to be established. In the closing days of February or the opening days of March an officer of our army was decoyed from his quarters and then murdered. In retaliation 24 Filipinos, not known to be guilty, were killed, and a town was burned. Such was the report, and to this date it remains uncontradicted. In a dispatch from Manila, dated April 16, the country is informed that Captain Dodd, of the Third Cavalry, surprised 200 Filipinos, of whom 58 were slain, 44 were captured, and the village was then burned. Of Captain Dodd's force 1 man was wounded. This was a massacre rather than a battle or a skirmish. We have official knowledge that in the first three months of the year there were 124 skirmishes in the islands, in which 2,800 Filipinos were slain, wounded, or captured. On the 1st day of January the President informed the country that the war in the Philippines was ended, and in April the War Department reestablished the recruiting system for the reenforcement of the army in the Philippines.

In the month of April the country was informed that an American force in the island of Samar had been besieged for five days, with a loss of 19 men killed and 2 wounded. This reversal of all former experience indicates the presence of sharpshooters in the ranks of the Filipinos. A new aspect of the war is thus presented.

Was not the statement that the war was ended and that civil rule was to be established a pretext designed to mislead this country? Under a civil government every person accused of crime is accorded an open trial.

Nothing more brutal could have occurred on the theater of war than the assassination of four and twenty men. Nothing more brutal has ever been charged upon the savage tribes on our Indian frontier. And was it not known in January that a detachment of 10 men could not march 10 miles in any part of the island of Luzon, and was it not then known that our stations of 300 men or less were in fact only besieged garrisons? And was it not known in January that the only peace in the archipelago was the peace that President McKinley had purchased of the Mohammedan slaveholder in the Sulu isles? And is it not known to us that this purchase was a violation of the statute laws and Constitution of the United States?

PRESIDENTIAL BUNCO.

I am now to consider a pretext for which, through many and various forms of statement, the President is responsible, namely: That we did not seek the possession of the Philippine Islands, but that the responsibility of taking and governing the archipelago has been thrust upon the country. Secretary Long, in his speech delivered before the Middlesex Club, on the day of the vernal equinox, attempts to shield the Administration by placing the responsibility upon the Supreme Being.

Whitelaw Reid says that an inquiry as to the way or means by which the responsibility was thrust upon the country is not now in order. As Mr. Reid is in a degree responsible for the calamities in which the country is involved, and as I dissent from his theory of responsibility in rulers, I shall proceed to set forth the views that I entertain.

While I may not be able to make a statement of the policy on which President McKinley has entered, there can be no hazard in saying that it is a new policy. Its friends make that claim when they assert that the United States is now a "world power," a rank that has come with or as a consequence of the President's policy. The President is a candidate for reelection, and with the avowed purpose of continuing that policy. The country is urged to sanction the President's policy, to authorize its continuance, and its enlargement possibly, and all without any inquiry, any investigation, any judgment as to the wisdom, the justice—in fine, the criminality—of this war, which is an incident of his policy.

The people from whose households have gone forth the young men who have fought and who have fallen in this war, the people who bear the burden of a system of taxation such as the country has known only when the nation's existence was in peril, are to accept in silence all that has been done.

A DEGRADING DEMAND UPON THE PEOPLE.

In the history of despotisms there is not a record of a more degrading subserviency than this which the people of America are asked to accept. Thus is brought home to us Americans the infamy of the doctrine that a people may be governed without their consent.

This is the demand now made upon the American people. Let the demand be made. I answer, as one citizen, the country is not thus to be silenced into abject submission. There will be inquiry, investigation, scrutiny, as the only process by which a judgment can be reached upon the all-important question of the fitness of President McKinley to be again intrusted with the fortunes of the country.

The demand for silence and for the suppression of discussion and of opinion is an admission that that which has been done can not be defended. Such a policy was hazarded recently in the trial of a criminal cause in this city of New York, and with disastrous results. Every incident or event in human affairs that is assailed by anybody is defended by somebody if it is open to any defense.

Whenever in former times the Republican party was assailed, it accepted the issue without delay, and without delay or hesitation it entered upon its defense. Whenever its officers were charged with misconduct or malfeasance in office it entered at once upon an investigation, and pursued the investigation to the end, and that without regard to consequences to the party or to the accused.

PRESIDENTIAL ACTS NOT SACRED THEN.

The plea that what had been done had been made sacred by the lapse of time, was never tendered by the Republican party, nor was it accepted by the Republican party when made by others. Nor did the party accept as accomplished facts proceedings on the part of a President that were unlawful, or unjust, or injurious to the country.

When the Congress assembled in December, 1865, it appeared that the State of North Carolina and six other States that had been engaged in the rebellion had been re-organized under proclamations issued by President Johnson, and it was claimed that they had been restored to their former places in the Union and that they were then entitled to representation in the House and in the Senate, without action on the part of Congress. The acts of the President were disregarded and Congress proceeded to reconstruct the Government according to its ideas of justice and wisdom. In those days the doings of a President, that had not been authorized specifically, were not treated as binding upon the country, and inquiries without reserve were instituted. An appeal to the country was made, and by a two-thirds majority the action of the President was condemned.

At this point I turn aside that I may indulge in an observation which may appear pertinent or otherwise, according to the opinions of those who may hear or may read. If President Johnson's plan of reconstruction had been accepted, the evil to the country would have been light compared with the evil of accepting the Philippines, either as colonies or as States, and either as States or as colonies they are to be attached to the union if the lead of President McKinley shall be followed by the country.

And further, I express the opinion that the fair-minded historian will be able to frame a better defense for President Johnson than the historian, or the casuist even, will be able to offer in behalf of President McKinley.

I am not disturbed by the admission, which I make for the purposes of this address, that the United States is in the lawful possession, under the Spanish treaty and the law of nations, of Porto Rico and the Philippine Islands. However we may designate them, they are territorial possessions, and as such they fall within the scope of this provision of the Constitution: "The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States." In view of what has been said recently, I add the remark that the Constitution speaks always in the present tense.

HAVE SURRENDERED TERRITORY BEFORE.

The United States is not embarrassed by the fact that our title to Porto Rico and the Philippines is impregnable as against Spain and all other countries. Indeed, the absolute defensibility of our title is proportionately the strength of our evidence that our power to "dispose of" and to transfer our title to another is free from doubt or lawful challenge. In the Oregon controversy we surrendered territory that we claimed as the territory of the United States.

In John Tyler's administration, and under Mr. Webster's lead, we transferred to Great Britain a territory that was of the State of Maine. This was done by the consent of the State of Maine and of the State of Massachusetts, that were then joint owners of the lands that were thus transferred. Upon these precedents and upon the power granted in the Constitution, I assume that the United States may transfer its title to Porto Rico and the Philippines without "let or hindrance" from anybody. Thus should disappear the pretexts that these islands have come to us by some unseen agency, divine or malevolent, and that it is a duty from which we can not shrink to keep them and to train their millions of inhabitants up to our idea of self-government. It is the theory of the Administration that responsibilities have come to us without our agency, and that we can not avoid those responsibilities. Upon this theory Porto Rico and the Philippine Islands are with us, and of us, as Territories and States, or as colonies, and for all periods of time. Hence it is that Mr. Reid claims that discussions are out of place, and that there is no power in the American people to reverse what has been done.

For my purposes and for this occasion I shall assume that there is power in the American people to relieve themselves of all responsibility for Porto Rico and the Philippine Islands, and thus we may escape from the danger of holding them either as colonies or as territories on their way to statehood. If the islands should be held as colonies for the moment, it will be found, and without much delay, that they are on their way to statehood.

THE PRESIDENT AND NOT DESTINY RESPONSIBLE.

I come now to a more careful examination of the claim that these islands, with many evils, actual and present, and with forebodings of evils that are at once probable and immeasurable, have been thrust upon us by processes which were inevitable and which could not have been foreseen. If any part of this exculpatory excuse is true as regards the country, none of it is true as regards the President and those who may have advised and supported his policy since the war with Spain was ended.

The remark has been so often made that it is now a vain repetition to say that the war of the 19th of April, 1898, was undertaken for the sole purpose of relieving Cuba from the dominion of Spain. Even as to that war, it has been claimed that the President was forced by Congressional action to accept and indorse it. If, then, the President had conformed to the act of the 19th of April, or if he had obeyed an impulse of opinion such as has been attributed to him, he would have ended the war when the authority of Spain over the island of Cuba had been extinguished.

The President had no authority for further action, either by war or by aggressive demands through the treaty-making power. Incidentally, two pretexts

have been offered. First, the destruction of the ship *Maine;* and, second, the destruction of the Spanish fleet in the harbor of Manila. The destruction of the *Maine* was an historical event when war was declared, and the liberation of Cuba was undertaken, in part, at least, in retaliation for the destruction of the battle ship. The contest in the bay of Manila was a part of the war for the freedom of Cuba, and when the freedom of Cuba had been secured the war in the East should have been ended. It is often asserted that Dewey should have left Manila when the Spanish fleet had been destroyed. The President is responsible for the course that was pursued. Dewey could only obey orders.

There are those who admit the badness of the President's policy and who yet exonerate the President. If the President is a man of ability, as I think he is, then he alone is responsible for his policy. If, as some assume, the President is a weak man, and under the influence of bad advisers, then, manifestly, his rule in office ought not to be extended. If the President's policy is a bad policy, it is immaterial whether the policy originated with the President or with advisers by whom he has been misled. In either case he is thereby unfitted for the office of President.

Has anyone from the President along the line of imperialists taken upon himself the responsibility of the assertion that the condition of the United States, or its fortunes, present or prospective, have been improved by the acquisition of a paper title to the Philippine Islands?

The fatal error was made the 10th day of August, 1898, when the President, upon his sole responsibility, passed beyond the requirements of the war declaration of April 19, and exacted a cession of islands to the United States and a footing in the Philippines, which was made the basis for a demand for a cession of the entire archipelago, which demand was consummated by the treaty of Paris. In the presence of these facts, what ground remains for the statement that our situation in the Philippine Islands and in Porto Rico has been thrust upon us, and that we are under a burden which we ought to accept and to carry as mankind are forced to bear a visitation of a pestilence or to endure a year of famine.

It may with truth be said that the possession of the Philippines and the Philippinean war as a consequence have been thrust upon the country, but not by an unseen hand. As to the President, this only can be said: He demanded the surrender of the Philippines, and he was enabled to enforce his demand from a prostrated enemy through fear that delay would lead to yet further demands upon the Kingdom of Spain. Upon these facts of history I stand committed to the charge I now make, namely: That the claim that the Philippine Islands, with the consequent horrors of war, have been thrust upon us is only a pretext that was designed to mislead the people away from the truth.

NO HOPE NOW FROM THE REPUBLICAN PARTY.

One conclusion is deducible from the facts of history. Our occupation of the Philippine Islands and the war and blood incident to that occupation are due, and due solely, to the policy and doings of President McKinley, and for which he first and chiefly is responsible. That policy he will pursue until it is reversed by the people, irrespective of party alliances. It is a vain hope that the Republican party as an organization can reverse the policy of the President. The hope is as vain as was the hope in 1861–1865 that the Democratic party as an organization would aid in the abolition of slavery.

Again, it is claimed that trade follows the flag. This is true when the flag is the herald of peace, but the saying is false, false utterly, when the flag is transformed into a menace of war.

If, in 1898, we had acted in good faith, if we had encouraged the inhabitants of the Philippines in their efforts to establish an independent government, our increase in exports to the islands would not have been limited to the pernicious trade in alcoholic liquors. Nor, on the other hand, would the users of hemp and of the products of hemp in the United States been taxed 100 per cent for the benefit of importers, and to the injury alike of the people of the United States and of the Philippine Islands. War is the enemy of commercial trade, and trade does not follow the flag when the flag is the emblem of war.

Peace and friendship are the certain and constant promoters of trade and of every other business pursuit.

WHEN TRADE FOLLOWS THE FLAG.

There are supporters of the Administration who are not content with the possession of the Philippines and the war in the Philippines, but they advocate a warlike undertaking ostensibly for the extension of our trade with China.

China and Russia are combined, and nothing of trade facilities with China can be secured by force or by threats of force. The authorities of China have given notice that further territorial concessions will not be made. The recent speeches of the Chinese minister should be accepted as a declaration that trade with China is to depend upon friendships, agreements, reciprocal relations, and that nothing will be conceded to force. England and the United States, acting separately or combined, have not the power to dictate a commercial policy to China. Russia has gained more in the last five years by peaceful means and agencies than England has gained by war in the closing quarter of this century. Russia has connected its vast Siberian empire with the great Pacific sea on the east and with the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean on the south.

The British Empire in India is now embraced in the arms of Russia. That country has allied itself with China on one side and with Persia on the other, and with openings to the sea through each country. Thus Russia is to control a third of the population of the globe, and, if we are to enjoy the benefits of trade with the millions of the East, we are to secure that trade by the profession and the practice of the principles and the arts of peace. Thus, again, it may appear that the maxim or saying that trade follows the flag is true only when the flag is the emblem and herald of peace. Legitimate and systematic trade shuns the flag in the times of war.

Of the import trade with the Philippine Islands in the year 1899, not less than 44 per cent was in English hands, and not more than 8 per cent was from the United States. The noncombatants enjoyed more than nine-tenths of the trade of the islands.

SOME DIFFICULTIES IN THE WAY OF EMPIRE.

I may be asked this question: Can the tendency to autocratic, despotic rule in America be arrested? Something of an answer may be found in the record of passing events. There are inherent difficulties in the transformation of our Government, and those difficulties the Administration is now called to meet.

We have a legal title to Porto Rico and the Philippines, but the President does not yet venture to say whether they are Territories on the way to Statehood or dependencies to be held as colonies. He is called to choose between English policy and American policy. That question inheres in the nature of things, and an answer must be given.

When the President exacted the protocol of August, 1898, that question was involved, and that question the President must answer. Out of what has been done the nation may learn as much as this, namely, that with every acquisition of territory comes this question: Are the people inhabiting this territory to be received as citizens and as our equals or are they to be treated as vassals or as persons not yet fully emancipated from slavery? This question inheres in our system of government, and there it must remain. The question has appeared already in the case of Porto Rico, and it will appear in the Philippine Islands. It vexes Congress in the attempt to frame a government for Hawaii.

The anti-imperialists offer a solution, and the only solution of this grave difficulty. We say to the country: Let us keep the pledge which we have made to Cuba and to ourselves, and let us at once accord to the inhabitants of Porto Rico and to the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands the opportunity to set up governments for themselves.

Our policy is in harmony with our system of government, and it is in harmony with the great truths on which our system of government has been made to rest.

The issue is a plain issue. It is to be submitted to the people, and, for one, I rest in full confidence that the people will deliver the nation from the evil policy which President McKinley is pursuing.

At a cost of not less than $500,000,000 and the sacrifice of as many thousand young lives a great lesson will have been taught, namely, that this Government can not be perverted, either through the follies or the crimes of its rulers. As the fruit of the sacrifices that have been made, the Declaration of Independence and the preamble to the Constitution will be again accepted by us as cardinal truths worthy of acceptance in all free governments. Thus do we vindicate the character and example and teachings of Washington and of Jefferson and the line of patriots and statesmen to Lincoln and Grant and the rest, who believed in the equality of men and recognized in all peoples and communities the right of self-government.

EXPANSION AND IMPERIALISM.

The imperialists are active in promoting the notion that the antiimperialists are opposed to the expansion of American territory, and that their opposition to the Philippine war and to the attempt to occupy the islands by force is due entirely to that opinion.

Professor Hart, of Cambridge, has given himself, through many serious pages of Harper's Monthly, to the task of proving that the founders of the Republic were expansionists, and his logic leads him to the conclusion that we are opposing the fathers of the Republic when we protest against the forcible annexation of the Philippine Islands to the United States.

The founders of the Republic never committed themselves to expansion beyond the oceans nor to the forcible seizure of territory for the purpose of enlarging the limits of the Union, nor to the subjugation of communities either to slavery or to American citizenship. The founders of the Government favored peaceful expansion within the oceans, and some there were who favored the acquisition of the West India Islands. Beyond these possibilities there is no evidence of a public policy or of a public opinion.

In the eleventh article of the articles of confederation provision was made for the admission of Canada into the confederation upon the condition that Canada should accede "to this confederation" and join "in the measures of the United States." The fathers did not favor forcible annexation, nor annexation "beyond seas," nor the annexation of peoples of other races, other languages, and who had been trained under institutions and laws of which we have no knowledge.

The logic born of necessity knows no other law than the law of necessity.

The imperialists say our fathers favored the annexation of Canada by conference and friendly agreement; therefore we are bound to sustain a war for the annexation of the Philippines.

Some persons opposed the annexation of Louisiana, and time has demonstrated their error; therefore the antiimperialists are in error in opposing the annexation of the Philippines. Again they say if some persons were in error in opposing the annexation of contiguous territory, it follows that they who oppose the acquisition of territory 10,000 miles away are also in error. The antiimperialists are not committed upon the question of public policy either for or against the expansion of American territory. We are opposed, unalterably opposed, to the subjugation by war of 10,000,000 human beings into the American Union as citizens and equals, and we are opposed, unalterably opposed, to the subjugation of one man, even, as a vassal.

THE MOST DISGRACEFUL CHAPTER OF ALL MODERN HISTORY.

Of all modern history, the most disgraceful chapter is that which the American nation is now writing. At the opening of the last third of this century we abolished slavery in America, and at the end of this century we are making war for the establishment of a system of slavery in Asia. The crimes of England in the Sepoy war, on the Upper Nile, in South Africa, are trivial offenses against justice and humanity when compared with the crime of subjugating and enslaving 10,000,000 people.

It was a long step downward from Lincoln's proclamation of January 1, 1863, to McKinley's proclamation of December 21, 1898. Lincoln raised 4,000,000 slaves to full and free American citizenship, and invited them to prepare themselves for the work of self-government. McKinley announced to 10,000,000 human beings who had already secured freedom by their own efforts, his purpose to subject them to his authority by the armies of the United States, unless they would submit themselves to his will without resistance. "My terms," said he "are, first, submission and vassalage, and I will then consider further as to your fortunes." It is the reproach of the age and an omen of evil to America that there is one citizen to approve of this departure from the true doctrines of the Republic.

Senator HOAR, in his lofty, eloquent, and unanswerable speech against President McKinley's Philippine policy, has made Aaron Burr appear as the supporter of McKinley, and upon the ground that his buccaneering expedition to Mexico has been vindicated by McKinley's buccaneering expedition in the Philippine Islands. Burr's crime has been so minimized by comparison that it may not receive a place in history; but what of the country? Burr was pursued, arraigned, tried, driven from public employments, and ostracized by society. He had been Vice-President of the United States and a formidable aspirant to the Presidency against Mr. Jefferson. When his trial was ended and the facts were known he had not a supporter, and his aspirations had come to an end. Such was the fate of Aaron Burr. Has the country changed? There has been a change, but the country has not changed.

If, however, the city of Washington were the Government of the United States, as the city of Rome ruled the Roman Republic, and, under corresponding conditions, the art of printing unknown, the rapid communication of thought not yet even imagined as a possibility, and the Republic not welded into harmony, the words of the historian De Vertot might soon be applied to America: "Luxury and the love of riches came into Rome with the treasures of the conquered provinces, and poverty and temperance, which had formed so many great captains, fell into contempt. And what is most surprising is that it was not by degrees, but all at once, that this vast alteration happened, and the Romans ran headlong into luxury and effeminacy." Is this to be our fate?

THE FAMILIAR PRETEXT OF CONQUERORS.

The policy of the conqueror has always been gilded by one pretext: The conquered are to be well governed. Such was President McKinley's promise to the Filipinos. We begin civil government in Porto Rico by treating the inhabitants as alien subjects, and the trade regulations proceed upon the theory that we are to enjoy the markets of Porto Rico, and that a duty is to be levied upon the products of Porto Rico when brought into the United States. We are setting up a civil government which is as absolute as could be devised. Thus do we violate our promises, and prove the iniquity of the pretexts that we have tendered to the country and to our victims in the island.

In the days of reconstruction, "carpetbaggery" was an unprecedented condition of affairs. It was abolished at an early day, and by a general concurrence of opinion. We have established a carpetbag system for Porto Rico and upon the basis of perpetuity. The first fruits of this system have been gathered already in the island of Cuba.

In four years the doctrine of the right of self-government has been repudiated in Washington, and an avowal of the doctrine is a hazardous experiment for a member of the Republican party. The downfall of Rome, as described by De

Vertot, was not more rapid than the change that has taken place in the capital city of America.

THE GENIUS OF THE PRESENT REPUBLICAN PARTY—IT MUST BE OVERTHROWN.

In the year 1895 or 1896 a man emerged from the obscurity of unrecognized citizenship, and in the intervening time he has advanced himself to the head of the Republican party, and without delay he became the apparent director of its policy. He contributed most largely to the nomination and election of President McKinley.

Following the inauguration, he secured a seat in the Senate by the enforced retirement of a statesman who, in an experience of forty years, had never before yielded to the menaces of those in power, nor been misled by vain promises. During the three years now ended this man, so recently unknown, has stood before the country as the author of our public policy. This may be error, but in the month of April, 1900, he announced the renomination of President McKinley, and predicted his reelection. At the same time the Republican party waited in submissive silence for his utterance in regard to a candidate for the Vice-Presidency. All this appears to have been the outcome of immense energy in one man, combined with unlimited resources in money. For the moment the combination is supreme in the Republican party.

And thus a party that became historically great for its victories in war, and for its achievements in peace, bows in subserviency to a self-created dictator. What is the remedy? The party must be overthrown, and in its downfall the dictatorship will disappear, and in a quadrennial period, or in a decade, the party, regenerated, may come again to the head of affairs in the Republic.

HANNA, M'KINLEY & CO., WHOLESALE DEALERS IN FILIPINO SLAVES.

[Speech of Capt. Patrick O'Farrel, in Cooper Institute, May 24, 1900.]

The chairman introduced the next speaker, Capt. Patrick O'Farrel, a lifelong Republican and a brave soldier, who served in the gallant Sixty-ninth New York, under Corcoran.

The captain spoke in part as follows:

While we have not an ideal Government of our own, yet I contend that we have the best system so far devised by man to regulate our own affairs, while we have the worst system to regulate the affairs of others. You can not govern foreign colonies or run imperialism with Republican machinery. It requires a king or an emperor—like the Empress of India—whose rule will be continuous, to do that. We elect our Executive every four years, and we change policies and officials with every change of party.

We appoint a postal agent or tax collector at Mindanao or Manila. He can't bring his wife or children there on account of the climate. He has a four years' job. He will try and feather his nest before the other party comes in; and when it does, he will be succeeded by another, who will also go into the nest-feathering business. [Great applause and cries of "That's so! You're right!"]

I now boldly state that this acquiring and keeping of foreign colonies will bring disgrace on our flag and discredit on our republican institutions.

When it comes to looting, swindling, and crookedness, the Spaniards were not "in it" with our fellows. I said this to a United States Senator (General Hawley) a few months ago, and he exclaimed, "Oh, Pat! don't say that about your own countrymen." I say it advisedly, on good proof. Didn't we rob and plunder our own countrymen in the South during the "carpet-bag" régime, and after we had robbed and beggared the whites we then plundered our wards, the negroes, and looted the Freedman's Bank.

This is no reflection on the honesty of the American people in general. It only illustrates the fact that we can not govern honestly, even at home, by military rule; and how can we expect to do it abroad in our foreign colonies and over a people whom we despise as a subject race? If we continue in the colonial imperial business, I suggest that we amend our Constitution so that the title of our President shall read as follows: "William McKinley, President of the United States and Emperor of the Philippines." [Cheers and laughter.]

Abraham Lincoln said, "We can not last long half slave and half free," and now, at the beginning of a new century, we are going to be half subject, half citizen.

I remember when I first saw the sacred soil of Virginia during the great civil war—yes, the great war for liberty—I read a sign on a large brick building in Alexandria—"Price, Birch & Co., dealers in slaves." I remained South long enough to shoot that slavery business to death. Oh, I am awfully proud that I was an abolitionist and a Republican in those days! [Tremendous applause.] Those were the days of Lincoln and liberty. Now, when I walk up Pennsylvania avenue, I look up at the White House and I am carried back to the days of "Price, Birch & Co., dealers in slaves," and I read on that White House in imaginary lines, "Hanna, McKinley & Co., wholesale dealers in Filipino slaves." [Great applause.]

There is another feature of this colonial business that the country has not noticed so far. That is the matter of church and state. McKinley is trying to work the church—I mean the Catholic Church—but he "wobbles" on that as well as on other matters.

What he said last week he contradicts this week. A weak man is a dangerous man when placed in high position. Nero was one of the weakest of Roman emperors, but at the same time the most dangerous.

Just look at President McKinley making tracks on both sides of the stream. We find him last summer at the Catholic Summer School at Plattsburg, N. Y., holding forth and telling the people there about the flag, and you would actually think he was born next door to the Blarney Stone. Next week we find him at Asbury Park, N. J., preaching to the Methodists about piety and patriotism. And the next week we find him executing a treaty, offensive and defensive, with the Sultan of Sulu, whereby he recognizes slavery, polygamy, and the religion of Mahomet.

To crown all, we next find the President of the United States going on his knees to the Pope of Rome, and asking him to help him out of the difficulties which neither his generals nor his peace commission could do. He holds several secret sessions at the White House with Archbishop Chapelle, the Papal delegate, and commissions Father McKinnon, ostensibly as a chaplain in the United States Army, but actually as the secretary of the Papal delegate, and sends both in princely style to Manila to negotiate with the Spanish archbishop there as to the confirming of the Spanish friars and monks in their possession of some twenty or thirty million acres of the best land in Luzon and the other islands. This is the first time in the history of the United States when the President dared to interfere in a matter of church and state. What right has our Government to summon or invite the Papal delegate to aid or assist us in settling our political affairs?

I feel keenly on this subject, knowing that there are many gentlemen on this platform who, if they should speak as I do, would run the risk of being called A. P. A's. But I, as a Catholic, lest there should be any mistake, a Roman Catholic, who lived in Ireland until I was man big, and understand all about landlords, the glebe lands, and the Established Church, I don't want to see my church going into the landlord business in the Philippines or anywhere else under the protection of the American flag. [Tremendous applause, which broke out again and again.]

The student of history knows well that it was this ownership of land by the church that was one of the causes of the bloody revolution in France, and it enabled King Henry VIII to succeed in his so-called reformation in England. Daniel O'Connell, my illustrious countryman, used to say: "We take our religion from Rome, but not our politics. Keep the priests poor and they will be always the friends of the people." Landed property has always been the curse of the church.

In conclusion I appeal to my old-time Republican friends—yes, and to men of my own blood and race; yes, and to the Germans, and to all others who came here to seek that liberty which was denied us in our own native lands; yes, and I appeal to my old comrade soldiers, who marched with me to Appomattox; yes, and the general whom I served under, I am proud to see on this platform to-night. [The speaker here seized General McIvor by the hand. The great audience seemed to catch the inspiration of the speaker and fairly jumped to their feet, cheering, and hurrahing for several minutes.]

Yes, I appeal to my old comrades who did the fighting, not to the "carpet-baggers" who did the robbing. [Cheers.]

Again I appeal to my old-time Republican friends to not bother about dollars or tariffs. In this campaign the battle cry is "Republic *versus* Empire." That should be the thought uppermost in the mind of every citizen from now until next November.

The trusts and a few millionaires have the grand old party by the throat. These corrupt, unscrupulous politicians have shunted it from the constitutional track. Let the plain people, the common people, the sovereign people—Republicans and Democrats—rally to the standard of William J. Bryan, who is a brave and courageous man of the Lincoln type—an American who believes in American principles. Who is the same to-day as he was four or six years ago. You and I may differ with him about dollars and tariffs, but we admire his courage and his honesty, and we will stand by him and make him our next President. [Tremendous applause.]

Code for the District of Columbia.

SPEECH

OF

HON. HENRY D. CLAYTON,

OF ALABAMA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, May 28, 1900.

The House having under consideration the bill (H. R. 9835) to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia—

Mr. CLAYTON of Alabama said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that this amendment to the bill is entirely proper. The code, as I understand it, as originally reported in this bill deprived parties litigant of the right of supersedeas in cases of judgment rendered by justices of the peace. I understand the amendment now under consideration restores the law in the District to what it is now, or rather preserves it in the new code, when adopted, as it is to-day. I think that amendment as well as the other amendments I have had the opportunity of examining are entirely proper.

Mr. Speaker, I do not care to further discuss this bill. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD certain documents and papers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Without objection, permission will be given.

There was no objection.

APPENDIX I.

WHAT NEXT?

[By William J. Bryan.]

Imperialists seek to create the impression that the ratification of the treaty has terminated the controversy in regard to the future of the Philippines, but there is no ground whatever for such a conclusion. The President has not as yet outlined a policy and Congress has so far failed to make any declaration upon the subject. Several Administration Senators have expressly denied that ratification commits the United States to the permanent annexation of the Philippine Islands.

The treaty extinguishes Spanish sovereignty, but it does not determine our nation's course in dealing with the Filipinos. In the opinion of many (and I am among the number) the ratification of the treaty, instead of closing the door to independence, really makes easier the establishment of such a government in the Philippine Islands.

The matter is now entirely within the control of Congress, and there is no legal obstacle to prevent the immediate passage of a resolution promising self-government to the Filipinos and pledging the United States to protect their government from outside interference. If we have a right to acquire land, we have a right to part with it; if we have a right to secure, by purchase or conquest, a disputed title from Spain, we certainly have a right to give a quitclaim deed to the party in possession.

If the power to part with the islands is admitted, the only question remaining for discussion is whether the United States should permanently hold the Asiatic territory acquired from Spain. For two months the sentiment against imperialism has been constantly growing, and there is nothing in the ratification of the treaty to make such a policy more desirable.

Until Dewey's victory no one thought us under obligations to extend our sovereignty over the Filipinos. If subsequent events have imposed such an obligation upon the United States, it is worth while to inquire as to its nature and extent. Is it political in its character? Must we make subjects of the Filipinos now because we made allies of them in the war with Spain? France did not recognize any such obligation when she helped us to throw off British supremacy. Are we compelled to civilize the Filipinos by force because we interfered with Spain's efforts to accomplish the same end by the same

means? Are we in duty bound to conquer and to govern, when we can find a pretext for doing so, every nation which is weaker than ours or whose civilization is below our standard? Does history justify us in believing that we can improve the condition of the Filipinos and advance them in civilization by governing them without their consent and taxing them without representation? England has tried that plan in India for a hundred and fifty years, and yet Japan has made more progress in the last thirty years than India has made in the hundred and fifty. And it may be added that the idea of self-government has developed more rapidly among the Japanese during the same period than it has among the people of India.

Government is an evolution, and its administration is always susceptible of improvement. The capacity for self-government is developed by responsibility. As exercise strengthens the muscles of the athlete and as education improves the mental faculties of the student, even so participation in government instructs the citizen in the science of government and perfects him in the art of administering it.

We must not expect the Filipinos to establish and maintain as good a government as ours, and it is vain for us to expect that we would maintain there, at long range, as good a government as we have here. The government is, as it were, a composite photograph of the people, a reflection of their average virtue and intelligence.

Some defend annexation upon the ground that the business interests of the islands demand it. The business interests will probably be able to take care of themselves under an independent form of government, unless they are very different from the business interests of the United States. The so-called business men constitute a very small fraction of the total population of the islands. Who will say that their pecuniary interests are superior in importance to the right of all the rest of the people to enjoy a government of their own choosing?

Some say that our duty to the foreign residents in the Philippines requires us to annex the islands. If we admit this argument, we not only exalt the interests of foreigners above the interests of natives, but place a higher estimate upon the wishes of foreigners residing in Manila than upon the welfare of our own people.

The fact that the subject of imperialism is being discussed through the newspapers and magazines, as well as in Congress, is evidence that the work of education is still going on. The advocates of a colonial policy must convince the conservative element of the country by clear and satisfactory proof. They can not rely upon catchwords. The "Who will haul down the flag?" argument has already been discarded, "destiny" is not as "manifest" as it was a few weeks ago, and the argument of "duty" is being analyzed. The people are face to face with a grave public problem. They have not acted upon it yet, and they will not be frightened away from the calm consideration of it by the repetition of unsupported prophecies.

The battle of Manila, which brought loss to us and disaster to the Filipinos, has not rendered "forcible annexation" less repugnant to our nation's "code of morality." If it has any effect at all it ought to emphasize the dangers attendant upon (if I may be permitted to quote from the President again) "criminal aggression." The Filipinos were guilty of inexcusable ignorance if they thought that they could prevent the ratification of the treaty by an attack upon the American lines, but no act of theirs can determine the permanent policy of the United States. Whether imperialism is desirable is too large a question to be settled by a battle. Battles are to be expected under such a policy. England had been the dominant power in India for a century when the Sepoy mutiny took place, and she rules even now by fear rather than by love.

Force and reason rest upon different foundations and employ different forms of logic. Reason, recognizing that only that is enduring which is just, asks whether the thing proposed ought to be done; force says, "I desire, I can, I will." When the desire proves to be greater than the ability to accomplish, the force argument reads (in the past tense) "I desired, I tried, I failed." But even force, if accompanied by intelligence, calculates the cost. No one doubts that the United States Army and Navy are able to whip into subjection all the Filipinos who are not exterminated in the process, but is it worth the cost?

Militarism is only one item of the cost, but it alone will far outweigh all the advantages which are expected to flow from a colonial policy. John Morley, the English statesman, in a recent speech to his constituents, uttered a warning which may well be considered by our people. He said:

"Imperialism brings with it militarism, and must bring with it militarism. Militarism means a gigantic expenditure, daily growing. It means an increase in government of the power of aristocratic and privileged classes. Militarism means the profusion of the taxpayer's money everywhere except in the taxpayer's own home, and militarism must mean war.

"And you must be much less well read in history than I take the liberals of Scotland to be if you do not know that it is not war, that hateful demon of war, but white-winged peace that has been the nurse and guardian of freedom and justice and well-being over that great army of toilers upon whose labor, upon whose privations, upon whose hardships, after all, the greatness and the strength of empires and of states are founded and are built up."

Militarism is so necessary a companion of imperialism that the President asks for a 200 per cent increase in the standing Army, even before the people at large have passed upon the question of annexation.

Morley says that imperialism gives to the aristocracy and to the privileged classes an increased influence in government. Do we need to increase their influence in our Government? Surely they are potent enough already.

He calls attention to the fact that the toiler finds his hope in peaceful progress rather than in war's uncertainties. Is it strange that the laboring classes are protesting against both imperialism and militarism? Is it possible that their protest will be in vain?

Imperialism has been described as "the white man's burden;" but since it crushes the wealth producer beneath an increasing weight of taxes, it might with more propriety be called the poor man's load.

If the peace commissioners had demanded a harbor and coaling station in the Philippines and had required Spain to surrender the rest of the land to the Filipinos, as she surrendered Cuba to the Cubans, we would not now be considering how to let go of the islands. If the sum of twenty millions had been necessary to secure Spain's release, the payment of the amount by the Filipinos might have been guaranteed by the United States.

But the failure of the peace commissioners to secure for the Filipinos the same rights that were obtained for the Cubans could have been easily remedied by a resolution declaring the nation's purpose to establish a stable and independent government.

It is still possible for the Senate alone, or for the Senate and House together, to adopt such a resolution.

The purpose of annexationists, so far as that purpose can be discovered, is to apply to the government of the Filipinos methods familiar to the people of Europe and Asia, but new in the United States.

This departure from traditions was not authorized by the people; whether it will be ratified by them remains to be seen. The responsibility rests first upon Congress and afterwards upon that power which makes Congresses.

Whatever may be the wish of individuals or the interest of parties, we may rest assured that the final disposition of the Philippine question will conform to the deliberate judgment of the voters; they constitute the court of last resort; from their decision there is no appeal.

What next? Investigation, discussion, action.

APPENDIX II.

SEES NO HOPE IN REPUBLICAN PARTY—WE ARE WRITING THE MOST DISGRACEFUL CHAPTER OF ALL MODERN HISTORY.

[Speech of ex-Governor Boutwell in Cooper Institute, May 24.]

I have set before myself the task of specifying some of the errors in which President McKinley and his Administration have indulged in regard to the Constitution of the United States, and I shall then mention some of the pretexts that have been resorted to as apologies or excuses or shields for what has been done. There are indications that attempts are making to so construe the Constitution as to justify the policy of seizing, through war, foreign lands and alien peoples, and governing them as they might be governed if the Constitution of the United States did not exist. It is the manifest purpose of the Administration to seize and to hold countries and to govern races and communities outside of the jurisdiction of the Constitution. Thus is the Administration creating a power in the President and Congress independent of the Constitution, and over which the people can have no control. It is with that usurpation that I am now to deal. The question before the country is this: Republic or empire?

Of many propositions that may be laid down concerning the Constitution of the United States, no one can be more worthy of universal acceptance than this, namely: The Constitution can not of its own force apply to territory that is not of the United States.

A second proposition, which seems to justify itself without argument, is this: The Constitution by its own force applies equally and everywhere and always to every part of the United States.

THE JURISDICTION OF THE CONSTITUTION.

In elucidation and support of the first proposition, if that proposition is open to debate, it may be said that it was not in the power of the men who made the Constitution, nor of the people and States that ratified it, to have it applicable to Great Britain, to the Philippines, or to the island of Porto Rico, that was then under the dominion of Spain.

If, then, the first proposition must be accepted as an indisputable truth, it follows inevitably that the Constitution does not give power, and, in fine, that the Constitution could not have given power, to Congress to legislate for territories and peoples that then were or that thereafter might be outside of the jurisdiction of the Constitution itself. The power of legislation, which subsists in the Congress of the United States, is a derived power, and it is subject to one inherent limitation; its powers can not exceed the powers possessed by the body of authority—in this case the Constitution—from which its own powers are derived. If upon argument this proposition might be open to debate, it remains to be said that the Constitution has fixed the limit of legislative power. As a declaration of a limitation of legislative power in Congress the provision is superfluous; but its value is now to be appreciated in the enforcement of a manifest truth which otherwise in these times might be resisted stubbornly.

CONGRESS CAN NOT GO BEYOND CONSTITUTION.

Following the preamble to the Constitution and standing at the head of all things and of all declarations else are these words: "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives." Hence it follows that Congress must find authority in the Constitution for each and every of its legislative acts.

In vain will be the search for authority to legislate beyond the jurisdiction of the Constitution. No attempt has been made in the Constitution to give such authority, and such authority could not have been given. The limits of legislative powers in Congress have been fixed by the Constitution, and they are fixed, irrevocably fixed, in the nature of things.

As a nation we are to obey the Constitution and to apply these truths. If Porto Rico is of the United States, then its ports are ports of the United States, and its inhabitants are citizens of the United States, and they are endowed already with all the rights and privileges of citizenship. If Porto Rico is not of the United States, then the attempt to exercise jurisdiction over the island through the lawmaking power is a gross usurpation abroad and a violation of duty at home which can not be defended and which ought not to be tolerated.

President McKinley and his imperialistic supporters, through two steps in an argument, have deduced an erroneous conclusion from an admitted truth: (1) Our Government, in common with other sovereignties, has a right to acquire territory. (2) That right carries with it the right to govern territory so acquired. From these propositions they deduce the false conclusion that Congress may indulge in a full and free discretion in the government of territories so acquired. Herein is the error, and herein is the usurpation. By their acquisition the territories have become a part of the United States. As a part of the United States the Constitution extends to them, and the privileges and guaranties of the Constitution are their possession, as they are the possession of the preexisting States and Territories. In these features of our system of government is the security that this nation can not at the same time play the part of empire and of republic.

We have the right to acquire territory, and we have the right to govern all territory acquired; but we must govern it under the Constitution, and in the exercise of those powers, and those only, which have been conferred upon Congress by the Constitution. Any attempt further is a criminal usurpation.

I do not now enter upon the inquiry whether, within the constitutional limits, as I have laid them down, Congress may or may not, in some particulars, make distinctions between States and Territories; but beyond question there can be no gradations, no exemptions in the matter of taxation, and the sin of a departure from this constitutional obligation can not be qualified by any conditions that may be found in the legislation of Congress. Whatever is within or is of the United States is entitled to the benefit of this provision: "All duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States." Whatever territory is not of the United States is not subject to taxation by us, and if, through the forms of legislation in Congress, we take money from any people who are not within the jurisdiction of our Constitution, the taking is an act of robbery for which neither justification nor excuse can be found. The act is not different in morals from piracy on the high seas.

And if, as is the admitted fact in the case of Porto Rico, upon the theory of the President as set forth in his message, we have taken moneys wrongfully from citizens of the United States who have imported products from that island, it is an odd form of recompense that an equivalent sum of money is now to be given to others who are destitute and starving and who have been brought into poverty and misery by our wrongdoing.

The claim that Congress may extend the Constitution to the new Territories is only a restatement of the claim that the Constitution does not apply of its own force to our newly acquired possessions and that the power of Congress over such possessions is an unlimited power.

Congress is to obey the Constitution. It has no power to increase or diminish the scope of that instrument.

Whenever a territory is acquired, either by purchase or conquest, the Constitution becomes immediately and by its own force the fundamental law of such acquired territory, or it must remain forever outside the Constitution, and consequently outside of the jurisdiction of Congress, inasmuch as Congress can not legislate beyond the jurisdiction of the Constitution, the source, and the sole source, of its legislative authority. The inquiry thus made leads to these conclusions, namely:

1. Whenever territory is acquired, whether by conquest or purchase, such territory becomes subject to the Constitution, and that without the aid or agency of any branch or department of the Government of the United States.

2. The power of legislation by Congress over such territory is fixed and limited by the Constitution.

3. That power is so limited that the "duties, imposts, and excises" must be the same in the newly acquired possessions as they may then be in preexisting States and Territories at the same periods of time.

4. The claim that Congress may govern territories and provinces that are not within the jurisdiction of the Constitution, or that Congress may extend the Constitution over Porto Rico, or the Philippines, or Japan, is an assumption of arbitrary power that must prove fatal to our republican system. These conclusions are in harmony with the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, with the opinion of Chancellor Kent, with the decision, after argument, of an international tribunal, in which the United States was a party, and in harmony with the opinion given recently by Judge Lochren. A dissenting opinion has been given by Whitelaw Reid. It may be inferred, however, from the accompanying remarks which he has submitted to the public, that if he were to be convinced of the error of his opinion, he would become an anti-imperialist, as he can not accept Porto Rico, Cuba, and the Philippines as equal States in the American Union.

THE PERIL OF THE NATION.

I am now to consider some of the pretexts that are tendered in justification of the President's policy and doings in the Philippine Islands. If we pass by Shakespeare, Milton, and Pope, our own poet, Oliver Wendell Holmes, may be classed among the leading philosophical writers of the modern era, in whatever relates to the passions and weaknesses of mankind. Holmes has named sin among the diseases that are catching. America has caught from England the diseases of land grabbing, of thirst for the subjugation of inferior races, all tributary to empire building, the crowning sin of dead nations and the peril of struggling nations that yet exist.

As criminals pass on to the prison they pass through three or more stages. First, the crime; then falsehood as a means of concealment, and, at last, upon discovery, they resort to pretexts in which they seek to find and to furnish to others excuses for what they have done. It is the office of a pretext to accomplish by indirection what is accomplished directly by a falsehood. Its purpose is to mislead, and therefore its sphere of action is not limited to crimes and the protection of criminals. There is a resort to pretexts whenever a private person falls into error, and it is the first and most inviting defense of public and offical personages when they become responsible for a pernicious public policy, or whenever they mislead a country into an unjust or criminal war.

This last statement embodies the offense of which President McKinley is guilty. Whenever a public officer is called to meet a charge which asserts or assumes wrongdoing on the part of such officer, he should be able to present himself in one of two aspects. He should be able truthfully to deny the charge, or, accepting the truthfulness of the facts alleged, he should be ready to defend what has been done and upon the ground of right and justice.

PRETEXTS AND THE FACTS.

I am not disposed to think better of my countrymen even than I ought to think, but I venture to express this opinion: In every election the people of all parties have given their votes for measures and for policies which they then believed to be right and just, both upon ethical and legal grounds, and the advocates of measures and policies have so presented the issues when engaged in an attempt to mold and guide public opinion. The position taken by the President and the speeches made in Congress by his supporters portend a change in this time-honored policy, and indicate that the people are to be urged to sanction and support a war for whose righteousness nobody has ventured to become responsible. Hence it is that we are called to encounter a long array of pretexts.

It was announced in the month of January that the war in the Philippines was ended and that civil rule was to be established. In the closing days of February or the opening days of March an officer of our Army was decoyed from his quarters and then murdered. In retaliation 24 Filipinos, not known to be guilty, were killed and a town was burned. Such was the report, and to this date it remains uncontradicted. In a dispatch from Manila, dated April 16, the country is informed that Captain Dodd, of the Third Cavalry, surprised 200 Filipinos, of whom 53 were slain, 44 were captured, and the village was then burned. Of Captain Dodd's force 1 man was wounded. This was a massacre rather than a battle or a skirmish. We have official knowledge that in the first three months of the year there were 124 skirmishes in the islands, in which 2,800 Filipinos were slain, wounded, or captured. On the 1st day of January the President informed the country that the war in the Philippines was ended, and in April the War Department reestablished the recruiting system for the reenforcement of the Army in the Philippines.

In the month of April the country was informed that an American force in the island of Samar had been besieged for five days, with a loss of 19 men killed and 2 wounded. This reversal of all former experience indicates the presence of sharpshooters in the ranks of the Filipinos. A new aspect of the war is thus presented.

Was not the statement that the war was ended and that civil rule was to be established a pretext designed to mislead this country? Under a civil government every person accused of crime is accorded an open trial.

Nothing more brutal could have occurred on the theater of war than the assassination of four and twenty men. Nothing more brutal has ever been charged upon the savage tribes on our Indian frontier. And was it not known in January that a detachment of 10 men could not march 10 miles in any part of the island of Luzon? And was it not then known that our stations of 100 men or less were in fact only besieged garrisons? And was it not known in January that the only peace in the archipelago was the peace that President McKinley had purchased of the Mohammedan slaveholder in the Sulu Isles? And is it not known to us that this purchase was a violation of the statute laws and Constitution of the United States?

PRESIDENTIAL BUNCO.

I am now to consider a pretext for which, through many and various forms of statement, the President is responsible, namely, that we did not seek the possession of the Philippine Islands, but that the responsibility of taking and governing the archipelago has been thrust upon the country. Secretary Long, in his speech delivered before the Middlesex Club on the day of the vernal equinox, attempts to shield the Administration by placing the responsibility upon the Supreme Being.

Whitelaw Reid says that an inquiry as to the way or means by which the responsibility was thrust upon the country is not now in order. As Mr. Reid is in a degree responsible for the calamities in which the country is involved, and as I dissent from his theory of responsibility in rulers, I shall proceed to set forth the views that I entertain.

While I may not be able to make a statement of the policy on which President McKinley has entered, there can be no hazard in saying that it is a new policy. Its friends make that claim when they assert that the United States is now a "world power," a rank that has come with or as a consequence of the President's policy. The President is a candidate for reelection, and with the avowed purpose of continuing that policy. The country is urged to sanction the President's policy, to authorize its continuance and its enlargement, possibly, and all without any inquiry, any investigation, any judgment, as to the wisdom, the justice—in fine, the criminality—of this war, which is an incident of his policy.

The people from whose households have gone forth the young men who have fought and who have fallen in this war, the people who bear the burden of a system of taxation such as the country has known only when the nation's existence was in peril, are to accept in silence all that has been done.

A DEGRADING DEMAND UPON THE PEOPLE.

In the history of despotisms there is not a record of a more degrading subserviency than this which the people of America are asked to accept. Thus is brought home to us Americans the infamy of the doctrine that a people may be governed without their consent.

This is the demand now made upon the American people. Let the demand be made. I answer, as one citizen, the country is not thus to be silenced into abject submission. There will be inquiry, investigation, scrutiny, as the only process by which a judgment can be reached upon the all-important question of the fitness of President McKinley to be again intrusted with the fortunes of the country.

The demand for silence and for the suppression of discussion and of opinion is an admission that that which has been done can not be defended. Such a policy was hazarded recently in the trial of a criminal cause in this city of New York, and with disastrous results. Every incident or event in human affairs that is assailed by anybody is defended by somebody, if it is open to any defense.

Whenever, in former times, the Republican party was assailed, it accepted the issue without delay, and without delay or hesitation it entered upon its defense. Whenever its officers were charged with misconduct or malfeasance in office, it entered at once upon an investigation and pursued the investigation to the end, and that without regard to consequences to the party or to the accused.

PRESIDENTIAL ACTS NOT SACRED THEN.

The plea that what had been done had been made sacred by the lapse of time was never tendered by the Republican party, nor was it accepted by the Republican party when made by others. Nor did the party accept as accomplished facts proceedings on the part of a President that were unlawful or unjust or injurious to the country.

When the Congress assembled in December, 1865, it appeared that the State of North Carolina and six other States that had been engaged in the rebellion had been reorganized under proclamations issued by President Johnson, and it was claimed that they had been restored to their former places in the Union, and that they were then entitled to representation in the House and in the Senate, without action on the part of Congress. The acts of the President were disregarded, and Congress proceeded to reconstruct the Government according to its ideas of justice and wisdom. In those days the doings of a President, that had not been authorized specifically, were not treated as binding upon the country, and inquiries without reserve were instituted. An appeal to the country was made and, by a two-thirds majority, the action of the President was condemned.

At this point I turn aside that I may indulge in an observation which may appear pertinent or otherwise, according to the opinions of those who may hear or may read. If President Johnson's plan of reconstruction had been accepted, the evil to the country would have been light compared with the evil of accepting the Philippines, either as colonies or as States, and either as States or as colonies they are to be attached to the Union if the lead of President McKinley shall be followed by the country.

And, further, I express the opinion that the fair-minded historian will be able to frame a better defense for President Johnson than the historian, or the casuist, even, will be able to offer in behalf of President McKinley.

I am not disturbed by the admission, which I make for the purposes of this address, that the United States is in the lawful possession, under the Spanish treaty and the law of nations, of Porto Rico and the Philippine Islands. However we may designate them, they are Territorial possessions, and as such they fall within the scope of this provision of the Constitution: "The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States." In view of what has been said recently, I add the remark that the Constitution speaks always in the present tense.

HAVE SURRENDERED TERRITORY BEFORE.

The United States is not embarrassed by the fact that our title to Porto Rico and the Philippines is impregnable as against Spain and all other countries. Indeed, the absolute defensibility of our title is proportionately the strength of our evidence that our power to "dispose of" and to transfer our title to another is free from doubt or lawful challenge. In the Oregon controversy we surrendered territory that we claimed as the territory of the United States.

In John Tyler's Administration, and under Mr. Webster's lead, we transferred to Great Britain a territory that was part of the State of Maine. This was done by the consent of the State of Maine and of the State of Massachusetts, that were then joint owners of the lands that were thus transferred. Upon these precedents and upon the power granted in the Constitution I assume that the United States may transfer its title to Porto Rico and the Philippines without "let or hindrance" from anybody. Thus should disappear the pretexts that these islands have come to us by some unseen agency, divine or malevolent, and that it is a duty from which we can not shrink to keep them and to train their millions of inhabitants up to our ideas of self-government. It is the theory of the Administration that responsibilities have come to us without our agency and that we can not avoid those responsibilities. Upon this theory Porto Rico and the Philippine Islands are with us and of us as Territories and States, or as colonies, and for all periods of time. Hence it is that Mr. Reid claims that discussions are out of place and that there is no power in the American people to reverse what has been done.

For my purposes and for this occasion I shall assume that there is power in the American people to relieve themselves of all responsibility for Porto Rico and the Philippine Islands, and thus we may escape from the danger of holding them either as colonies or as Territories on their way to statehood.

If the islands should be held as colonies for the moment, it will be found, and without much delay, that they are on their way to statehood.

THE PRESIDENT AND NOT DESTINY RESPONSIBLE.

I come now to a more careful examination of the claim that these islands, with many evils, actual and present, and with forebodings of evils that are at once probable and immeasurable, have been thrust upon us by processes which were inevitable and which could not have been foreseen. If any part of this exculpatory excuse is true as regards the country, none of it is true as regards the President and those who may have advised and supported his policy since the war with Spain was ended.

The remark has been so often made that it is now a vain repetition to say that the war of the 19th of April, 1898, was undertaken for the sole purpose of relieving Cuba from the dominion of Spain. Even as to that war, it has been claimed that the President was forced by Congressional action to accept and indorse it. If, then, the President had conformed to the act of the 19th of April, or if he had obeyed an impulse of opinion such as has been attributed to him, he would have ended the war when the authority of Spain over the island of Cuba had been extinguished.

The President had no authority for further action, either by war or by aggressive demands through the treaty-making power. Incidentally two pretexts have been offered. First, the destruction of the ship *Maine*, and, second, the destruction of the Spanish fleet in the harbor of Manila. The destruction of the *Maine* was an historical event when war was declared, and the liberation of Cuba was undertaken, in part at least, in retaliation for the destruction of the battle ship. The contest in the bay of Manila was a part of the war for the freedom of Cuba, and when the freedom of Cuba had been secured the war in the East should have been ended. It is often asserted that Dewey should have left Manila when the Spanish fleet had been destroyed. The President is responsible for the course that was pursued. Dewey could only obey orders.

There are those who admit the badness of the President's policy and who yet exonerate the President. If the President is a man of ability, as I think he is, then he alone is responsible for his policy. If, as some assume, the President is a weak man, and under the influence of bad advisers, then, manifestly, his rule in office ought not to be extended. If the President's policy is a bad policy, it is immaterial whether the policy originated with the President or with advisers by whom he has been misled. In either case he is thereby unfitted for the office of President.

Has anyone from the President along the line of imperialists taken upon himself the responsibility of the assertion that the condition of the United States, or its fortunes, present or prospective, have been improved by the acquisition of a paper title to the Philippine Islands?

The fatal error was made the 10th day of August, 1898, when the President, upon his sole responsibility, passed beyond the requirements of the war declaration of April 19, and exacted a cession of islands to the United States and a footing in the Philippines, which was made the basis for a demand for a cession of the entire archipelago, which demand was consummated by the treaty of Paris. In the presence of these facts, what ground remains for the statement that our situation in the Philippine Islands and in Porto Rico has been thrust upon us, and that we are under a burden which we ought to accept and to carry as mankind are forced to bear a visitation of a pestilence, or to endure a year of famine?

It may with truth be said that the possession of the Philippines and the Philippine war, as a consequence, have been thrust upon the country, but not by an unseen hand. As to the President, this only can be said: He demanded the surrender of the Philippines, and he was enabled to enforce his demand from a prostrated enemy through fear that delay would lead to yet further demands upon the Kingdom of Spain. Upon these facts of history I stand committed to the charge I now make, namely: That the claim that the Philippine Islands, with the consequent horrors of war, have been thrust upon us is only a pretext that was designed to mislead the people away from the truth.

NO HOPE NOW FROM THE REPUBLICAN PARTY.

One conclusion is deducible from the facts of history. Our occupation of the Philippine Islands and the war and blood incident to that occupation are due and due solely to the policy and doings of President McKinley, and for which he first and chiefly is responsible. That policy he will pursue until it is reversed by the people, irrespective of party alliances. It is a vain hope that the Republican party as an organization can reverse the policy of the President. The hope is as vain as was the hope in 1861–1865 that the Democratic party as an organization would aid in the abolition of slavery.

Again, it is claimed that trade follows the flag. This is true when the flag is the herald of peace, but the saying is false, false utterly, when the flag is transformed into a menace of war.

If in 1898 we had acted in good faith, if we had encouraged the inhabitants of the Philippines in their efforts to establish an independent government, our increase in exports to the islands would not have been limited to the pernicious trade in alcoholic liquors. Nor, on the other hand, would the users of hemp and of the products of hemp in the United States have been taxed 100 per cent for the benefit of importers, and to the injury alike of the people of the United States and of the Philippine Islands. War is the enemy of commercial trade, and trade does not follow the flag when the flag is the emblem of war.

Peace and friendship are the certain and constant promoters of trade and of every other business pursuit.

WHEN TRADE FOLLOWS THE FLAG.

There are supporters of the Administration who are not content with the possession of the Philippines and the war in the Philippines, but they advocate a warlike undertaking ostensibly for the extension of our trade with China.

China and Russia are combined, and nothing of trade facilities with China can be secured by force or by threats of force. The authorities of China have given notice that further territorial concessions will not be made. The recent speeches of the Chinese minister should be accepted as a declaration that trade with China is to depend upon friendships, agreements, reciprocal relations, and that nothing will be conceded to force. England and the United States, acting separately or combined, have not the power to dictate a commercial policy to China. Russia has gained more in the last five years by peaceful means and agencies than England has gained by war in the closing quarter of this century. Russia has connected its vast Siberian empire with the great Pacific Sea on the east and with the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean on the south.

The British Empire in India is now embraced in the arms of Russia. That country has allied itself with China on one side and with Persia on the other, and with openings to the sea through each country. Thus Russia is to control a third of the population of the globe, and if we are to enjoy the benefits of trade with the millions of the East, we are to secure that trade by the profession and the practice of the principles and the arts of peace. Thus, again, it may appear that the maxim or saying that trade follows the flag is true only when the flag is the emblem and herald of peace. Legitimate and systematic trade shuns the flag in times of war.

Of the import trade with the Philippine Islands in the year 1899, not less than 44 per cent was in English hands, and not more than 8 per cent was from the United States. The noncombatants enjoyed more than nine-tenths of the trade of the islands.

SOME DIFFICULTIES IN THE WAY OF EMPIRE.

I may be asked this question: Can the tendency to autocratic despotic rule in America be arrested? Something of an answer may be found in the record of passing events. There are inherent difficulties in the transformation of our Government, and those difficulties the Administration is now called to meet.

We have a legal title to Porto Rico and the Philippines, but the President does not yet venture to say whether they are Territories on the way to statehood or dependencies to be held as colonies. He is called to choose between English policy and American policy. That question inheres in the nature of things, and an answer must be given.

When the President exacted the protocol of August, 1898, that question was involved, and that question the President must answer. Out of what has been done the nation may learn as much as this, namely, that with every acquisition of territory comes this question: Are the people inhabiting this territory to be received as citizens and as our equals, or are they to be treated as vassals or as persons not yet fully emancipated from slavery? This question inheres in our system of government, and there it must remain. This question has appeared already in the case of Porto Rico, and it will appear in the Philippine Islands. It vexes Congress in the attempt to frame a government for Hawaii.

The anti-imperialists offer a solution and the only solution of this grave difficulty. We say to the country: Let us keep the pledge which we have made to Cuba and to ourselves, and let us at once accord to the inhabitants of Porto Rico and to the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands the opportunity to set up governments for themselves.

Our policy is in harmony with our system of government, and it is in harmony with the great truths on which our system of government has been made to rest.

The issue is a plain issue. It is to be submitted to the people, and for one I rest in full confidence that the people will deliver the nation from the evil policy which President McKinley is pursuing.

At a cost of not less than $500,000,000, and the sacrifice of many t[illegible]nd young lives, a great lesson will have been taught, namely, that this [illegible]ern-ment can not be perverted, through either the follies or the crimes of its rulers. As the fruit of the sacrifices that have been made, the Declaration of Independence and the preamble to the Constitution will be again accepted by us as cardinal truths worthy of acceptance in all free governments. Thus do we vindicate the character and example and teachings of Washington and of Jefferson, and the line of patriots and statesmen to Lincoln and Grant and the rest, who believed in the equality of men and recognized in all peoples and communities the right of self-government.

EXPANSION AND IMPERIALISM.

The imperialists are active in promoting the notion that the anti-imperialists are opposed to the expansion of American territory, and that their opposition to the Philippine war and to the attempt to occupy the islands by force is due entirely to that opinion.

Professor Hart, of Cambridge, has given himself, through many serious pages of Harper's Monthly, to the task of proving that the founders of the Republic were expansionists, and his logic leads him to the conclusion that we are opposing the fathers of the Republic when we protest against the forcible annexation of the Philippine Islands to the United States.

The founders of the Republic never committed themselves to expansion beyond the oceans, nor to the forcible seizure of territory for the purpose of enlarging the limits of the Union, nor to the subjugation of communities either to slavery or to American citizenship. The founders of the Government favored peaceful expansion within the oceans, and some there were who favored the acquisition of the West India Islands. Beyond these possibilities there is no evidence of a public policy or of a public opinion.

In the 11th article of the articles of confederation provision was made for the admission of Canada into the confederation upon the condition that Canada should accede "to this confederation" and join "in the measures of the United States." The fathers did not favor forcible annexation, nor annexation "beyond seas," nor the annexation of peoples of other races, other languages, and who had been trained under institutions and laws of which we have no knowledge.

The logic born of necessity knows no other law than the law of necessity.

The imperialists say our fathers favored the annexation of Canada by conference and friendly agreement, wherefore we are bound to sustain a war for the annexation of the Philippines.

Some persons opposed the annexation of Louisiana, and time has demonstrated their error, therefore the anti-imperialists are in error in opposing the annexation of the Philippines. Again, they say if some persons were in error in opposing the annexation of contiguous territory, it follows that they who oppose the acquisition of territory 10,000 miles away are also in error. The anti-imperialists are not committed upon the question of public policy either for or against the expansion of American territory. We are opposed, unalterably opposed, to the subjugation by war of 10,000,000 human beings into the American Union as citizens and equals, and we are opposed, unalterably opposed, to the subjugation of one man, even, as a vassal.

THE MOST DISGRACEFUL CHAPTER OF ALL MODERN HISTORY.

Of all modern history, the most disgraceful chapter is that which the American nation is now writing. At the opening of the last third of this century we abolished slavery in America, and at the end of this century we are making war for the establishment of a system of slavery in Asia. The crimes of England in the Sepoy war, on the Upper Nile, in South Africa, are trivial offenses against justice and humanity when compared with the crime of subjugating and enslaving 10,000,000 people.

It was a long step downward from Lincoln's proclamation of January 1, 1863, to McKinley's proclamation of December 21, 1898. Lincoln raised 4,000,000 slaves to full and free American citizenship, and invited them to prepare themselves for the work of self-government. McKinley announced to 10,000,000 human beings, who had already secured freedom by their own efforts, his purpose to subject them to his authority by the armies of the United States, unless they would submit themselves to his will without resistance. "My terms," said he, "are, first, submission and vassalage, and I will then consider further as to your fortunes." It is the reproach of the age and an omen of evil to America that there is one citizen to approve of this departure from the true doctrines of the Republic.

Senator HOAR, in his lofty, eloquent, and unanswerable speech against President McKinley's Philippine policy, has made Aaron Burr appear as the supporter of McKinley, and upon the ground that his buccaneering expedition to Mexico has been vindicated by McKinley's buccaneering expedition in the Philippine Islands. Burr's crime has been so minimized by comparison that it may not receive a place in history. But what of the country? Burr was pursued, arraigned, tried, driven from public employments, and ostracized by society. He had been Vice-President of the United States and a

formidable aspirant to the Presidency against Mr. Jefferson. When his trial was ended and the facts were known he had not a supporter, and his aspirations had come to an end. Such was the fate of Aaron Burr. Has the country changed? There has been a change, but the country has not changed.

If, however, the city of Washington were the Government of the United States, as the city of Rome ruled the Roman Republic, and under corresponding conditions, the art of printing unknown, the rapid communication of thought not yet even imagined as a possibility, and the Republic not welded into harmony, the words of the historian De Vertot might soon be applied to America: "Luxury and the love of riches came into Rome with the treasures of the conquered provinces, and poverty and temperance, which had formed so many great captains, fell into contempt. And what is most surprising is that it was not by degrees, but all at once, that this vast alteration happened, and the Romans ran headlong into luxury and effeminacy." Is this to be our fate?

THE FAMILIAR PRETEXT OF CONQUERORS.

The policy of the conqueror has always been gilded by one pretext: The conquered are to be well governed. Such was President McKinley's promise to the Filipinos. We begin civil government in Porto Rico by treating the inhabitants as alien subjects, and the trade regulations proceed upon the theory that we are to enjoy the markets of Porto Rico, and that a duty is to be levied upon the products of Porto Rico when brought into the United States. We are setting up a civil government which is as absolute as could be devised. Thus do we violate our promises and prove the iniquity of the pretexts that we have tendered to the country and to our victims in the island.

In the days of reconstruction "carpetbaggery" was an unprecedented condition of affairs. It was abolished at an early day and by a general concurrence of opinion. We have established a carpetbag system for Porto Rico, and upon the basis of perpetuity. The first fruits of this system have been gathered already in the island of Cuba.

In four years the doctrine of the right of self-government has been repudiated in Washington, and an avowal of the doctrine is a hazardous experiment for a member of the Republican party. The downfall of Rome, as described by De Vertot, was not more rapid than the change that has taken place in the capital city of America.

THE GENIUS OF THE PRESENT REPUBLICAN PARTY—IT MUST BE OVERTHROWN.

In the year 1895 or 1896 a man emerged from the obscurity of unrecognized citizenship, and in the intervening time he has advanced himself to the head of the Republican party, and without delay he became the apparent director of its policy. He contributed most largely to the nomination and election of President McKinley.

Following the inauguration he secured a seat in the Senate by the enforced retirement of a statesman who, in an experience of forty years, had never before yielded to the menaces of those in power nor been misled by vain promises. During the three years now ended this man, so recently unknown, has stood before the country as the author of our public policy. This may be error, but in the month of April, 1900, he announced the renomination of President McKinley, and predicted his reelection. At the same time the Republican party waited in submissive silence for his utterance in regard to a candidate for the Vice-Presidency. All this appears to have been the outcome of immense energy in one man, combined with unlimited resources in money. For the moment the combination is supreme in the Republican party.

And thus a party that became historically great for its victories in war and for its achievements in peace bows in subserviency to a self-created dictator. What is the remedy? The party must be overthrown, and in its downfall the dictatorship will disappear, and in a quadrennial period, or in a decade, the party, regenerated, may come again to the head of affairs in the Republic.

APPENDIX III.

THE SHAME OF IT.

[From the Washington Post.]

It will not be wise in the Administration to overlook the fact that this is a sentimental people. We laugh at Frenchmen and Italians and the Latin races generally. It is our caprice to speak of them as being hysterical and effervescent. It is the caprice of ignorance. The Teutonic temperament is the most maudlin of all, and the Anglo-Saxons come next, because of their inheritance. The Latins are demonstrative, perhaps, but we furnish for the world the permanent supply of sentimentality. And the Administration will find its welfare in considering this fact.

Perhaps it is difficult here in Washington to keep one's touch upon the nation's pulse. Perhaps the high official, in this atmosphere of luxury, and diplomatic calculation, and unwonted and novel environment, finds it hard to maintain intact his simple patriotism and his pure ideals. But the great American people west of New York—the yeomanry upon whose loyalty and brawn and courage the honor of this Republic rests—these must be taken into account by any government or party that hopes to stand. We advise the powers that be that this hideous scandal in Cuba can not safely be treated as a case of mere vulgar embezzlement and breach of trust. We tell them—and we know whereof we speak—that every American who loves his country and holds its honor sacred regards this frightful business in Havana as a personal sorrow and humiliation. It strikes him as a treason committed against the nation—as a betrayal and degradation of the flag. He is not to be cajoled with the proposition that this is a mere official delinquency. He knows that we took up the cause of Cuba as altruists and missionaries. He knows that we went there in the guise of unselfish and heaven-sent redeemers. He knows that we prated to Christendom of our holy mission, and he remembers how we qualified the declaration of war with the unctuous pledge of piety. And we all know, now that our professions have been put to shame—that, after taking possession of Cuba in the name of God, we have plundered and despoiled it as the most ruthless buccaneers of the last century could scarce have done.

He who tells himself that this infamy can be hushed and set aside and hidden from the public gaze by a pretense of vigor and an alluring travesty of indignation must be drunk with eminence and power. He must have forgotten his own thoughts and sentiments and lost his hold upon the feelings of his fellow-citizens. We declare that is the most ghastly and abhorrent stain that has ever been put upon the escutcheon of the nation. If there be any man within our boundaries who does not feel that he has been betrayed and stabbed in his own person, then he is no true patriot, no genuine American.

APPENDIX IV.

[From the Washington Post, supporter of McKinley's Administration.]

WHAT M'KINLEY MUST FACE.

There is a pestiferous muddle in Cuba—a humiliating contradiction of policies and attitudes. We say in one breath that Cuba is a foreign country, merely held in tutelage; yet we are legislating for her in the matter of taxation and social observance; we are rearranging her laws and her judicial machinery; we are disbursing her revenues for our own purposes, and we are treating directly with the consular and diplomatic representatives of European nations in the island. The Cubans complain, and seemingly with justice, that our attitude is inconsistent, and they are beginning to assert that our protestations are not sincere. Thoughtful men in this country fear that we are preparing sorrow for ourselves and new calamities for Cuba by taking up with the professional brigands and disturbers and neglecting the responsible, property-holding, and taxpaying classes, who alone can be trusted to establish and conduct a civilized government after our forces shall have been withdrawn. The outlook in Cuba is far from reassuring.

In Porto Rico our attitude is even more embarrassing. We have annexed the island outright, under the treaty of Paris, and made Porto Rico a part of our territory. When we annexed Hawaii we gave it free trade with the United States, but against Porto Rico we set up a tariff tax upon her industries. The pretext for this is that Porto Rico is destitute and that the money thus raised by taxing her products will be used to maintain a machinery of government in the island. In other words, we put a burden upon the industrious and producing classes in order to pay the salaries of our office-holders. We could find $3,000,000 to send to Cuba and distribute among the worthless marauders who followed Gomez in his predatory insurrection, but we have nothing to help Porto Rico to its feet and restore a prosperity which we destroyed by our occupation. Porto Rico is ours and we do nothing for it, but we send millions to Cuba to placate the drones and agitators of a foreign state. We say that Porto Rico is not in the United States, that our flag does not make it a Territory like Hawaii and Alaska, yet the governor we send there to preside over the island makes oath to uphold, in that capacity, the Constitution of the United States. If the Constitution is there, why is not Porto Rico an integral part of the Union? If the Constitution is not there, how can Governor Allen defend it?

Then we have the Philippines. The country is far from satisfied as to the situation. Three or four times, perhaps oftener, within the past eighteen months we have been assured that the trouble was over, the insurrection finally and forever crushed, yet the next day American soldiers are trapped and killed within sight of Manila. The roll of the dead grows hourly; the hospitals add steadily to their hapless populations, and cemeteries fatten without ceasing as the weeks roll by. The Administration insists that there is no war in the Philippines, but Otis says there is war every time he dismisses an officer from the Army, and he does this with ghastly frequency. The country is not contented with this state of things. There is much to be explained.

As to the South African Republics, now struggling for their very existence, the American people deplore the failure of their official representatives to declare for them that sympathy which it is our boasted mission in the world to feel, and, if need be, to exemplify. It will not do to say that our sympathies in this direction have always been confined to the Western Hemisphere. We remember Kossuth too well. The truth is that hundreds of thousands of thinking men who will vote next November are to-day asking themselves for some creditable explanation of the Government's apparent alliance with England in the war of rapine and spoliation upon the South African Dutch.

It will be for Mr. McKinley to bear in mind the fact that this is a sentimental people; that, while Americans idolize valor, humanity, and justice, they condemn with equal fervor unfairness, cruelty, and bad faith. They recognized in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty a trap for shameful possibilities, and they are watching, with a vigilance perhaps unsuspected in high quarters, what they begin to regard as a dangerous and abominable tendency. The President still holds the people's affectionate regard and trust, but this may be strained too far. Indeed, the tension has already become perilous, and everybody knows it.

APPENDIX V.

[Washington Post, June 5, 1900.]

POSTMASTER-GENERAL SMITH.

Mr. Charles Emory Smith is an accomplished gentleman. He writes well and talks well. As the spokesman or orator of the Administration—a self-constituted rôle, we understand, and one of which the Administration has really stood in no need—his official career has not been without its brilliant aspects. In literary work Mr. Smith excels. His contribution to Collier's Weekly, only last month, entitled "The mails follow the flag," dealing familiarly with the Cuban postal service and lauding Director Rathbone's work to the skies, was an especially fine bit of work from a purely literary point of view. The service he rendered in upholding the hands of Congress during the Porto Rico imbroglio, in his exhaustive, though anonymous, presentation of the merits of the proposition to his doubting and even obstinate countrymen, also stands out as a shining example of the value of a Cabinet officer who wields a trenchant pen.

But generously conceding to Mr. Smith his notable achievements in literature, and granting his usefulness as an Administration orator, the close observers of affairs—of whom the Post is one—will naturally pause to inquire, Has all this literary work, all this oratory, really been worth while? Has Mr. Smith, the accomplished writer and gifted speaker, in the rôle to which we here allude, been of as great service to President McKinley as he might have been had he more closely pursued the duties of his important office? In view of recent deplorable events, which might easily have been prevented, or at least minimized, by proper official vigilance here at Washington, a negative response is sure to be given to both the foregoing queries.

The Post is moved to these remarks not through an uncharitable feeling toward the Postmaster-General, but by a most remarkable statement given to the press yesterday in his own defense in connection with the fraud disclosures at Habana. We are told that the work of retrenchment and reform now being so effectively performed by Mr. Bristow was, in fact, ordered—"imperatively demanded" is the term used—"some months ago" by Postmaster-General Smith. Such an excuse is neither potent nor creditable. Are we to understand that a Cabinet officer's duty and responsibility end when he imperatively demands that abuses be corrected?

Are we to justify him in closing his eyes in the months ensuing while the extravagances multiply and culminate in wholesale peculation? Was it not the Postmaster-General's duty—his imperative duty—to see that his orders for retrenchment were carried out? Is it anyone's fault but his own that Director Rathbone was not required or compelled to keep the Department here fully and correctly informed as to postal affairs on the island? Does it relieve the Postmaster-General to intimate that it was Governor-General Brooke who should have discovered the deficiencies?

The explanations of Mr. Smith are lame and illogical throughout. They are neither courageous nor businesslike. It is unfortunate for Mr. Smith that he explained at all. His statement has simply emphasized his own shortcomings in the premises.

Civil Code for Alaska.

SPEECH

OF

HON. HERMAN B. DAHLE,

OF WISCONSIN,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, May 17, 1900,

On the bill (S. 3419) making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes.

Mr. DAHLE said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will not enter into any general discussion of the pending bill (the Alaska code), but will take advantage of the rules and practice of the House and will speak on a measure of very great importance to the producers and consumers of dairy products of our country.

The magnitude of the dairy industry in my State, and especially in my district, emboldens me to address the House on the subject of suitable protection for that industry from unfair and ruinous competition. There is an old maxim to the effect that when the farmer is prosperous the country is prosperous, but that when the farmer is not prospering the country can not long prosper without him. The experience of generations has proven the truth of the saying. There can be no enduring prosperity unless it is based on the welfare of the men who till the soil.

There has been before the House for the greater part of this session a bill (H. R. 3717), introduced by Mr. GROUT, of Vermont, which I believe will do more to promote the legitimate prosperity of the agricultural interests of the country than any measure which has been before Congress for many years. It will not only promote the interests of the agricultural population, but will do so notwithstanding the assertions of those opposed to it, without injuring any legitimate industry which places reliable, pure products on a fair market and is free from fraud.

This bill, if passed, will serve two purposes. It will not only safeguard the interests of the producer of butter, but will at the same time protect the consumer from deception in the nature of the food he buys, and enable him to buy butter if he wishes butter, and oleomargarine if he wishes oleomargarine, at the proper price for each commodity. The bill to which I refer has been extensively misrepresented. It simply provides that oleomargarine shall be sold as oleomargarine and not as butter, and that consumers seeking butter shall not be imposed upon. The bill seeks to place each industry on its own basis and make each stand or fall by its own merits. Can anything be more fair? What injustice is there in this proposition?

If the manufacture of oleomargarine is a legitimate industry, free from fraud, what wrong is there to it to require its product to be sold on the open market for what it really is, and not for something which it is not? We have heard a great deal during this session about this bill being an effort to crush a legitimate business. How can a legitimate business be crushed by a law which requires its product to be sold for what it actually is? The cry raised by the friends of imitation butter that the bill will ruin them is a confession that they depend on selling their imitation for butter to continue that enormous business and to reap the enormous profits they have been reaping.

The cry against this bill is a confession from the men engaged in the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine that their great profits, amounting in some cases to over 100 per cent, depend on fraud and the deception of the consumer. When has a more startling position been taken before a committee of this House by the representatives of any industry? The farmers of the nation come to us with a memorial for protection from fraudulent and ruinous competition with imitation butter, and the representatives of the manufacturers of that imitation come before us and demand that they be permitted to sell an imitation to deceive the consumer and to ruin the farmer.

We are asked to place each industry on its own basis: make each class of producers sell their product for what it is—butter as butter and oleomargarine as oleomargarine. We are asked to protect the consumer from being deceived as to the food he buys; to protect him from being given oleomargarine, or some other imitation, when he asks for and pays the price of butter. A more fair and just proposition was never laid before Congress.

The importance and necessity of some such legislation as this is readily seen, when it is remembered that the oleomargarine manufacture has doubled and more than doubled in the past four years. The oleomargarine factories of the United States produced 45,000,000 pounds of the imitation in 1897, and in 1899 the amount had risen to 83,000,000 pounds. Of this the greater part was consumed under the belief that it was butter.

Were it not that the greater part was palmed off as butter, this bill would not have received the support it has received from the farmers and butter consumers of the United States. Congress was not appealed to until every other method of protecting the dairy industry from this fraudulent and ruinous competition had been exhausted. A majority of the States of the Union have enacted laws forbidding oleomargarine being colored to imitate butter, but from the very nature of things these laws have been found insufficient to protect either the producer or consumer of butter. Oleomargarine manufactured in one State can be sold in another in violation of law, and the officials of neither State can successfully trace the shipment and effectively enforce the law.

Twenty years' experience has demonstrated that imitation butter of any kind can be sold by the dealer to his customers for butter if it be colored to imitate butter, and the substitution is difficult of detection. Any law which seeks to prevent the sale of colored oleomargarine as butter to the consumer by the retailer is very difficult of enforcement, and is on the whole impracticable. Experience in the State of Wisconsin has shown that the proper way to protect the legitimate butter industry is to so tax the manufacture of oleomargarine colored to imitate butter that its cost to the retailer will be equal to that of butter and the incentive to fraud is thereby done away with.

Under existing conditions the temptation to substitute the cheaper imitation for butter when sold to the consumer at retail is very strong. Both kind of goods look alike, and the unskilled consumer can not detect the difference. The dealer will get a profit of perhaps 2 or 3 cents a pound on the butter and twice as much or more on the oleomargarine. Both kinds of goods are kept in the same refrigerator.

The opportunity for substitution and fraud on the consumer is more than the morals of many men can stand, and the result is that multitudes are given oleomargarine, costing the dealer from 10 to 15 cents a pound, in place of butter which was called for and which cost the dealer 18 to 28 cents a pound. The customer pays for butter. As long as the dealer confines his sales of oleomargarine as butter to known customers, whom he can rely on not investigating the nature of the goods they are supplied with, he is comparatively safe, and may continue his fraudulent practices for a long period of time and reap the large profits resulting from getting butter prices for a cheaper substitute. Against this condition of affairs the producers and consumers of butter are helpless unless Congress comes to their relief.

The present laws for the protection of the public from fraud in the sale of oleomargarine have failed, and it is because of the failure of these laws, State and national, that this Congress is appealed to. Thirty-two States have enacted statutes against the sale of colored oleomargarine. These statutes have been found unequal to the task of protecting the public, and twenty years of experience has shown that only a law which shall control the manufacturer and the nature of his product will accomplish the desired end. The evil must be met at its own source and freed from fraud before it gets into the great channels of trade. Human experience has demonstrated the insufficiency of State laws to protect the public from this fraud.

Experience has also shown that only a law which will clearly distinguish between butter and oleomargarine, in some way that the one can not be sold for the other and the public deceived, will meet this growing evil and avert the danger which threatens the legitimate dairy industry of the nation. Gentlemen may quibble, may talk of the rights of the oleomargarine manufacturer to deceive the consumer, but the fact remains that only a national color law will meet the evil.

As long as oleomargarine can be made and put on the market in imitation of butter, resembling pure butter in color, so long will it be sold as butter. In voting on this question we must take one horn of the dilemma; we must either allow this admitted evil to continue or we must stop the sale of an imitation for the pure article. The people of the United States demand this action, as is shown by the multitude of memorials before the Committee on Agriculture. In another way, however, the public sentiment of the nation has been shown on this question. Over thirty States have enacted statutes intended to protect the people from deception in the nature of the food they buy under the name of butter. Not a single one of these statutes has ever been repealed. Can any more direct testimonial be desired of the nature of public sentiment on this question?

We have heard before the Committee on Agriculture a great deal of argument against the bill, during which much was said of oleomargarine as a food for the poor, because it is cheaper than butter. The representatives of the oleomargarine manufacturers have posed as the friends of the poor man. Now, if this statement of the representatives of the oleomargarine manufacturers is true, why do they wish to color their product and sell it at butter prices? How does the poor consumer benefit from the sale of oleomargarine when he pays butter prices for it? Would a law forbidding the coloring of oleomargarine prevent the poor from buying it?

Would such a law in any way restrict his right and opportunity to consume it?

No reasonable man will contend that it will. If the poor or any other class of consumers wish to eat oleomargarine instead of butter, this bill will not prevent them doing so. The dairymen and butter consumers of the country do not ask that any individual who prefers oleomargarine shall not be allowed to buy and consume it at his wish. Let butter be sold as butter, and the imitation as imitation. As said before, oleomargarine can be sold to the consumer for from 10 to 15 cents a pound.

This being so, how does the poor man benefit from the sale of oleomargarine when he is charged from 15 to 25 cents a pound for it, the regular price of pure butter? The bill lowers the tax on oleomargarine as such to one-quarter of a cent a pound, and if it is left uncolored, or is colored some other color than that of butter, the consumer, the poor consumer, will get it at its rightful price, and will be saved from 5 to 15 cents a pound of what he is now charged. Nothing shows the hypocrisy of the argument of the oleomargarine manufacturers more clearly than their unwillingness to sell their product for what it really is at its proper price. They claim to be the friends of the poor man, and at the same time insist that they be allowed to sell him oleomargarine at butter prices.

This fact was shown in my own State within the past few years, when numerous convictions were had of retail dealers for selling colored oleomargarine against the State law. The oleomargarine was sold to the poor, but was sold as butter and for butter prices. In no case, as far as I am aware, was the imitation sold otherwise than as pure butter and for the best butter prices. This is the whole contention, this is the whole opposition to the bill. "We must be allowed to sell our product for butter," is the cry of the oleomargarine industry, "and we must color it to imitate butter to do this."

The enormous profits resulting from selling oleomargarine at butter prices has caused the bitter fight against this bill. The same enormous profits have caused the creation of a huge fund for the defense of dealers arrested charged with the violation of State laws in the sale of oleomargarine. The profits are so great that men are willing to take many risks of fine and imprisonment, and the manufacturers are willing to spend large sums to keep the market open to their imitation butter.

One of the principal arguments used against this bill has been the importance of the oleomargarine industry and the large sums invested in the plants of the manufacturers. The bill, we have been assured, will seriously impair the prosperity of this business, and thereby injure a large established industry. The immensity of the dairy interests which are being undermined by the fraudulent sale of oleomargarine as butter has received but scant attention from the plausible gentlemen who have been before the committee. The importance of the oleomargarine business, except to the millionaire owners of the business, is a matter of opinion.

The importance to the country of the prosperity of the millions of farmers engaged in the production of butter is a matter of fact. The two classes of products can not live together. Pure butter or colored oleomargarine must give way. Either the sale of colored oleomargarine sold as butter must end, or the farmers engaged in the manufacture of butter must forfeit their prosperity. Which is the most important to the country? Can any reasonable man sincerely believe that the prosperity of a handful of manufacturers, numbering 26 firms, to be of greater importance than the prosperity of 5,000,000 or more farmers who depend either wholly or partly on the butter market for their well-being? Is the piling up of a few colossal fortunes better to the nation than the prosperity of the farmers scattered over the smiling face of the country?

The farmer is the great consumer, and on his financial welfare depends, more than on any other, the well-being of the rest of us, and the fact, for fact it is, can not be too strongly dwelt upon, that either he must suffer serious loss or the sale of oleomargarine as pure butter must stop. In 1899 the oleomargarine product was over 83,000,000 pounds, and more than three-fourths of that was sold as butter. Every pound sold as butter displaced a pound of butter and took the value of that pound of butter from the pockets of the farmer. Were this done by legitimate competition there could be but little objection, but all this immense loss to the farmers of the country was caused by fraud, was caused by the consumer who wished to obtain the farmer's product being deceived and tricked into buying something he did not want at a price far in excess of a legitimate profit.

The sale of oleomargarine is steadily increasing at an average rate of 20 per cent a year, and if this continues, as it is most likely to unless some legislative safeguards are thrown about the consumer, the butter makers of the land will soon have to divide the market with this cheaper substitute, and the consumers will be sold more and more of an article they do not want in the guise of what they do want.

Considering the facts, aside from the exaggerations of the importance of the oleomargarine industry, it is easy to see how entirely insignificant the oleomargarine interest is when compared with the dairy interests of even a single State. If the injury which we are assured this bill will work to the oleomargarine business is to be made the test, we will readily appreciate the greater claim of the dairymen and consumers for protection. Much has been said before the committee of the immensity and importance of the oleomargarine industry.

The fact is that the entire oleomargarine business, as measured by the value of the plants, machinery, and fixtures of the 26 factories, is not equal to the value of the plants, machinery, and fixtures of the 252 dairy plants of my district alone. Think of it! The entire value of the plants, machinery, and fixtures of the oleomargarine factories of the United States not equal to capital invested in dairy plants in one Congressional district of four counties.

One of the largest oleomargarine manufactories in the country is that of William J. Moxley & Co., of Chicago. According to the last statement by this firm to one of our most reliable mercantile agencies, the value of this plant, fixtures, and machinery is $30,850.63. There are 26 such factories in the United States, the majority of them smaller and with less capital than this one and with less invested in machinery and fixtures.

The Moxley plant being worth $30,000, it is fair to estimate the average value of the oleomargarine plants, machinery, and fixtures at $25,000. There are 26 oleomargarine manufactories in the United States, and at the average value of $25,000 the total value of these plants would be $650,000. That is the value of the plants, machinery, and fixtures of the oleomargarine factories of the United States.

How does this compare with the value of the creameries of a single State, or, better still, a single Congressional district? If it is a business of such magnitude as has been urged, surely it must be worth more than the creameries of four counties comprising the Second Wisconsin district. There are 252 creameries in my district, worth on an average $2,700, making a total value for the creameries of the district, taking only the values of the plants, machinery, and fixtures, $680,000, or $30,000 more than the entire value of the plants, machinery, and fixtures of all the oleomargarine factories of the United States.

This oleomargarine business, because established, now comes before us and argues that it is of such importance and has so much money invested in it that it has the right to undermine and fraudulently ruin one of the oldest legitimate agricultural industries of the country. It defends itself against this bill on the ground that it is so important, and yet it has less money invested than is invested in the legitimate dai industry of a single Congressional district.

In the State of Wisconsin there are 951 creameries, with an average value of $2,700, making a total value for the State in plants, machinery, and fixtures of $2,567,700. Set against this sum the value of the plants, machinery, and fixtures of the oleomargarine factories of the country, which was given before as $650,000, and you can readily see the insignificant amount invested in the imitation business when compared with the legitimate industry.

The representatives of the oleomargarine manufacturers have laid great stress on the amount of money invested in their business as the reason why it should be allowed to continue its fraudulent practice. If the amount invested is the test, how small a voice should the oleomargarine business have in this discussion as compared with the colossal amount invested in butter making in my State alone, not counting the other great dairy States of the Union.

This method of measuring the relative importance of the two industries is the best one, for it precludes the consideration of watered stock, overcapitalization, and exaggerated values. The average statement as to the value of the oleomargarine business is unreliable because of the impossibility of knowing the exact conditions of the business. In order to make the investment of the industry look large, the representatives of the oleomargarine industry figure in immense outstanding accounts, large amount of cash on hand, great quantities of stamps kept in the offices of the concerns.

The Moxley Company claims total assets at $291,581.16. This is made up, however, chiefly of cash on hand, stamps, bank deposits, and outstanding accounts. Its plant, machinery, and fixtures are worth but $30,850.63 on its own statement; and the actual value of the plant, with the fixtures and machinery considered, is the only true way to measure the two industries. Were the stock kept on hand by the dairymen to be known and the value of their outstanding accounts capable of being measured, they would show a sum so immense the amount claimed for the oleomargarine industry would sink into insignificance.

The necessity of some Federal legislation for the protection of the consumer and the legitimate butter producer can not be more clearly shown than by the immense quantity of oleomargarine

sold, colored like butter, in the States where such sale is absolutely prohibited. I can speak more knowingly, Mr. Speaker, of my own State, where I am somewhat familiar with the conditions, and the efforts that have been made to enforce the law. Some years ago a statute was passed absolutely forbidding the sale of oleomargarine colored to resemble butter.

I know from personal knowledge that the most strenuous efforts have been made by the State dairy and food inspector to enforce this law, and numerous convictions were had for its violation. In each of these cases colored oleomargarine was sold to consumers who asked for butter, and they were charged butter prices. In spite, however, of the stringent State law, and the earnest efforts of the State authorities to enforce it, 714,742 pounds of yellow oleomargarine were sold in Wisconsin in 1899. This is from the report of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Notwithstanding this report and the undisputable evidence of the sales it offers in Wisconsin, you may travel the State over and you will not find a pound of oleomargarine for sale as such. Over half a million pounds sold in the State, and not a pound offered on the market as oleomargarine. Requests in several cities of the State for oleomargarine by would-be consumers was met by the statement from dealers that there was no oleomargarine on the market in Wisconsin. The conditions in Wisconsin are but a sample of the conditions prevailing all over the United States, and demonstrate most effectually the necessity for a Federal law for the protection of the legitimate industry.

The experience of many years, both among the officials whose duty it is to enforce the law and among men of large experience in the marketing of dairy products, has also taught the necessity of such legislation as the pending bill. I have had some correspondence with various firms of long experience in the dairy markets in various States, firms which as a merchant and manufacturer I have intrusted with my own goods. They are unanimous in saying that only a Federal law taxing colored oleomargarine, so that its cost to the retailer will be equal to that of butter, will be effective. I quote from some of these letters:

Potter & Williams, Buffalo, N. Y.:

Your esteemed favor of May 10 is to hand and noted. In reply we would say that from our point of view there is no question but what Mr. GROUT'S bill should become law. The laws of the State of New York governing the sale of oleomargarine are in all probability as prohibitive as the laws of any State in the Union, nevertheless the oleomargarine manufacturers find a way of getting around our law, with the result that thousands and thousands of pounds are sold all over the State of New York, not sold as oleomargarine, but sold for butter and colored to look like butter. Our present law forbids the coloring of oleomargarine, and when it is uncolored it is almost as white as lard, but in defiance of the law the goods are colored to resemble butter and are sold for butter.

One of our nearest neighbors was apprehended this spring with something over 500 packages of oleomargarine on hand. His sales previous to the time of his apprehension amounted to thousands and thousands of packages, all of which he sold for butter. He also claims that he bought it for butter. We understand the fines due the State of New York from this one man alone amount to about $16,000, but as yet nothing has been done. Whether the manufacturers of the oleomargarine are protecting him or not we do not know, but at all events the State authorities are not bothering him any now.

During the time our neighbor was handling oleomargarine every package of it took the place of a package of pure butter and affected the demand for pure butter to just that extent. We and all others who were dealing honestly in the pure article during the time that our neighbor was handling oleomargarine were practically put out of business. We could not compete with him in price, and apparently his goods were just as good as any pure butter.

Up to the present time the manufacturers of oleomargarine appear to have been strong enough to defeat the object of all State laws so far as they interfered with the sale of oleomargarine. At the present time no one knows when he buys a pound of butter at the retail store whether he is really taking home butter or oleomargarine.

Mr. GROUT'S bill, of course, is in the interests of dairymen, but at the same time it is also in the interest of every person who desires to deal honestly in honest goods, and in the interest of every family in the United States.

A. H. Barber, commission merchant, Chicago:

I surely think that the Grout bill will be a great benefit to all the farmers who are interested in the dairy business. I think that at least seven-eighths of all oleomargarine is sold over the counters by the retailers as butter, and if these goods were made uncolored they could not be pawned off to the consumers for butter. The manufacturers and the wholesalers, I think, as a usual thing sell it to the retailers as butterine or oleomargarine.

It is a fact that the sale of oleomargarine has driven the dairymen quite largely out of business, as the prices on genuine butter have been so low the past two or three years that but very few factories are getting much more than half the amount of milk they formerly did. This past winter butter has ruled higher than formerly, on account of the smaller production of butter. If the Grout bill should become a law, it would stimulate the dairymen to increase their herds, and the consequence would be a larger production of butter, and the prices of dairy products would rule at a remunerative price to the farmer.

Pitt, Barnum & Co., New York:

The State law prohibits the sale of butterine and oleomargarine in our State, but, beyond all doubt, there is lots of it sold—and it is sold as genuine butter. Our State dairy commissioner is watching it very closely, and has prosecuted a number of cases successfully. There can be no doubt but that the unlawful sale of butterine and oleomargarine has its effect upon the demand and price of pure butter in the sections where they are selling it on the quiet.

T. L. Brundage, commission merchant, Cleveland, Ohio:

Since receiving your letter I have had a conversation with Mr. Reynolds, who was deputy dairy commissioner for a time, and he tells me that he is satisfied that from the investigations he has made, fully one-half of the oleomargarine sold is sold to the customers for butter, and of course so far as the influence of such sales are concerned on the price of pure butter it must certainly have a great effect, and it can not be otherwise, and as so much of it is being used the demand for butter is very much smaller. I do not think that it is sold to the retailer for butter, but it is the retailer that sells it to the consumer for butter. The retailer without doubt knows what he is handling, and the consumer is the one who suffers, and the dairy industry is crippled and injured also.

Earl Brothers, Chicago:

We find that the sale of colored butterine, or oleomargarine, is certainly injurious, and also know that it hurts the sale of butter.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican party has a traditional policy of protection to American industries from destructive foreign competition. To that policy the great party to which we belong is committed heart and soul. Protection is the cornerstone of Republican policy. Is it consistent to protect the manufacturing industries of the United States from destructive foreign competition and leave the greatest industry of America, that of agriculture, open to the onslaughts of an insidious foe from behind?

Can we justify ourselves before the people in our policy of protection if we leave the farmers of the United States at the mercy of a fraudulent business, which is demoralizing one of the principal agricultural industries of our country? Is it not as worthy, and, indeed, as necessary, to protect this great agricultural industry from ruinous and fraudulent competition at home as well as from injurious competition with underpaid labor abroad?

The dairymen of the United States are protected from Canadian competition by a tariff. The injury that the Canadian butter makers could do the dairy industry of the United States, however, is slight when compared with the ravages being made in the legitimate dairy industry by the ruinous competition of the oleomargarine dealers selling their imitation as butter. If the General Government felt it its duty to protect the dairymen of the country from Canadian competition, how much more is it the duty of the Government to now step in and protect them from this new danger, compared with which the Canadian competition is a mere incident.

The real danger to the dairy industry is from within, not from without, the United States. The Government protects the iron industry with a tariff of $4 a ton on pig iron, $1 a ton on iron ore, seven-twentieths of a cent a pound on steel rails, and a half a cent a pound on structural steel. Lumber is protected by a tariff of from $1 to $2 a thousand feet; shoe leather, 20 per cent ad valorem; chinaware, 55 per cent; brick, 45 per cent; and many others, examples of which might be multiplied.

All this protection is practical, because the danger to these industries is from foreign competition with its underpaid labor. These industries have nothing to fear from imitations at home. Brick can not be easily imitated by some cheaper substitute. Steel rails can not be made from the waste slag of iron foundries. Shoes can not be made from the leather scraps of harness shops. They have nothing to fear from an imitation made of far cheaper materials, but which can not be detected by the consumer. The position of butter is unique. It can be successfully imitated in taste and appearance so that the consumer is unable, without making a chemical test, to recognize the true from the false.

This being the case, it becomes the duty of the Government to protect the public from imposition in the nature of the food it buys, and at the same time protect the farmers of the nation from the danger which is staring them in the face. Congress has defended the American farmer when he was threatened from without by comparatively harmless foes. Shall it now desert him when he is threatened from within by a stalwart enemy? Shall Congress, after its long career as the friend of the American farmer, desert him in his hour of need? Let us join in saying "No," by voting for the Grout bill.

Civil Code for Alaska.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN F. FITZGERALD,

OF MASSACHUSETTS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, May 26, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole, and having under consideration the bill (S. 349) to provide a civil code for Alaska—

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I desire to call the attention of the House at this time to an editorial which appeared in this morning's Washington Post. It contains a statement of fact which seems to me to demand the immediate attention of Congress, and I therefore ask the indulgence of the House while I read the extract:

INFAMOUS SCHOOL MANAGEMENT.

If Congress needs any further evidence of the imperious and immediate necessity for a change in the management and the methods of our public

school establishment, the Post is prepared to furnish it. To that end we call attention to two circulars recently distributed among the teachers. They are designated, respectively, as "Form C" and "Form D," and they require the teachers to obtain from their pupils certain information which, in our opinion, the superintendent has no sort of right to seek, and the mere seeking of which is a vile and insolent outrage upon the children and their parents.

We have had an opportunity of examining these two circulars, and we take this occasion to reproduce a few specimen queries which the teachers are expected to respond to, of course by questioning the children themselves or their parents, for naturally the teachers could not possibly speak of their own knowledge:

"Smoke cigarettes habitually?"
"Smoke cigarettes sometimes?"
"Attend theaters and parties frequently?"
"Father illiterate or nearly so?"
"Father lazy and improvident?"
"Father a drunkard?"
"Mother illiterate or nearly so?"
"Mother intemperate?"
"Other perceptible mental or bodily defect."
"Nature of this bodily or mental defect."
"Increase in measurement of chest since October 11, 1899."
"Increase in measurement around the hips since October 11, 1899."

I think this is the most remarkable circular that has ever been issued in a civilized community. It is an insult to every scholar in the schools and an outrage on every family. The man who caused any such document as this to be issued is not a proper man to have at the head of our school system, and I hope the proper committee of this House will take immediate action. An investigation should be started immediately. Congress is responsible for the school system of this District, and if this circular furnishes any basis for judging the qualifications of the head of the public-school system in this District, the sooner we have a change the better.

Porto Rico.

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES T. McCLEARY,
OF MINNESOTA,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, June 5, 1900.

The House having under consideration the bill (H. R. 11538) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy—

Mr. McCLEARY said:

Mr. SPEAKER: On the afternoon of February 28 last this House passed a bill for the relief of Porto Rico, reducing the tariff rates between that island and the United States by 85 per cent and turning the proceeds of the revenue collected at both ends of the line over for the benefit of the Porto Ricans.

That bill passed the House by a majority of 11—almost the exact Republican majority in the House—only 6 Republicans voting against it and 4 Democrats voting for it. Later on, slightly modified in detail, but identical in principle, and supplemented by the addition of a temporary form of government for Porto Rico, it passed the Senate.

Passed by both Houses and approved by the President, it is now the law of the land. In the coming campaign it will probably be one of the things discussed. I therefore avail myself of the latitude allowed in the present debate to present to the House a few facts, some of which, so far as I know, have not heretofore been brought to its attention.

In that bill two questions were involved: First, the constitutional right of Congress to lay and collect any tariff on goods between Porto Rico and the United States; and, second, the propriety of extending the help needed by Porto Rico in that way.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION STATED.

What is the constitutional question involved? It all hinges on the meaning of the first clause of the eighth section of the first article of the Constitution, which reads as follows:

> The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Under the Articles of Confederation, which was our form of government from 1781 to 1789, the General Government had no power to raise money by taxation. It had to depend upon the several States furnishing it with necessary funds. This arrangement worked very disastrously. So under our Constitution, which was put into operation in 1789, the very first power granted to Congress was the one above cited, under which it gets its authority to levy taxes for its own support.

It will be noted that the clause of the Constitution above quoted consists of three parts:

1. The grant of power expressed in the words, "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises."

2. The purpose of this collection of money, expressed in the words "to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

3. The limitation on the power thus granted, expressed in the words, "But all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

Our Democratic friends claim that as soon as Porto Rico came into our possession the island became a part of the United States and, as such, entitled to the same treatment as any other part of the United States; they claim that the Constitution *ex proprio vigore*—by its own force without the action of Congress—extends over national territory as soon as it is acquired; and they claim that, in view of the limitation in the last part of the constitutional provision above cited, Congress can not levy duties on goods coming from Porto Rico to New York any more than Congress could levy duties on goods going from Minnesota to New York.

Under the constitutional provision, "all duties * * * shall be uniform throughout the United States."

We claim that that provision applies only to the "United States" in its *constitutional* sense and when the duties levied are for the Treasury of the United States, and not otherwise.

We hold, therefore, that the limitation imposing equality of duties does not apply in the case in question for two reasons:

First. Because in the constitutional sense Porto Rico is not a part of the United States, but simply territory belonging to the United States.

Second. Because the money collected under the act is not to be used to "pay the debts or provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States," but simply as a local tax levied and collected for the benefit of Porto Rico.

In this controversy, therefore, the first thing to do is to determine the meaning and scope of the term "United States" as used in the Constitution.

CONSTITUTIONAL MEANING OF "UNITED STATES."

In its usual, everyday, geographical sense the term "United States" includes, of course, all the territory of the nation. But in its constitutional sense the term "United States" means simply what it says, namely, "the *States* united."

It was "We, the people of the United States," who "ordained and established" the Constitution. Who were "we?" It was only the people of the *States* who were privileged to vote on the adoption of the Constitution. At the time of the adoption of the Constitution in 1788 we had, outside of the States themselves, the vast national domain between the Allegheny Mountains and the Mississippi River. A year before the adoption of the Constitution the part of this domain lying north of the Ohio River, and comprising the present States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin, had been organized by the famous Ordinance of 1787 into the Northwest Territory, with a regular territorial government. But no resident of that Territory, or of the territory south of the Ohio, had any voice in "ordaining and establishing" the Constitution.

By the Constitution, all legislative powers therein granted are "vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives." *Only States* choose Senators and Representatives.

The Executive power under the Constitution is vested in the President of the United States. He is chosen by the people of the *States*, no resident of a Territory having any voice in the matter.

The judicial power of the United States is vested by the Constitution in "one Supreme Court and in such inferior courts as Congress may from time to time ordain and establish." It is further provided that "the judges, both of the Supreme and inferior courts, shall hold their offices during good behavior." Evidently, then, the courts of the Territories, though they are established by Congress and though their judges are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate of the United States, are not courts of the United States in the constitutional sense, because their judges serve only for a term of four years.

Elsewhere the Constitution says, "New States may be admitted by Congress into this Union." And again it says, "The United States shall guarantee to each State in this Union a republican form of government." It is evident that the Constitution uses "Union" and "United States" as meaning the same thing, namely, the Union of the States, not including the Territories, whether organized or unorganized.

There was considerable question as to how many of the States would ratify the Constitution, so it was provided that the ratification of nine States should establish the Constitution for and among the States so ratifying. Eleven of the States ratified the Constitution within a year of its formulation. Rhode Island and North Carolina did not ratify it until after George Washington had been inaugurated as President; so at the time of his inauguration the Union consisted of only eleven States. These had ratified the Constitution and so they constituted at that time the United States of America.

The Constitution was ordained and ratified by the people of the States, and by them only can it be amended. The people of the Territories never have had any voice in the making, ratifying, amending, or operating of the Constitution.

The thirteenth amendment clearly shows the constitutional meaning of the term "United States." It says, "Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction." Here, as elsewhere in the Constitution, "United States" means the States united; hence the necessity of adding the words "or any place subject to their jurisdiction" in order to exclude slavery from the Territories.

And when the Constitution says (Article IV, section 3) "the Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property of the United States," it distinctly separates the "territory" belonging to the United States from the Union itself and gives Congress full and unlimited power over such territory.

THE PORTO RICO TAX IS FOR MERELY LOCAL USES.

A good deal of valuable time has been wasted by the "constitutional lawyers" of the House, citing cases decided by the Supreme Court as to the interpretation of this clause of the Constitution. Practically all of the effort in this direction is simply "love's labor lost," for the cases cited were not relevant. They had to do with occasions when the money collected was to go into the National Treasury for national purposes. In that case the rule of uniformity would of course apply to all territory included within the United States.

One of the difficulties in getting the original States to unite was the fear of the large States entertained by small States. The small States were especially afraid that the large States might impose upon them an undue share of the general burden of expense. It was to allay that fear that the limitation above referred to was inserted in the Constitution.

Thus it is seen, as above stated, that this limitation is to apply only to the States of the Union and in relation to taxation for national purposes. But since Porto Rico is not a State, and since the taxation is for local and not for national purposes, the limitation does not apply to the case of Porto Rico.

THE SENATE'S EMPHATIC ACTION.

To test the Senate on the matter of its judgment as to whether or not the Constitution and laws extended to Porto Rico without action by Congress, Senator ALLEN of Nebraska proposed on March 16 last the following amendment to the bill for the relief of Porto Rico:

Provided, That the Constitution was by force of the treaty concluded between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Spain at the city of Paris, France, April 11, 1899, extended over the island of Porto Rico and its inhabitants.

On Senator ALLISON'S motion to lay the amendment on the table—and thus defeat it—the vote was as follows (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 3176):

YEAS—36.

Allison,	Foraker,	Lodge,	Ross,
Baker,	Foster,	McBride,	Sewell,
Bard,	Gallinger,	McComas,	Shoup,
Beveridge,	Gear,	McCumber,	Simon,
Carter,	Hale,	McMillan,	Spooner,
Davis,	Hanna,	Penrose,	Thurston,
Deboe,	Hawley,	Perkins,	Warren.
Elkins,	Kean,	Pritchard,	Wellington,
Fairbanks,	Lindsay,	Quarles,	Wetmore.

NAYS—17.

Allen,	Chilton,	Harris,	Tillman,
Bacon,	Clark, Mont.	Kenney,	Turley.
Bate,	Clay,	McLaurin,	
Berry,	Cockrell,	Morgan,	
Butler,	Culberson,	Rawlins,	

NOT VOTING—34.

Aldrich,	Hansbrough,	Mason,	Stewart,
Burrows,	Heitfeld,	Money,	Sullivan,
Caffery,	Hoar,	Nelson,	Taliaferro,
Chandler,	Jones, Ark.	Pettigrew,	Teller,
Clark, Wyo.	Jones, Nev.	Pettus,	Turner,
Cullom,	Kyle,	Platt, Conn.	Vest,
Daniel,	McEnery,	Platt, N. Y.	Wolcott.
Depew,	Mallory,	Proctor,	
Frye,	Martin,	Scott,	

Thus we see that by a vote of more than two to one the Senate decided against the proposition of Senator ALLEN. It will be noted that the vote was strictly on party lines, except that Senator LINDSAY of Kentucky probably the ablest lawyer on his side of the Chamber, voted with the Republicans.

"TREAT PORTO RICO AS WELL AS OTHER UNITED STATES TERRITORIES."

Some good people who favor immediate free trade for Porto Rico argue thus: "Porto Rico is certainly a part of the United States as that term is used in its geographical sense, whether it is so in the constitutional sense or not. It should, therefore, be treated as well as any other United States territory—as well as Arizona or New Mexico or Alaska, for instance." To every word of which we say emphatically, Amen.

And now, having agreed that Porto Rico should be treated as well as any other United States territory, let us devote a few minutes to finding out just what that implies.

From figures furnished me by the Treasury Department, and which I have here in my hand, showing the amounts collected by the United States in Arizona, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Alaska in 1899, and from figures furnished me by the clerk of the House Committee on Appropriations showing national expenditures in those Territories for the same year, I have prepared and submit herewith a table showing the sums collected in 1899 in each of those Territories and turned into the Treasury of the United States, and the sums paid out for the respective Territories during that year from the Treasury of the United States.

	Paid into United States Treasury.	Returned to Territory.	Profit to the United States Treasury.
Arizona	$221,653.60	$49,650.00	$172,003.60
New Mexico	154,606.30	59,400.00	95,206.30
Oklahoma	587,461.48	44,150.00	543,311.48
Alaska	1,190,282.80	263,150.00	927,132.80
Total	2,154,004.18	416,350.00	1,737,654.18

It will thus be seen that out of every $5 collected in the four Territories named less than $1 goes back to be expended in those Territories. In other words, sir, over 80 per cent of the money collected by the United States in those Territories remains in the Treasury of the United States, or is expended for the general purposes of the Union itself—so much clear profit out of those Territories, as it were. Is that the way that the advocates of immediate free trade for Porto Rico would like to have us deal with that island in its distress? They say that they do; but it can not be that they understand what they are urging upon us.

TERRITORIES PAY THEIR OWN LOCAL EXPENSES.

The number of misstatements concerning the act for the relief of Porto Rico and its operation are not more wonderful than the high standing of those who make them. Here, for example, is the statement made on the floor of the Senate by a distinguished United States Senator:

> The theory and practice have always been for the General Government itself to pay all the necessary expenses of the Territory. Why not raise the revenue as to Porto Rico the same as it is raised everywhere, cove[r] it into the United States Treasury, and, as heretofore, if an appropriation is necessary for schools, for roads, or for administration, or to alleviate distress, do it by means of a direct appropriation?

Such a statement from such a source is simply amazing. I know the Senator too well to think for one moment that he meant to state an untruth, and yet his statement—which will no doubt be widely quoted—is utterly misleading. What are the facts?

The people of a Territory pay taxes for the support of the General Government precisely the same as do the people of the States. If a resident in New Mexico makes cigars, for example, he pays the same internal-revenue taxes as are paid by a resident of Minnesota. *In both cases the money collected goes into the National Treasury. In neither case does any of it go back to the State or to the Territory for the building of roads or the support of schools therein.* Why, sir, the very purpose of organizing a Territory is to give the people therein control and management of such purely local matters. And the expenses for these local improvements—wagon roads, bridges, schools, the care of the poor and other unfortunates, and other purely local affairs—are paid, in the Territories as in the States, by direct taxation of the persons and property therein.

Not a dollar is appropriated from the National Treasury for such things in the Territories any more than for similar things in the States. The only money that goes from the National Treasury into either States or Territories, with very rare exceptions, is that which goes to pay for the improvement of rivers and harbors, the construction of Federal buildings, the payment of postmasters and other Federal officials, and such other expenditures as are Federal in their nature. The only exception, therefore, that we are making in the case of Porto Rico is in *treating her better than we have ever before treated any Territory of the United States!*

ANOTHER SAMPLE "ARGUMENT."

Another sample of the argument that is made for immediate free trade is the following, from a supposed petition of Porto Ricans, which was used recently, among others, by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON]:

> We recognize the fact that a revenue to support the insular government would be necessary; but we are decidedly of opinion that the better method for raising that revenue will be by internal taxation, for the following reasons:
>
> First. Because by that system no restriction will be placed on our commerce with the United States.
>
> Second. Because the adoption of that system will be as simple in operation here as it is in the United States.
>
> In considering the amount of revenue needed for this island, we beg to submit the following calculation, which, after due consideration, we believe can be realized.

There are annually produced in Porto Rico the following:

1,300,000 gallons rum, which at $1.10 per gallon	$1,430,000
250,000,000 cigarettes, which at $1.50 per thousand	375,000
120,000,000 cigars, which at $3.60 per thousand	432,000
	2,237,000
Estimate the entire special license tax as nominal at	15,000
This will give us revenue total	2,252,000
One-third of that equals	750,666
A fair estimate of the annual cost of administration	600,000
Add for interest and sinking fund on bonds to be issued	150,000
Total required	750,000

Even with free trade with the United States there would be an additional revenue of at least $300,000 annually from customs duties on goods coming here from foreign countries.

If Congress will authorize Porto Rico to issue $2,000,000 of forty-year 5 per cent bonds, the above provides for them, viz:

For interest	$100,000
For sinking fund	50,000
Total	150,000

Therefore we infer that it will be unnecessary to adopt for this island the full internal-revenue rates of the United States. One-third of those rates will give ample receipts to cover all the above.

It will be noted that here, as everywhere else in the free-trade argument, the issuing of bonds is a necessary accompaniment. How natural the relation—free trade and bond issues!

It will be noted that the writers of the petition seem to be utterly unaware of the fact that, with our fiscal system extended to the island, *every dollar collected* in Porto Rico from internal revenue and from duties on imports from other countries *would go into the Treasury of the United States for the use of the nation as a whole! Not one dollar* of the money, above referred to by the petitioners as money which they would be able to raise, *would, under our fiscal system, go to them for local uses.*

As I have said, every dollar of it would go into the National Treasury, and none of it would go back to the island, except the small amount required to pay the salaries of the United States judges and other United States officers, and such as might be expended on the rivers and harbors of the island. After grinding themselves down to pay the $2,252,000 a year of internal revenue, indicated in the above table, the people of Porto Rico would still have before them the present problem of how to raise in their impoverished condition the money needed for schools, roads, municipal expenses, and so on.

The above figures, so far from showing that the people of Porto Rico could raise from internal revenue the funds required to pay the expenses of the island, simply serve to show the amount of the useless burden which immediate free trade would impose upon them. The figures show in part the hardship to the island of immediate free trade.

SOME PRECEDENTS FOR THE ACTION RELATIVE TO PORTO RICO.

It has been asserted by gentlemen whose names carry great weight that our action in not immediately extending to Porto Rico our fiscal system is "unprecedented." Surely, sir, that must have been a slip of the tongue. No American who knows his country's history could soberly make such a statement. Let us look into the matter a moment.

The first territory acquired by the United States from a foreign power was Louisiana. This vast territory was purchased from France in 1803. The treaty was ratified October 21, 1803, and ten days later an act of Congress was passed authorizing the President to take possession of the newly acquired territory. Section 2 of that act reads as follows:

SEC. 2. *And be it further enacted*, That until the expiration of the present session of Congress, unless provision for the temporary government of the said territories be sooner made by Congress, all the military, civil, and judicial powers, exercised by the officers of the existing government of the same, shall be vested in such person and persons, and shall be exercised in such manner, as the President of the United States shall direct for maintaining and protecting the inhabitants of Louisiana in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and religion.

Under the authority thus granted to the Executive, Albert Gallatin, then Secretary of the Treasury, sent a letter of instructions to our collector of customs in the Mississippi district, a part of which letter was as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, *November 14, 1803.*

H. B. TRIST, Esq., *Collr, Fort Adams.*

SIR: The President of the United States having decided that until otherwise provided for, you shall immediately after the occupation of New Orleans by the United States, exercise the powers heretofore vested in the administrator or Collector, Treasurer of the Revenues at New Orleans, and authority for that purpose is transmitted to you by this mail. You will therefore be pleased immediately to proceed to New Orleans, appointing a deputy to act during your absence in the Mississippi district, or remaining at Fort Adams yourself, you will appoint a deputy to proceed to New Orleans.

In the exercise of this temporary authority, it is impossible to prescribe from this Department any precise rules of conduct and much must necessarily depend on your zeal & judgment, on both which perfect confidence is placed.

You will only be pleased to observe—

1st. That the taxes & duties to be collected under your direction are *precisely the same* which by the existing laws or regulations of Louisiana were demandable under the Spanish government at the time of obtaining possession.

2d. That in those taxes & duties are included specially those on imports, exports, transfer of shipping, &c., which were collected under those officers whose powers are vested in you & generally all other taxes and duties which made part of the general revenue of the province.

* * * * * * *

10th. That until otherwise provided for, *the same duties are to be collected* on the importation of goods, in the Mississippi district from New Orleans and vice versa, *as heretofore.*

I am very resp y Sir Yr obt Sert—

ALBERT GALLATIN.

Later, on February 24, 1804, an act of Congress was passed providing that on March 25, 1804, the collection of duties on goods coming into the United States from the territory acquired from France and on goods going into that territory from the United States should cease. On February 27, 1804, Secretary Gallatin wrote to the collector of customs at New Orleans another letter of instructions, from which I take the following paragraph:

As to the period of time preceding the 25 day of March 1804 on which the above mentioned act commences to operate, I have only to observe that in conformity with the Spanish laws heretofore in force, articles exported before that day from New Orleans to the United States, and to any other country, Spain excepted, were liable to pay the export duty; that articles imported before that day into New Orleans from any country whatever and even from the United States unless deposited under the privilege of deposit, were liable to pay the import duty.

It should be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that Thomas Jefferson was then President of the United States. The Democrats of those days did not seem to think that our fiscal system extended to newly acquired territory except by act of Congress. *Calhounism had not yet been born.*

THE CASE OF TEXAS.

Now let us take the case of Texas. The joint resolution for the annexation of Texas was passed on March 1, 1845. But it was not until the next session of Congress, on December 29, 1845, that an act was passed extending over Texas the laws of the United States. In the meantime the Secretary of the Treasury, Robert J. Walker, issued an order, of which the following is a part:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, *July 29, 1845.*

To Collectors and other Officers of the Customs.

The President of the United States has received official intelligence, that the Convention, as well as the Congress of the Republic of Texas, have sanctioned and adopted the joint resolution of the Congress of the United States of the first of March last, for the admission of Texas as a State of the Union.

By the 24th section of the act of Congress of the United States of the 30th August, 1842, it is provided: "That it shall be the duty of all Collectors and other Officers of the Customs to execute and carry into effect all instructions of the Secretary of the Treasury relative to the execution of the Revenue laws; and in case any difficulty shall arise as to the true construction or meaning of any part of such Revenue laws, the decision of the Secretary of the Treasury shall be conclusive and binding upon all such Collectors and other Officers of the Customs." In conformity with this provision of the law, it becomes my duty to communicate the views and instructions of this Department upon various important questions arising out of the new relations between Texas and the United States.

First. Although there is now a solemn compact obligatory upon both parties for the admission of Texas as a State of the Union, yet until further action of the Congress of the United States upon this subject, and instructions founded thereon from this Department, *you will collect duties, as heretofore, upon all the imports from Texas into the United States.*

A similar question arose in relation to exports from Florida into New Orleans in 1819, when it was decided by the Treasury Department "that all goods which have been, or may be, imported from Pensacola, *before an act of Congress shall be passed, erecting it into a collection district*, and authorizing the appointment of an officer to reside thereat, for the purpose of superintending the collection of duties, will be liable to duty."

At that time James K. Polk, a Democrat, was President of the United States. And yet no one dreamed in those days of claiming that our Constitution and laws extended to newly acquired territory until expressly so extended by act of Congress. *Calhounism had not even then been born.*

As I said on a previous occasion, the Calhoun doctrine that the Constitution extends *ex proprio vigore* to newly acquired territory was not invented until 1847, when was begun the struggle to extend the institution of slavery to the free territory recently acquired from Mexico. That doctrine was shot to death in the civil war. It was "of few days and full of sorrow."

OUR CONSTITUTION AND LAWS ONLY RECENTLY EXTENDED OVER HAWAII.

Passing over other illustrations showing that there is nothing "unprecedented" in not extending at once our fiscal laws over Porto Rico, I beg leave to remind gentlemen that, although we acquired Hawaii two years ago, our laws were not extended over Hawaii until a few weeks ago.

I hold here in my hand a copy of the joint resolution, approved July 7, 1898, which annexed the Hawaiian Islands to the United States. Let me read parts of it:

Whereas the government of the republic of Hawaii having, in due form, signified its consent, in the manner provided by its constitution, to cede absolutely and without reserve to the United States of America all rights of sovereignty of whatsoever kind in and over the Hawaiian Islands and their dependencies, and also to cede and transfer to the United States the absolute fee and ownership of all public, government, or crown lands, public buildings or edifices, ports, harbors, military equipment, and all other public property of every kind and description belonging to the government of the Hawaiian Islands, together with every right and appurtenance thereunto appertaining: Therefore,

Resolved, etc., That said cession is accepted, ratified, and confirmed, and

that the said Hawaiian Islands and their dependencies be, and they are hereby, annexed as a part of the territory of the United States, and are subject to the sovereign dominion thereof, and that all and singular the property and rights hereinbefore mentioned are vested in the United States of America.

The existing laws of the United States relative to public lands shall not apply to such lands in the Hawaiian Islands; but the Congress of the United States shall enact special laws for their management and disposition: *Provided*, That all revenue from or proceeds of the same, except as regards such part thereof as may be used or occupied for the civil, military, or naval purposes of the United States, or may be assigned for the use of the local government, shall be used solely for the benefit of the inhabitants of the Hawaiian Islands for educational and other public purposes.

Until Congress shall provide for the government of such islands all the civil, judicial, and military powers exercised by the officers of the existing government in said islands shall be vested in such person or persons and shall be exercised in such manner as the President of the United States shall direct; and the President shall have power to remove said officers and fill the vacancies so occasioned.

* * * * * * *

Until legislation shall be enacted extending the United States custom laws and regulations to the Hawaiian Islands the existing customs relations of the Hawaiian Islands with the United States and other countries shall remain unchanged.

THE PORTO RICO ACT NEITHER ANOMALOUS NOR UNPRECEDENTED.

Thus we see, Mr. Speaker, that all through our history it has been the practice of the Government to allow a period of time to elapse after the acquirement of territory before extending over that territory the Constitution and laws of the United States. The length of that time has always been fixed by Congress. It is therefore not true that the plan embodied in the bill for levying temporarily for the benefit of Porto Rico a duty on goods carried between that island and the United States is either "anomalous" or "unprecedented." On the other hand, it follows the precedents of our entire national history. No Jefferson or Jackson Democrat can object to it, for it follows the practice of Jefferson in Louisiana and of Jackson in Florida. No Lincoln Republican can find fault with it, for it follows the principle for which Lincoln contended and on which he was elected President.

PROFESSOR SCHURMAN'S MISQUOTATION.

It is very easy to misquote. Indeed, it requires effort to quote correctly. But when an error in quotation may seriously mislead a large number of people, it would seem that a man of high character and position would feel bound to exercise great care to quote correctly.

Professor Schurman, late president of the Philippine Commission, is a gentleman who deservedly stands high in the respect of the American people. Any statement of his carries great weight with us all. It is especially incumbent on such a man, talking at a critical time about an important matter, to be exceedingly careful when he ascribes to a person in authority certain words to be sure that he quotes exactly.

In a letter to a personal friend, which has found its way into print and which has been used in this debate, Professor Schurman is quoted as saying:

DEAR SIR: I agree with you that the United States is under obligation to extend its tariff laws to the island of Porto Rico. But I can not accept your contention that this obligation is derived from the Constitution, which, in my judgment, does not of its own force apply to annexed territories. The obligation is moral, not constitutional. As the President said, with equal truth and felicity, it is "our plain duty."

We are bound to this course by solemn promises. The supreme and irresistible reason for removing all customs barriers between the United States and Porto Rico is the promise made by General Miles, when first landing American forces on the island, that *the Porto Ricans should enjoy the same rights, privileges, and immunities as the people of the United States. On this understanding* the Porto Ricans accepted American sovereignty, not only without opposition, but with joyful trust and confidence.

The present issue is simply this: Shall we repudiate, or shall we fulfill, the national engagements? Shall this great Republic break faith with the little island of Porto Rico? Having secured the fruits of General Miles's promise, shall we now renounce the promise?

The American people will not tolerate any faltering with solemn obligations. Recognizing the national good faith as the nation's chiefest good, they will condemn any violation of it as the blackest crime.

That is the language of a good and true man. In it he voices the sentiment of his countrymen. They do not propose that the national faith shall be broken at any time, in any way, to any person. And the weaker and more helpless the one to whom the promise is made, the more scrupulously must that promise be kept, if it is duly made by one authorized to promise in the name of the United States.

It behooves us, then to inquire what promise was made, by whom it was made, under what circumstances and by what authority, and what may be inferred therefrom.

WHAT GENERAL MILES ACTUALLY SAID.

Let us see first what General Miles really did say. Here is the text of his proclamation:

HEADQUARTERS OF THE ARMY,
Ponce, Porto Rico, July 28, 1898.

To the Inhabitants of Porto Rico:

In the prosecution of the war against the Kingdom of Spain by the people of the United States in the cause of liberty, justice, and humanity its military forces have come to occupy the island of Porto Rico. They come bearing the banner of freedom inspired by a noble purpose to seek the enemies of our country and yours, and to destroy or capture all who are in armed resistance.

They bring you the fostering arm of a nation of free people, whose greatest power is in its justice and humanity to all those living within its fold. Hence, the first effect of this occupation will be the immediate release from your former political relations, and it is hoped a cheerful acceptance of the Government of the United States. The chief object of the American military forces will be to overthrow the armed authority of Spain and to give to the people of your beautiful island the largest measure of liberty consistent with this military occupation.

We have not come to make war upon the people of a country that for centuries has been oppressed, but, on the contrary, to bring you protection, not only to yourselves but to your property, to *promote your prosperity*, and bestow upon you the *immunities* and *blessings* of the liberal institutions of our Government. It is not our purpose to interfere with any existing laws and customs that are wholesome and beneficial to your people so long as they conform to the rules of military administration of order and justice. This is not a war of devastation, but one to give to all within the control of its military and naval forces the advantages and blessings of enlightened civilization.

NELSON A. MILES,
Major-General Commanding United States Army.

WHAT GENERAL MILES'S PROCLAMATION PROMISED.

What General Miles really promised was, therefore, not as Professor Schurman alleged, "the same rights, privileges, and immunities as the people of the United States," but—what is a very different matter—"the immunities and blessings of the liberal institutions of our Government."

What are some of these "immunities and blessings?" Let me enumerate a few of them:

Immunity from arbitrary arrest. Under the Spanish régime a person could be arrested without cause; he could be cast into prison and held there without trial and without opportunity to communicate with friends who might act in his behalf.

Immunity from "star-chamber" trials. Under Spanish rule trials of accused persons were in whole or in part secret.

Immunity from involuntary confinement without cause. Prior to our advent into Porto Rico the writ of habeas corpus was unknown there.

Immunity from press censorship. There was no freedom of the press until after we took possession of the island.

Immunity from unwarranted searches and seizures and other immunities and blessings enumerated in the early amendments to our Constitution.

The immunities which go to make up liberty of person, of thought, and of expression—blessings which Porto Ricans had never enjoyed—these are the "immunities and blessings of the liberal institutions of our Government" which General Miles promised. That promise will be abundantly redeemed. It is already being redeemed.

WHAT GENERAL MILES DID NOT PROMISE.

General Miles did not promise all of even the "immunities" enjoyed by our citizens, and he did not promise any of the "rights and privileges" enjoyed by American citizens. The immunities which the Porto Ricans can enjoy they shall have. But there are rights and privileges which will come to them only after considerable time has elapsed, if ever. For example, the most intelligent European coming to live among us is required to reside in this country at least five years before he is admitted to citizenship. Should a people, 85 per cent of whom can neither read nor write, be given *all* of those rights and privileges *at once?*

General Miles knows too well the institutions of his country to promise the Porto Ricans all the rights, privileges, and immunities of American citizenship. And Professor Schurman should know them well enough and have sufficient respect for General Miles not to put into his mouth such an absurd promise. A promise of "the same rights, privileges, and immunities as the people of the United States" would be a promise to give Porto Rico immediate statehood, with the right to vote and the privilege of holding any office of profit or trust under the Government. General Miles knows that it is one of the fundamental principles of our Government that the military shall be subordinate to the civil power, and that it is for Congress and not for him to determine the civil status of the Porto Ricans.

In the language of the treaty with Spain, under which we acquired our new island possessions:

ARTICLE IX. * * * The civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants of the territories hereby ceded to the United States shall be determined by the Congress.

General Miles did not use the language which Professor Schurman ascribes to him, nor did the language used by him have at all the meaning so often, on the strength of Professor Schurman's statement, given to it. General Miles knew that Uncle Sam would treat the Porto Ricans justly and kindly, giving them immunity from many of the practices from which they had suffered and dowering them with blessings characteristic of our institutions. But the General did not presume to arrogate to even the Commanding General of our forces the powers and prerogatives which Congress holds in trust for the people of the United States.

Nor is Professor Schurman any more fortunate in his statement that "on this understanding" the Porto Ricans accepted American sovereignty. They simply accepted the inevitable as gracefully as they could, and the pleasure manifested was simply because

they believed from what they knew of Uncle Sam that he would treat them better than they had been treated. And all their reasonable expectations are being and will be realized.

As I have stated, I think that Professor Schurman owed it to himself and to the American people, who hold him in such high regard, to be more careful in quoting General Miles. We should remember, however, that he made the statement in a personal letter written to a friend and not intended for publication. He is probably chagrined to find that the letter has been published.

REDUCTION IN TAXES AND EXPENSES.

It is not an easy task to reform conditions that have been forming for centuries. But considering the brevity of our occupancy of the island and the difficulties to be encountered, we have accomplished a great deal.

From the report of General Davis, military governor of Porto Rico, I take the following table, showing the taxes and expenditures of the island during the last two years of the Spanish rule:

	1897-98.	1898-99.
RECEIPTS.		
Budget of the island:	*Pesos.*	*Pesos.*
1. Land and other taxes	576,200.00	901,200.00
2. Customs	3,132,900.00	3,377,900.00
3. Taxes on monopolies	184,200.00	312,200.00
4. State property	9,300.00	9,300.00
5. Contingent receipts	96,900.00	181,900.00
Budget of provincial deputation:		
Total of receipts	1,217,700.00	324,592.89
Total for both budgets	5,157,200.00	5,117,092.89
EXPENDITURES.		
Budget of the island:		
1. General liabilities	498,501.60	498,501.60
2. Justice	423,818.80	454,773.80
3. War	1,252,377.76	1,252,377.76
4. Finance	260,800.00	225,825.00
5. Navy	222,668.20	222,668.20
6. State }	878,175.83	592,653.83
7. Interior }		1,210,527.12
Budget of provincial deputation:		
1. Deputation provincial	221,261.48	227,772.89
2. State	210,254.00	.....
3. Interior	788,184.52	96,820.00
Total for both budgets	4,754,042.19	4,781,920.20

In our short period of control we have struck out of those expenditures the general liabilities, which had been going to Madrid, 498,501.60 pesos; the charges for the army, 1,252,378 pesos; for the navy, 222,668 pesos; for the clergy, 197,945 pesos. This is a total reduction of 2,171,492.60 pesos. And the budget of the coming year contains further reductions.

As testified by Mr. Henry G. Curtis, a member of the insular commission (Senate hearings, pages 95 and 96), "In the town of San Juan we found that they [salaries] cost $362,000 by the last budget—that for the year ending June, 1899. By our plan we will save $148,000 a year and give them a better government. At Caguas [a town of 5,000 people] we save $35,000 a year." These are samples of improvement in administration general throughout the island. And although expenses have been thus cut down, we are expending $119,709.30 more for education in the island than last year.

In his report on the island, General Davis says that under Spanish rule there were 21 officials who received salaries exceeding $4,000 a year, against 2 under our military government; 48 received salaries exceeding $3,000 a year, against 17 under our rule; and so on.

The reduction in customs rates can be readily seen by the following tabular statement of the rates per hundred kilograms, under Spanish rule, the rates under our temporary military government, and the rates in the act as finally passed:

	Duty under Spanish rule.	Under military government.	Under act as passed.
Wheat flour	$4.10	Free.	Free.
Wheat	3.25	$0.60	$0.09
Corn	3.25	.18	.027
Corn meal	4.10	Free.	Free.
Pork	4.60	Free.	Free.
Lard	4.60	1.70	.255
Hulled rice	2.88	.60	.09
Jerked beef	2.45	2.50	.375
Codfish	1.00	Free.	Free.
Salt fish	1.00	.50	.075

It will be noted that food products are admitted free, or nearly so. So are clothes and medicines.

THE METHOD OF TAXATION MADE LESS BURDENSOME.

But the reduction in the amount of taxation and expenses are not the only improvements made under our control. The methods of collecting the taxes have been improved and rendered less burdensome. In order to appreciate this we must take a brief glance, at least, at the methods of taxation under Spanish rule. From the report of Mr. H. K. Carroll, the special agent sent to investigate the condition of the island, I take the following:

Customs were levied both on imports and exports. There was a special tax on the loading and unloading of freight, the embarkation and disembarkation of passengers, and transitory duties of 10 per cent on duties on imports. * * *

No kind of business seems to have escaped the sharp eye of the State experts. Public baths, balls, and concerts; periodicals, including daily papers; laundries, funeral agencies, gymnasiums, livery stables, all kinds of industries, even the manufacture of artificial feet, were taxed.

Blacksmiths paid, according to the town in which their business was conducted, from 12 to 3 pesos, architects from 36 to 6, dentists and pharmacists the same, physicians and surgeons 48 to 12, nurses and midwives 18 to 5, veterinarians 15 to 5, barbers 8 to 2, lawyers, registers of property, and notaries 48 to 16, while carpenters, cabinetmakers, bookbinders, florists, tailors, milliners or dressmakers, professors of music and languages, painters, etc., paid according to their class and grade. * * *

Day laborers were assessed on the basis of one-third of the value of a half year's wages. * * *

The earnings of merchants, manufacturers, and other producers were subject to a tax of 12½ per cent or more, according to the financial exigencies of the treasuries, provincial and municipal.

If a merchant's income were valued at $10,000 a year, he would pay in direct taxes $1,250. He would also pay for his cedula or personal passport, the amount of which was graduated, according to personal means, from 12 cents up to $25 or more. He would pay a direct tax on his residence and furniture, and on his horses and other live stock, if not used for labor. If he were just starting in business, he would pay a patente or tax for the privilege. * * *

Articles of common use, such as rice, flour, corn, charcoal, wines, etc., not only paid heavy import duties, but were subject, with fresh beef, milk, and sugar produced in the island, to a consumo tax at the gates of the municipalities.

Flour, which had paid a duty of $4 at the custom-house per hundred kilos, paid at the city gates $2.50 consumo tax, or a total of $6.50, which was at the rate of about $3 per hundredweight. Rice, the common article of diet, paid $2.70 import duty and $1 consumo tax. Fresh beef paid a consumo tax of $5 a hundred kilos or 220 pounds. This was in addition to the head tax paid the city by the slaughterer.

* * * * * * *

As between Spanish and Porto Rican producers and manufacturers the latter had no chance. Nor were the needs of Porto Rican consumers, however urgent they might appear from the insular point of view, treated as worthy of serious attention. Indispensable articles of food not produced in the island had to come in a roundabout way through the hands of the merchants in Spain or pay enormous duties if imported direct from other countries.

The principal consumo taxes on food, fuel, and drink have been abolished. All export duties have been discontinued. The use of stamped paper and all stamp taxes have been abolished. The fisheries have been made free. Notarial fees have been greatly reduced.

In the light of these facts, Mr. Speaker, are we not keeping the promise made by General Miles?

SOME OF THE NEEDS OF PORTO RICO.

And now let us consider briefly the condition and needs of the island.

That was a very suggestive statement which was made by one of the Porto Ricans to our commissioner, Mr. Carroll: "With what has been collected for the making of roads in the four hundred years of Spanish domination we could have all our roads paved with silver." And yet, sir, in all the island there are only about 150 miles of wagon road. Another Porto Rican testified that from June to October, inclusive, a journey the length of the island, from Maunabo to Mayaguez, about 85 miles, costs more than one from Porto Rico to New York. To use his own words:

After four centuries of existence we are almost cut off from intercommunication. Of our internal roads it is best to say nothing; no one dares journey by them. Even in traveling on foot one's ribs are not safe. There are towns where no mail is delivered for five or six days when the rivers rise, and neither the public-works department nor private enterprise has thought of spanning the rivers by footbridges even. With a thousand obstacles and expenses, we have to carry our produce to market and bring back our provisions the same way, adding to the expenses of freight those of "consumos," which keeps up the already excessive prices and causes general discontent. The want of activity of the Porto Ricans forcibly condemned to inertia by want of means of travel is not to be wondered at.

In the Senate hearings Mr. Curtis, a member of the insular commission, testified as follows (page 86):

We found not a single schoolhouse on the island which had been built for a schoolhouse and but one owned by a school district. The schoolhouses used were rented and were generally shacks which belonged, many times, to the teachers and were occupied by them as a family residence or in some cases as a store. * * * They were public schools, yet with the understanding of the right of the teacher to charge or collect from those able to pay a tuition fee. * * * Very few of the children attended. Those that did and those we found in the schools were bright little fellows, anxious to learn. Each had to furnish his own seat, little bits of boxes and chairs brought by themselves. The school books were very scant.

As to the condition of the people, Mr. Curtis says, same page:

We found the population of the island—some of them—quite wealthy and well-to-do and living in fine style. * * * Only a very few of them speak English, but their education is good. However, the most of them have given little attention to the subject of government. * * * The other portion of the people perhaps might be classified in two parts—the small owners of little patches of land and the teamsters, who do freighting and such, and keepers of small stores, and then those who simply depend on day labor.

They are mostly ignorant of everything except their particular work. You can not get them into conversation about any public matters, for they do not know anything about them.

What American can read this series of pictures without feeling an interest in those people, who, after four hundred years of Spanish rule, come to us in the providence of God in this condition? And who does not realize the seriousness of the problem and the sanctity of the opportunity that lies before us?

THE PRESENT ARRANGEMENT THE KINDEST POSSIBLE.

As I said on a previous occasion when addressing the House on this subject, we had three alternatives to choose from in providing the means with which to meet the public expenses of the island: We could donate the necessary funds from the National Treasury; or we could establish a local government and permit it to issue bonds; or we could arrange to make the island self-sustaining from the beginning.

Being in the receipt day by day of urgent requests from citizens of my State for a reduction of the "war taxes" levied by the National Government, I could not see my way to donate funds from the Treasury to pay the expenses of the island. Our own people have some rights in this matter that must be respected. Besides, people who live in a warm climate like that of Porto Rico need no encouragement to become lazy and dependent.

Inasmuch as Porto Rico came to us without a public debt, we naturally disliked to inaugurate our control of the island by the issuance of bonds. Moreover, while the needs of the island were urgent, there was at the time the bill originally passed the House no government in Porto Rico and consequently no authority which could properly issue the bonds.

The third alternative, that of putting the island on the basis of self-support, being the only alternative remaining, the problem then became how to raise the money in the way least burdensome to the people of the island.

While the island had no public debt when it came to us, the private or personal debts were and are enormous. Many of the little farms are so heavily mortgaged that even to put a tax on them would jar them out of the hands of their owners. We could not bear to think of doing that. We wanted to give those poor fellows every possible chance to recover. Twice by order of the President have the mortgages been extended, once for a year and again for six months. As General Davis said in his testimony before the Senate committee, "A general system of taxation to produce revenue enough to carry on the government would amount to confiscation."

In the Senate hearing on this subject Senator NELSON of Minnesota asked General Davis: "Have you any system of taxation akin to our internal-revenue system?" To which General Davis answered: "Only on two articles—one, the liquor tax, of which I have spoken, of 3 cents a liter, and the other a tax on matches, the manufacture of matches." To have imposed upon them our internal-revenue system would have thus been to treat them worse than Spain treated them and would have made rebels of them.

There remained, then, only one thing to do, and that was to raise the revenue so far as possible by customs duties. As will be seen by the table given a few minutes ago, the bulk of the funds for the expenses of the island had been raised for many years by customs duties. The people were accustomed to that kind of taxation and their affairs were adjusted to it. Besides, the bulk of it was and is paid by the wealthy, the poor not using imported articles to any great extent. The poor live largely on the tropical fruits which grow there in such abundance. Children up to 8 years of age go naked. People never wear many clothes. Three-fourths of the people never in their lives wear shoes or stockings.

To sum up on this point, free trade would have freed the Porto Ricans from customs taxes, but it would have imposed upon them our internal-revenue taxes, the proceeds of which would have gone into the National Treasury, and then it would have been necessary for them to raise by direct taxation the funds necessary to defray their governmental expenses. This, as General Davis said, would have amounted to confiscation of their property.

On the other hand, with the small customs duties levied under the act, *the Porto Ricans escape entirely our internal-revenue taxation*, which would have made "moonshiners" and rebels of them; *and they escape entirely direct taxation of their property*, which would in many cases have amounted to confiscation.

Our plan gave them one small, usual, easily carried tax; the other plan would have put upon them two heavy, unusual, burdensome taxes.

We believe that we adopted the plan kindest to them and wisest for us. And I propose now to show that it is the most satisfactory plan to the people of Porto Rico themselves.

WHAT THE PEOPLE OF PORTO RICO THEMSELVES THINK.

None of the Porto Ricans in this city, except the lobby which came here in the interest of the men who own the sugar and tobacco now stored in the warehouses of Porto Rico, wanted immediate free trade. Those who were consulted were unanimous in their opinion that the small duty proposed in the House bill, and which saves the people of Porto Rico from having to carry the burden of our internal-revenue system and from direct taxation on their property, is kinder and better for Porto Rico than immediate free trade would be.

And now let us see what the people of Porto Rico say when talking among themselves. Here in my hand I hold a copy of the San Juan News of March 3, 1900. As its name implies, this paper is published at San Juan, the capital of Porto Rico. Its editor is Mr. Hobart S. Bird, formerly of Wisconsin. Mr. Bird is a Democrat, a free-trade, free-silver Democrat at that, my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. MINOR] advises me. So Mr. Bird will hardly be accused of using his columns to sustain the action of a Republican Administration. And Mr. Bird's own views as to the proper policy to be pursued may be seen from his "platform" here at the head of his editorial columns, which is as follows:

First. Free trade with the United States.
Second. Territorial government.
Third. Good roads.

Here on page 1 of the paper I find over a column of matter giving the substance of interviews with the leading business men of San Juan on the bill which passed the House on February 28, reducing the present tariff rates between Porto Rico and the United States by 85 per cent. Let me read a portion of this matter to show what the leading business men of Porto Rico said on this subject when talking among themselves:

BUSINESS MEN ARE PLEASED—THINK THE 15 PER CENT TARIFF SATISFACTORY FOR ISLAND—THE GENERAL OPINION IS THAT THE EXTERNAL REVENUE IS BETTER THAN LAYING HEAVY TAXES—WHAT PROMINENT BUSINESS MEN AND SAN JUAN MERCHANTS SAY OF THE WAYS AND MEANS BILL.

By interviewing a large percentage of the prominent bankers and business men of San Juan the News is able to state that the consensus of opinion here is that the passing of the Porto Rico tariff bill will be the signal for renewed prosperity on the island.

For the last four or five months the financial condition of Porto Rico has been very critical. Money has been extremely scarce, and business transactions have been growing fewer and fewer. Men desirous of borrowing money to carry on some business enterprise, even though they were of acknowledged integrity, were unable to raise the desired amount. Men who needed a few hundred dollars to consummate their plans were forced to give up in despair because the necessary money was not forthcoming.

* * * * * * *

The passing of the Ways and Means bill has relieved the tension. The business men feel confident that the Senate will follow the example of Congress and rule the 15 per cent of the Dingley rate. There is now a feeling of certainty. Men know what are to be the duties on goods and what money will bring.

The majority of business men think that the 15 per cent of the Dingley tariff duty is preferable to free trade with a high internal revenue. They say that so long as the proceeds from the tariff are to go toward educating the Porto Rican children, cleansing the cities, and improving the roads, it is better to have the duty than not. *Even if there were free trade, it is not at all certain that the consumers of the island would be benefited.* The wholesale dealers might place a lower price on their goods, but it is highly improbable that the retail dealers would offer their articles cheaper.

HOW IT STRIKES SAN JUAN.

Mr. George S. Latimer, of the firm of Latimer & Fernandez, *believes that 15 per cent of the Dingley tariff will be better than free trade.* He said to a News reporter:

"I am pleased to have this matter of customs tariffs so nearly settled. It will bring about a great change for the better in the welfare of the island. The great trouble has been that business men have felt the uncertainty which has been prevalent because of the trade question. Now that the American government is definitely known, the present tension will be relieved and business will begin to boom."

Mr. Andros Crosas, when interviewed on the subject, said:

"I have talked with a number of business men on the tariff bill, and I can tell you that they all are delighted to have the question so nearly settled. The uncertainty which has recently prevailed has ruined the business of the island."

Mr. Townes, of the Porto Rican American Tobacco Company: "We have never shipped any tobacco because we could not afford to ship under its tariff. As soon as we get the new factory up we will ship under the new 15 per cent tariff."

A. Berg said: "*The 15 per cent tariff is a good thing.*"

Mr. Arnold, of the Colonial Bank, said: "*Personally I should rather have had 25 per cent of the Dingley tariff.* Fifteen per cent will not be enough for the needs of the island. Still, the main thing is to have this tariff question settled, and I am pleased to have had Congress pass favorably on the bill. Goods have been held back all over the island waiting for this tariff question to be settled. Now there will be a great deal of sugar and tobacco shipped which has been stored up."

De Ford & Co. are also of the opinion that *25 per cent would have been better for the interests of the people at large.* They are, however, pleased with the 15 per cent bill, and believe it will, to some extent, relieve the present hard times.

CONCLUSION.

"Civis Romanus sum"—I am a Roman citizen. That, Mr. Speaker, was the proudest boast of antiquity. But prouder still is the boast of him who can say to-day, "I am an American citizen." Vaster in area, greater in population, richer in natural resources and accumulated wealth, more potent for good in the world than the Roman Empire in its palmiest days is the great Republic in which it is our good fortune to live.

Under the Roman system, though citizenship was very extensive, it was only by going to the imperial city itself that a citizen could participate in the government of the empire. The principle of representation had not yet been discovered or invented. But in this country the people of every State in the Union can participate in the government of the Republic through their right to

share in the selection of President and the Senators and Representatives in Congress.

With us every campaign is an education. In 1892 the great question was the fiscal policy of the country. In 1896 it was the question of the standard of value. In 1898 everyone was studying geography. This year all of these subjects will be reviewed, with the addition of the study of our great charter—the American Constitution—its history, nature, and applications. These are great questions, worthy the candid consideration of a great people.

Upon the wisdom of the people in deciding aright the questions arising will much of their own weal depend. For the sake of themselves and their children, for the sake of the institutions under which we have prospered so wondrously, it is vitally necessary that the consideration of all pending questions be in the spirit of calm deliberation. The man who uses epithets and appeals to passion and prejudice confesses thereby that he has a bad case. The man who would rather be consistent than right is not a safe counselor.

Mr. Speaker, I have faith in the American people. I have faith in our institutions. I believe that this nation, the highest product of civilization, has been predestined to a great work for the world, and I believe that it will do that work under the guidance of Him who assigned it the duty and who holds the destiny of nations in the hollow of His hand. [Applause.]

Statues of Benton and Blair.

REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN B. ELKINS,

OF WEST VIRGINIA,

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

Saturday, May 19, 1900.

The Senate having under consideration the following resolutions:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *February 4, 1899.*

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the thanks of Congress be presented to the State of Missouri for providing and furnishing statues of Thomas Hart Benton, a deceased person, who has been a citizen thereof and illustrious for his historic renown and for distinguished civic services, and of Francis Preston Blair, a deceased person, who has been a citizen thereof, and illustrious for his historic renown and for distinguished civic and military services.

Resolved, That the statues be accepted and placed in the National Statuary Hall in the Capitol, and that a copy of these resolutions duly authenticated be transmitted to the governor of the State of Missouri—

Mr. ELKINS said:

Mr. PRESIDENT: Reared and educated in Missouri, I feel a deep interest in everything which concerns that great Commonwealth. Added to this, because of my father's great loyalty to and admiration for Mr. Benton I wear his honored name. I feel, partly for this reason and others, that I can not allow this occasion which helps perpetuate his fame to pass without a word from me.

I will have but little to say about his life and public services, because they have been dwelt upon in the eloquent speeches of the honored Senators from Missouri just pronounced in the Senate.

No man ever dominated a political party more than Mr. Benton did the Democratic party of the State of Missouri from 1820 to 1850. His hold was so great on the Democrats of that State during this period that he hardly asked to be reelected to his high office—his party thrust his election upon him. Once in two or three years he made what might be called Benton's triumphal progress through the State, and told the multitudes who came out to greet him and hear him speak what "I, Thomas H. Benton," had done as their public servant in the Senate of the United States for the State of Missouri and the whole country.

Benton's greatest weakness was his vanity and egotism, so seldom united with genuine ability and merit. But in Benton this weakness was pardonable and forgotten, because it laid alongside so much merit and virtue, such great integrity, loyalty, and unselfish devotion to his country and its best interests. Listening to his speeches on the hustings and remembering the great services he had rendered his State and the country, people forgot his vanity, although he constantly referred to himself and what he had accomplished. In his Thirty Years' View—the best political history of that period ever written—he never fails to make mention of what Mr. Benton did and give him the fullest credit.

He was not the equal of Clay as an orator, nor of Webster as a constitutional lawyer, but he was greater than either in being a many-sided statesman in understanding the wants and needs of the whole country, especially those of the West. No statesman during his time or since has had as clear a conception of the possibilities of the great West beyond the Mississippi River, and especially that part which came to us by the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, as Benton. It is a historic fact that Webster denounced as worthless the vast territory that came to us through this treaty. He said it never would be useful, could not sustain population, and would be a burden to the General Government; while Benton foresaw and foretold in the most accurate way its future. Webster's vision did not extend much beyond the Mississippi; he could not see as far as the shores of the Pacific.

Benton not only saw the Pacific, advocated a Pacific railroad, and said it would be built one day, but he saw with an unerring eye the road to the Orient, the commerce of the Pacific and our trade with Asia, which is just beginning. The mighty events that are so rapidly crowding upon us are verifying his prophecies as to the possibilities of trade and commerce with the islands of the Pacific and the Orient. No American statesman ever advocated and proposed so many public measures that were beneficial and affected the welfare and destiny of the whole country as Benton.

He was the best informed man of his time on questions growing out of the public lands, Indian affairs, and mines. This was not altogether due to his ability and persevering industry, but he enjoyed the advantage over other statesmen of living beyond the Mississippi and learned lessons of wisdom from the trappers, miners, and pathfinders of the Rocky Mountains who made frequent visits to St. Louis from the West as far as Oregon. He was acquainted with all these daring and adventurous spirits, among them the Astors, who told him of the wealth of the Rocky Mountains and the climate and soil of the Pacific coast, now occupied by prosperous States. He not only understood the West, but favored all measures looking to its development.

Twenty years after Benton's prophecy that a Pacific railroad would be built across the continent uniting the two oceans, even General Sherman doubted that it would ever be accomplished, and, with all his knowledge of the West, said a Pacific railroad was impracticable.

Though a Southern man, Benton persistently opposed the extension of slavery into the Territories, and in the early talks about secession and the mutterings of discontent on the part of slaveholders and nullifiers and threats of the dissolution of the Union, Benton stood like a stone wall against all these evil and pernicious things.

He was the last link between the makers of the Constitution and the present era; he reached from Jefferson to Sumner. An incessant worker, tireless and persistent, he never gave up a purpose when adopted after mature consideration. He was so sensitive in the discharge of his public duties that he would not appoint a relative to office, no matter how great his merit and qualifications.

When elected to the Senate he was the leading lawyer of St. Louis, and engaged in the heaviest litigation in the State, notably that growing out of the public lands and grants of land made by France, which was the most important and paid the best fees. After his election to the Senate he called his clients together and gave up all his land cases, stating that their interests might conflict with those of the General Government and his duty as a Senator. He did this when to have continued as attorney would have made him a rich man for those times. He not only gave up these cases, but refused to name any lawyer to take charge of them.

Benton stood for sound money and the faithful performance of all national obligations. He favored a liberal distribution of the public lands and selling them to actual settlers at a very low price. Although this policy was strongly opposed by the Eastern States, yet after a struggle covering many years he secured its adoption. He was the author of the preemption system.

When he was the leader of the Jacksonian Democrats in the Senate he opposed the spoils system and favored the merit system.

As a Senator, Benton never could be swerved from his public duty as he understood it. He lived up to his convictions and voted according to the lights before him and his best judgment, without regard to the consequences to himself. With him personal appeals against duty fell upon deaf ears. His patriotism was as broad as the Union and knew no section. While he stood for the whole country, he always supported and defended the West and Western interests. Better than any statesman of his time he understood the grandeur, power, and glory of the great Republic, its possibilities, certain progress, growth, and expansion in trade and commerce.

He mastered nearly all the economical and political problems that affected in any way the Union and the whole country. He had but little regard for foreign things and foreign countries, and ignored their claims everywhere and whenever in conflict with those of the United States. Especially was he opposed to the pretensions and claims of Great Britain, and constantly fought British influence on this continent. His Americanism was intense, and his love of the Union, with its manifold blessings and splendid future, so clear to his vision, was his grand passion.

In a service in the Senate of thirty years, covering most exciting times, his integrity was never questioned. Honesty of purpose

characterized all of his official acts. He was satisfied to be a Senator of the United States and never tried to be President. He knew that many leading statesmen had been dwarfed and enfeebled by pandering to popular favor to reach the Presidency. This dementia never reached Benton; therefore he was always able to act up to his convictions and follow his best judgment on all public questions. His public life and services, his rectitude and singleness of purpose, his unselfishness, as well as his perseverance and industry, furnish an example and pattern worthy of imitation. Taking Benton all in all during his thirty years' service in the Senate, he was the most important factor in the general legislation of the country.

It is a remarkable fact, alike honorable and creditable to the intelligence and fairness of the people of Missouri, that, though a slave-holding State and favoring strongly the cause of the South in the civil war, its legislature should have voted that Benton and Blair, with their splendid records and achievements in favor of the Union and against secession and the extension of slavery, were of all other statesmen most deserving to have a place in the Hall of great and famous men in the nation's Capitol.

GENERAL FRANCIS P. BLAIR

Was both a soldier and a statesman; his name and fame sheds luster on the history of Missouri. His services in behalf of the Union can never be forgotten. Through his ability and prompt action as an officer of the Army the first year of the war Missouri was saved to Federal control and authority during the entire war.

For his splendid services in behalf of his State and country, both in peace and war, he deserves a place by the side of Benton.

The Late Denis M. Hurley.

REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. RAY,
OF NEW YORK,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Friday, June 1, 1900.

The House having under consideration the following resolutions:

"Whereas the late Hon. DENIS M. HURLEY, member of the Fifty-fifth Congress from the Second district of the State of New York, died on the 26th day of February, 1899, immediately preceding the final adjournment of the Fifty-fifth Congress; and

"Whereas the pressure of public business in the few days then remaining of the Fifty-fifth Congress prevented a day being set apart for the customary tributes to the memory of the said deceased:

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives be permitted to print in the RECORD appropriate remarks in eulogy of the said Hon. DENIS M. HURLEY, deceased"—

Mr. RAY of New York said:

Mr. SPEAKER: The life and character of DENIS M. HURLEY, late a member of this House, demonstrate the truth of the frequently repeated statement that in the United States of America we have no aristocracy save that of brains and integrity. DENIS M. HURLEY was born in Limerick, Ireland, in 1843. He came to Brooklyn, N. Y., in 1850, at the age of 7 years, where he always resided, except that for twelve years during his boyhood, from 1854 to 1866, he resided in the city of New York. He was educated in the public schools and in the broad field of human activities, where, availing himself of every opportunity, he added to his knowledge and mental resources until he became a leader among men.

His ability, integrity, and worth, the estimation in which he was held by his fellow-citizens, are shown by the fact that in the city of Brooklyn he was elected to the Fifty-fourth and reelected to the Fifty-fifth Congress as a Republican by substantial majorities. He was neither a politician nor an office seeker, as those words are commonly understood. He mingled actively in politics for the reason that he was interested in good government, the growth and prosperity of his city and State and adopted country, and also fully realized and appreciated the benefits conferred upon the human race by our system of government. He accepted office not as a business or means of livelihood or to gratify ambition, but that he might do his part to insure the honest administration of affairs and promote the general welfare. He was an industrious, intelligent worker wherever found. When a young man he learned and practiced the trade of carpenter and joiner with success. He knew how to shape, fashion, and fit material things and make them useful to man.

When he engaged in municipal and State affairs, he demonstrated his ability to shape governmental policies, to utilize the moral and mental forces about him, and construct useful and permanent laws. He never tore down a structure for the mere sake of destruction, but that it might be replaced with something better, something more useful. He never opposed any proposition or measure unless he could see that its adoption would produce injury, or more injury than possible good. He was progressive in his instincts and purposes. He was American in every act and inspiration. He was a Republican because he believed in the principles of the party—was convinced that the prosperity of the whole country depended on the adoption and execution of its policies. He had the warm, generous nature characteristic of his nationality. He was genial, he was kind, he was true. He was aggressive when occasion demanded, and brave, but he rarely gave offense.

In his habits and manners DENIS M. HURLEY was unostentatious and unpretentious. He was a practical man—practical and accurate in his judgment and so made few mistakes in dealing with men either in public or private life. He knew the people and sympathized with them. He always opposed anything and everything savoring oppression. He believed in the broadest measure of liberty to the citizen consistent with good government. In his judgment, force was the fit instrument of despots and tyrants, but the last resort in the government of a free and an intelligent people. He believed that aggregations of men will care for themselves, and if intelligent, will govern themselves wisely and well and that therefore the only true form of government is a republic; that to insure a high degree of liberty there must be a high degree of intelligence and education. Hence he was the friend and champion of our common-school system and of governmental aid in every field where the uplifting of the masses is possible.

He had no enemies in this House. We came to know him gradually, but knew him to be an honest, careful, painstaking business legislator, a true reliable friend. He admired oratory, but was never swayed by it. Mere words made no impression on his judgment. He was always himself. It has been said that "he is great who is what he is from nature, and never reminds us of others." It is certainly true that no man can become great by imitation. DENIS M. HURLEY imitated no man. He was what he was and as he was because he was natural and made the most of his opportunities without trenching upon the rights of others.

Not a demagogue himself, he had no respect for demagogical statesmanship. He wanted the truth and the wise action demanded by actual conditions. He had great pride in his home city, in the city of New York and in the Empire State, but he felt an equal pride in the Republic. He was not, could not be sectional. Hence, he had no sympathy with sectionalism. He would not support legislation designed or calculated to benefit one locality at the expense of another. He was respected by his colleagues irrespective of party. He was a safe adviser. He never sought to wear the laurels won by another. He was happy when his Republican colleagues from New York won recognition. He always stood by his party on party questions, but never hesitated to act independently when private rights were at stake, nor would he permit private rights to be made a party question.

But DENIS M. HURLEY is, as we say, dead. When the tidings came that our loved and honored colleague had been called from his field of usefulness here to that other land of which we think much, but know little, a feeling of sadness, of bereavement, permeated every heart. We realized that we had lost a companion and a friend. It is fitting and proper that we pause in our labors and pay fitting tribute to his memory. True, what we say here will not be long remembered, but we can point to the life of DENIS M. HURLEY and say to the young men of America, "Do thou likewise," and trust that some will find encouragement and perhaps inspiration to pursue life's work with greater zeal and determination.

Lives of great men all remind us
We can make our lives sublime,
And, departing, leave behind us
Footprints on the sands of time.
Footprints that perhaps another,
Sailing o'er life's solemn main,
A forlorn and shipwrecked brother,
Seeing, may take heart again.

Who will say that the life and successes of DENIS M. HURLEY, born in Ireland, educated in the free schools of New York, a toiler at the carpenter's bench, a wise, respected, and honored legislator in the Congress of the United States of America, are not an inspiration to the youths of America, "footprints" that shall guide young men aright and encourage hundreds to renewed effort? This age is wedded too much to fiction. We have too many dreamers. Too many follow visions that constantly change and thus lead their devotees a weary chase after the unattainable and the impossible. DENIS M. HURLEY was not visionary, but a practical man and hence a successful one. There was no dash or glitter in his make-up. He was solid, substantial, reliable, persistent, and hence he carried men with him when he advocated a measure or a policy. He succeeded because the man and his methods merited success.

Whatever of greatness he possessed he achieved; it was not thrust upon him. What great and good men have done others may do, and with improved methods and more extensive knowledge those who study the lives of worthy and successful men and

avoid their errors may accomplish still greater results. Our late colleague has not lived in vain. His example was worthy of emulation and his influence was felt impelling men in the right direction. Those who know what he did, those who read the story of his simple and honest and laborious life, more fully appreciate the blessings flowing from our system of government and the rewards that crown honest and persistent effort. When he became a man he saw a field of labor open to all who would compete. He at once became a competitor. The occupation was humble but useful. He mastered the business and became a leader and then a commander. He knew how to do things and did them. He honored labor and labor honored him. The masses in his Congressional district were entitled to representation, and their choice fell upon him because he was of them and understood them and could speak for them.

In the broad sense DENIS M. HURLEY is not dead, but called to a higher field of usefulness. God has so ordained that no material thing, however much it changes its form, is lost. Who can doubt that in some form somewhere the brave spirits of God's noblemen find an eternal home and work to do? It is well that we do not know what lies beyond the grave. We do know that this earth on which we live is but an atom in the vast creation of Omnipotent power. We do know that there is room beyond the sky and that our Creator has planted deep in every human breast, not hope merely, but an expectation of immortality. In the firm belief that this expectation is to be fully realized let us assert what our late colleague firmly believed, that what we call death is but "transition," and that he is now where the grasses are ever green, the flowers ever bloom, the birds ever sing, and the ended centuries are ever in the springtime of an eternal life.

There are no dead; we fall asleep
To waken where they never weep.
We close our eyes on pain and sin,
Our breath ebbs out, but life flows in.

Military Academy Bill.

We supposed General Otis and the Administration meant what they said when they informed us that the war in the Philippines was over.

What war are we getting ready for now? Is it a war of the tax eaters on the tax payers?

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN J. LENTZ,

OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, June 5, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the conference report on the bill (H. R. 11538) making appropriations for the Military Academy—

Mr. LENTZ said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN AND GENTLEMEN: This amendment has in it a proposition to make Major-General Miles a lieutenant-general, and that is the only merit in the amendment; next it proposes to make Mr. Corbin a major-general, and in addition, if I am not mistaken, the bill carries with it a proposition for 50 more cadets at West Point to be appointed by the President. I ask the chairman of the Military Committee [Mr. HULL] if I am right in that.

Mr. HULL. The bill increases the number of cadets to be appointed by the President from 20, as now provided by law, to 50, making an increase of 30.

Mr. LENTZ. I understood the President had only 10 appointments.

Mr. HULL. No; he has 20.

Mr. LENTZ. When did he get the twenty?

Mr. HULL. About a year ago.

Mr. LENTZ. That shows just what is going on. You can slip along and increase the number from ten, as it was a year ago, and give the President twenty appointments, and now in the last hour of Congress, when we are railroading hundreds of bills through, there will be an effort to sneak in the proposition for thirty more. Why not go into the military business entirely? Why not stop all other legislation and simply convert the whole country into a military establishment. We have spent five months out of our six months in legislating about people on the other side of the earth. It is about time that we look after our own family of 75,000,000. Thirty more cadets at West Point! Fifty appointments by the President a year! Why?

Mr. HULL. Fifty altogether.

Mr. LENTZ. Fifty altogether. We supposed General Otis and the Administration meant what they said when they informed us that the war in the Philippines was over. What war are we getting ready for now? Is it a war of the tax eaters on the tax payers? We have Army officers to burn. [Laughter.] They are in and about the Military Committee room every hour asking for some kind of promotion or restoration. Millions of dollars on the pay roll for men who are retired! Will this thing ever stop? Personal legislation, political legislation, or pull legislation—call it what you please. It does seem to me, gentlemen of this Congress, that the brakes ought to be put on somewhere. Fifty men for West Point and Otis saying the war is over! We have stolen enough down in Cuba, it is true, if we had gotten it into the Treasury, to pay for the support of these military heroes we propose to create by legislation, but those who are doing the stealing in Cuba are not turning the spoils into the public Treasury; they are getting ready for another campaign, to prate about the flag and national honor.

Now, I suppose after this infernal post-office scandal and thievery we are about to retire from the work of benevolent assimilation in Cuba. It ought not be long until we need no forces in Porto Rico, and Otis says the war is over in the Philippine Islands. Yet you are here legislating at the last hour for fifty cadets, to cost the Government thousands of dollars each. What purpose is there in it if this is not to establish militarism—if it is not another step in the career of imperialism?

Can it be possible that these cadets are to receive all the advantages of an education at West Point and $2,200 in cash in addition for the four years without suggesting militarism and imperialism? What will the farmer and mechanic receive for the education of his son or daughter? Whose sons will receive the perquisites and cash allowances of these fifty appointments to be made by the President? Will they not go to those sons of those dads who have political pull? You who are stupid enough to believe they will not should read the article in the May number of the Jeffersonian Democrat, which is as follows:

PATRIOTISM AND TREASON.

[By Lieutenant Nopull.]

During a recent debate in the United States Senate Senator SEWELL, replying to a speech of Senator PETTIGREW, stigmatized the latter as a "traitor." Senator PETTIGREW's speech, which brought forth this violent epithet, related to the Philippine question, and was a vigorous denunciation of the war policy of the present Administration.

Senator SEWELL's reply was intolerant and violent, and his epithet of denunciation was one seldom heard in the halls of Congress.

With excited words and angry gestures he denounced the "treason" of Mr. PETTIGREW, and proclaimed his own patriotism. He availed himself of the proud opportunity to announce that he had a son fighting in the Philippines, who had been on the staff of Lawton; a gallant soldier whose life was endangered by the cowardly traitors who disapprove of the war in the Philippines.

Let us examine the "patriotism" of Mr. SEWELL and the "treason" of Mr. PETTIGREW. They are terms now frequently heard. Let us see what they mean when used as the shibboleth of partisan appeal.

Let us commence by making inquiries about this gallant son, this soldier that is fighting and bleeding and dying in the Philippines.

We will consult the Army Register: "Robert Sewell, appointed second lieutenant Seventh Cavalry, 1892."

"Ah! a West Pointer, no doubt," you say. Let us see. No; he is not a West Pointer. There are no "M. A." after his name to indicate that he belongs to the graduates of the National Academy.

"Then he served faithfully and gallantly in the ranks, and won his commission by force of honest merit, as many a deserving young man has done."

Be patient, gentle reader; we will see. It is all here in the record.

No; he has no service in the ranks. He was appointed from civil life.

"Then he was a young man of especial brilliant parts, of fine education, who had attended some military school and achieved distinction."

The register is silent as to this. Go to any Army post or camp and ask the question of any officer that you meet. It won't matter who, but better ask one who has won his commission with his brains at West Point; and that it may all be clear in his mind, let his service date back as far as young Sewell's. With these limitations any officer will do. Here is his answer; here is what he will tell you:

"Young Sewell's appointment caused much comment at the time, because of rank favoritism. He was ordered before an Army board in due form for mental examination, and failed. Notwithstanding this, and in violation of the regulations made for the common herd, he was appointed. He is a fat, lazy, good natured boy."

If our interrogated officer is talkative, he will add that of late it has become a common practice to appoint the sons or relatives of influential men who fail in their examination, while holding the rule of successful examination operative for the general applicant.

But let us return to the register and further examine the record of the Senator's son:

"Appointed first lieutenant, 1898." This is all right; this is in due form. "Captain and assistant quartermaster, September, 1899." Captain and transferred to the staff with its safety and special privileges. And why this promotion?

Had he distinguished himself in battle? Not at all.

Had he acquired especial proficiency through painstaking experience? Not at all. He had had no experience as a quartermaster.

Did his rank entitle him to promotion? Not at all. At the day of his appointment 103 first lieutenants ranked him in his arm of the service, of whom 87 were educated West Pointers; while 428 first lieutenants ranked him in the Army, of whom more than three-fourths were graduates of the Military Academy.

Why, then, was Robert Sewell made captain and quartermaster? Why was he passed over 428 deserving officers? Let justice answer. His father is a United States Senator and filled to o'erflowing with "patriotism."

And what about this "patriotism" which volunteers at the firing of the first gun for appointment as brigadier-general or staff officer, with high rank and ample safety?

And what about the bestowal of brigadier-generalships, colonelcies, and majorities upon the sons of fathers and children of society?

What about this patriotism which walks hand in hand with a high ranking military appointment, this patriotism and spot pay? Here are a few of such appointments made since the commencement of the war with Spain:

Name.	Position.	Recommendation.	Experience.
1. Wm. J. McKee	Brig. gen.	Father of "Baby McKee"	Nothing.
2. C. A. Whittier	do	Child of wealth	Do.
3. John A. Hull	Lieut. col.	Son of Representative HULL	Do.
4. John J. Astor	do	Child of society	Do.
5. R. B. Harrison	Major	Son of President Harrison	Do.
6. Geo. A. Hobart	do	Nephew of Vice-President	Do.
7. Perry Belmont	do	Child of society	Do.
8. P. B. Strong	do	Son of Mayor Strong	Do.
9. Wm. B. Schofield	do	Son of General Schofield	Do.
10. G. C. Webb	do	Child of society	Do.
11. James G. Blaine	Captain	Son of father	Do.
12. Stuart M. Brice	do	Son of Senator Brice	Do.
13. D. VAN VOORHIS	do	Son of Representative VAN VOORHIS.	Do.
14. Wm. A. Harper	do	Child of society	Do.
15. C. D. Coudert	do	do	Do.
16. Fred. M. Alger	do	Son of Secretary Alger	Do.
17. Wm. B. Allison, jr.	do	Son of Senator ALLISON	Do.
18. Harry S. New	do	Son of Representative New	Do.
19. Webb Hayes	Lieut. col.	Son of President Hayes	Do.

Seriously, were those appointments made because of patriotism and military efficiency, or because of corrupt partisan promptings?

Ask any returned soldier, any officer or private returned from the Philippines and not obligated by an undeserved appointment, and he will tell you that the conflict with the Filipinos came as the natural result of our own work in attempting to subdue a people to whom we had given arms and encouraged to rise and fight for their freedom.

Ask any "patriotic" Senator whose son holds a high commission without possessing military education or merit, and he will tell you that the conflict with the Filipinos was caused by the disagreement of Senator HOAR or Senator MASON or Senator PETTIGREW with the policy of the Administration. Out upon such canting hypocrisy!

Senator PETTIGREW should reform. He should "bend the pregnant hinges of the knee" just a trifle. He should sing hosannas to the benign Republican party. He should exalt his patriotism, hire a band, gather crowds, and denounce the "traitors," "antis," and "copperheads" who oppose war. He should declare for the elevation of the poor Filipinos even though it were necessary to shoot every one full of holes in order to accomplish the elevation.

Then, perchance, his son or nephew would be made a colonel or major in the Army, and with sanctified face and benign unction he could repeat to admiring audiences:

"I thank thee that I am not as other men are, extortioners, unjust adulterers, or even as this publican."

I ask those of you whose brains are torpid enough to submit tamely to these political raids on the public Treasury for the benefit of the sons of those who have political pull to read the Scriptures, and, in the language of Jeremiah, I ask, "Can the Ethiopian change his skin or the leopard his spots? Then may ye also do good that are accustomed to do evil." What was done before will be done again by the President and his political general, who heretofore has been known as the Adjutant-General and hereafter is to be known as major-general.

If we could change the title of the Adjutant-General and call him Political General, so as not to deceive the uninitiated, there might not be so much confusion about the title and duty of the major-general. But if a few more sons of members and relatives of their wives are to be appointed, why will it not be in order to make the Adjutant-General also a Lieutenant-General? And don't forget the pay and allowances. As for General Miles, I place him where Lincoln placed him, among the bravest and worthiest leaders. I would promote him as I would Winfield Scott Schley. These two men achieved the greatest results and won the greatest victories of the Spanish war with the least sacrifice of human life among our boys.

Schley at Santiago and Miles at Porto Rico have no superior and only one equal—that of Dewey at Manila.

Had Miles been sent with full power to Luzon he would have been diplomat and strategist enough to have brought the Filipinos to friendly terms just as he did the Porto Ricans. I know there are men who think ill of General Miles because he did not support the beef trusts, and others because he did not have enough bloody war in Porto Rico—that he did not sacrifice enough of his men by attacking the Spaniards in their forts and strongholds. But what should the people ask or expect of a great general if not that he should save his own men and still receive the sword of the enemy?

Let the mothers answer who is the great general—whether Miles in Porto Rico, or Shafter in Cuba. Let us not forget that critical day when Shafter wished to retreat from Santiago, and when the President and his political general gladly turned to General Miles to extricate them all. Let us remember that the Spaniards did not surrender at Santiago until they met the tact and strategy of General Miles.

I am in favor of General Miles's promotion to that of Lieutenant-General, but I am not in favor of allowing any staff officer who remains here in Washington in a bomb-proof building in time of war receiving any higher grade or pay and allowances than that of a brigadier-general. Six thousand two hundred dollars a year, with retirement at age of 64 on three-fourths pay, is enough for any staff officer, and much better treatment than that received by any other servant of the people, be he Senator or Cabinet officer or Vice-President.

But there are other evidences of militarism abroad in the land besides that of giving the President royal and autocratic power of appointment. You have an army out in Idaho which has been used to break up labor unions and deny men the right to work. The type giving a history of this militarism is set up in the Printing Office, and sets forth the testimony taken at the investigation which we have made of that matter. This morning in the Military Committee we asked to have a resolution passed to print 10,000 copies of that evidence. The Republican end of that committee reported that there was no justification in the resolution that we filed here for an investigation.

The Republican end of the Military Committee will place before the country their findings that the charges are not sustained by the evidence; and when we made a motion requesting the Printing Committee to bring up a resolution which was passed in the Senate to print 10,000 copies of that evidence, to show how the Army was used in Idaho to break up the labor unions, the chairman of the committee ruled that that motion was out of order. It was merely a motion to request the running of a few sheets of white paper over a cylinder with black ink on it, and it would cost this Government only a pittance, and yet the Republican chairman ruled it out of order.

It is exceedingly harsh to say, but it is an old and a well-known maxim that "the man with a pure heart and a clean record has nothing to conceal." Every Republican on the Military Committee and every Republican in the House who had anything to say with reference to printing of the testimony in the Cœur d'Alene matter seems to be determined to burn or bury the record. Every Democrat on that committee is equally determined to have the complete record given to the public. This alone ought to show thinking men that somebody has something to conceal. The two reports of the two ends of the committee are diametrically opposed to each other, hence one or the other is false, and the fact that the Republicans refuse to give the public the testimony ought to be considered significant, to say the least.

You Republicans refuse to give the public anything except a garbled statement of the testimony, made by yourselves to support a finding which you confess is not supported by the complete record, or you would be glad to publish the complete record.

We spent nearly all of our time in the Military Committee room between the 19th of February and the 10th of May taking this testimony. It cost the Government in the neighborhood of fifteen to twenty thousand dollars to bring the witnesses from Idaho, to pay stenographers' fees, and to set the type to print the testimony from day to day for the use of the members of the committee, so that at this time the only expense to which the Government would be put in giving this testimony would be that of running some white paper over some printers' ink. You can fool the people a part of the time, as Lincoln said, but I do not believe you will be able to fool them all the time.

Labor unions and newspapers and public thinkers all over the country are asking for the complete record of that evidence, and not a Republican in the committee or here in the House dares to raise his voice in favor of the publication of that record. The Republican end of the Printing Committee of this House has had the privileged resolution from the Senate for the printing of 10,000 copies since last Friday or Saturday.

Mr. LACEY. Will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. LENTZ. I do.

Mr. LACEY. What is the politics of the governor of Idaho who called for these troops?

Mr. LENTZ. He belongs to any old trust or capitalistic combine that wants to use him. That is his politics, and that explains why you and the Republicans on the Military Committee love him. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HILL. He is a Democrat, is he not?

Mr. LACEY. Do you mean to say that, being a Democrat, he belongs to a trust?

Mr. LENTZ. His politics is exactly the same as those of Mr. William McKinley. He is in the service of the capitalistic mine owners.

Mr. LACEY. What political party elected him?

Mr. LENTZ. I understand he was elected on a mixed ticket. [Manifestations of derision on the Republican side.] But the mere fact that he calls himself a Democrat does not make him one, for he proves himself a despot, and a rose would smell as sweet by some other name. Although you call this man a Democrat, every Democratic member of the committee, without an exception, signed a report condeming him and the President alike in their use of the military for no other purpose than to black list the labor unions of Idaho and to drive them out of the State. Now, sir, we insist that you men shall go before the country confessing that you are ashamed to publish this testimony, if you allow this House to adjourn without publishing the 10,000 copies of

it as provided in the privileged resolution passed by the Senate and sent over here a week ago. Publish it if you dare, and show your good faith in support of your findings that the resolutions are not sustained. The type is there, the plates are there; it is only a question of a few pounds of white paper.

But I do not care to take any more time on that. I propose to serve notice upon gentlemen here that if you are honest in your report you will agree to publish ten or twenty or thirty thousand copies of the evidence complete.

Fifty cadets for West Point! And General Corbin to be made a major-general. General Corbin, just at the last hour of the last Congress, when we sat up all night, was hovering around the corridors here trying to have himself legislated up to a major-general and a salary almost double that of a Senator. I would like to see some of these men getting higher military honors by fighting for it. I am tired of having men beg for military degrees.

I have not much respect for political beggars or military beggars. A major-generalship, the highest place, the highest office we have in the Army to-day, to be given to a man who sits in a bombproof building and does nothing but act as the clerk for the President! What do we have a commanding general for? It is his place to direct the movements of the Army in war. Are these men here simply to wear shoulder straps and go to good dinners and attend the theaters and be handsome-looking fellows for the benefit of the ladies, or are they to fight?

I repeat and emphasize that I am not in favor of any staff officer holding a higher title than brigadier-general. Six thousand two hundred dollars a year, with the privilege of retiring at the age of 64 on three-fourths pay, is as much as any clerk in the War Department or any other Department ought to receive, and the man who goes in on the staff ought to understand that he can not have the highest office, even by legislation. And if there is no way of limiting this infernal system of begging for promotion instead of fighting for it, we need a constitutional amendment to limit the greed of the staff officers rather than to limit the greed of the trusts.

Within the past few weeks we on the Military Committee have listened for many days to the claims made by the officers of the line for greater privileges and opportunities of becoming staff officers. They all know of the luxury and ease of these places here at Washington and they are impatient to secure them.

I have as much good feeling for the brave Army officer and patriotic soldier as any man in this Congress can have, but I am unwilling to have the taxpayers utterly ignored, and I am as jealous of militarism as Jefferson and Lincoln were.

I am not willing to see the cartoons of America, like those of the monarchies of Europe, representing every workingman with a soldier on his shoulders; and I agree with Andrew Jackson's declaration that "Industry in peace is the source of our wealth."

On some other occasion, when time shall permit, I may pay my respects further to the court-martial of the man of whom the President is reported to have said, "General Corbin is the best politician in the Army."

In conclusion and in further support of my repeated assertion that "the times are out of joint" and that the principles of Jefferson and Lincoln have been repudiated by the Republican Administration, I submit herewith a report given by the Akron (Ohio) Daily Democrat of correspondence which has recently taken place between Hon. M. A. HANNA, chairman of the Republican national committee, and ex-Governor Sidney Edgerton, of Akron, Ohio, one of the founders of the Republican party and one of its delegates to the Philadelphia convention which nominated Frémont in 1856. The account of the Akron Democrat is as follows:

[Akron Daily Democrat.]

SPEAKS FOR THE "OLD CAUSE"—"FOR THAT OLD CAUSE IN WHICH I WAS FROM MY YOUTH ENGAGED"—GOVERNOR EDGERTON, REPLYING TO SENATOR HANNA, TELLS WHY HE WILL NOT ATTEND THE PHILADELPHIA CONVENTION—SHOWS HOW THE REPUBLICANISM OF "THE HEROIC AGE OF THE PARTY" DIFFERS FROM THE REPUBLICANISM OF TO-DAY—DEPLORES THE PARTY'S INTOLERANT ATTITUDE TOWARD HONEST CRITICISM AND DISCUSSION.

Ex-Governor Sidney Edgerton, one of the 14 survivors of the memorable Republican conventions of 1856, which founded the Republican party, has mailed an answer to the invitation sent to him to attend the Republican convention in Philadelphia next week.

In his letter to Senator M. A. HANNA, who mailed the invitation, Governor Edgerton sets forth comparative views of Republican policy in the day of Lincoln and the day of HANNA. He gives his reasons for refusing to accept the invitation to occupy a place of honor on the platform in no uncertain manner. The invitation from Senator HANNA was as follows:

SENATOR HANNA'S INVITATION.

HEADQUARTERS REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE,
NORTHWEST CORNER FOURTEENTH AND G STREETS,
Washington, D. C., June 2, 1900.

Hon. SIDNEY EDGERTON, *Akron, Ohio.*

DEAR SIR: The Republican national committee presents its compliments and congratulations to you as one of the few Republicans now living who participated in the Republican conventions of 1856 at Pittsburg and Philadelphia, and on behalf of the delegates to the coming Republican national convention extends to you and to your surviving associates in those historic events a cordial invitation to be present at and occupy a seat upon the platform of the convention which meets on the 19th day of June, 1900, in the city of Philadelphia.

Nearly half a century has elapsed since you participated in laying the foundation of the Republican party. You have witnessed its magnificent growth from a popular vote of 1,341,264 and 114 electoral votes cast for Frémont in 1856 to a popular vote of 7,104,779 and 271 electoral votes for McKinley in 1896; and therefore the Republicans of to-day, profoundly appreciating the work of yourself and other pioneers of our party, will feel honored by your distinguished presence, and we assure you a most cordial welcome.

With considerations of high esteem, very truly, yours,

M. A. HANNA, *Chairman.*

CHAS. DICK, *Secretary.*

GOVERNOR EDGERTON'S REPLY.

Governor Edgerton's answer, which was mailed to the Senator in due season, is printed in full below:

AKRON, OHIO, *June 5, 1900.*

MY DEAR SIR: I have received your letter of the 2d instant, in which you invite me to be present at the convention to be held in Philadelphia on Tuesday next.

For your courtesy in extending to me this invitation I am extremely obliged to you. The thoughtfulness which inspired it—knowing, as you do, how little there is in common between the principles held by me and the foreordained work of the occasion referred to and how little use you will have for such as I am—argues a disinterestedness on your part which, being so rare in this day, is appreciated accordingly.

You do no more than justice to the conventions held at Pittsburg and Philadelphia in 1856 by characterizing them in your letters as "historic events." They truly were so; and to have been concerned in them is to me a source of pride and satisfaction.

I am indeed very unequal to the task to which you have invited me, for I am borne down by the weight of many years and am laboring under great infirmities of body. Nevertheless I should feel it my duty to hazard the undertaking if my journey thither and my presence there could at all promote the keeping by the coming convention of the ancient faith of the Republican party or the maintenance of its ancestral honor. What that convention will do is absolutely known to yourself, and is substantially known to me. From this knowledge I am persuaded that the condition of my attendance, above referred to, must fail—has failed in advance—and, the condition failing, my presence must fail also.

I purpose stating briefly some of the facts which show that the doctrines to be advocated, the policies to be indorsed, and the plans to be pursued by your convention are quite the opposite of those which obtained in the convention of 1856; the only community between them is that of place and party name.

The Philadelphia convention of 1856 was made up of men who had convictions of political right and duty and the courage of them. And they came together for conference and comparison of views, to the end that by wise and tolerant concert of political effort the welfare of the people might be promoted and the great cause of human liberty advanced. The Philadelphia convention of 1900 has for its sole work to ratify and register a political rescript set forth by one man, having for its purpose to perpetuate in power an Administration which has wholy disregarded the interests of the masses.

The Pittsburg convention of 1856 was held on the birthday of Washington, and the Philadelphia convention of that year was called for the 17th of June, the anniversary of the battle of Bunker Hill, the significance of which dates will suggest itself to you. Your convention will indorse and eulogize with fulsome praise a policy which has turned its back upon the last counsel of Washington to his people, and which is an organized sneer at the principles for which he fought, and will commend an Administration which, for its supple lackeying and truckling subserviency to Great Britain has not its match in history; and this is, too, by a President whose principal political stock in trade for a generation past has been our economic wrongs suffered at the hands of this hereditary industrial enemy of ours.

The convention held in Philadelphia in 1856 addressed its declaration of doctrine to those who were "in favor of * * * restoring the action of the Federal Government to the principles of Washington and Jefferson," and it accordingly "*Resolved*, That the maintenance of the principles promulgated in the Declaration of Independence and embodied in the Federal Constitution is essential to the preservation of our Republican institutions." And again it "*Resolved*, That with our Republican fathers we hold it to be a self-evident truth that all men are endowed with the inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and that the primary object and ulterior design of our Federal Government were to secure these rights to all persons within its exclusive jurisdiction."

The Philadelphia convention of this year will be made up of men in whose view "the principles of Washington and Jefferson" are avowedly antiquated and far out of date—useful only in the orations of the Fourth of July or the warmed-over porch platitudes of a political campaign; and it will in terms countenance a policy which denies to 10,000,000 "persons within our exclusive jurisdiction" the "inalienable rights" which in its earlier days the Republican party thus guaranteed, a policy which avows its purpose of governing subject peoples without their consent, outside of constitutional principles and safeguards, at the caprice of irresponsible appointees or a venal majority in Congress, and in flagrant and derisive violation of the "principles of Washington and Jefferson," and those "promulgated in the Declaration of Independence and embodied in the Federal Constitution." It will vociferously uphold and applaud the doings of an Administration which, doubling in its own track within a space of sixty days, has broken faith with an innocent and confiding people who, by the hazards of war, had passed under its jurisdiction—an act rightly characterised by itself as the breach of "a plain duty"—at the command of the conscienceless and mercenary appetite for plunder possessed by those by whom that Administration was itself created, and which thus is constrained to remember its creator.

It will indorse a policy which thus lawlessly put in motion has already begun to bear the fruits of lawlessness in the peculations being perpetrated by our officials upon those whom it appears we rescued from one set of brigands only to turn loose another upon them, and it will denounce the individual thieves, in apparent forgetfulness that the thievery is but the symptom and necessary sequence of an irresponsible despotism. For a government of peoples outside of constitutional sanctions is, upon any rational Republican theory, but a despotism; and it is so not the less because it is promised to be administered "benevolently" and for the good of the governed; the fact that they are governed without their consent puts the policy at war with the Republican doctrine of 1856. And so, being irresponsible at its source, the principle of irresponsibility permeates the entire fabric, and stealing and spoliation by subordinates follow as night succeeds the day. Shortly before the convention of 1856 a man of some prominence then and later said: "When the white man governs himself, that is self-government; but when he governs himself and also governs another man, that is more than self-government—that is despotism. * * *

"What I do say is, that no man is good enough to govern another man

without that other's consent. * * * Little by little, but steadily as man's march to the grave, we have been giving up the old for the new faith. Near eighty years ago we began by declaring that all men are created equal; but now from that beginning we have run down to the other declaration that for some men to enslave others is a 'sacred right of self-government.' These principles can not stand together. They are as opposite as God and Mammon."

The utterer of these words was Abraham Lincoln. Was he a Republican or not? Measured by the standard of 1856, plainly he was. Judged by the test which will govern the Philadelphia convention of this year, just as plainly he was not.

The Philadelphia convention of 1856 declared in its platform that it was "both the right and the imperative duty of Congress to prohibit in the territories those twin relics of barbarism, polygamy and slavery." The Republican party of that time, in obedience to this mandate, and improving the opportunity created by the great civil war, did far more. At a cost in blood and treasure beyond computation, it emancipated a race and secured the adoption of an amendment to our Constitution which forever prohibits slavery or involuntary servitude, except upon due conviction of crime, in all places "within the United States, or subject to their jurisdiction." In like manner it by lawful means extirpated polygamy within our borders.

The Philadelphia convention which you ask me to attend will, by its platform, approve the work of an Administration which, claiming to have subdued the Sultanate of Sulu, nevertheless is in treaty with its Sultan, whereby it guarantees the integrity of his dominions and promises to protect him in maintaining his slave barracoon and his harem of wives. And not only has it thus given him immunity for his breach of our organic and statute law, but it has put a premium upon "those twin relics of barbarism" by paying him a yearly stipend for continuing to be a lawbreaker. And by way of sarcasm on your campaign cry of 1896, it pays him the bounty in those sinful and utterly "dishonest" Mexican dollars! It is a little curious to see how a government can make a treaty with one of its own subjects, for you will perceive that our country, under the "benevolent" extra-constitutional doctrine, has progressed far enough to have subjects as well as citizens; but let that pass. You will claim, and I do not now deny, that the Sultan's territory is "subject to the jurisdiction" of the United States. Upon the morality, national or otherwise, of the transaction I make no comment.

But for the party which by blood and iron imbedded the thirteenth amendment in our organic law to sanction it seems to me monstrous—a party sacrilege, a political blasphemy. The same organization, too, thus to be commended at Philadelphia in the polygamy line strains at the gnat (Roberts) and swallows the camel (the Sultan of Sulu). Holy Writ tells us what the proper name of people who do this thing is. I can not improve its definition. And the party has annexed Hawaii also, bringing over, I suppose, its laws with it. By Hawaiian law coolie contract labor is permitted and sanctioned. By that law such contracts for "involuntary servitude" may be specifically enforced in the courts, now under our jurisdiction, or their violation may be corporally punished by the lash. And this is, I understand, in fact done. A clergyman lands on our shores under an agreement to break the Bread of Life to the people of Brooklyn. Upon this fact becoming known he is hustled back to his own land, because he is a violator of the contract-labor law. Here we have another gnat strained at and another camel swallowed. But the one is at the behest of the sugar barons of Hawaii; the other is only a poor person who has nothing but God's word to deal in. The Philadelphia convention of next week will commend the annexation of Hawaii, and, if it says anything on the subject, it will, with equal unction, denounce the wicked contracts to import labor into the harbor of New York.

The Philadelphia convention of 1856 contained this resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the highwayman's plea that 'might makes right,' embodied in the Ostend circular, was in every respect unworthy of American diplomacy, and would bring shame and dishonor upon any government or people who gave it their sanction."

The facts behind the "Ostend circular" are familiar to every student of history, and I need not repeat them. It is equally patent that the policy "embodied in the Ostend circular" and that now being pursued by our national Administration in regard to the Philippine Islands, and probably in regard to Cuba also, differ from one another in no essential respect, and a simple man would think that both should fall under the same condemnation. But it is quite safe to say that the latter will, at the convention to which you have invited me, be as vigorously applauded as the former was reprobated at the convention of four and forty years ago. How can I, then, if I would keep the political faith of 1856, attend upon or approve the work which the Philadelphia convention of this year has marked out for it, and which it will most obsequiously perform? It would be an inconsistency so gross as to shock the political moral sense of any reasonable creature endowed with a conscience and an appreciation of party fitness.

The Philadelphia convention of 1856 strenuously advocated the construction of a highway to the Pacific over our own territory, and of course under our own control, and to be defended, upon occasion, with the jealous care inherent in a free people against interference, restraint, guardianship, or espionage by any other power whatsoever.

The convention of 1900 will be expected to, and so will, loudly indorse the foreign policy of the Administration, which has been so far recreant to all our traditions of national independence of action and American manhood as to negotiate and ask the Senate to ratify a treaty whereby, at a time when Congress has made provision for a waterway designed also to bring us nearer to our Pacific possessions, over territory conceded to us by an independent power, and hence as much ours as if it were passing over one of our own watersheds, we obligate ourselves to Great Britain never to fortify the canal thus to be built with our own means on territory not at all under her jurisdiction, thus surrendering to her navy in advance in time of war a potential title to our own property.

And the same Administration has refused to allow the bill for the construction of the canal to come to a vote in the Senate, in order that time may be gained and the requisite pressure brought to bear upon legislators to consummate this abject flunkeyism which has become characteristic of our State Department as now occupied and administered. To a Republican of 1856 this fawning sycophancy to the most selfish of nations is nauseating.

The Republican party of that early day, and long afterwards, was upon every consideration the friend of and the sympathizer with the oppressed and downtrodden everywhere. And it so went on record time and again. In the convention of this year there will be no word of rebuke heard for the course of an Administration which has stood calmly but coldly by in sight of the death struggles of two republics in another hemisphere, crushed beneath the blows of armaments too overwhelming for hope of resistance, we all the while uttering no word of cheer and tendering in the meantime no good offices looking to an honorable peace, which, by the express terms of The Hague convention, we would have been warranted in doing without giving any just cause of offense to either belligerent. On the contrary, it is too notorious for controversy that our Government not only had no good offices to tender, being itself engaged in a like enterprise elsewhere, but it resolutely suppressed to the measure of its ability all public expression of sympathy with the South African Republics in their mortal agonies.

The newspaper oracles of the Administration were as dumb as oysters, in strange contrast to their effusiveness when reaching out for the Irish vote, and when the accredited representatives of the Transvaal Government reached the shores of a land, as they supposed, of liberty, they were at the State Department treated as outlaws, being refused other than an unofficial reception, although the refuser then had his own son at their capital, receiving official recognition for the benefit of our citizens, sojourners there; and the Secretary of State hastened to advertise the cold shoulder he had given the envoys, in order that his London friends might seasonably know of his good services, and the President consoled the suppliants for their chilly reception by showing them the fine view from the portico of the White House. No effort was spared to keep the sympathetic heart beat of the American people from their ear.

This is not the Republicanism of the heroic age of the party.

The Republican party of 1856 addressed its appeal to the conscience, to the reason, to the judgment of the people. The Republican party of to-day is wholly intolerant of criticism or discussion of partisan measures within its own ranks, and any dissent from them is promptly stigmatized as treason, not indeed to the nation, nor even to the party, but to the men who control it; so that all independence of thought is stifled and all manly expression of opinion is dragooned into a cowed and discreet silence.

That party, in any early day and to its everlasting honor, offered a lawful and temperate opposition to a decree of the Supreme Court which was wholly extrajudicial, and which, by denying to a race of men the commonest rights of nature, caused all Christendom to cry out against the barbarity of its judgment.

Now it is a cardinal doctrine of the organization which is to convene at Philadelphia that the most absurd and tyrannical deliverances of the most untoward and irresponsible judicial accidents shall be treated as inerrant, and that an intelligent criticism of them is to be hooted down as anarchy and contempt.

The Republican party of its early history was, above all things else, a party of the people. It was organized to voice the protests of the many against the aggressions of the few. It found the Government in the hands of a compact organization, insignificant in numbers and not respectable in political methods, but who held a part of their fellow-men as slaves and made the rest of the people slave catchers. It was, in more modern language, a gigantic trust of land and labor, which undertook to monopolize and control that product of God's earth of which the world was supposed to stand most in need, and which was therefore denominated "king." To the overthrow of this soulless and conscienceless oligarchy the party addressed itself, and its history throughout that long struggle was God-like. At this day it is at once the benefactor and beneficiary, not, indeed, of one trust, but of many trusts, which, in a greater or a less degree, monopolize and withhold from man nearly all of God's gifts to him, exacting an unearned and unmerited tribute for their enjoyment, and usurping the constitutional power of taxing the people.

At the last session of Congress it passed a law which created a monopoly of the circulating medium of the people, and so put into the hands of the few the most unconscionable weapon of oppression over the industry, the frugality, and the thrift of the country which human sagacity, backed by unscrupulous power, could manipulate; and for thus bartering away the rights of the producing and earning masses it expects to be perpetuated in power. This law it passed early and easily. When the last days of the session were here, at a time when it was known that no legislation could pass for want of time for intelligent debate, it proposed the farce of a constitutional amendment which asked the States simply to abdicate all control over their industrial creatures and go out of the governing business.

To this proposition all right of amendment was denied, and upon its merited defeat the purpose of deceiving the people was, if not avowed, at least not denied. At the same time an amendment to make effectual an anti-trust law already on the statute book was not allowed to come to a vote in the Senate; a trust attorney from a trust State was at the head of the Department of Justice, and trust lawyers all over the country were appointed, charged with the duty of prosecuting trusts. The Philadelphia convention will loudly denounce trusts, on paper; its campaign fund will be replenished from their tolls from the people, and its managers will guarantee them countenance and immunity. In this respect also the Republican convention of 1856 was the exponent of a policy the reverse of that which the coming convention will not indeed indorse, but which it will take care to see enforced.

The time was in the history of the party when it chose its public servants for their capacity, their integrity, and their allegiance to principle. Now oleaginous mediocrity may fill the highest position within its bestowal, and places may be sought and obtained from the most sordid motives. A purchased seat in the Senate is no longer esteemed a disgrace to the purchaser, while the purchased are rewarded with Federal appointments, and he who is most astute in obstructing an investigation and in instructing witnesses not to answer is intrusted with the prosecution of the common offenders whom want or misfortune has impelled to crime. Hypocrisy masquerades as political virtue, and platforms constitute only abortive attempts to cover up the nakedness of a bad record with the fig leaves of loud professions and fair promises, coupled with swelling appeals to the glorious lineage and historic past of the party.

It was the Republican party of a generation ago, which as the harvest gathering of peaceful agitation and armed conflict and as an enduring guaranty of political equality among us, planted in the Federal Constitution the fourteenth amendment, which provides the appropriate means for its own efficient execution. The Republican party is and for some time has been in complete control of all branches of our Government. It has the power, therefore, to advance the remedy and to make that amendment a living letter instead of a sealed book, and to right the enormous wrong now being perpetrated against the suffrage in several of the States of this Union. From a constitutional and ancient Republican point of view, this crime against the ballot is the master grievance of the age, and beside which, as a matter of fidelity to party and party principles, every other question and all other offenses dwindle into insignificance.

But I am safe in saying that the Philadelphia convention, to which you invite me, will do nothing and say nothing to cure this abominable evil. If a pledge to repeal or to emasculate the amendment could be hopefully used as a trap to catch a single Southern electoral vote, I venture to predict it would be forthcoming. The past record of the party imposes the duty upon that convention to make good its early pledges by making some deliverance on the subject. It makes another reason why I can not attend that convention that this implied promise is to be ruthlessly and contemptuously broken.

I might enumerate other points in which the old convention and the new are repugnant to each other in matter of substance and principle, so that to countenance by my attendance the latter would be to stultify myself as a member of the former. But these, I conceive, are enough.

The last words spoken by my illustrious and patriotic namesake, Algernon Sidney, as he laid his head upon the block on Tower Hill was to thank his Maker for the opportunity for saying a final word for that "old cause" in which I was from my youth engaged—the "old cause," as he pathetically called the cause of constitutional liberty.

I, too, am grateful that I have been spared thus to bear witness to the same end.

Very sincerely, yours,

SIDNEY EDGERTON.

Hon. M. A. HANNA, *Cleveland, Ohio.*

Nicaragua Canal.

We must place the American flag above American-built vessels, manned by American seamen, and carrying the products of American skill and American farms into every port of the world.

It is not good government farming to pay others $200,000,000 per annum for doing what we could and should do ourselves.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. THROPP,

OF PENNSYLVANIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, May 2, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 2538) to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans—

Mr. THROPP said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is not often that so practical a question as this of the Nicaragua Canal presents itself for consideration by the American Congress. It is one which has attracted much attention, not only of the people of our own country, but of those of the commercial centers of the whole world.

As a business man representing a large inland district with large and varied industrial interests, but hundreds of miles from the sea, I yet feel it an especial privilege to support this measure.

Aside from the effect of the various grants which have from time to time been made to different parties or companies who have desired to be interested in the construction of the canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, and aside from the fact of the Clayton-Bulwer or any other treaty which we may have, or may have had, with European powers, the question under discussion now is a plain, practical, business one.

We know that to transport by water from Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, or other of the large cities on the Atlantic coast to points on the Pacific coast within our own country involves the passage of the vessels around the dangerous Cape Horn and a trip of possibly 10,000 miles more than by the way of the proposed canal. The distance from San Francisco to New York by way of the canal would be 4,760 miles. An ordinary steamer could make the voyage in about fourteen days. The canal route would only be 60 per cent longer than the rail route.

The whole tendency of the age is to annihilate time; to reduce the cost of transportation and of communication between business centers. The pack mules and Conestoga wagons have given way to the canals, the canals to the railroads, and the slow trains of the railroads to the express freights and limited passenger trains; the "pony post" has been superseded by the special mail trains, the telegraph systems spreading like cobwebs all over our country and the cables under the oceans connecting different parts of the world, and as we sit in our offices, where formerly it took days to communicate, even with the most improved facilities, by mail or by telegraph, we now talk to distant points by the telephone.

The question of connecting the oceans is not a new one. As far back as 1825 Nicaragua asked the United States to undertake this canal. In 1845 Louis Napoleon Bonaparte got a concession from the Nicaraguan Government granting him power to organize a company to build the canal. That farsighted and practical business man, Cornelius Vanderbilt, in 1849 got a concession from the Government of Nicaragua for the construction of a canal on almost the identical route now proposed, and from 1852 to 1857 he used the San Juan River and Lake Nicaragua as part of a system for the transportation of passengers and merchandise from points on the Eastern coast of the United States to California and other points on the Western coast.

General Grant, after he was President, in his practical, commonsense way, strongly urged the construction of this canal, writing thus in 1881:

> I commend an American canal on American soil to the American people.

Read this carefully, not only "between the lines," but weigh the words, and you will see clearly Grant's views of what the canal should be and who should control it.

Mr. Hayes followed this with as strong an indorsement, for the first time declaring that we had the right to construct, operate, and own it, and that such a canal should be "considered a part of the coast line of the United States."

Mr. Blaine strongly advocated its construction; President Harrison, with a zeal and earnestness equaling if not surpassing any of his predecessors, urged its construction. In 1892, the great parties approved of it in their platforms; President Cleveland advocated it, and now we have the great mass of the people of our country and boards of trades in all sections urging the American Congress to stop further delay and construct this great public highway.

I understand that powerful influences connected with the transcontinental railroads have for years had much to do with the failure of legislation on this important subject. Having been educated as a civil engineer and having had my first practical experience in life in connection with the construction of railroads, I will yield to no one in my firm belief in the great benefits they are to the country, when the same are properly conducted, keeping in mind not only the rights of their stockholders, but the rights of their patrons, and the fact that the interests of both are mutual; but while I have this feeling for the railroads, I think they are mistaken in pursuing anything like the "dog-in-the-manger" policy. Naturally, those interested in the great transcontinental roads do not wish the incomes of these roads reduced, and some of them, taking a short-sighted view of the conditions, may be fearful that the construction of this canal will injuriously affect the income of the roads. It is right here that I think they make their mistake.

The facts are that among the most prosperous railroads in our country are the Boston and Maine, which, with its branches, skirts the coast of New England and comes into competition with the coast trade on the ocean; the New York, New Haven and Hartford; the Pennsylvania, and Reading railroads, and the Seaboard Air Line, which great systems, with their connections, skirt the coast from Boston to Florida, and all save one are prosperous roads. Then the Lake Shore, from Buffalo, encircling the lakes to Chicago, and the other roads which might be mentioned in the Northwest are among the most prosperous roads, notwithstanding many millions of freight are annually carried upon the bosoms of our great inland seas in competition with the railroads skirting their shores.

Let us consider just for a few minutes some of the conditions that exist and some of the possibilities that are before us: The three Pacific Coast States, California, Oregon, and Washington, contain an area of 325,645 square miles; the population of the three States, according to the census of 1890, was about 1,871,287. Everyone knows that these States have varied soil, varied climate, and, stretching from the southern end to the extreme northern end, all conditions of climate and all possibilities for development are presented both for agricultural and industrial purposes. Now, the three States of Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, which can be safely compared with them, because they can not be said to be settled so largely with the foreign element as are New York and portions of Pennsylvania, contain an area of 139,405 square miles, and yet by the census of 1890 they had a population of 9,691,071.

If the same population per square mile existed in the three Pacific Coast States as existed in 1890 in these three Central West States, the Pacific Coast States would have had a population of 22,612,499, and, estimating the increased population from 1890 to 1900 at 25 per cent, their population to-day could be 27,134,998. Will anyone say that if these States were as thickly populated per square mile as are the three Western States to which I have alluded, the railroads would not have more traffic in the way of passengers and freight than they have to-day, even granting that the Nicaragua Canal carried the heavier freight and those travelers content with the slower passage?

Will intelligent, broad-minded men for a moment deny this proposition; and in view of its correctness will not all agree with me that no injury to the railroads could accrue by the construction of this great highway, which would be so important a factor in building up and developing the wonderful resources of the Pacific Coast States, but would it not rather be a positive benefit to the roads, and the holders of their securities, and to the citizens of our entire country?

Anything which tends to build up and develop the wonderful resources and make prosperous the people in any portion of our country can not but prove a benefit to the people of all other sections.

The construction of this canal would possibly double the value of every acre of farm land in the Pacific Coast States. The acreage of these three States is about 208,412,800, and an advance of $1 per acre of these three States alone would more than equal the cost of the canal.

There may be those here who think that my estimates as to the possible number of inhabitants of the Pacific coast are visionary, but let me say to them, and in a broader way, too, to the "doubting Thomases" all over our country who are talking about the danger which we may suffer from even proper emigration—and I favor only such—or from too rapid development within our own borders, that the figures I mention are really conservative. Just in this connection I take a moment to compare the possibilities of our country, and I hope, so far as within my power lies, silence the mutterings of the pessimists, who think we have reached the zenith of our power.

No one will question that France to-day is a fairly prosperous nation. Her people have shown wonderful recuperative powers after telling, adverse blows. Her fearful reverse in the conflict with Germany in the Franco-Prussian war and the large indemnity she had to pay was one of these, and the even greater disaster, from a financial standpoint, of the failure of the Panama Canal, which robbed her people possibly of $300,000,000, was another, and yet to-day France is a prosperous nation and is not overpopulated, else there would be greater immigration from her shores. France has an area of 204,177 square miles, and a population of 38,517,975 people. If California, Oregon, and Washington were as thickly settled as is France, they would contain about 62,000,000 people, or about the population of the entire United States in 1890. Comparing her area with that of the United States, not including Alaska, which has of itself an area of 599,446 square miles, or any of our new possessions, and supposing that we were as thickly populated per square mile as is France, we could have a population to-day of 583,433,650.

Let us go a step further. We know that Prussia is one of the prosperous countries of Europe and a part of one of the rapidly developing great world powers. Prussia has an area of 134,467 square miles and a population of about 31,855,123 people. If the three Pacific Coast States were as thickly settled per square mile as is Prussia, they would have a population of about 77,000,000 people, a population about equal to the present estimated population of the United States.

Great Britain has been the great industrial center of the world, although she is rapidly taking second place in some branches, compared with the United States.

The area of England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales, with the adjoining small islands, is 120,973 square miles, and the population about 38,000,000. If the three Pacific Coast States named were as thickly settled as is Great Britain to-day, they would contain 102,000,000 people. Just one more comparison: Omitting Alaska and our new possessions, were we as thickly populated all over the United States proper as is England, we would contain 971,470,000 people. These figures seem almost too great to comprehend, and yet you will notice that the comparisons I have made have been with three progressive nations and with peoples who occupy the highest positions in the world's civilization, and also with countries from which the percentage of immigration is but small, showing that their people are fairly prosperous and are contented.

Now, I think that if our people here would stop to consider for a moment these figures they would see how absurd is the course of those who would attempt to retard the development of the United States for fear that our pace is too rapid, or of others who say that we need to acquire foreign possessions in order to afford our young men opportunities in life.

Now, I am not going to enter into the discussion of the wisdom or lack of wisdom of our present foreign policy. Our soldiers are upholding our flag under the burning sun of the Philippines, and it is the duty of every loyal American citizen, so long as the soldiers remain there, to sustain them, not only with all the sinews of war, but words of good cheer and encouragement.

Some things are certain. First, that we have to solve the problem of the possession of the Phillipines; second, that we have to take our stand and endeavor to secure our share of the growing trade with the Orient. In order to do this it is necessary to shorten, as much as possible, the route between the great industrial centers on the Atlantic and the rapidly developing trade of the Gulf with the Pacific Ocean, not only for the benefit and for the purpose of rapidly developing our Pacific Coast States, but that we may also have a shorter route, under our own control, to reach by water from our Eastern coasts our new possessions in the Pacific Ocean. Not only would the canal play an important factor in this connection, but it would also be an important aid to our developing trade with the Pacific coast portions of South America, and will aid the Pacific Coast States, by way of the canal, to reach with their products the Atlantic coast countries of South America by a shorter and safer route.

Let us pause a moment to consider one or two practical matters. We have reached the stage of being *among* the greatest and in some respects *the* greatest industrial nation in the world. This is the fruit of that wise policy of protection advocated by the Republican party in season and out of season, when victorious or defeated, with a constancy that at times seemed heroic, when one considers the vile torrents of abuse that have been heaped upon the heads of some of us. Not a few Democrats believed in the policy, but lacked the courage to say so. That problem we have solved. The furnaces of the South are shipping 80,000 tons of pig iron within the next few weeks to Europe. The Phœnix Iron Company, in the Chester-Delaware district, has, in competition with foreign bidders, just taken the $4,000,000 contract for the greatest steel bridge in the world, to be erected at Quebec. We send cotton goods to China, farm implements to Europe and South America, locomotives and rails all over the world, and bridges to Egypt.

Now, another great problem presents. Will not the Democrats join us in solving it? We must place the American flag above American-built vessels, manned by American seamen and carrying the products of American skill and American farms into every port of the world. We paid out last year to the foreign owners of vessels built abroad and manned by foreigners $200,000,000 in gold for carrying freights which should have been carried in American vessels. We may have an opportunity to consider this question when another bill is before us, but I just introduce it to show how great are the various points which present in connection with the consideration of the great problem of developing our foreign trade, building this Nicaragua Canal, building vessels and fixing differential duties or subsidies to equalize the expense due to the increased pay to American sailors and the better provision which is made for their comfort in American vessels. It is not good government farming to pay others $200,000,000 per annum for doing what we could and should do ourselves.

It is estimated we can supply from our industrial establishments all the demands of our own people in eight months at most. Do the professional men of this body comprehend just what this means? Unless we pursue a broad, far-reaching national policy along many lines, we may find ourselves with our working people compelled to sit idle one-third of the time.

If we promote the American shipbuilding industry we will give work to thousands in the coal and ore mines, stone quarries, on the railroads, about the furnaces, mills, and shops in the construction of the necessary vessels. If we build up our merchant marine for foreign commerce we will also give employment to thousands upon the high seas and at our wharves. If we make possible the opening of foreign markets to the products of our factories, foundries, shops, and farms, we will give employment to more thousands in providing the cargoes these vessels will carry.

This canal, connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific, will be only about 168 miles in length and only about 26 miles of this will have to be through excavations; and yet, when completed, it will be of greater importance to the commercial world than the Suez Canal.

There is another practical point to consider in connection with this matter. Wherever our commerce goes, there must go, either on peaceful mission or as an evidence of the strong power of the United States, our Navy. We have already spent, since 1883, $98,529,511.85 for the building up of a new American Navy; we have under construction now vessels which will cost $62,570,610.23 in addition, and we are legislating for other vessels which will cost us about forty millions more. We have spent many millions for the building up of the navy-yards and proper dry docks; we will spend $6,000,000 for the rebuilding and proper equipment of the Naval Academy at Annapolis. Now, anything that will add to the effectiveness of this Navy is worth serious consideration.

Secretary Root, who, as an intelligent Cabinet officer, certainly has facilities for learning more than we of the purposes of foreign powers, says "we will have to be prepared in the near future to maintain by force the Monroe doctrine." If this be true, how better prepare than by building this canal, and thus almost doubling the efficiency of the American Navy?

In our recent Spanish-American war we all know how anxiously the people watched the movements of the *Oregon*, from the time she was separated from the victorious American fleet in the harbor of Manila, during the long days when she steamed over 14,000 miles around Cape Horn to join our fleet in the vicinity of Cuba. We know, too, how uncertain might have been the result there had the second Spanish fleet not attempted to go by way of the Suez Canal to reach Manila, but had sailed direct to join the first Spanish fleet in the Cuban waters and their united fleets had met our vessels in battle without the presence of the *Oregon*.

No one will seriously question that the chances are that any other great war in which we may have to engage in the future will be upon the seas, and the more rapidly we can concentrate our Navy, either in the Pacific or Atlantic Ocean, the more effective it will be and the greater return we will get—viewing it from an economical as well as a national standpoint—upon the investment made in its construction and expense incurred in keeping it in first-class condition by being able to use it quickly in either ocean. For this reason alone it would almost seem advisable to construct this great canal; but when we consider this in connection with the wonderful possibilities for the future development of our country we see how doubly important it is.

We have on the Atlantic coast, not counting the small indentures, 3,895 miles of general coast line to defend; on the Pacific coast, 1,810 miles. This is not counting Alaska, a country whose area, 599,446 square miles, is equal to about one-fifth of that of the entire United States, and whose coast line is over 4,750 miles, and of whose resources we are but beginning to learn the extent.

We have been expending millions in the construction of coast defenses. Who will question for a moment how much wiser it is for us to spend some of our millions in constructing this canal and doubling the efficiency of our floating forts—the American battle ships, men-of-war, and cruisers? Some hesitating ones may say that it involves too great an expenditure and should not be undertaken by the Government.

If consideration be given to some of the thoughts I have suggested, then will not all progressive men agree that the canal should be completed by the Government and that it should be owned and controlled by the Government? Not only that, I go one step further and say it should be built, owned, and the fixing of its tolls be in the hands of the United States Government without limitations or restrictions, even if, in order to obtain the right to so construct and own and control by the United States, it be necessary for us to compensate to a larger degree than is now purposed the Governments of Nicaragua and Costa Rica. I take this ground not only because of what I have said in connection with our Navy, but for another reason.

Before the civil war we possibly carried one-half of all our exports and imports in American bottoms. To-day we carry less than 9 per cent of our exports and imports in American vessels. Last year, as I stated before, we paid to the owners of foreign vessels $200,000,000 for freight. We are considering even at this eleventh hour—and fifty-ninth minute, it might almost be said—the propriety of endeavoring to build up our foreign commerce by encouraging the construction of an American merchant marine. Men of breadth will not question the wisdom of this policy; and how can we better help do it than by building this canal and giving reduced rates on all tonnage passing through the canal, in either direction, to American vessels?

The Government to-day can borrow money on 2 per cent bonds, and these bonds be above par, while we have a Republican Administration. This canal could possibly be built for $100,000,000 or less, and accommodate the vessels of the size now afloat, or could be built for $130,000,000, or possibly less, and allow to pass through the largest men-of-war and largest merchant vessels contemplated. This latter would be the wiser course. The interest at 2 per cent would be from $2,000,000 to $2,600,000 a year, and if we get no return from this investment, save the increased efficiency of the Navy and carrying the commerce of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans in vessels in which our own people are directly interested to and from one ocean to the other through the canal, the money would be well spent. Our financiers can easily devise a plan by which this debt need not be paid off altogether by the present generation, but the bonds could be made payable in installments after a fixed period.

In ordinary business enterprises, where large expenditures have been made, far-sighted industrial leaders consider it the part of wisdom to add to the investments where such additions promise not only fair returns upon the increased investments, but also to add much to the return upon those already made. Such I would regard the expenditure upon this Nicaragua Canal. We have expended in the improvements of the rivers and harbors of our country about $353,000,000, and upon the Navy since 1883, coupled with what we now have in contemplation, about $207,000,000, making a total investment for our Navy and for the improvements of our rivers and harbors of about $560,000,000.

Now, if by the expenditure of $130,000,000 more we make the Navy doubly as effective in time of war, and possibly add so much to our coastwise and foreign commerce that we will make the $353,000,000 doubly useful, will anyone question that it would be a wise thing for us to build this canal, even if we get no other return upon it than adding to the returns upon the investments to which I have alluded and which we have already made? But I believe if this canal be properly constructed and properly managed that a fair revenue can be directly realized upon this investment without regard to these other two important matters. If I am correctly informed, the gross revenue from the Suez Canal during the past year has been about $18,000,000. If the revenue from the Nicaragua Canal were only half as much, and if one-half of this decreased revenue were required for operating expenses, there would still be left $4,500,000 to provide for the interest and the sinking fund.

Just another moment or two and I have done. We are paying out now over $145,000,000 annually in pensions to the veterans of the civil war. No one will question that this money is well spent, because we are teaching not only our own people, but we are proving to the people of the world that this great Republic of ours is not ungrateful. The effect of this large expenditure is to strengthen us not only among our people at home, but to strengthen us in the eyes of the world by building up such a spirit at home of devotion to our Republic that no foreign power would have the temerity to ever attempt to invade our shores. But if it be the part of wisdom to make this large annual expenditure for this purpose, is it not equally wise for us to encourage this great new enterprise, which would involve a total expenditure of less than the amount spent annually for pensions, and the annual interest charges would be one-fiftieth of the annual appropriations for pensions?

We are a great nation to-day, yet we are but in our infancy, at the end of the first century and a quarter of our national existence, in comparison with what it is possible for us to be; and the men of to-day who take the broadest view and look furthest ahead and legislate not only for the present, but for the great future that remains for our country, under God's wise providence, are the men who best serve the nation, themselves, their children, and their children's children.

Trusts.

SPEECH
OF
HON. FRANCIS G. NEWLANDS,
OF NEVADA,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, June 1, 1900.

The House having under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 198) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, as follows:

ARTICLE XVI.

SECTION 1. All powers conferred by this article shall extend to the several States, Territories, District of Columbia, and all territory under the sovereignty and subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

SEC. 2. Congress shall have power to define, regulate, control, prohibit, or dissolve trusts, monopolies, or combinations, whether existing in the form of a corporation or otherwise. The several States may continue to exercise such power in any manner not in conflict with the laws of the United States.

SEC. 3. Congress shall have power to enforce the provisions of this article by appropriate legislation.

Mr. NEWLANDS said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I quite agree with the view taken by this side of the House, that the constitutional amendment now pending is a makeshift measure intended to meet a political emergency, and without any real, sincere, and honest intention on the part of the dominant party to have it finally enacted and make it a part of the Constitution of the United States. I believe that it has been intentionally framed in such a way as to violate Democratic theories regarding government and to alienate Democratic support, although it will require a two-thirds vote in this House, and although Democratic support is absolutely essential.

I believe in the amendments that are proposed by the minority of the Judiciary Committee—amendments which, while securing enlarged powers to the Federal Government over trusts, will at the same time clearly and unequivocally retain coordinate and concurrent powers in the States.

I regret that the rule has been adopted by the vote of the dominant party which denies us the opportunity to vote on these amendments. The opportunity to perfect the pending constitutional amendment by providing for equal power in the State government being denied us, the question is then as to what the action of the minority shall be.

So far as I am concerned, I intend to vote for this constitutional amendment, because I believe that the Federal Government should have enlarged powers for the dissolution and control of trusts, monopolies, and combinations, and I shall vote for the measure that gives those powers, even though it is not framed according to my individual views and those of my political associates, rather than obstruct and defeat the initial action necessary to its subsequent consideration by the people of the various States.

The Republican party is now in possession of all of the departments of the Federal Government, and the Senate of the United States is secure to that party for many years. The constitutional amendment that is submitted to the people of the States must necessarily be framed by the Republican party. So far as I am concerned, I will not take the responsibility of denying to the States the opportunity of adopting a constitutional amendment giving to the Federal Government enlarged powers as to trusts, and I shall vote for this amendment for the purpose of starting it on the course of legislation, so that it may go to the Senate to be perfected there if possible, and so that it may go to the people of the various States in order that they may render judgment upon it.

I do not believe that a constitutional amendment in this form will ever be accepted by three-quarters of the States; but I do believe in the benefit of discussion as affecting public opinion in a free government, and I am confident that the discussion of this measure in the Senate and the various State legislatures in the Union will formulate public sentiment as to what is right, practicable, and expedient in dealing with these great organizations

of capital, which are advancing steadily toward the control of industrial conditions in this country.

Having made this preliminary statement, I will now take up the consideration of the constitutional amendment and the House bill presented by the dominant party in detail, and will consider the question as to the power of the States and the power of the Federal Government in controlling and regulating combinations, monopolies, and trusts.

POWERS OF THE STATES.

The power of the State over trusts, monopolies, or combinations organized, existing and operating within it, is ample. It has the power to regulate, dissolve, or destroy such organizations. If such organization takes the form of a combination between independent producers it can be reached by the courts in the exercise of common-law jurisdiction. If it takes the form of unity of ownership of plants heretofore independent by one great corporation, each State can, by its control over domestic corporations, their capital, their powers, and their field of enterprise, regulate, control, or destroy.

The State can, if it chooses, prevent foreign corporations from doing business within its boundaries, or it can put any limitations or restraints upon them as a condition for permitting them to do such business, but it can exercise no control over the extra State production of trusts or combinations organized in other States or the transit of their products from the place of production outside to the place of consumption inside its boundaries. It can not exclude such products from the State; it can not subject them to taxes or duties, for this would be an interference with interstate commerce, which is under the control of the Federal Government. The evil under which the country is suffering is that there are certain States in the Union which in return for certain benefits received from the trusts in the shape of taxes and other considerations, harbor these trusts, and such trusts created, organized, and manufacturing in the trust-protecting States, prey upon all the other States, and each State is powerless against the invasion of the products of the trust-protecting States.

It follows, therefore, that although a State possesses the most enlightened and efficient laws regarding the regulation, control, or destruction of the trusts, monopolies, and combinations within its boundaries, it is the victim of similar organizations in other States, and the domestic field of consumption is open to the products of monopolistic production elsewhere conducted by great corporations which destroy all competition by lowering their prices within the territory of competition and raising prices in the field of their monopoly, and thus without loss in the aggregate yielding to the localized loss which destroys all competitive enterprises. The laborers are also powerless against such combinations, for the corporation which has ten individual plants located in trust-protecting States can by discontinuing work at any individual plant bring its laborers there to terms without affecting its general business, and can thus by discontinuing work at each plant in succession starve its operatives into submission. Thus the individual capitalist and the individual laborer stand no chance against such gigantic corporations of extra State organization and operation.

The result is that the State which endeavors to regulate or prevent domestic combinations, simply loses the benefit of the local investment of monopolistic capital whilst its people are the victims of the enterprises of monopolistic capital conducted in States which harbor them for certain advantages received, and the State is powerless to protect them against the invasion of the goods produced by trusts in sister States, and against the schemes of such trusts cunningly devised to control trade and monopolize the field of consumption.

It is for this reason that the Federal Government is appealed to for a measure which will attack and destroy monopolistic combinations in the States which harbor them, and thus protect sister States from the invasion of trust-made goods.

FEDERAL POWERS.

The Federal Government can exercise such powers only as are conferred upon it by the Constitution or are necessarily implied from powers granted. Nine-tenths of the subjects which affect the industrial, social, and intellectual welfare of the people of this country are by our system of government left with and provided for by State jurisdiction. The domestic sovereignty of the respective States is by the Constitution of the United States deemed adequate to deal with practices which attempt to disturb or impede that welfare. The Federal Constitution assumes that the highest intelligence available to dissolve conditions hurtful to domestic prosperity is to be found in the center of domestic power. The sovereignty of the several States in all matters not granted to the Federal Government is admitted by every political creed, and has been so many times confirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States that no one now questions it. The effects of vicious combinations in business are felt in the centers of domestic consumption. The injury done by trusts is measured by the local suffering therefrom. Such suffering is realized when the consumer fails to obtain at reasonable rates the articles dominated by such trusts, and also when the domestic producer finds that the markets for his products are made less available to him by such combinations. The power of States to expel from their territory combinations practicing extortion has been vindicated by the highest court of the Union. If domestic corporations forestall the markets they may be dissolved and punished by State authority. The people of the State prosper in proportion as they are self-reliant and possess the knowledge and courage to protect themselves. Their added strength in this respect strengthens the Union. The endurance of the Federal Government may be measured by the continuance of State independence. The Federal Government was created for specific purposes; its jurisdiction is limited to particular general topics.

The centralization of power in the Federal Government to administer this specific and general jurisdiction was wise. To unnecessarily enlarge that power and to unnecessarily embrace what was and is reserved to the States may change the whole theory of our Government and imperil the entire system. It would be equally fallacious, however, in matters affecting the entire country to withhold needed powers from the General Government at the prompting of loyalty to State rights. Whilst the people of the several States should realize that the power over illegal combinations is a domestic affair, and that they are now equipped with State authority ample to redress whatever injuries are inflicted upon them by domestic combinations, it is a mistake to contend that any State can protect itself against trust-made products of sister States and the countless schemes by which the monopoly of domestic markets is secured for such products. Whilst, therefore, we should keep clearly in view the power and the duty of each State to regulate and control domestic combinations, we should also keep clearly in view that the powers of the Federal Government should be exercised for the protection of the people of trust-regulating States against the combinations fostered by trust-protecting States. If such powers in the Federal Government now exist they should be exercised, and if not adequate they should be enlarged.

Now, what are the powers at present possessed by the Federal Government which can be invoked upon this subject? Congress has power, under the Constitution, to establish post-offices and post-roads, which involves the control of the mails; to levy and collect taxes, duties, etc., under which trusts can be taxed or duties can be suspended as to articles controlled by trusts; and the power to regulate interstate commerce, under which it is contended that the transit of trust-made goods from one State to another can be regulated or prohibited. Are these powers sufficient to reach the evil complained of?

MAILS.

Congress can prohibit the use of the mails by any organization which it considers unlawful or injurious to the public welfare. It can, therefore, declare that any combination organized for the purpose of monopolizing the manufacture, production, or sale of any article of commerce or for the purpose of preventing competition is illegal, and can forbid and prohibit the use of the mails of the United States in aid of such business, but I apprehend that the exercise of this power will be very unsatisfactory in the operation of trusts, as sealed letters do not betray their contents and regulation through the mails would be ineffective. Besides which the express and the telegraph could be used as substitutes for the mails.

CUSTOMS DUTIES.

As to customs duties, the regulation is somewhat more difficult. It should be recollected that the complaint of a single State is that its competitive industries are prostrated and its people victimized by the invasion of trust-made goods of adjoining States. Is it wise to contend that the duties on articles monoplized, or partially monopolized, by American trusts should be removed in order that American markets may be invaded by the cheap-labor products or the trust-made products of foreign countries? Such a course would prostrate not only the American trusts, but their victims, for there is no occupation in the United States which is absolutely monopolized by a trust.

The paper trust, which is a familiar instance of the modern trust, has about 20 factories, and outside of it there are nearly 500 paper and pulp companies in the country. It is true that the paper trust, with its splendid plants, meeting every requirement of modern invention and improvement, produces 60 per cent of the entire American product, but the other American paper and pulp companies that are not in the trust supply the other 40 per cent. Would it be wise to abolish the present tariff duty of 15 per cent on paper for the purpose of crippling the paper trust, when its effect would be to cripple and perhaps destroy the five hundred and odd factories that are competitors of the paper trust? Would it be any benefit to the industries of this country to put all

the employees of the paper trust and the five hundred and odd competitive paper mills out of employment and allow the cheap labor of Canada, with abundant forests near at hand, to supply all the paper used in this country? The trusts should be attacked inside the tariff wall, whether it be high or low, in such a way as to restrain or dissolve them, and at the same time preserve the individual and competitive industries that are engaged in similar occupations. A foreign club should not be used to destroy the domestic trusts when it necessarily also prostrates and destroys the struggling victims of such trusts, who should be assisted by our national legislation in their efforts to maintain individual effort.

INTERNAL-REVENUE TAXATION.

Would it not be better to use our powers of taxation in applying an internal-revenue tax, which would reach these great combinations alone rather than in removing the customs tax, which would prostrate both the trusts and their victims? The power of taxation of the Federal Government is ample. It can be used either to destroy or restrain, and it has been so used within our experience.

Thus, for instance, as to the undoubted right of State banks to issue currency under State statutes permitting it, the Federal Government does not deny the right, but it has seen fit to impose a tax of 10 per cent upon State-bank currency and thus practically to prohibit its issue.

So, also, with reference to oleomargarine. The beef trust had organized for the production and sale of oleomargarine upon a great scale. Oleomargarine was innocuous and resembled in appearance and taste the genuine butter. The use of this material was threatening the destruction of the dairy interests of the country, in which large amounts of capital were invested and hundreds of thousands of people were employed.

The States took hold of the matter, and by legislation within their own boundaries sought to protect the dairy interests and restrain the oleomargarine interest. Their legislation was, in the main, ineffective, and so recourse was had to the Federal Government for a far-reaching law. The result was that the power of taxation was so exercised by the Federal Government as to restrain the oleomargarine interest and protect the dairy interest. Thus oleomargarine was made a subject of revenue to the Government, and the tax imposed upon it served to limit its efficiency in competition with butter.

Here, then, we have two illustrations of the power of Federal taxation—one the power to destroy and the other the power to regulate and restrain. Why can not this power be used with reference to the modern trust? Through it two evils can be reached—one the monopoly of production by unions of capital and the other the escape of organized wealth under present conditions from the burdens of Federal taxation. The latter is one of the crying evils of the times. The whole tendency of Federal legislation has been to exempt accumulated wealth from taxation. The wealth of the country has been for years rapidly drifting into corporations. Stocks and bonds in corporations represent more than any other class of property the surplus wealth of the country, for the man who owns stocks and bonds has something which he has accumulated over and above his current wants and expenditures, and the best method of reaching the surplus wealth of the country is to tax corporations.

It is true that the income-tax decision has in a measure restricted the field of Federal taxation. It practically exempts real property and its income from internal-revenue taxation, yet the field of Federal taxation is still a large one, for it embraces all the transactions of business, and though the real and personal property of a corporation and the income therefrom can not be directly reached, yet every transaction in which such corporations engage may be made the subject of taxation by the Federal Government, and the taxes imposed may be classified in such a way as to restrain unions of capital in their monopolistic tendencies.

The purpose, then, of Federal legislation upon this subject should be to reach accumulated wealth and at the same time protect individualism. Taxes therefore imposed upon the transactions of corporations will accomplish both purposes. They will reach accumulated wealth and they will protect individualism, for the individual, freed from the handicap of such taxes, may be able to hold his own, and thus the handicap of the tax will preserve the equilibrium between individual enterprises on the one hand and corporate enterprises on the other.

It is true that it will take time to work out this problem wisely and justly, but there is no reason why progressive legislation, advancing with conservatism, step by step, should not ultimately surmount every difficulty.

The first step should be the organization of a bureau somewhat resembling that of the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency, to which report should be made by all corporations, showing the amount of their capital stock, their bonds, their income, their transactions, their taxes, the number of operatives employed, the wages paid, and all the other data, which in time will present a mass of statistical information that will aid and guide legislation. Publicity itself will do much in the way of correcting evils, for definite statistics will suggest definite remedies.

The tax at first inaugurated should be moderate. It should reach at first only those great organizations whose evil effects on modern individualism is conceded, and reliance should be placed upon the statistics accumulated later on to furnish suggestions for additional tax legislation.

I shall append to my remarks a statement of the so-called industrial trusts which have been organized in recent years. It possibly embraces quite a number which would not properly come within that term, but it shows how important it is that reliable statistics should be obtained by the General Government regarding these great corporations. These statistics would be useful both in the framing of the tariff law and in the framing of the internal-revenue law. The capital employed and the profits made by these corporations in the manufacture of particular articles would indicate to what extent the duty imposed upon such articles should be protective or otherwise. It would also be instructive to know the amount of taxes paid by such corporations, for all the indications are that such corporations largely escape the taxes which are imposed upon and collected from individual enterprises of like nature. These corporations are the creations of the State, and it is right that the State should be informed as to their operation and conduct, and it is essential that the proper statistical information should be secured for the purpose of not only regulating the question of combination, but also for the purpose of regulating the question of tariff and internal-revenue taxation.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE.

The national power most frequently invoked for the regulation of trusts is the power conferred by the Constitution upon Congress to regulate interstate commerce. Under this power it is contended that Congress may declare any combination, whether in the shape of a corporation or otherwise, formed for the purpose of controlling or monopolizing the production or sale of any article of commerce, to be illegal, and may provide for the forfeiture of all articles of commerce transported in violation of the provisions of law. It is also contended that under this power common carriers may be punished for transporting any articles which are the product of a monopoly or trust from one State to another.

It will be observed that the United States Government can not, in the exercise of its control over interstate commerce, break up or destroy a monopoly or trust operating in any State. It can only prevent such trust and monopoly from carrying on interstate trade. It has been decided by the Supreme Court that under this power Congress can not reach combinations for the control of production in any of the States of the Union. All it can do is to harass the transit of the articles produced by such combinations from one State to another. It is safe to say the evils of trusts and combinations will never be reached if the Government simply practices guerrilla warfare upon them through the exercise of its power regarding interstate commerce—the mails, the levying of customs duties, and the levying of internal-revenue taxes. These powers do not reach the real evil—the combining for manufacture and production—and they leave the combination in existence with full powers for manufacture and production, and subject only to harassing legislation which may be easily evaded.

BRYAN'S PLAN.

A much more effective way of reaching combinations engaged in interstate commerce would be to carry out the suggestion of Mr. Bryan by Congressional legislation requiring every corporation engaged in interstate commerce to be licensed by the Federal Government to do business in other States than that in which such corporation is organized, and requiring a sworn statement showing the nature of its business, the value of its plants, its issues of stocks and bonds, the taxes paid—in fact, all the statistical information essential to enable the Government to determine whether it is engaging in an attempt to monopolize the production or sale of any article. Under such an act corporations organized for monopoly could be prevented from engaging in interstate trade, and all the transactions of corporations engaged in interstate trade would be put in the light of public investigation and criticism, and publicity itself would necessarily tend to the limitation of the extraordinary powers now exercised by trusts. Under the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution all discriminations and rebates and other unfair advantages in transportation could be prevented.

NEED OF CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.

I have thus reviewed the powers of the States regarding trusts and monopolies and the powers of the Federal Government. It is apparent that the State can dissolve all trusts and combinations organized within it. It is apparent that the Federal Government has, under the Constitution as it now stands, no such

power, but has simply the power to harass such a trust or monopoly in its operations. It is also apparent that those States which are disposed to exercise their powers in the dissolution of trusts are at the mercy of trusts organized in other States which are disposed to protect them, and as the arm of the State can not reach to and destroy such trusts, the Federal Government must be appealed to.

The power of the Federal Government, if it is to be exercised, ought to be as full and complete as that of the State government. If the one has the power to dissolve and destroy trusts, the other ought to have the same power and should not be limited to a mere guerrilla warfare upon trusts, which will prove annoying to business generally, and which will be weak and inefficient in operation. The power should be accordingly exercised both by the Federal and State governments. The State should have the power to dissolve trusts organized within its boundaries. Congress should have the power to dissolve trusts in trust-protecting States and prevent them from preying upon trust-regulating States.

The constitutional amendment proposed by the dominant party declares that Congress shall have power to define, regulate, control, prohibit, or dissolve trusts, monopolies, or combinations, whether existing in the form of a corporation or otherwise, and also that the several States may continue to exercise such power in any manner not in conflict with the laws of the United States. It is contended by many of the minority that this constitutional amendment will withdraw from the States the powers which they now have as to the regulation or destruction of domestic monopolies and will vest such power absolutely in the Federal Government. The minority have proposed certain amendments which will secure concurrent powers in this matter both to Congress and to the States, and will prevent the absorption by Congress of the powers now exercised by the States.

I am entirely in harmony with these proposed amendments, and I think that good faith and a proper regard for the rights of the States demand that they should be incorporated in the proposed constitutional amendment. But the dominant party refuses to allow such amendments to be considered, and proposes to confine our vote simply to the proposition submitted by them. As a matter of political judgment, I do not think we should defeat the proposed constitutional amendment. On the contrary, I think we should send it to the Senate, where it will be submitted to a crucial criticism, such as we are not permitted to make under the arbitrary rule that has been passed. It may there be put in such shape as that all the States can approve it. As it is, the Senate will be Republican for at least five years; and as no constitutional amendment can be passed which does not have the sanction of that body, we must seek relief in the form presented by the Republican party or abandon all hope of efficient Federal relief.

The aim of Federal legislation should be to enable Congress, in the interest of the general welfare, to attack and destroy the trusts which are created by States that are selfishly harboring trusts for the purpose of local advantage in the way of taxes, employment of labor, and other considerations. As no State can reach such an evil in an adjoining State, the Federal Government must be appealed to, and its powers should be ample, not simply to harass, but to destroy.

The whole theory of democratic government is that power should be kept as closely as possible in the hands of the people in our municipalities, our county governments, and our State governments, and that only such powers should be conferred upon the Federal Government as are essential to the general welfare and the protection of all the States. Thus far the Federal Government has exercised all the powers conferred upon it regarding the mails, interstate commerce, customs duties, bankruptcy laws, and other matters in a manner generally beneficial to the entire country.

No one would to-day demand that any one of these powers should be taken away from the Federal Government and vested in the States, respectively. Experience has proven that an evil exists to-day which was unknown when our Government was formed, and which can be reached only by the Federal Government. If for the general welfare it is desirable that the Federal Government should have more power on this subject, is it well for us to deny it because the amendment conferring it is not framed or prepared as we would wish? Recollect that when Congress once defines a trust under this constitutional amendment, the States can pass laws in harmony with that definition, and can then enforce their domestic laws against the domestic trusts, so that we will have two powers operating—the State courts operating against the domestic trust, and the Federal courts operating against those great centers of production and manufacture in trust-protecting States which are preying upon sister States and victimizing their people.

I do not believe that there is any danger of an inefficient law being passed under the proposed constitutional amendment, for the dominant party that passed such a law would be driven from power by an indignant people. We can not assume that Mr. Bryan will not gain the Presidential chair or that the Democratic party will never be in power, and if we assume that the power under this Federal amendment will be inefficiently and insufficiently exercised, we indict our own leaders and our own organization.

Whilst, therefore, I prefer that the constitutional amendment should reserve in clear and unequivocal terms all the powers now enjoyed by the States, I shall not vote against an amendment which gives in clear and unequivocal terms to the Federal Government the power to destroy and dissolve trusts. I shall therefore vote for this constitutional amendment and shall vote for the amendments presented by the minority to the Littlefield bill, and if they are voted down I shall vote for the Littlefield bill, confident that I shall be sustained by my constituency in an honest effort to secure the full exercise of both Federal and State powers in the suppression of an evil which has thus far defied the lawmaking power of both the States and the Federal Government.

APPENDIX.

List of trusts to May 27, 1900, prepared for Commercial Yearbook by Byron W. Holt.

Present name of trust.[a]	Where incorporated.	Location principal office.	Capitalization.[a]	
			Common stock.	Preferred stock.
Adams Express Company	New York	New York City	[b] $12,000,000	
American Automatic Weighing Machine Company (three companies—all in U.S.)	England	New York (?)	£135,000	£135,000
American Axe and Tool Company (16 plants)	Kentucky	New York City	$3,872,500	
American Beet Sugar Company			15,000,000	$4,000,000
American Bell Telephone Company (owns American Telephone and other telephone companies).	Massachusetts	Boston	25,886,300	
American Birch Company (to control New York market)	New Jersey		4,000,000	6,000,000
American Brass Company	Connecticut	Waterbury	20,000,000	
American Bridge Builders' Association (trust forming 13 firms)	Pennsylvania	Philadelphia	[c] 30,000,000	
American Caramel Company (all export trade of United States)	do	do	1,000,000	500,000
American Car and Foundry Company (railroad cars)	New Jersey		27,600,000	27,600,000
American Cereal Company (much larger company forming)	Ohio	Chicago	3,400,000	
American Cotton Oil Company (123 properties)	New Jersey	New York City	20,237,100	10,198,600
American District Telegraph Company[d]	New York	do	3,844,700	
American Electric Heating Corporation		Boston	10,000,000	
American Express Company (not incorporated)[d]	New York	New York City	18,000,000	
American Felt Company (nearly all companies in United States)	New Jersey	do	2,500,000	2,500,000
American Fisheries Company (menhaden oil, 15–18 companies)	do	do	8,000,000	2,000,000
American (Window) Glass Company (majority in United States)	do	Pittsburg	20,000,000	
American Glucose Sugar Refining Company (opposition company)	do		3,000,000	
American Glue Company		Boston	1,400,000	700,000
American Hay Company	Michigan		[e] 5,000,000	
American Ice Company (forming; to control ice output of Maine)	Maine		60,000,000	
American Indies Company (gas, electric, etc., new colonies)	New Jersey		$13,000,000	$5,000,000
American Jute Bagging Manufacturing Company			2,800,000	
American Lamp Chimney Company (one-third total United States)	West Virginia		500,000	250,000
American Last Company	Ohio		2,000,000	1,500,000
American Linseed Oil Company (82 plants; 85 per cent of all in country)	New Jersey	Chicago	14,250,000	14,250,000
American Lithograph Company	do	New York	8,000,000	3,500,000
American Machine Company (sewing)	Ohio	Cleveland	[f] 10,000,000	
American Malting Company (30 companies; nearly all in United States)	New Jersey	New York City	13,750,000	12,540,000
American Ordnance Company (guns, projectiles, etc.)		Washington	2,500,000	
American Pegamoid Company			5,000,000	
American Pipe and Foundry Company (5 plants in South; bigger trust forming)			[g] 10,000,000	
American Potteries Company (forming; nearly all in United States)	New Jersey	New York City	17,000,000	16,000,000

Present name of trust.[a]	Where incorporated.	Location principal office.	Capitalization.[a]	
			Common stock.	Preferred stock.
American Powder Company		Chicago	$1,500,000	
American Preservers' Company	West Virginia	do	2,500,000	
American Radiator Company (4 companies; 75 per cent United States product)	New Jersey	do	5,000,000	$3,000,000
American Saddle Company (bicycle saddle consolidation)	do		1,000,000	800,000
American Screw Company	Rhode Island	Providence	3,250,000	
American Sewer Pipe Company (forming, with 51 big companies)	New Jersey (?)	Pittsburg (?)	12,500,000	12,500,000
American Silk Manufacturing Company (silk thread)	Connecticut	New London	7,500,000	5,000,000
American Skewer Company (all manufacturers in United States)	Indiana (?)		300,000	
American Soda Fountain Company	New Jersey	New York	1,250,000	2,500,000
American Spirits Manufacturing Company (whisky; 18 distilleries)	New York	do	28,000,000	7,000,000
American Steel and Wire Company of New Jersey (controls wire industry, etc., in United States).	New Jersey	Chicago	50,000,000	40,000,000
American Steel Casting Company	do		4,200,000	
American Stove Board Company (7 manufacturers)	West Virginia	New York	81,100	
American Strawboard Company (19 plants)	Illinois	Chicago	6,000,000	
American Sugar Refining Company	New Jersey	New York City	35,968,000	36,968,000
American Telegraph and Telephone Company (controls long-distance lines)	New York	do	25,000,000	
American Thread Company (18 cotton-thread companies)	New Jersey		6,000,000	6,000,000
American Tin Plate Company (281 mills—95 per cent of all)	do	Chicago	28,000,000	18,000,000
American Tobacco Company (plug business sold in 1898)	do	New York City	21,000,000	14,000,000
American Type Founders' Company (23 companies in United States)	do	do	4,000,000	
American Whip Company (20 manufacturers)	Massachusetts	do	250,000	
American Woodworking Machinery Company (14 firms)	New Jersey		2,000,000	2,000,000
American Woolen Company (men's woolens—mills in New England; forming)		New York City	30,000,000	20,000,000
American Wringer Company	Rhode Island	Rhode Island	850,000	1,650,000
Ammunition Manufacturers' Association (cartridges)		New York City	[b]4,000,000	
Anaconda Copper Mining Company	Montana		30,000,000	
Associate Wine Dealers (agreement with California Winemakers' Corporation		San Francisco	[b]5,000,000	
Association of Boat Oar Manufacturers of United States; (agreement on prices)			[b]500,000	
Association of Fire Underwriters for Arkansas (44 companies)[c]	Arkansas	Little Rock (?)	39,694,226	
Atlantic Dynamite Company (giant powder, etc.)	New York	New York City	[b]2,500,000	
Atlantic Passenger Steamship Pool (renewed in 1899)			[b]100,000,000	
Atlantic Snuff Company (all but 2 companies)	New Jersey	Nashville	2,000,000	8,000,000
Atlas Tack Company	Massachusetts	Boston	700,000	
Atwood-Morrison Company (consolidation of 3 silk and cotton machinery companies).	New Jersey		300,000	
Baltimore Electric Light Company (3 electric companies of Baltimore)			5,000,000	
Barber Asphalt Paving Company (pools with other companies)[d]		New York City	5,000,000	
Bay State Gas Company (several gas companies in and near Boston)	Delaware		100,000,000	
Bessemer Ore Association		Cleveland	[b]20,000,000	
Bolt and nut (several associations—carriage, stove, tire, etc.)			[b]10,000,000	
Booth, A., & Co. (fish and oysters; 43 concerns)	Illinois	Chicago	3,000,000	2,500,000
Borax Consolidated, Limited (absorbing Pacific Borax, etc., Company)			£800,000	£800,000
Boston Fruit Company (4 companies, controlling output from West Indies)		Boston (?)	[b]10,000,000	
Boxmakers' Combine (of California-Oregon)		San Francisco	1,000,000	
Brass Foundry and Machine Company (iron and brass castings)	New Jersey	Jersey City	6,000,000	
Brooklyn Rapid Transit (most streets, ways, elevated and Brooklyn)		New York	45,000,000	
Brooklyn Union Gas (7 companies)	New York	Brooklyn	15,000,000	
Brooklyn Wharf and Warehouse Company[e]	do	do	5,000,000	$7,500,000
Broom Manufacturers' Association of United States (regulates prices)		Chicago	5,000,000	
Broom Twine (selling combine)			[b]500,000	
Brunswick-Balke-Collender Company (billiard tables, etc.)	Ohio	New York City	1,500,000	
Buffalo City Gas Company (4 companies; consolidated with People's Gas in 1898).[e]	New York	Buffalo	5,500,000	
Buffalo Traction Company (consolidation pending)		do	5,370,500	
California Raisin Growers' Association (2,000 growers and 60 packing houses; controls 95 per cent of crop).			[b]5,000,000	
California Winemakers' Corporation (allied with California Wine Association)[e]	California	San Francisco	10,000,000	
Cambria Steel Company (owns Cambria Iron Company; plants in five counties in Pennsylvania).	Pennsylvania	Philadelphia	16,000,000	
Cedar Shingles Manufacturers' Association (Washington State; limits production).			[b]5,000,000	
Celluloid Company	New Jersey	Newark	3,000,000	
Central Coal and Coke Company (selling agency)[e]	Ohio	Columbus	500,000	
Central Coal and Coke Company of Kansas City, Mo.[e]	Missouri	Kansas City	1,500,000	1,500,000
Central Electric Railway of Kansas City, Mo. (all companies)		do	500,000	
Central Lumber Company of California[e]			[b]$70,000,000	
Central New York Brewing Company	New Jersey		2,200,000	1,800,000
Central Union Telephone Company (consolidation of Bell Telephone in Indiana, Illinois, and Ohio, except certain cities).			6,605,300	
Central Union Gas Company (17 gas and electric lighting companies in Ohio and Indiana).	Virginia		5,000,000	9,000,000
Central Walnut Association (California; fixes prices)			[b]2,000,000	
Chain Manufacturers' Association (trace, wagon, etc.)			[b]3,000,000	
Charleston (South Carolina) Consolidated Railway, Gas and Electric Company (forming with all in city).			1,500,000	
Chemical (Pharmaceutical Manufacturers') Combine		Philadelphia	[b]50,000,000	
Chicago and Northwestern Granaries Company (agreements with other companies).		Chicago	£120,000	£120,000
Chicago City Railway Company (cable, electric, and horse lines)		do	$14,000,000	
Chicago Consolidated Traction Company (8 suburban companies)	Illinois	do	14,400,000	
Chicago Edison Company (absorbed 4 companies)		Chicago	4,975,900	
Chicago Junction Railway and Union Stock Yards Company (meat packing and cattle; consolidation 3 companies).	New Jersey	do	6,500,000	$6,500,000
Chicago Milk Company (forming to supply three-fourths of city's milk)		do	3,000,000	3,000,000
Chicago Packing and Provision Company (Limited)		do	£200,000	£200,000
Cincinnati Gas-Light and Coke			$9,000,000	
City of Chicago Brewing and Malting Company (English and American companies).		Chicago	£625,000	£625,000
Cleveland and Sandusky Brewing Company (11 breweries)			$3,000,000	$3,000,000
Colorado Fuel and Iron (connected with Colorado Coal and Iron Company)	Colorado	Denver	11,000,000	2,000,000
Columbia Electric Car Lighting and Brake Company	New Jersey		10,000,000	
Columbia River Canneries Company (fish packers; re-forming, 1899)		Portland	[b]2,000,000	
Columbia Spring Company	Ohio	Cleveland	2,000,000	
Columbus (Ohio) Gas-Light and Heating Company (will own 2 big companies)	West Virginia	Columbus	1,700,000	3,300,000
Commercial Chemical Company, United States (paris-green manufacturers form selling agency).		New York City	[b]2,000,000	
Commonwealth Electric Company (12 companies; pools with Edison)		Chicago	3,000,000	
Consolidated City Water Company (3 companies, Los Angeles, Cal)		Los Angeles	2,480,000	
Consolidated Gas of Baltimore City[e]	Maryland	Baltimore	10,770,968	
Consolidated Gas Company of Newark, N. J. (all gas companies between Passaic and Elisabeth).	New Jersey	Newark	6,000,000	
Consolidated Gas of New York City (all but New Amsterdam Company)[e]	New York	New York City	9,078,000	
Consolidated Gas of Pittsburg (5 companies in west Pennsylvania)		Pittsburg	4,000,000	2,500,000
Consolidated Ice (10 or 12 companies in New York and Maine)[e]	Maine	New York City	6,500,000	3,500,000
Consolidated Packing Companies (Beef)			5,000,000	
Consolidated Smelting and Refining Company (forming with 11 big companies in United States and Mexico).	New Jersey		27,000,000	27,000,000

Present name of trust.[9]	Where incorporated.	Location principal office.	Capitalization.[3] Common stock.	Preferred stock.
Consolidated Street Railway Company		Grand Rapids	$1,600,000	$1,419,000
Consolidated Traction of New Jersey[5]		Newark	15,000,000	
Consumers' Ice Company (all dealers of Indianapolis)		Indianapolis	[5]1,000,000	
Continental Cement Company	New Jersey		5,000,000	5,000,000
Continental Tobacco Company (7 plug companies and plug interests of American Company).	do	New York City	30,000,000	30,000,000
Copper Sheets and Bolts, Manufacturers' Association (fixes prices)		Pittsburg	[5]5,000,000	
Denver City Tramway Company (consolidated street lines)		Denver	5,000,000	
Denver Union Water Company (complete plant)[6]	Colorado	do	5,000,000	2,500,000
Derby Hat Pool (4 big companies sell together)			[5]3,000,000	
Detroit Citizens' Street Railway Company[6]		Detroit	2,650,000	
Detroit City Gas (all natural and artificial gas companies in city)[6]	Michigan	do	4,560,000	
Diamond Match Company (mills all over United States)	Illinois and England	Chicago	11,000,000	
Dry Dock Trust (Philadelphia syndicate)[6]			1,000,000	
Dynamite Pool (3 big California companies)		San Francisco	[5]2,000,000	
Eastern Burial Case Association (big trust forming in 1899)			[5]4,000,000	
East Jersey Electric Company			1,000,000	
Edison Electric Illuminating Company of Boston	New Jersey		3,744,000	
Edison Electric Illuminating Company of New York[6]		New York City	9,200,000	
Electric Boat Company	New York		5,000,000	5,000,000
Electric Company of America (gas and electric companies just outside of Philadelphia).	New Jersey		25,000,000	
Electric Storage Battery Company (absorbed other companies in 1895)	do	Philadelphia	8,500,000	5,000,000
Electric Vehicle Company	do		5,000,000	1,000,000
Electrotypers, New York city and vicinity[6]	do	New York City	[5]5,000,000	
Erie Telegraph and Telephone Company (controls 4 telephone companies in 7 Western and Southern States).		Cleveland	5,000,000	
Factory Insurance Association, 29 companies ††		Hartford	34,655,000	
Federal Steel Company (owns many mills and properties)		New York City	46,484,000	52,767,000
Fire-Proofing (9 Ohio companies sell together)	New Jersey		[3]3,000,000	
Five States Milk Producers' Association (farmers to keep prices of milk up, as against the trust.)			[20]20,000,000	
Fox River Birch and Tile Company (consolidated 15 birch yards in Wisconsin)	Wisconsin		200,000	
Francis Gowdy Distilling Company (combination Eastern gin companies)	Connecticut		100,000	
General Chemical Company	New York		12,500,000	12,500,000
General Electric; pools with other companies	New York	Schenectady	18,276,000	2,551,200
General Electric Company of Minneapolis; light, heat, and power	New Jersey		2,100,000	
Glucose Sugar Refining Company; nearly all in United States	do	Chicago	24,027,300	12,619,000
Granite Ware Trust; 4 companies combining			[20]6,000,000	
Grape Growers' Pool; agree on prices in northern Ohio			[2]2,000,000	
Havana Commercial Company (Cuban tobacco, etc.)	New Jersey		10,000,000	6,000,000
Havana Electric Railway; electric, gas, telephone, etc	do		5,000,000	
Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company			[2]2,312,755	
Hecker-Jones-Jewell Milling Company[6]	New Jersey	New York City	2,000,000	3,000,000
Herkimer County Light and Power Company; companies in 3 cities in county		Herkimer(?)	400,000	
Herring-Hall-Marvin; reorganizing	New Jersey	New York City	1,650,000	1,650,000
Illinois State Board of Fire Underwriters; 72 companies [3]			49,430,760	
Indiana League of Fire Underwriters; 27 companies [3]			10,028,568	
Indurated Fiber Industries Company	New Jersey	New York City	1,000,000	
International Air Power Company; plants in Massachusetts and Rhode Island	do		6,400,000	600,000
International Cement Company; forming	do		25,000,000	25,000,000
International Heater Company; 4 companies	New York		900,000	900,000
International Paper Company; 25 news and printing paper manufacturers east of Chicago.			16,040,400	20,530,700
International Silver Company; 24 companies—75 per cent silver plate companies.	New Jersey		11,000,000	5,000,000
International Steam Pump Company; 5 biggest companies in United States	do		12,500,000	15,000,000
Kansas City (Mo.) Gas Company	Missouri	Kansas City	5,000,000	
Kentucky Distilleries and Warehouse Company; 57 "bourbon" plants	New Jersey	Brooklyn	18,500,000	10,500,000
Kings County Electric Light and Power Company; all electric companies in Brooklyn except one.			1,998,000	
Knickerbocker Ice Company, Chicago; 28 companies, all in Chicago		Chicago	4,000,000	3,000,000
Kodak Limited Company; consolidated English, French, German, and American companies.			£21,000,000	£800,000
Laclede Gas Light Company;[4] controls all in St. Louis since 1889	Missouri	St. Louis	$7,500,000	$2,500,000
Lake Carriers' Association; 3 lines; pool prices			[5]10,000,000	
Lake Dredgers' Association; 123 owners of dredges on Great Lakes	Illinois		$5,000,000	
Lake Superior Consolidated Iron Mines[6]		New York City	28,450,000	
Lanyon Zinc Company	New Jersey		1,000,000	$2,000,000
Lexington (Ky.) Railroad; 4 companies			800,000	
Linen Thread Company; selling agency 3 manufacturers	New Jersey	Paterson (?)	[5]4,000,000	
Lumber Carriers' Association; vessels on Great Lakes		Detroit	[5]6,000,000	
Manhattan Spirit Company; wood alcohol			5,000,000	
Manufacturers' Paper Company of Chicago; selling agency for many mills			[5]10,000,000	
Maple Flooring Manufacturers' Association; fixes prices			[5]2,000,000	
Marsden Company of Philadelphia (cellulose trust)			30,600,000	1,500,000
Martin Kalbfleisch Chemical Company	New York	New York City	1,450,000	
Maryland Brewing Company; 17 brewery companies of Baltimore		Baltimore	3,250,000	3,250,000
Mass Consolidated Company; 5 copper properties in Michigan belt			2,500,000	
Metropolitan Street Railway Company[6]		Kansas City	5,586,800	
Metropolitan Street Railway; most in New York city		New York City	40,000,000	
Metropolitan Tobacco Company; selling combine	New York	do	500,000	500,000
Michigan Salt Association			[5]4,000,000	
Milk Combine of Scranton, Pa.; entire supply		Scranton	[5]1,000,000	
Milwaukee and Chicago Breweries Company; English and American companies			£775,000	£775,000
Milwaukee Electric Railway and Light Company; all in city		Milwaukee	$5,494,500	
Minneapolis General Electric; plants in city	New Jersey	Minneapolis	1,500,000	$500,000
Minnesota and Dakota Fire Underwriters; 53 companies [3]		do	45,119,740	
Mississippi River Steamboat Pool; 3 companies pool			[5]10,000,000	
Missouri Edison Electric Company [1]	Missouri	St. Louis	[5]4,000,000	
National Abrasive Manufacturing Company; controls corundum and other abrasive materials.			1,000,000	
National Association of Axle Manufacturers		Pittsburg	[1]5,000,000	
National Biscuit Company (90 per cent of large bakeries in United States)	New Jersey	Chicago	29,000,000	23,000,000
National Carbon Company (all companies in United States and three-fourths in world).	do	Cleveland	5,500,000	4,500,000
National Casket Company		New York City	[4]$10,000,000	
National Electric Car Lighting Company			2,000,000	(?) $500,000
National Enameling and Stamping Company (consolidation of 4 principal companies in United States).	New Jersey		20,000,000	10,000,000
National Harrow Company (spring-tooth harrows)	New York		[7]2,000,000	
National Lead Company (20 white lead, etc., plants)	New Jersey	New York City	14,905,400	14,904,000
National Mirror Manufacturers' Association (40 companies; fix prices, etc.)			[5]5,000,000	
National Rice Milling Company	New Jersey	New Orleans	1,867,000	1,320,000
National Salt Company of New Jersey (forming to control salt interests in the East).		New York City	[5]5,000,000	
National Saw Company (controlled by Diston)	Kentucky	do	[2]2,000,000	600,000
National Shear Company	New Jersey	Newark	1,500,000	1,500,000
National Starch Manufacturing Company (20 plants; price agreement with other companies in 1898)	Kentucky	New York City	3,233,000	4,066,200

Present name of trust.[2]	Where incorporated.	Location principal office.	Capitalization.[3]	
			Common stock.	Preferred stock.
National Tin Plate and Stamped Ware Company (opposition to National Enameling Company).	New Jersey		$10,000,000	$10,000,000
National Steel Company; expects to control 20 plants	New Jersey		32,000,000	27,000,000
National Tube Company; forming with 17 companies	do	Pittsburg	80,000,000	30,000,000
National Wall Paper Company; 28 companies in 1892, absorbing 2 or more in 1899; forming.		New York City	27,931,500	7,500,000
New Amsterdam Gas Company; consolidates 3 companies in New York City		do	12,000,000	9,000,000
New England Gas and Coke Company of Boston; all in Boston except Bay State.[6]	Massachusetts	Boston	14,000,000	
New England Dairy Company; milk companies	New Jersey		600,000	250,000
New England Telephone and Telegraph Company		Boston	11,986,400	
New England Insurance Exchange; 84 fire-insurance companies[6]		do	58,537,167	
New Orleans Water Works Company[6]		New Orleans	2,000,000	
New York and New Jersey Telephone		Brooklyn (?)	4,062,400	
New York Arch Terra-Cotta Company; allied with other companies	New York	New York City	[4] 2,000,000	
New York Gas, Electric Light, Heat and Power Company of New York City	do	do	36,000,000	
New York Suburban Gas Company (5 companies in Westchester County)	do		1,500,000	
Nicholson File Company; 5 plants—70 per cent product		Providence	[4] 2,000,000	
North American (owns street railways and electric companies)	New Jersey	New York	39,733,600	
North Carolina Pine Timber Association; fixes prices			[5] 20,000,000	
North Jersey Street Railway Company; consolidated trolleys and 2 ferries	New Jersey		5,000,000	
North River Light, Heat and Power Company	do	Hoboken	300,000	
North Shore Traction Company; controls railways around Boston	do	Boston	4,000,000	2,500,000
Oilcloth Pool (table, enamel, etc.)			[5] 1,500,000	
Oil Well Supply Company	Pennsylvania	Pittsburg	1,000,000	
Omaha Street Railway Company[6]		Omaha	5,000,000	
Otis (Passenger) Elevator Company; 13 companies—85 per cent of product	New Jersey		6,000,000	4,000,000
Pacific American Fisheries Company	do	Chicago	5,000,000	
Pacific States Telephone Company; 4 telegraph and telephone systems of Pacific coast.			[5] 10,000,000	
Paducah (Ky.) Railway and Electric Light Company; all railway and electric-light plants of Paducah.			200,000	
Paterson and Passaic Gas and Electric Company; consolidation of 4 companies	New Jersey		5,000,000	
Pennsylvania Central Brewing Company; 12 breweries in Wyoming Valley	Pennsylvania		2,800,000	2,800,000
Pennsylvania Manufacturing Light and Power; all electric companies of Philadelphia.[6]	New Jersey	Philadelphia	15,000,000	
People's Gas Light and Coke Company of Buffalo; consolidated		Buffalo	4,975,000	3,025,000
People's Gas Light and Coke Company of Chicago; took in new Chicago companies in 1898.[6]	Illinois	Chicago	28,750,000	
People's Light and Power Company; 14 companies in New Jersey		Newark	20,000,000	
Petersburg, (Virginia), Railway and Electric; consolidation of all companies		Petersburg	500,000	
Photographic Paper; 24 companies, manufacturers of sensitized paper			2,000,000	
Pillsbury-Washburn Flour Mills Company (Limited)	Minnesota	Minneapolis	£500,000	£500,000
Pittsburg Brewing Company			$6,500,000	$6,500,000
Pittsburg Plate Glass Company		Pittsburg	9,850,000	150,000
Postal Telegraph Cable Company		New York City	15,000,000	
Pressed Steel Car Company; consolidates Fox and Schoen companies and has a monopoly.	New Jersey	Pittsburg (?)	12,500,000	12,500,000
Print Cloth Pool; 30 mills; restrict production and fix prices			50,000,000	
Pueblo Traction and Electric Company; owns 3 electric light companies of city.	California	Pueblo	500,000	
Reading Company (Anthracite Coal Trust)			[5] 150,000,000	
Refrigerator Trust; 36 firms; 80 per cent of trade			[5] 8,000,000	
River Coal Operators' Company; Pittsburg to New Orleans			[5] 11,000,000	
Royal Baking Powder Company; consolidation of all companies	New Jersey	New York	10,000,000	10,000,000
Rubber Goods Manufacturers' Company; consolidation of mechanical goods companies.	do	New York city	25,000,000	25,000,000
Saginaw Valley Traction Company; consolidation of 4 companies		Saginaw	700,000	400,000
San Francisco Breweries, Limited (agreement with other breweries)		San Francisco	[5] 20,000,000	
Santy-Kalsomine Company (Plaster Trust)	Michigan	Grand Rapids	[5] 3,000,000	
Sash and Door Combine; 26 companies; fix prices		Chicago (?)	[5] 15,000,000	
Shelby Tube Company; weldless tubes		Shelby, Ohio	5,000,000	
Shot and Lead Manufacturers' Association; fixes prices			[5] 2,000,000	
Shovel Makers of United States and Canada; international agreement			[5] 6,000,000	
Southeastern Tariff Association; 67 fire insurance companies[3]		New Orleans (?)	$41,424,318	
Sperry Flour Company; California	California		10,000,000	
Spirits Distributing Company; selling agency for American Spirits and Southern Distributing companies.	New Jersey		3,675,000	3,676,000
Springfield Coal Association; 10 companies	Illinois	Springfield	[5] 4,000,000	
Standard Distillingland Distributing Company; whisky	New Jersey	New York City	16,000,000	8,000,000
Standard Oil; controls petroleum refineries, etc., in United States		do	97,250,000	
Standard Rope and Twine Company; sells through Union Selling Company	New Jersey	do	12,000,000	
Standard Sardine Company			5,000,000	
Standard Telephone Company; bought Central Missouri Company in 1898	Missouri (?)	Kansas City	[5] 10,000,000	
Steel Beams Association; fixes prices		Pittsburg	[5] 20,000,000	
Steel Rail Manufacturers' Association; all big companies agree			50,000,000	
Steel Steamers; forming with all manufacturers on Great Lakes			[5] 15,000,000	15,000,000
Steel Tired Car Wheel Company; 6 or 7 car-wheel companies		Trenton	2,000,000	
Swift and Company (beef)	Illinois	Chicago	20,000,000	
Syracuse Rapid Transit Railway Company; all in Syracuse		Syracuse	2,750,000	1,250,000
Temple Iron Company; consolidated 7 anthracite coal companies in Pennsylvania.				
Tennessee Coal, Iron and Railroad Company; plants in Tennessee and Alabama		Birmingham	20,000,000	1,000,000
Theatrical Trust; 50 big ones work together			[5] 30,000,000	
Tidewater Oil Company; consolidation of 4 companies	New Jersey	New York City	5,000,000	
Torrington Needle Company			1,500,000	1,500,000
Trenton Gas and Electric Company; 4 companies		Trenton	[5] 2,000,000	
Tubular Dispatch Company; consolidated 2 companies			2,100,000	
Twin City Rapid Transit; all street railways in Minneapolis and St. Paul[6]	New Jersey	Minneapolis	15,000,000	2,462,200
Umbrella Hardware Company	do		2,000,000	
Underwriters' Association of State of New York; 72 companies		Syracuse	58,428,711	
Union Bag and Paper Company	New Jersey		16,000,000	11,000,000
Union Carbide Company (acetylene consolidated)	Virginia		6,000,000	
Union Light and Power Company; 4 companies of Salt Lake and Ogden, Utah	Utah		4,250,000	300,000
Union Switch and Signal Company; consolidated with National Switch and Signal Company.			$997,950	$397,000
Union Tobacco Company; absorbed Durham Company	New York	New York City	12,000,000	7,350,000
Union Traction Company; all trolleys in Philadelphia[6]	Pennsylvania	Philadelphia	30,000,000	
Union Typewriter; 5 leading companies	New Jersey	New York City	10,000,000	8,015,000
United Breweries Company; 13 breweries, Chicago	do	Chicago	5,463,000	
United Electric Company of New Jersey; to unite all companies in North, New Jersey.	do		20,000,000	
United Gas Improvement Company	Pennsylvania	Philadelphia	15,000,000	
United Ice Cream Company; 4 companies in Chicago	Illinois	Chicago	300,000	
United Lighting and Heating Company; 8 companies; oil lighting interests of United States.	New Jersey		6,000,000	6,000,000
United Paper Company (tissue)	do	Paterson	1,500,000	1,500,000
United Railways and Electric Companies of Baltimore; all in city	Maryland	Baltimore	24,000,000	14,000,000
United Shoe Machinery Company	New Jersey		8,625,000	8,625,000

Present name of trust.[2]	Where incorporated.	Location principal office.	Capitalization.[3] Common stock.	Preferred stock.
United Traction Company; controls all electric roads in Reading, Pa		Reading	$1,400,000	
United Traction and Electric Company; all roads in and near Providence[4]	New Jersey	Providence	8,000,000	
United States Cast Iron Pipe and Foundry; 13 companies, practically all in South and West.			12,000,000	$12,000,000
United States Dyewood and Extract Company; to unite all in United States	New Jersey		4,000,000	6,000,000
United States Eaves Trough and Conductor Pipe Association		Pittsburg	[5] 2,000,000	
United States Envelope Company; 10 companies; 90 per cent product in United States.	Maine		750,000	3,750,000
United States Express; not incorporated	New York	New York City	10,000,000	
United States Furniture Company (school; enlarging and reforming in 1899)		Chicago	[5] 10,000,000	
United States Glass Company; flint glass	Pennsylvania	Pittsburg	3,458,100	690,000
United States Leather Company[7]	New Jersey	New York City	62,854,600	62,254,600
United States Oil Company		Boston (?)	1,250,000	
United States Playing Card Company; allied with 3 other companies		Cincinnati	3,600,000	
United States Rubber; controls boot and shoe output of United States	New Jersey	New York City	23,666,000	23,525,500
United States Varnish Company; organizing with all in United States	do		18,000,000	18,000,000
Vermont Marble Company[6]	New York	New York City	3,000,000	
Virginia-Carolina Chemical Company; 27 fertilizer factories			4,393,900	5,085,000
Virginia Electric Company of Norfolk; consolidated all companies in city	Virginia	Norfolk	450,000	
Virginia Iron, Coal, and Coke Company; properties in Virginia			7,500,000	
Welsbach Commercial Company; owns Welsbach light; 3 companies	Colorado	Philadelphia (?)	3,500,000	3,500,000
Wells-Fargo Express			8,000,000	
Western Elevator Association; 40 leading in Buffalo		Buffalo	[5] 15,000,000	
Western Factory Insurance Association; 33 companies[8]		Chicago (?)	23,862,500	
Western Live Stock and Land Company	Colorado	New York City	408,000	
Western Strawboard Company; plants not in American Company			2,500,000	2,500,000
Western Union Fire Insurance Association; 50 companies in Western and Southern States.[8]		Chicago	47,902,368	
Western Union Telegraph; consolidated other companies in 1881, 1887, and 1891	New York	New York City	97,370,000	
Westinghouse Air-Brake Company; bought American and Boyden companies in 1888.	Pennsylvania		10,950,000	
Westinghouse Electric and Manufacturing Company; pools with General Electric and owns United States Electric Locomotive Company and Walker companies.	do	Pittsburg	8,987,950	
Wholesale Druggists' National Association; 25 firms.[9]		Philadelphia	[5] 25,000,000	
Wholesale Grocers of New England.[10]		Boston	[5] 75,000,000	
Window Shade Manufacturers' Association; nearly all in country			[5] 2,000,000	
Wire Cloth Manufacturers' Association of America; 12 firms agree on prices			[5] 5,000,500	
Writing Paper Trust; forming with 35 mills in Connecticut Valley			[5] 40,000,000	
Yarn (cotton hosiery) Manufacturers; fix prices		Philadelphia	[5] 3,000,000	
Yellow Pine Company[6]	New Jersey	New York City	2,500,000	
Totals			4,247,918,981	870,575,200

[2] A few of the trusts included in this list are not at this particular time in full force. In most such cases new agreements are pending, and it is unlikely that, having realized the benefits of combination, capital in these industries will long continue to compete with itself. Some trusts, like the Michigan Salt Association, are renewed every five years, or at other regular or irregular periods. The Paris Green Combine is likely to make its appearance during, or previous to, the potato-bug season.

[3] When a trust is incorporated the amount of capital reported as issued is usually taken, though it is often far above or below the actual capital employed. When not incorporated, the capital employed in the allied concerns is estimated.

[4] Unincorporated trusts pay no dividends, though they often make profits to the constituent companies. Sometimes the rate of dividends on preferred stock is averaged for two or more kinds of such stock. In bonded indebtedness several kinds of bonds are often grouped together.

[5] Estimated.

[6] Only typical trusts are taken in these industries. Such trusts are duplicated in many other cities or sections of the country.

[7] This association maintains prices of proprietary medicines by refusing to handle goods sold to wholesalers who cut prices. Similar local associations cover all sections of the United States and regulate prices of most leading articles. Jobbers and retailers have similar combinations in States, counties, and cities.

[8] Wholesale grocers' associations exist in all parts of the country. By means of rebates, etc., they assist the manufacturers of sugar, starch, baking powder, and of hundreds of other leading articles in maintaining uniform prices.

ADDITIONS TO TRUSTS AND COMBINATIONS.

The following are some of the industrial trusts formed and projected since about the middle of March to May 27:

Present name of trust.	Where incorporated.	Location principal office.	Capitalization. Common stock.	Preferred stock.
Amalgamated Copper Company; to acquire copper properties	New Jersey		$75,000,000	
American Agricultural Chemical Company; 23 fertilizer plants	Connecticut		17,000,000	$17,000,000
American Bicycle Company; 100 plants—95 per cent in country	New Jersey		45,000,000	35,000,000
American Chicle Co.; forming with 6 chewing-gum plants	do		6,000,000	3,000,000
American Gas and Electric Lighting Fixture Company; forming with 14 plants	do		9,000,000	6,000,000
American Hide and Leather Company; 30 companies—35 per cent upper leather output.	do		40,000,000	30,000,000
American Plow Company; forming—17 agricultural implement manufacturers, Chicago.		Chicago	[1] 65,000,000	
American Plumbing Supply and Lead Company; 45 companies			25,000,000	10,000,000
American Railways Company; to control electric railway companies in United States.	New Jersey		25,000,000	*
American Railway Equipment Company; forming—18 freight-car equipment companies.	do	Chicago	9,730,000	7,730,000
American School Furniture Company; school and church furniture	do		10,000,000	
American Shipbuilding Company; shipbuilding, etc., on Great Lakes	do		10,000,000	10,000,000
American Smelting and Refining Company; controls many big companies[1]	New Jersey		27,400,000	27,400,000
American Steel Hoop Company; 10 hoop, tie, and band companies	do		19,000,000	14,000,000
American Stoneware Company; forming—35 potteries companies east of Mississippi River.	Delaware	Akron	2,500,000	
American Window Glass Company; forming to control 80 or 90 per cent of all			30,000,000	
American Writing Paper Company; forming with 21 mills in Massachusetts[2]		Holyoke	12,500,000	12,500,000
Automobile Machine and Screw Company; forming—9 screw manufacturers in United States.			6,000,000	4,000,000
Boston Breweries Company; forming—6-10 breweries	New Jersey	Boston	3,250,000	6,500,000
Carnegie Steel Company; forming—includes 15 Carnegie & Frick iron, steel and coke companies.[3]	do	Pittsburg	125,000,000	125,000,000
Central Hudson Steamboat Company; 9 Hudson River boats[4]	do		1,000,000	
Consolidated Street Car Company; 5 of largest manufacturers	do		10,000,000	8,000,000
Chamber Furniture Manufacturers' Association; 50 manufacturers of sideboards, etc.; fixes prices.			[1] 10,000,000	
Chicago Laundry Combine; forming with 75 steam laundries		Chicago	[1] 4,000,000	
Chicago Sash, Door, and Blind Company; 35 Chicago companies	New Jersey		3,500,000	2,500,000
Columbian Car Lighting and Brake Company; 3 companies	do		10,000,000	
Consolidated Ice Company; all artificial companies in Pittsburg			2,000,000	2,000,000

Present name of trust.	Where incorporated.	Location principal office.	Capitalization.	
			Common stock.	Preferred stock.
Continental Cotton Oil Company; 7 Southern companies	New Jersey		$3,000,000	$3,000,000
Continental Packing Company; with Standard Company; controls sardine output.	do		3,000,000	
Cotton Yarn Combination; forming—7 mills in Massachusetts			8,460,000	
Encaustic Tile Company; to control all companies			4,000,000	3,000,000
Federal Sewer Pipe Company	Delaware		10,750,000	10,750,000
Hot Air Furnace Manufacturers' Association; fixes prices		Pittsburg	[1] 5,000,000	
International Automobile and Vehicle Tire Company; 3 rubber-tire companies	New Jersey		1,500,000	1,500,000
Ledger Paper Combination; forming with 4 Massachusetts companies			[1] 1,000,000	
Macbeth-Evans Glass Company; forming—5 chimney concerns, all in the United States.			2,000,000	
Manufactured Rubber Company; to control output	New Jersey		5,000,000	1,000,000
National Association of Wagon Manufacturers; fixes prices			[1] 40,000,000	
National Car Equipment Company; forming in California	California		10,000,000	
National Carpet Company; forming—nearly all mills in United States			[1] 50,000,000	
National Dining Table Association; 39 firms; fixes prices		Chicago	[2] 2,000,000	
National Glass Company; 17 flint bottle, etc., companies			4,000,000	8,000,000
National Screw Company; forming—includes American and 13 other companies			10,000,000	
National Strawboard Company; forming; will act with American Company	New Jersey		2,000,000	2,000,000
Pacific Coast Biscuit Company; forming with 7 big companies [3]	do		2,500,000	1,500,000
Patent Leather Combination; forming; 95 per cent of United States product		Newark	[1] 20,000,000	
Pittsburg Laundry Company			1,750,000	1,750,000
Puget Sound Packers' Association; 8 big salmon packers; fixes prices		Seattle	[1] 1,400,000	
Republic Iron and Steel Company; 31 bar and forge iron companies, etc	New Jersey	Chicago	30,000,000	25,000,000
Soapmakers' Combination; most of big Western companies			[1] 25,000,000	[1] 25,000,000
Southern New England Brick Manufacturers; trust forming			[1] 5,000,000	
Springfield (Mass.) Breweries Company; 4 breweries [7]			1,150,000	1,150,000
Standard Metal Company; forming—10 companies, car-journal bearings, etc			4,000,000	1,800,000
Standard Chain Company; forming—95 per cent machine-made chains			3,250,000	3,250,000
Union Steel and Chain Company; forming	Delaware		30,000,000	30,000,000
United Fruit Company; 10 big companies; tropical fruits	New Jersey		20,000,000	
United Power and Transportation Company; to control street railways in Pennsylvania.	do		12,500,000	
United States Dry Paint Company; forming—mineral paints	New Jersey		[1] 3,000,000	[1] 4,500,000
United States Flour Milling Company; forming—19 mills [††]			3,500,000	5,000,000
United States Glue Company; forming to control glue product	New Jersey		15,000,000	10,000,000
United States Worsted Yarn Company; forming to unite 19 largest mills	do		20,000,000	16,000,000
United Zinc and Lead Company; to unite mills in Missouri and Kansas	do		5,000,000	1,000,000
Western Drug Jobbers; forming—Western combination			[1] 15,000,000	[1] 15,000,000
Total			962,740,000	490,830,000

[1] Estimated. [2] $2,133,000 bonds. [3] $17,000,000 bonds. [4] $100,000,000 5 per cent bonds. [5] $500,000 bonds. [6] $1,500,000 6 per cent bonds. [7] $1,150,000 bonds. [8] $7,500,000 6 per cent bonds.

In the above list only the capital stock and bonds actually issued or proposed to be issued at once are given, when known. Some of the trusts in this list include trusts in the main list. Thus the United Fruit Company includes the Boston Fruit Company; the United States Flour Milling Company includes the Hecker-Jones-Jewell Milling Company, etc. Some of the trusts are under different names, since being formally organized. Thus the Chicago Sash, Door, and Blind Company probably includes but little more than the Sash and Door Combination; the American Shipbuilding Company is the incorporated name of the Steel Steamers Combination. Some of the trusts marked "forming" are so far advanced that retraction is hardly possible. Others have simply secured options on plants and are attempting to float the bonds and stocks.

Statue of Oliver P. Morton.

REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT J. BEVERIDGE,

OF INDIANA.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

Saturday, March 24, 1900.

The Senate having under consideration the following resolution:

"*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)* That the statue of Oliver P. Morton, presented by the State of Indiana, to be placed in Statuary Hall, is accepted in the name of the United States, and that the thanks of Congress be tendered the State for the contribution of the statue of one of the most eminent citizens and illustrious statesmen of the Republic.

"Second. That a copy of these resolutions, suitably engrossed and duly authenticated, be transmitted to the governor of the State of Indiana—"

Mr. BEVERIDGE said:

Mr. PRESIDENT: Great men are the instruments of God. They are His voice to the suffering, His shield to the oppressed, His hand for the building of nations. The Almighty needed his Maccabee, his Joshua, and his David as much as his John the beloved. Richelieu and Washington and Bismarck were his ministers as much as Luther or Wesley or Brooks. And just as truly was Oliver P. Morton one of the small group of mighty men who bore heaven's commission to establish the imperishable nationality of the American people; and fidelity to that trust is the key to all he ever said or did or was.

I do not believe that inspiration is confined to the dreamer of dreams or the singer of songs. Inspiration may glorify the doer of deeds as well. In a sense Oliver P. Morton was inspired when, in the midst of doubt, hesitation and beaconless purpose, he said: "I would rather come out of a seven years' struggle defeated in arms and conceding independence to successful revolution than to purchase present peace by the concession of a principle that must inevitably explode this Nation into small and dishonorable fragments;" and, speaking thus, voiced the loyalty of the land to the flag of the Nation. He was inspired when, on the very day and hour that Lincoln called for troops, he flashed back this message in response:

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT OF INDIANA,
April 15, 1861.

To ABRAHAM LINCOLN, *President of the United States:*

On behalf of the State of Indiana I tender to you for the defense of the nation and to uphold the authority of the Government 10,000 men.

OLIVER P. MORTON,
Governor of Indiana.

And, speaking thus, made disgraceful all delay and left only action glorious. He was inspired when he hurled regiment after regiment into battle with all of duty's heroic sternness, and inspired when he cared for and comforted those soldier boys with all a mother's tenderness for her suffering child. His sanitary commission was as holy as religion; his military agency was as sacred as the church; his bureau of finance an institution divinely blessed as an instrument of the great purposes of God.

All this was done in a holy cause. A single passionate belief inspired his life—a single irresistible resolution. A Nation in reality the American people ought to be, and a Nation in reality he would give his powers to make us. To the current of this great purpose every act and word and thought of Oliver P. Morton was tributary. His statesmanship was Nationality. His loves and hates, his hopes and fears, were incidents to the mighty thought that glorified his life and made him mighty as itself.

He was himself an argument for his cause. All great men are God's incarnations of national life. A man like Morton makes sectional lines absurd. Washington was too great for Virginia; Hamilton too great for New York. Bismarck was too great for Prussia—he was, by divine right, the statesman of all the German people. And so we see that God has made all great men for *all* their people—not for a local subdivision of them. As civilization broadens, governments widen, men are great only as their powers and sympathies are large enough for all the people of their race. At the beginning the greatest man was great in his family alone. From families sprang communities. From communities grew petty states, and from these great nations with all their possibilities of commerce and art, of interchangeable industry and mutual helpfulness, of united power, collective achievement, the civilization of cooperation, the royalty of labor and the sovereignty of citizenship. And so in the hearts of the common people the inspiration toward nationality ever dwells. It is their

instinct of power. That is why the common people of every land respond to their Alfreds, their Lincolns, their Cavours, and their Mortons. These seers of statesmanship behold in a consolidated nationality the sovereignty of the people, the prosperity of the people, the happiness and safety of the people; and so the people hear them gladly. No man is great except he serves the people and becomes the visible expression of the people's better thought and higher purpose. He who thinks to be great by serving self alone is ambition's fool, trifling with the lightnings of fate.

And so it was to the establishment of the people's nationality that Morton consecrated his giant powers. He was the Gibraltar of the Government in the West. Stanton and Morton were the imperial wills that held aloft the hands of Lincoln until victory came. So far as deeds and facts could make it so, Morton was Deputy President of the United States in active charge of the Ohio Valley. No man can tell what the result would have been had not some man like Morton been what and where our Morton was. Consider our position. Indiana was the keystone of the North. Indiana invaded, Chicago and Detroit taken, and the Confederate flag would have prevailed from lake to gulf. This territory was a necessary factor in any grand strategy the Confederacy might attempt. Portions of the State were gangrened with sympathy for the rebellion. The Knights of the Golden Circle, numbering 50,000 in Indiana, with $200,000 for the purchase of arms, actually planned a military uprising. Powerful men hoped to see Indiana the open gateway by which the hosts of the stars and bars might split the North in twain. Suppose a commonplace man had been in Morton's place? Think of the certain consequences had a Confederate sympathizer been the executive of this strategic State!

But Oliver P. Morton was governor of Indiana, and, instead of an inward swinging gate to the enemies of the Union, Indiana was made by Morton an entering wedge for the rending of the Confederacy. He did more. He made Indiana an example for every loyal State. He obliterated State lines for the purpose of patriotism. Before Ohio had equipped a single man, Morton had sent four regiments flying across her territory en route to Washington. The Confederates threatened Cincinnati. The proper authorities were laggard in responding; the frightened city turned to Morton. In fifteen hours 3,000 stand of arms, 24 pieces of artillery, with ammunition for both, two regiments of Indiana soldiers in Cincinnati's streets, proved that Morton's patriotism knew not the boundaries of States.

Morgan crossed the Cumberland; they wired the news to Morton, and back the answer flew: "One regiment leaves to-night, another to-morrow, two more next day." He knew neither night nor day in his terrific activity. The Sixty-eighth and Sixty-ninth regiments were mustered in by candlelight and started to the front before the break of dawn. The Government needed ammunition. Morton, on his own responsibility, established a great manufactory of the materials of war. Admiral Foote needed powder to bombard Fort Henry; Morton furnished it, and that stronghold fell. Most of the ammunition with which the battle of Shiloh was fought and won was supplied by Morton. Indiana's soldiers needed overcoats; the supply of the Government was short; Morton did not wait, but himself bought nearly 30,000 overcoats, paid for them, and, while the Government waited, Indiana's soldiers were kept warm. Indiana's treasury was empty from the very start; Morton raised on private paper more than $4,000,000. Such were the deeds of Morton. He was the Union's flaming sword all along the border. He was faith to the faltering, certainty to the doubtful, courage to the weak of heart, and an inspiration to every State and to every man throughout the entire Nation. Such activity in other days would be called unbalanced, ill-considered, neurotic. But it is the tempest-like activity and the instantaneousness of action which genius always has.

And all this time men planned his death. More than once they sought his life; one time their bullet barely missed its mark. These were the only men that Morton ever hated. He respected the enemy in the field—they were brave men fighting in a mistaken cause. But for the cowards who sought by stealth to kill the cause for which he had sent more than 200,000 Indiana boys to battle, Oliver P. Morton had a hatred hot as the thunderbolts of God. Yet when their leaders, condemned to death, stood in the shadow of the gallows, Morton interceded with the President and saved their lives—so close to the fountains of righteous wrath in the breast of this tender and heroic man the springs of mercy welled.

Morton's whole career was based upon profound belief in the common people—not the theoretical belief of the doctrinaire, not the simulated belief of the demagogue; but the living, vital, human faith of one who in himself is of the people. That is why he was a Nationalist. That was why he sent that telegram to Lincoln the very hour the President called for troops—he believed the 10,000 men he tendered would respond. Faith is the heart of deeds. That was why he built arsenals, bought provisions, equipped a quarter of a million of men for war—he believed the people would sustain him. That was why he pressed the ratification of the fourteenth amendment, and, as a Senator, the adoption and ratification of the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States. That was why he championed reconstruction, based, as he declared, "upon the everlasting principles of equal and exact justice to all men."

Nearly a quarter of a century ago Morton proposed an amendment to the Constitution providing for the election of Presidents by the people. All his measures, all his deeds were based upon his faith in the people. He did not doubt, he did not underestimate the intelligence, the purity, and the patriotism of the masses. He did not believe in Matthew Arnold's doctrine of the "Saving remnant." He knew that if this Republic is to be saved the plain people must do the saving; that when men get too far away from the soil they cease to love it enough to die for it. He knew that nearly all the heroes of Lexington and Concord, of Vicksburg and the Wilderness, were toilers before they were soldiers.

And so Morton looked at every problem from the view point of the common people. He sprang from them—was one of them himself. His father was a shoemaker. He was himself a hatter. His association, till full manhood, was exclusively with the working classes. Let me again and again repeat that no one can understand Oliver P. Morton who forgets that, first of all, he believed profoundly in the plain people, whom Abraham Lincoln loved; and, second, that the passion of his life was to see this matchless people welded into an indivisible and immortal Nation. These vast characters attract the people by a sort of law of moral gravitation. The people trust them by an instinct that passes the wisdom of formal thought. The people know that these great characters are the agents of the eternal verities, even, perhaps, unconsciously to those characters themselves.

Inspired by such a faith and such a purpose, he put his will into his thought, and instantly they were facts. And his was the kingliest will of that heroic period. After all, courage is the royal element of human character. Stricken with paralysis, this Indiana shoemaker's son, this child and lover of the common people, went from the governor's chair to the Senate, and there, without experience or wide learning, he instantly became the leader of that glorious company of intellect and spirit and learning. And what a Senate it was!—a Senate to be a mediocre member of which was to be a distinguished man! Sumner was there, Conkling was there, Thurman was there, Edmunds and Carpenter and Logan were there. Distinguished men of the Nation who still are Senators of the Republic began their services with Morton—warriors and scholars and lawyers and orators, some of them statesmen equal to the greatest the world has seen. It was a time when America pointed proudly to her Senate and said, "These are representative of American courage and character and mind." And among them sat the Senator from Indiana, stricken unto death, yet lord and leader of those princes of the people.

And he knew that a republic can only be preserved by parties. He understood that principles were greater than personalities, and that a party standing for a principle is greater than any man standing for a personality. Therefore he was a partisan. A partisan like Morton is one who believes in the sovereignty of an idea. A partisan like Morton is one who would have theories reduced to practice. A partisan like Morton is one whose faith in essential things dissolves his discontent with incidentals—whose loyalty to an eternal belief is greater than any temporary representative of that belief. All the world's achievers have been such partisans. From Savonarola to Luther, from Cromwell to Gladstone, from Washington to Lincoln, the lords of human conviction and achievement have been for that very reason partisans of the cause they championed. Between a partisan of a cause and his opposite is all the difference between beliefs and interests, between convictions and investments, between a principle and an expedient. In this sense Morton was a king of partisans. He was a partisan of principle; but he was not the puppet of a machine—a distinction frequently forgotten. No man honored a conviction that differed from his own more than did Morton, the incarnation of conviction; no man so swift and terrible in wrath at wrong in his own party than he, its strongest leader.

America needs to-day more partisanship like that.

Courage and honesty, the gift of seeing things, and an appalling energy—these were the reenforcements that Morton brought to the Union. He was a bridled hurricane. And he saw things with that clear vision which, in another age, would have made men call him a seer. Morton saw through the hearts of men, understood the conclusion of the syllogysm of events, and so beheld the flag of the American people—man's last experiment in liberty—saw that dear banner, carrying with it the destinies of his country and the hope of all mankind, sinking from sight in the smoke of rebellion.

And so, with a passion we can not understand in these cold days, he spoke and wrought. But Indiana's soldiers understood him when he handed them their colors and spoke to them those words of fire at parting. They understood him when, suffering

in the hospitals of pain, comforts and cheer and nursing came there from the old Indiana home, sent by the hand of their great war governor. They understood him when the soldiers of other States told them how they looked on Morton as their governor, too. I knew a family of soldiers, Ohio volunteers, yet such was the influence of that matchless man on loyal hearts from every State that in that household to this very day the name of Morton is second only to Lincoln as the best beloved of all our country's civil names since Washington. This Napoleon of patriotism was national in his activity. I have it at first hand from authority absolutely reliable that he made many secret trips to Washington to strengthen the decision of the President, perplexed with conflicting considerations and distraught with the double necessity of acting, and at the same time of holding together discordant elements essential to success, which decided action in any direction threatened to explode. I am told that Lincoln declared that Morton had more influence with that iron man, Stanton, than the President himself. If Lincoln was the great conservative, the genius of statecraft, the scientist of popular feeling, whose skill in the management of men made ultimate victory possible, Morton was the spirit of decision, moving the President to act when the hour had struck. There was none so great that he feared to tell them all his thought; none so humble that Morton would not listen to their suggestion and advice.

He frankly spoke his mind to all. That was the secret of his power in public speech. Every thought was to Morton a conviction. That is the characteristic of all great speakers. The only perfect argument is a truthful statement of your case. That is the method of all immortal words. Christ spoke as one having authority. The Declaration of Independence is not weakened by the expression of a doubt. John the Baptist never said, "I may be wrong." The man who influences men to die for a principle must be an intellectual absolutist. This was the method of Morton. He was not an orator as the term is used to-day—no tonguey man, no round-voiced, graceful-gestured carpet knight of words. I thank God he was not. Had he been he never could have touched the people's hearts as so masterfully he did. But he was an orator in the sense that the great apostle was. Oratory is the telling of a needful truth at an appropriate time by an honest man, who believes what he says so fervently that to his hearers he becomes a magnet of conviction; all else is merely entertainment by a skilled performer upon that wonderful instrument called human speech. The three model speeches of the world are the Saviour's Sermon on the Mount, the appeal of the Apostle Paul on Mars Hill, and the inspired words of Abraham Lincoln at Gettysburg. These have no tricks, no tinsel, no flowers of wax; they are immortal in the simple majesty of the truths they so perfectly reveal.

Mr. President, Oliver P. Morton was an elemental man. He had the sincerity and simplicity of nature. He was the personification of the people who are always natural, always elemental, and in the end always—necessarily always—right. All great men are this. They have in them something of the oceans, the mountains, and the stars. In their presence the schemes of schemers seem illogical and absurd—seem like the houses of cards that children build. The road is always plain before these elemental men because they perceive, with the large vision of the seer, whither that road inevitably leads.

Such men have that courage which lesser men call folly, but which history always estimates aright, and to which the people in the end unfailingly respond. They do not hesitate to make their stand. They do not hesitate to act their thought. They do not hesitate to put their destiny to the touch. Indeed, their destiny, their personal fortunes, are the last items they consider. Their cause or their country alone is a thing of consequence to them. Such are all the inspired and inspiring characters in history. Such was Leonidas, such Cæsar, such Cromwell, such Bismarck—such the greatest of all the great, our unapproached and unapproachable Washington. Men like these found States or save them. Men like these clear the rugged and, to weaker men, the impossible way up the mountain, and, taking humanity by the hand, lead it upward to purer atmosphere and broader vision. And such was Indiana's titanic son, the elemental Morton.

The world is so much better than it ever was before. In all civilization no absolute autocrat wears a crown to-day. Men's minds as well as bodies, everywhere, are free. The inquisition is so impossible to-day that all its horrors seem the imperfect memory of a dream. Slavery is gone forever, and on the seat of independence, dignity, and power free labor sits enthroned. There is bread for all who work, and what within this generation were the luxuries of the few to-day are the necessities of all. Thought is free, speech is free; liberty at last is dwelling among the sons of men. All this we owe to the heroes of the people—those minds of light and lion hearts and wills imperial who voiced the people's thought, led the people's cause to victory, and enshrined the people's rights in the people's imperishable Nation. And among them stands our Morton, immortal with the immortality of deeds!

Trusts.

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN WESLEY GAINES,
OF TENNESSEE.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, June 2, 1900.

The House having under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 138), proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States—

Mr. GAINES said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: By the very words of his own lips I shall prove that the mouthpiece of the Administration on this floor—the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR]—is "unwise and unstatesmanlike" in that he and his party are advocating this proposed sixteenth amendment to the Constitution which will destroy the ancient and existing rights of the States over corporations. In a speech in this House December 15, 1899, about five months ago, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] in powerful and unmistakable wise and statesmanlike words condemned such a measure and left us little room to believe that he would ever again fail to do his "plain duty." In this speech he said:

Mr. Chairman, I should not undertake to carry out the suggestions of Mr. Bryan and his supporters that Congress shall be authorized to legalize or destroy absolutely the corporations of this country in the different States of the Union. I believe in leaving to the States themselves the power to create and limit the operations of corporations, and I believe the suggestion that carries with it the limitation by Congress of the power of the States in *this regard unwise and unstatesmanlike*. A proposition that would curtail the power of the States themselves in the management of their local affairs, it seems to me, should shock every man and every intelligent American politician. I have said heretofore that I was a better Democrat than many of those who occupy seats upon the other side and who talk of Democratic principles in that regard. I do not believe in a recognition of power which would authorize the General Government to go into the States and undertake to interfere with domestic affairs or with domestic traffic and to say that such and such commodities shall not cross the line of the States, or which should undertake to limit or destroy the powers of State corporations.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I yield for a question.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I will ask the gentleman if the decisions of the courts in the last thirty years have not entirely changed the legal aspect of the interstate-commerce law? In other words, has not the doctrine, in a certain way, deprived the States of the very power the gentleman is now discussing?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Well, now, that opens quite a wide field. Would that be a justification why Congress should now undertake to assail the corporations of a State by legislation? I admit that there has been all over this country, in the State courts and in the Supreme Court of the United States, a growth of judicial interpretation. I admit that. The gentleman is a lawyer, and he knows I am right, and he knows that there is no great State of the Union that can say that this system of legal interpretation has not invaded the supreme authority of his own State. I admit that, but that is no reason why we should to-day undertake by Congressional action to destroy the power of the States to control and regulate their own domestic affairs in their own way. The States must finish the work so auspiciously begun by Congress and the Supreme Court.—*Congressional Record*, volume 33, page 345.

He now advocates this amendment, and will (and did) vote for it, possibly because he knew it would never pass Congress (even this House), and if it did it would never be ratified and become "the law of the land," or he may have really thought "there was nothing in it," but simply a campaign subterfuge to appease an enraged and trust-pillaged people until the next election has come and gone.

We all know Mr. Bryan never favored surrendering any rights of the States over corporations; on the contrary, he said at the Chicago trust convention this:

My plan is this: First, that the State has, or should have, the right to create whatever private corporations the people of the State desire.

Second, that the State has, or should have, the right to impose such limitations upon an outside corporation as the people of the State may think necessary for their own protection. That protects the right of the people of the State to say, first, what corporations they shall organize in their State; and, second, what corporations they shall permit to come from other States to do business in their State.

Third, that the Federal Government has, or should have, the right to impose such restrictions as Congress may think necessary upon any corporation which does business outside of the State in which it is organized.

In other words, I would preserve to the people of the State all the rights that they now have, and at the same time have Congress exercise a concurrent remedy to supplement the State remedy.

Mark his language:

I would preserve to the people of the State *all the rights that they now have*, and at the same time have Congress exercise a concurrent remedy to supplement the State remedy.

I was present at this trust conference, talked with Mr. Bryan before he spoke, when he disclaimed any intention to interfere with existing State rights, and heard this speech made just as I have read it.

Under existing Federal and State laws the "State has the power" to create, empower, regulate, control, and dissolve domestic corporations, and may "exclude foreign corporations entirely" when engaged in internal, local, or State commerce, even though, as in the Texas case, the foreign corporation was "incorporated"

to do business "in Missouri and other States" (or interstate and State commerce) by buying and selling naval stores, oils, etc., as the statement of facts shows which accompanies the opinion of the court.

In this case this oil company violated the anti-trust laws of Texas, and under that statute its charter was forfeited, and it was excluded from doing any local, internal, or State trade within the State of Texas. The judgment entered by the trial court was affirmed by the court of civil appeals of the State of Texas, which judgment was reaffirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States, March 19, 1900, and reads as follows:

It is therefore ordered, adjudged, and decreed by the court that the defendant, the Waters-Pierce Oil Company, be, and is hereby, denied the right and prohibited from doing any business within this State, and that the permit to do business within this State heretofore issued July 6, 1889, by the secretary of state of this State be, and the same is hereby, canceled and held for naught, and that said defendant, the Waters-Pierce Oil Company, its managers, superintendents, agents, servants, and attorneys be, and are hereby, perpetually enjoined and restrained from doing business within this State. Nothing herein shall be construed to in any way affect or apply to or prohibit said defendant's right to engage in interstate commerce within this State.

The defendant was forced to trial for its illegal acts of commerce in restraining the internal local or State trade done by it within the State of Texas. The trial court expressly excluded from the consideration of the jury the defendant's legal or illegal acts in restraint of interstate trade, to which action the defendant excepted, contending that the court could not put it on trial for its illegal acts done within the State because it was engaged also in interstate commerce. But the Texas court overruled this objection, and this ruling was expressly affirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States, holding that the courts of Texas had the right to construe a State statute, and that its action did not abridge any of the constitutional rights of the defendant, citing many authorities.

Justice McKenna said:

The transactions of interstate commerce were withdrawn from the consideration of the jury, and were also excepted from the judgment. * * * The statutes must be considered in reference to these contracts—that is, contracts pertaining to local commerce. In any other aspect they are not subject to our review on this record, *except the power of the State to restrict their regulation to local commerce, upon which a contention is raised.* It is based on the following provision:

"Every foreign corporation violating any of the provisions of this act is hereby denied the right and prohibited from doing any business within this State, and it shall be the duty of the attorney-general to enforce this provision by injunction or other proceedings in the district court of Travis."

The court continued:

The claim is, if we understand it, that the statute prohibits all business of foreign corporations, and hence is unconstitutional as including interstate business, and can not be limited by judicial construction to local business and the unconstitutional taint thereby removed.

Cases were cited which the court held did not apply, holding with the Texas court against the company.

Having stated that the Federal courts have the right to interpret Federal statutes, Justice McKenna said:

The courts of Texas have like power of interpretation of the statutes of Texas. What they say the statutes of that State mean we must accept them to mean, whether it is declared by limiting the objects of their general language or by separating their provisions into valid and invalid parts, citing 175 U. S., 348; 173 U. S., 404.

THE ANTI-TRUST ACT OF TEXAS CONSTRUED BY THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The court expressly held that the "permit" to do business in Texas was subject to the acts of 1889 and 1895, which "provide for the forfeiture of the permit of a foreign corporation which may violate any of the provisions of the statute."

The court said and held:

The act [1889] in force when the appellant entered the State informed it that for a violation of its terms the permit to do business here (Texas) would be forfeited. This provision of the law was as much part of the obligation and as binding upon the appellant as if it had been expressly made part of the permit * * * and that [act 1889], as we have seen, imposes valid conditions upon the plaintiff in error, and their violation subjected its permit to do business in the State to forfeiture. (Waters-Pierce Oil Company *vs.* Texas, 177 U. S. R., page —.)

"Judgment affirmed," declaring the permit of this corporation "forfeited."

Justice McKenna, for the court, had already said:

The plaintiff in error is a foreign corporation, and what right of contracting has it in the State of Texas? This is the only inquiry, and it can not find an answer in the rights of natural persons. It can only find an answer in the rights of corporations and the powers of the States over them. What those rights are and what that power is has often been declared by this court.

A corporation is the creature of the law, and none of its powers are original. They are precisely what the incorporating act has made them, and can only be exerted in the manner which that act authorizes.

In other words, the State prescribes the purposes of the corporation and the means of executing those purposes. Purposes and means are within the State's control. This is true as to domestic corporations. It has even a broader application to foreign corporations—

citing many cases.

As to foreign corporations, the court said:

Having no absolute right of recognition in other States, but depending for such recognition and enforcement of its contracts upon their assent, it follows, as a matter of course, that such assent may be granted upon such terms and conditions as those States may think proper to impose.

Now listen particularly to this language:

They [the States] may exclude the foreign corporation entirely; they may restrict its business to particular localities, or they may exact such security for the performance of its contract with their citizens as in their judgment will best promote the public interest. The whole matter rests in their discretion.

The court, in support of its opinion, cites and approves many cases.

So we have the law now perfectly clear that even a "foreign corporation, incorporated * * * to buy and sell, in Missouri and other States, naval stores and oils"—combining "in restraint of State trade," contrary to antitrust-combine State laws—can be by the State excluded, and was in this Texas case excluded from doing that business in Texas.

Here is not only the law reannounced, but a case in point where (under a Democratic administration) a foreign corporation is excluded from the transaction of any local or State commerce within the State of Texas and its permit to do such business in that State forfeited. The State law is and was held to be supreme in such a case.

THE POWER AND DUTY OF CONGRESS IS TO CONTROL FOREIGN CORPORATIONS AND COMMERCE.

The anti-trust act of 1890 undertook to and does "prohibit" though not *enforced*, foreign and interstate trust combines, and the court so held in December, 1899:

In the Pipe case the court held:

Congress may * * * prohibit the performance of any contract between individuals * * * to directly regulate to any substantial extent interstate or foreign commerce. * * * The power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce comprises the right to enact a law *prohibiting* the citizen from entering into those private contracts which directly * * * regulate to a greater or less degree among the States. (175 U. S. R).

We then see that Congress can "prohibit" interstate trust trade altogether. We will now show that Congress can "prohibit" foreign and interstate corporations and combines.

POWERS OF CONGRESS OVER FOREIGN AND INTERSTATE COMMERCE AND FOREIGN CORPORATIONS AND BODIES DEALING THEREIN.

While the States have this full and complete power over domestic corporations or foreign corporations engaged in local or State trade, Congress has full and complete power to control interstate and foreign commerce and foreign corporations and bodies engaged in such commerce, and such laws have been held uniformly constitutional, as I will show later on. It is not only within the power, but it is, says the Supreme Court of the United States, the "duty," of Congress to exact in such business and from such associations "any guaranties it might deem necessary for the public security and for the faithful transaction of business," * * * and, as Mr. Bryan says, it "ought to exercise it."

The State of Kentucky undertook to tax Crutcher, the agent of an express company doing interstate and local business, and undertook to justify this tax as a police regulation. Held unconstitutional for the State to levy this tax on interstate commerce, but also held it was within the power and it was the duty of Congress to protect the people from these foreign or interstate corporations and associations.

The power is squarely admitted in and the duty enjoined on Congress.

The Supreme Court of the United States says: *Congress has the power, the prerogative, and it is its duty to provide for the security of the people of the United States in relation to foreign corporate bodies or foreign individuals with whom they may have relations of foreign or interstate commerce. This the court held was the law in Crutcher* vs. *Kentucky (141 U. S., 57), citing many cases.* It has been reaffirmed.

This is the rule laid down by Justice Bradley in the leading case of Crutcher against Kentucky. Let us, then, assume that the States have no power to regulate or exclude foreign corporations engaged in foreign or interstate commerce and local, internal, or, State commerce. It is perfectly clear that Congress has the full power to exclude foreign corporations engaged in interstate or foreign commerce, or both, and that it is the duty of Congress to protect not only the people of the United States, but of the several States or any State, from such business or corporations. Thus we see Congress can exclude such corporations entirely from the State, while the States can exclude such of them as are engaged or who want to engage in local, internal, or State commerce. *Combining, then, the two powers—Federal and State—the trust evil is met, State and national, and crushed. But, as we see from the Texas case, a foreign corporation dealing in interstate and State commerce can be and was in that case prohibited from doing internal business in the State of Texas.* We will now read from the Crutcher case, that exploits the power and duty of Congress under the commerce clause of the Federal Constitution.

THE DUTY AND POWER OF CONGRESS TO PROTECT THE PEOPLE FROM FOREIGN OR INTERSTATE CORPORATIONS OR COMMERCE.

Crutcher *vs.* Kentucky (141 U. S., 57), the court says:

Congress would undoubtedly have the right to exact from associations of that kind (foreign or interstate commerce) any guaranties it might deem necessary for the public security and for the faithful transaction of business;

and, as it is within the province of Congress, it is to be presumed that Congress has done, or will do, all that is necessary and proper in that regard. * * *

It has frequently been laid down by this court that the power of Congress over interstate commerce is as absolute as it is over foreign commerce. * * * The prerogative, the responsibility, and the duty of providing for the security of the citizens and the people of the United States in relation to foreign corporate bodies, or foreign individuals with whom they may have relations of foreign commerce, belong to the Government of the United States, and not to the governments of the several States; and confidence in that regard may be reposed in the National Legislature without any anxiety or apprehension arising from the fact that the subject-matter is not within the province or jurisdiction of the State legislatures. And the same thing is exactly true with regard to interstate commerce as it is with regard to foreign commerce. No difference is perceivable between the two (citing many cases). * * *

The court happily says the "prerogative" belongs to Congress; the "responsibility" is on Congress; the "duty" devolves on Congress. To do what, I ask? To protect the people of this country against injuries or threatened dangers at the hands of foreign "corporate bodies" or foreign "individuals" in matters of foreign and interstate commerce.

Why, then, do we want an amendment to the Federal Constitution to protect the people in foreign or domestic commerce or from foreign or domestic corporations? Congress, we see, has full and complete power as to the former, while the States have full and complete power as to the latter, with the additional power to exclude foreign corporations dealing in State commerce. I will now show that Congress has for more than a century prohibited foreign commerce by constitutional laws uniformly upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States; that this court has repeatedly said that the power over foreign commerce was no greater than the power of Congress over interstate commerce (Crutcher and Brown cases cited); that Congress has repeatedly passed valid laws prohibiting interstate and foreign commerce; that the power of Congress over interstate and foreign commerce knows no limitation except the Federal Constitution itself. (Pipe case, and Gibbons *vs.* Ogden, 9 Wheat.)

Mr. Bryan, in the National Watchman of January 11, 1900, suggests that this power over Congress should be invoked to protect the people against foreign corporations and bodies dealing in interstate or foreign commerce. He says:

As the Constitution gives Congress legislative control over interstate commerce, it would seem to follow that Congress might impose any reasonable restrictions necessary for the protection of the public from monopolies.

The corporation would have in its possession the evidence necessary to secure a license, and it would be no hardship upon it to require it to present that evidence to the Interstate Commerce Commission or to some other body authorized to grant licenses.

Progress is made along the line of least resistance. The license system secures the desired results with but little annoyance to legitimate business. The honest corporation, with honest stock, engaged in honest industry, will find it easy to secure a license, and ought to welcome any system that will protect it from a dishonest corporation, with dishonest stock, engaged in an effort to establish a monopoly.

In answer to the contention that the restrictions above proposed would interfere with the right of a citizen to the free use of his money and property, it may be remarked that there is a material difference between the natural person—flesh and blood and conscience—and the fictitious person called a corporation.

From these adjudications we in brief gather the following as the law:

1. That the States have the power to exclude entirely or admit and regulate foreign corporations engaging in commerce done within the limits of the State, and can require "security" from them to protect the people in their relations with them, in the "discretion of the State."

2. The States have the power to exclude a foreign corporation "incorporated" to do or that is doing a foreign and interstate commerce, or either, and *State commerce in addition, in so far as such corporation engages in State commerce.*

3. That the States have not the power, but Congress has, to regulate or exclude a foreign corporation that is engaged solely or "strictly" in interstate or foreign commerce or which is employed by the Federal Government in the transaction of Federal business, which is the same thing as interstate commerce, as the court declared in the Pembini and Telegraph case.

MR. BRYAN'S BALTIMORE SPEECH.

We also know this Chicago speech was made before the Addyston Pipe case was decided in December, 1899, which removed all doubts as to the power of the States and Congress over commerce. After this case was handed down, Mr. Bryan in Baltimore last January said:

You ask me what you can do. I do not mean to say that there is but one remedy, nor do I mean to say that there is no better remedy than the one I suggest; but I believe there is an easy remedy that will make monopoly impossible. The Constitution has given to Congress control over interstate commerce. There are certain things which the State can do—and I would not take from the State a single power that it now has—to destroy the trusts. [Applause.] Place upon the corporation from the outside doing business in the State such limitations as the people of the State may think necessary for their protection. I will go further than that.

I believe the State should be permitted, if it pleases, to exclude any outside corporation from doing business in the State, for while the natural men in different States may compete with one another, I do not believe that an individual in one State must suffer competition with a fictitious person created in another State, and regulated by laws beyond the reach of people living outside of that State. But after the State has done all it can, I believe the power will not be complete over monopoly, for the State can only stop the monopoly at the State line, and if a monopoly has forty-four States in which to work, it may be able to get along without the forty-fifth; but if you will stop the corporation when it attempts to go out of its own State, there can not be any monopoly, because it is shut out of the other forty-four.

And I believe that Congress has the power, and ought to exercise it, to say that no corporation organized in any State shall do business outside of that State until it secures permission from Congress, or some body created by it, and that permission can be granted only when the corporation shows that there is no water in its stock, and that it is not attempting to monopolize any branch of business or the production of any article of merchandise. [Applause.]

He says: "And I believe Congress has the power, and ought to exercise it," to protect the people against foreign corporations.

However, the Texas court, through Justice Fisher, and Justice McKenna for the Supreme Court of the United States, recognized an "exception" to this power of a State to "exclude" a foreign corporation, *if* engaged in "strictly" interstate or foreign commerce. This oil company was engaged in interstate *and* State commerce, and was being tried for violating the Texas anti-trust statute prohibiting restraints in *State commerce*. The trial court properly, as Justice McKenna held, *separated* the two businesses, the interstate traffic and State traffic, and tried it for unlawful transactions *in State commerce only* and forfeited its permit.

This "exception" to the old rule, excluding "foreign corporations entirely," was first recognized, I believe, in the case of the Pensacola Telegraph Company against the Western Union Telegraph Company (employed by the Government), 96 U. S., page 1, and the Florida statute excluding the latter corporation from Florida was held invalid as an unconstitutional interference with a governmental means of interstate commerce in behalf of and *at the instance of the Government*. Justice Field says, in 125 U. S.:

This qualification of the ancient power of the State to exclude foreign corporations entirely was expressed in 91 U. S., 1.

This was, it seems, the first departure from the old law. Justice Fisher, for the Texas court of civil appeals, said:

Except where the foreign corporation is in the employ of the Federal Government, or is engaged strictly—

The word "strictly" is used in 125 U. S. by the court—

in matters of interstate commerce such bodies are entitled to no rights or privileges except those which may be conferred upon them as an act of grace by the State. (19 Texas Civil Court of Appeals, 19-20; S. C., 44 S. W. R., 930, citing 125 U. S., Pembini Mining Company *vs.* Penn.)

The Texas court held in this case (reaffirming a case in 90 Texas, 298, against the Pabst Brewing Company, wherein contracts were held nonenforceable because this foreign corporation had unlawfully restrained local commerce in Texas in making said contracts), did not aim at and did not apply to foreign corporations engaged in "strictly" interstate or foreign commerce, but at domestic and foreign corporations engaged in restraint of local or State commerce. Here is a clear, clean-cut distinction made, and adjudication of the power of the State to punish foreign corporations not engaged in strictly State commerce, but which was engaged in interstate commerce and in State commerce also, and the power and right of the State to separate the one from the other and punish for those illegal acts done as a part of a foreign corporation's business within the State lines, and the Supreme Court of the United States held such a distinction and judgment was valid. This, I think, is a nice question met, settled, and no longer an open question.

Justice McKenna cites the case of Pembini (supra) and approves it, with the later case, Hooper against California (155 U. S., 648), wherein an insurance company (foreign corporation) was held amenable to the laws of California. Justice White collected all the authorities touching upon the rights of foreign corporations in the States. He says:

The principle that the right of a foreign corporation to engage in business within a State other than that of its creation depends solely upon the will of such other State has been long settled, and many phases of its application have been illustrated by the decisions of this court—

Citing many cases—

Whilst there are exceptions to this rule, they embrace only cases where a corporation created by one State rests its right to enter another and to engage in business therein upon the Federal nature of its business. As, for instance, where it has derived its being from an act of Congress and has become a lawful agency for the performance of governmental or quasi governmental functions, or where it is necessarily an instrumentality of interstate commerce, or its business constitutes such commerce, and is therefore solely within the paramount authority of Congress. In these cases the exceptional business is protected against interference by State authority. The reasons upon which the exceptions to the general rule are based have been often explained.

Justice White, we see, recognizes this "exception" to, but reaffirms, the old rule, and quotes in substance what Justice Bradley said in the case of Crutcher against Kentucky, found in 141 U. S., wherein that State undertook to tax the agent of an express company engaged in Kentucky in carrying on State and interstate trade. Note well the tax was on the *agent*, whose business was *both* State and interstate, no effort being made to confine the tax to *business* done by the agent *entirely within the limits of the State*, but upon both businesses, State and interstate, the statute imposing the tax making no distinction.

Justice Bradley, in observing that the statute was sweeping in its application, and that the tax could be, as has been done, levied

"exclusively on the business carried on wholly within the State," said:

T? a case—

Which I have last stated—

is entirely different from that of foreign corporations seeking to do business which does not belong to the regulating power of Congress.

The court specifically, then, gives adjudged instances where the power of a State to tax or exclude the foreign corporations has been upheld, saying:

The insurance business, for example, can not be carried on in a State by a foreign corporation without complying with all the conditions imposed by the legislation of that State. So with regard to manufacturing corporations and all other corporations whose business is of a local and domestic nature, which would include express companies whose business is confined to points and places wholly within the State. The cases to this effect are numerous. (Citing many cases. 141 U. S., Crutcher's case.)

Justice Bradley cites the case of the Cook Manufacturing Company (113 U. S., page 727), repeatedly reaffirmed, which was a "manufacturing" *foreign* corporation of Ohio trading in Colorado contrary to the Colorado constitution, which ordained:

No foreign corporation shall do any business in this State without having one or more known places of business and an authorized agent or agents upon whom process may be served.

And by statute carrying this provision into effect provided—

Foreign corporations shall, before they are authorized or permitted to do any business in this State, make and file, etc. * * * And such corporations shall be subjected to all liabilities, restrictions, and duties which are or may be imposed upon corporations of like character organized under the general laws of this State, and shall have no other or greater powers. (Ib., 728.)

In a subsequent (foreign mining corporation) case this constitutional provision was again squarely upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States in Fritz *vs.* Palmer (132 U. S., 288), and the court said:

No question is made in this case—indeed, there can be no doubt as to the validity of these constitutional and statutory provisions, so far, at least, as they do not directly affect foreign or interstate commerce. (Fritts *vs.* Palmer, 132 U. S., 288; citing Cooper Manufacturing Company *vs.* Ferguson, 113 U. S., 727.

Justice Field, speaking for the court, says:

It is not every corporation, lawful in the State of its creation, that other States may be willing to admit within their jurisdiction or consent that it have offices in them; such, for example, as a corporation for lotteries. And even where the business of a foreign corporation is not unlawful in other States the latter may wish to limit the number of such corporations, or subject their business to such control as would be in accordance with the policy governing domestic corporations of a similar character. The States may, therefore, require for the admission within their limits of the corporations of other States, or any number of them, such conditions as they may choose without acting in conflict with the concluding provision of the first section of the fourteenth amendment. (125 U. S., 189; Pembina Mining Company *vs.* Pennsylvania—cited and approved in the Texas case.)

PROPOSED AMENDMENT DOES WHAT?

The second section of this proposed amendment will strip the States of their ancient and existing rights over domestic trusts, monopolies, corporations, or combinations. It reads as follows:

Congress shall have power to *define, regulate, control, prohibit*, or *dissolve* trusts, monopolies, or combinations, whether existing in the form of a corporation or otherwise. The several States may continue to exercise such power in any manner *not in conflict* with the laws of the United States.

Suppose Congress defines a trust, monopoly, corporation, or combination. The States by this amendment are prohibited from *differently* defining them, even if they have any power left them to define them at all. They can not add to nor take from such definition, because such an act, by the very words of this amendment, would be "in conflict with the laws of the United States," and therefore void. Or suppose Congress should incorrectly, or inadequately, or insufficiently define or describe a trust, monopoly, or combination; the States would be without power to correctly, adequately, or sufficiently define them, although the people in a particular State or States might be, as now, suffering by the oppressive actions of these concerns.

The States must, if this amendment is made "the law of the land," be mute, and appear deaf to, although they may hear, the wail of the people against these combines. Or suppose again that Congress should fail altogether to define these combines or to legislate against them. Would not the power of the State to legislate on the subject at least be doubtful, since this amendment ordains that Congress "shall have the power to define, regulate, prohibit, or dissolve trusts," etc.? What powers do the States reserve, or are reserved to the States in this amendment? As the law is, the sole power is "reserved" to the States to control internal, home, or State commerce (154 U. S., 470). Can the States legislate if Congress fails, when we remember that the existing Constitution ordains that—

This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof * * * shall be the supreme law of the land; anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

This provision alone would make the proposed amendment "the law" of our entire domain, and if the power is given for Congress to "define, regulate, control, prohibit, or dissolve trusts," etc., what power is left by this amendment to the States to do so? If you say the power is concurrent, and both Congress and the States legislate, the legislation must be the same, otherwise they would "conflict."

Why have two laws for the same offense?

Again, would not the courts of the United States and the several States conflict and clash?

Do we want this?

Again, suppose a particular State, to cultivate some local industry, desired to incorporate a company and Congress should say no, or should dissolve it. Congress could, under this amendment. Do we want this? In such event the State would have to surrender. In short, this proposed amendment paralyzes and dwarfs the States, destroys local self-government, and inaugurates a centralized or imperial government in its stead, and that, too, when there is no necessity for it. Exercise the powers we have and enforce existing statutes, and amend them if necessary, and maintain local self-government that we set out to do more than a century ago. This is our plan.

THE POWER OVER INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE AND WHAT CONGRESS HAS DONE TO PROHIBIT IT.

Mr. Speaker, I contend that Congress now possesses all-sufficient right and power to "regulate" or "prohibit" interstate commerce under the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. Having this prerogative, sovereign and complete within itself, we have only to invoke its full operation to destroy all "interstate" trust commerce, of the evil of which the people rightfully complain. With Congress to paralyze, under its commerce power, all "interstate" trust commerce, coupled with the anti-trust laws which the States have, or can enact and enforce, we will have all the anti-trust laws that we need throughout the broad domain of our fair country. These powers, Federal and State, fully invoked and cooperating, will cover our entire domain and crush the trusts. We want the powers the Federal Government, States, and organized Territories *have enforced*, and if we then fail, a constitutional amendment can be enacted.

The commerce power of Congress is found in section 8 of the Constitution, and ordains that—

The Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and amongst the several States and with the Indian tribes.

The distinguished chairman of the committee reporting this bill [Mr. RAY of New York], in response to my inquiry to-day, said:

Yes; Congress has full power to control interstate commerce.

Let us see what laws Congress has enacted not only regulating but prohibiting interstate and international commerce:

1. The Wilson tariff law of 1894 prohibited the importation of convict-made goods in these words:

That all goods, wares, articles, merchandise, manufactured wholly or in part in any foreign country by convict labor shall not be entitled to entry at any of the ports of the United States, and the importation thereof is hereby prohibited, etc.

This prohibitory provision was carried into and is now a part of the Dingley tariff law. So in recent legislation both the advocates of the Wilson tariff law—the Democrats—as well as of the Dingley tariff law—the Republicans—are committed to the admission that Congress under its commerce power has the right to prohibit foreign commerce, and, as I will show later on, interstate commerce, too.

2. The old laws prohibiting commerce with France and England, known as the embargo acts, were held constitutional as a proper exercise of the commerce power of Congress. They were generally discussed and approved in the Clark *vs.* Field case (143 U. S.), where the McKinley tariff law was brought in question. Mr. Cooley, on the principles of the Constitution citing cases at page 70, says the embargo acts were a constitutional regulation of our commerce powers, and adds:

The power that controls commerce from the very nature of things includes the power to restrict and limit—to prohibit as to certain things and to suspend altogether when, for the time, it seems wise. It is a sovereign power and knows no limit.

Again:

The power to regulate commerce among the several States is granted to Congress in terms as absolute as is the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations. (Brown *vs.* Houston, 114 U. S., 622; Crutcher *vs.* Kentucky, 141 U. S., p. 47).

3. Congress has prohibited commerce with the Indian tribes even within the limits of a State, and all manner of trade with them except by persons duly commissioned (act August 15, 1876), and has empowered the President to prohibit the introduction of certain articles of commerce into Indian Territory (United States Revised Statutes, 2132). Congress has prohibited the exportation of cattle from Indian Territory for trade (United States Revised Statutes, 2138) and the sale of liquors to Indians (ib., 2139).

These laws have all been held constitutional, and the power is unquestionable.

Chief Justice Taney, in the celebrated license cases (5 Howard, 504), enunciates the same doctrine:

Congress, under its general power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, may prescribe what articles of merchandise shall be admitted and what

excluded, and may therefore admit or not, as it shall seem best, the importation of ardent spirits.

And in United States *vs.* Forty-three gallons of whisky, etc. (93 United States, 188), it was likewise held that—

Congress, under its constitutional power to regulate commerce with the Indian tribes, may not only prohibit the unlicensed introduction and sale of spirituous liquors in the Indian country, but extend such prohibition to territory in proximity to that occupied by the Indians.

In United States against Holliday (3 Wallace, 407) it was held that—

The circuit courts of the United States have jurisdiction of the selling of ardent spirits to an Indian under the act of February 12, 1862.

By that act Congress made it penal to sell spirituous liquors to an Indian under the charge of an Indian agent, although it was sold outside of any Indian reservation and within the limits of a State. The act is constitutional under the power to regulate commerce with the Indian tribes.

We have seen from the cases above cited, based, as all our commerce law in question is, on the leading case of Gibbons *vs.* Ogden, (9 Wheaton), that the power to regulate interstate commerce is as complete as the power to regulate international commerce, and we see that Congress has the power, and has exercised it constitutionally, to actually prohibit international commerce.

Then why should Congress hesitate to prohibit interstate trust commerce? It clearly has that power and undertook to exercise it in the antitrust act of 1890.

In the recent Pipe case (175 U. S.), Justice Peckham, for the whole court, says:

The reasons which may have caused the framers of the Constitution to repose the power to regulate interstate commerce in Congress do not, however, affect or limit the extent of the power itself.

In Gibbons *vs.* Ogden (supra) the power was declared to be complete in itself, and to acknowledge no limitations other than are prescribed by the Constitution.

Under this grant of power to Congress, that body, in our judgment, may enact such legislation as shall declare void and *prohibit* the performance of any contract between individuals or corporations where the natural and direct effect of such a contract will be, when carried out, to directly, and not as a mere incident to other and innocent purposes, regulate to any substantial extent interstate commerce. (And when we speak of interstate we also include in our meaning foreign commerce.) We do not assent to the correctness of the proposition that the constitutional guaranty of liberty to the individual to enter into private contracts limits the power of Congress and prevents it from legislating upon the subject of contracts of the class mentioned.

The power to regulate interstate commerce is, as stated by Chief Justice Marshall, full and complete in Congress, and there is no limitation in the grant of the power which excludes private contracts of the nature in question from the jurisdiction of that body. Nor is any such limitation contained in that other clause of the Constitution which provides that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.

* * * * * * *

The provision in the Constitution does not, as we believe, exclude Congress from legislating with regard to contracts of the above nature while in the exercise of its constitutional right to regulate commerce among the States. On the contrary, we think the provision regarding the liberty of the citizen is, to some extent, limited by the commerce clause of the Constitution, and that the power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce comprises the right to enact a law *prohibiting* the citizen from entering into those private contracts which directly and substantially, and not merely indirectly, remotely, incidentally, and collaterally, regulate to a greater or less degree commerce among the States.

We can not so enlarge the scope of the language of the Constitution regarding the liberty of the citizen as to hold that it includes or that it was intended to include a right to make a contract which in fact restrained and regulated interstate commerce, notwithstanding Congress, proceeding under the constitutional provision giving to it the power to regulate that commerce, had prohibited such contracts.

We then see here, from the latest utterance, that Congress did "prohibit" interstate commerce trust combines, and that such a prohibition does not trench upon that liberty of the citizen the Constitution guarantees. In the other two leading cases—The United States against Joint Traffic Association (171 U. S., 505) and the Missouri transportation case (166 U. S.)—the court holds that Congress has the power to prohibit interstate trust commerce which is interstate commerce.

4. Congress has prohibited the importation of adulterated or unwholesome food or drugs and other things injurious to health (acts August 30, 1890, March 2, 1897) and the importation and exportation of diseased cattle (act August 30, 1890), and interstate commerce in diseased live stock (act May 29, 1884), and the exportation of slaughtered meat (act March 3, 1891).

5. Congress has prohibited the immigration of idiots, insane persons, criminals, polygamists, and Chinese (acts March 3, 1891, March 3, 1894, August 3, 1882, March 3, 1875). See the authorities touching upon these various acts and the power of Congress to enforce them in Desty's Federal Constitution, and Prentiss and Egan on the Commerce Clause of the Federal Constitution, page 387, etc.

6. Only a few days ago Congress passed what is known as the Lacey bird bill, prohibiting the sale and transmission, of birds killed in a State prohibiting their killing, to another State, which, as the author of the bill, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY], admitted in his speech, was based upon the right of Congress to prohibit interstate commerce.

7. Congress a few days ago passed a bill allowing the States to prohibit the introduction of convict-made goods in the several States that may refuse their admission.

8. In 1888, May 22 (RECORD, volume 92, page 4533), the House, by vote of 185 to 44, passed a bill prohibiting convict-made goods from being shipped from one State to another. Our most notable Republicans and Democrats in that Congress supported this measure—Mr. Speaker HENDERSON, President McKinley, Representatives GROW, GROUT, HOPKINS, CANNON, DALZELL, BROWN of Ohio, Dingley, Senator BURROUGHS, Senator GEAR, Senator LODGE, Senator MASON, and many leading Democrats.

Now, in the face of the action of Congress here shown for over a hundred years in prohibiting—not simply regulating, but prohibiting—international and interstate commerce, can any fair-minded man halfway patriotic longer dispute that Congress has the power to prohibit interstate and international commerce? For a hundred years Congress has enacted such legislation, and the court has uniformly upheld such laws.

Why, then, should not Congress prohibit interstate trust commerce?

The Democrats will when they get into power, March next, Congress with the full power to regulate commerce, why do we need an amendment to the Constitution to control interstate commerce, unless we desire to crush and paralyze State rights and turn over all the power that now exists in the State to Congress? We have lived happily for more than a century under our dual form of government, Congress having certain granted powers and those necessarily implied to execute these grants, with all the other powers and rights reserved to the States and the people by the express words of the Constitution. Even if this amendment were offered in good faith, I would oppose it, because Congress has full power to controll interstate commerce and the States have the balance of the power to legislate on State commerce, and most of them have done so or will do so, and those who refrain can bear the ills that follow such an omission until they are whipped into active concert with their sister States.

Tennessee has drastic anti-trust laws enacted by and vigorously enforced by Democratic officers. Under this law, in recent years, we have crushed a coal combine, an ice trust, a patent-medicine trust, and possibly others I do not now recall, while amongst the first cases under the anti-trust act of 1890 was one wherein Judge Key, a Democrat, dissolved a coal combine in Nashville, Tenn., while the Addyston Pipe case was begun in Chattanooga by a Democratic district attorney under the direction of the Cleveland Administration.

Every Democrat in Tennessee is proud of the anti-trust record of her Democrats. Every Democrat in Congress from Tennessee in 1890 voted for the anti trust act, improperly named "Sherman law," drafted by Senator Edmunds, except one section by Senator VEST, as Senator VEST informed me a few days ago, and every Democrat in Congress from Tennessee to-day will vote against this constitutional amendment and for the amendments of the minority to the Littlefield bill in their efforts to perfect that measure, which is a step in the right direction, and then, if they fail, will, as a unit, support the Littlefield bill. That bill contains several provisions that I suggested in a bill filed January 3, 1900, and in two speeches in this House, suggesting in them, as I proposed in my bill, amendments to the present anti-trust law. My suggestions were these:

REPUBLICANS ADOPT THE ANTI-TRUST SUGGESTIONS OF DEMOCRATS.

1. That interstate and *State trusts and monopolies* be excluded from the use of the mails in the transaction of their business, just as we did in the Louisiana Lottery and other cases. This bill only excludes trusts found guilty under the Federal law—but a good halfway invocation of this postal power.

2. That the people be given the right to go before our grand juries and indict these objectionable trusts and combines and to enjoin or sue them for damages, with reasonable attorney fees if successful in the civil cases.

3. That the district Federal judges be required to specially instruct the grand juries on this law at each term of court.

4. That the testimony given before grand juries should be privileged.

The Littlefield bill was not introduced until April 7, 1900—nearly three months after my bill—and these four suggestions of mine were made amendments thereto by the committee reporting it, and yet that bill is contended by the Republicans to be a Republican measure! I intended to introduce certain amendments to the anti-trust act of 1890 and did so all the more gladly that the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GROSVENOR), on December 15 last, in his speech in this House challenged the Democrats to propose in words any amendment to that law. His challenge was so framed as to practically dare the Democrats to suggest a possible, practicable amendment, believing, as he clearly did, that that law was perfect.

The greatest weakness of that law is giving the imperial power to the Attorney-General to say when and when not suits should

be filed against the combines reprehended by that law. My suggestions cure that. The people and not the Attorney-General only, with this bill a law, have a right to enforce the law by injunction, indictment, and suits for damages.

In my speech January 19, 1900—over two months before the Littlefield bill was *introduced*—I said:

Section 1 says if certain concerns or persons "are associated or combined for any one or either or all of the following purposes," naming them, and in addition have used the mail to transact their business, the Federal grand jury finds a true bill and enforces the law against them, as in any other criminal case.

Section 3 gives the right to the humblest man in this land to go before the grand jury, and gives the jury the right to summon him before the grand jury for the purpose of finding a true bill against the violator of this statute.

One of the weaknesses of the present anti-trust law, Mr. Chairman, is that it puts it entirely in the hands of the Attorney-General of the United States to say when suits shall be filed against trusts. By my bill I put it in the hands of the people of this country to say when it shall operate. They are the ones who suffer. They are the victims. I put it in the hands of the plain people of this country—our Federal grand jurors—I put it in the hands of the Attorney-General and the Federal judge in the district where the trust is, and the people can go before the grand jury and say, "Here is A, B & Co., a trust." They find whether it is or not a trust formed for any one, either, or all the purposes named in section 1; and if they find it is a trust, they ask, "Did it send its letters through the mail?"

If the grand jury find that it has done so, they find a true bill, and then they go before a jury of the country, a jury of their peers, and there the case is tried. If they find that it is a trust formed for any one, either, or all the purposes named and that it used the mail in transacting its business, it is found guilty and fined $5,000 or imprisoned one year. I am tired of this one-man Government; I am tired of the Attorney-General of the United States—I do not care whether he is Mr. Olney or Mr. Griggs, I do not care whether he is that greatest of patriots, William Jennings Bryan; if Attorney-General, I would oppose putting it in his hands exclusively—to say whether or not the trusts shall be prosecuted or arraigned by the injunctive process in the courts.

Sir, there has never yet been a remedy for the trust evil suggested that its apologists did not pick a flaw in it. They masquerade as friends of the people and are heard exclaiming, "Trusts are a bad lot, but this is not the way to get at them." Any way is the wrong way. The great nullifying defect in the law of 1890 was doubtless injected into it by the friends of the trust for the exact purpose it has served—to nullify the act. It leaves its execution and the institution of actions solely to the Attorney-General, and the Attorney-General does not see proper to do it, and so there you are. It is a dead letter, utterly and absolutely useless and of no avail, because its execution rests with one man who does not see proper to enforce it.

My bill addresses itself specifically to this great defect. I have seen this bill criticised for that, it was said, it throws upon postmasters and carriers the onus of determining what is a trust, and I admit the criticism would be fatal if it were well founded; but nowhere in the bill is such duty imposed. On the other hand, the inhibitions, penalties, and maledictions of the bill are all leveled at the person who misuses the mail, and postmasters are not commanded to throw out or refuse mail until the fact that it is sent by a trust is established by the court. Its mandates are addressed to courts and juries and not to postmasters.

The Federal judges are required to give it in special charge to other grand juries, and the juries are given inquisitorial power to ferret them out, and the doors of jury rooms are set ajar to citizens to lodge complaints, whomsoever will, and thus the path is so open and easy and straight to conviction that no trust or person will dare to take the risk. It eliminates this one-man power. It relegates the enforcement of it back to the people themselves, where it rightfully belongs.

The bill enforces itself by its terrors and the care and certainty with which they may be invoked by bringing the courts into use, and by the invitations it extends to citizens to cooperate with the courts, and the power it confers upon grand juries to ferret out and compel information. Our entire system of criminal jurisprudence rests upon the probity and effectiveness of the grand jury. It stands between the people and the lawbreaker with drawn sword, the guardian of the one and the terror of the other; it is hoary with age, and is the wisest and surest and most effective of all the instrumentalities designed for the protection of society and the suppression of vice, and this bill predicates itself in the impregnable and unimpregnable strength and wisdom of this old-time grand-jury system that has never failed in any other branch of crime to fully meet the exigencies and demands of the case.

And again I said April 23 on the same point this:

I have before stated that the great weakness in the Sherman anti-trust law is this: That the Attorney-General of the United States has the sole power to say when suits shall be instituted against these concerns and when they shall not. If he had the disposition to vigorously insist on this prerogative, he has not the time. This was never intended to be a one-man government. The President is one man, it is true, but his powers are limited and he is controlled largely—absolutely in some matters—by Congress, and sometimes by the Senate alone. But as the law is, the Attorney-General has too much power and it should be changed, even if no other legislation is had.

I am opposed to putting it in the power of any one man, I would not care if it was Andrew Jackson himself, to say when and whether or not suits against trusts should be filed. I want the right given to the people, the suffering people, the people who are the victims of these nefarious concerns, and let them go to the criminal courts, the Federal courts, and say: "Here is a trust that is grinding me to death and I have not the money to employ a great lawyer to back up a lawsuit; I have not the railroad fare to go to the Federal Government at Washington to see the Attorney-General about my rights." I want to give the right to the plain people, who are the sufferers. [Applause.]

DEMOCRATS SPOKE AND VOTED FOR ANTI-TRUST ACT OF 1890.

The gentleman from Maine [Mr. LITTLEFIELD] has cited the vote taken upon a question of "consideration," immediately preceding the vote which passed the present anti-trust law in the House, June 20, 1890, as proving the opposition of the Democrats to that bill. He also quotes Mr. Enloe's language on that occasion as evidence of the fact that the Democrats opposed the bill, and forgets to tell the House that Mr. Enloe himself voted for the bill within ten minutes of the time he made the remark. Mr. Enloe had introduced an amendment to the Constitution, without *interfering with State rights*, but the Republicans had killed it *because not necessary*. The power of Congress was not then clear nor fully understood. And now, when the power is full, clear, and complete, made so by the recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States that Congress can even "prohibit" interstate and foreign trusts and combines (Pipe Case), the Republicans want—in bad faith, I charge—a constitutional amendment giving Congress a power it already possesses, and an evil addition.

Notwithstanding the fact that the anti-trust bill passed by a vote of "240 to 0" within the same hour that the other vote was taken, and that not a single Democrat voted against it, the gentleman would have the country believe that the Democrats opposed the bill because they voted against "consideration," but the facts do not sustain him.

TRUST BILL FINALLY PRESENTED TO THE HOUSE AND SENATE—WHAT WAS SAID AND VOTE.

The trust bill was presented to the House under a conference report, and it became a question of order whether or not it superseded the regular order. The regular order was the "silver bill;" and when it was proposed to sidetrack that for the trust bill, Mr. Bland raised the question of "consideration," and the Democrats voted with him.

It was not because any single one of them opposed the trust bill, but because they favored the silver bill above all things and were not willing to see it displaced for any reason. The great silver champion, whose spirit has now passed into the unknown, but whose patriotic virtues abide with us still, never, on any occasion, at any time, for any reason, wavered in his allegiance to the principle of which he was the ablest and most conspicuous exemplar, and he was on guard upon that eventful day, as he ever was, to see that no opportunity slipped that gave a chance to enact it into law. And then, and upon all other occasions before and since, the Democrats loyally followed him, but not one of them uttered a word against the trust bill and not one of them voted against it.

The RECORD utterly refutes the gentleman's assertions, and to decide it all I quote Mr. Bland's own language after the vote on consideration was taken. He said:

I regret that the amendments that the House put upon the bill were stricken out; and while I fear the bill in its present shape is not what its friends expect of it, I shall cheerfully vote for it. I raised the question of consideration simply for the purpose of going to the Speaker's table and taking up the silver bill. I am not opposed to the bill itself.

That is, not opposed to the anti-trust bill. He and other leading Democrats had made many speeches in the House and Senate for the bill and proposed several amendments to broaden and strengthen the act, but they were defeated by a Republican House and Senate.

I call attention of the country to the fact that Mr. Bland then gave notice that the Republicans in conference had emasculated the bill. And then I call attention of the country to the further conspicuous fact that the act under Republican administration has been almost a dead letter. Were the Republicans sincere then; else why did they emasculate it? Have they ever been sincere; else why have they refused to execute the act? The history of the act, both in its inception and its execution, has proven the utter insincerity of the Republican party in its pretended opposition to trusts, and the inevitable supposition is that this measure we are considering is a premeditated pretense, a studied deception, a foreordained fraud, and that the Republican party never has and never will sincerely offer harm to the trusts.

HOUSE PROCEEDINGS ON PASSAGE OF ANTI-TRUST ACT OF 1890.

Mr. STEWART of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit the following conference report.

Mr. BLAND. I desire to raise a question of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Vermont presents a conference report.

Mr. BLAND. The question simply is, Whether under the rules bills are now in order to be reported from the Speaker's table?

The SPEAKER. The conference report takes precedence of even a motion to adjourn.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I raise the question of consideration.

The SPEAKER. The conference report must first be read.

Mr. BLAND. I raise the question of consideration.

The SPEAKER. Precisely; but the House must know what it is asked to consider.

Mr. STEWART of Vermont. Let me say to the gentleman from Missouri that it will take but a moment. I hope it will be read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the conference report.

The report was read, signed on part of the House by E. B. Taylor, J. W. Stewart, both Republicans, and D. B. Culberson, Democrat.

Mr. BLAND. Now, Mr. Speaker, I raise the question of consideration, in order to go to the Speaker's table and take up the silver bill.

Mr. STEWART. On that I demand the yeas and nays.

And the House, by an aye and nay vote of 144 to 103, not voting 80, refused to consider the silver bill, and then took up and passed the anti-trust act of 1890 by a vote of "242 yeas; nays 0."

Mr. CULBERSON of Texas. Will the gentleman [Mr. Stewart of Vermont] permit me to make a statement?

Mr. STEWART of Vermont. Certainly.

Mr. CULBERSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to state to the House that I rise simply to state that we agree to this report because it is in compliance with the instructions of the Houses. Individually I thought the amendment originally made by the House was desirable, but the House having instructed otherwise, I agree to this report in accordance with that instruction.

Mr. BLAND. I would like to make a statement.

Mr. STEWART of Vermont. I will yield the floor for a question.
Mr. BLAND. I only want a minute in which to make a statement.
Mr. STEWART of Vermont. Very well.
Mr. BLAND. I regret that the amendments that the House put upon the bill were stricken out; and while I fear the bill in its present shape is not what its friends expect of it, I shall cheerfully vote for it. I raised the question of consideration simply for the purpose of going to the Speaker's table and taking up the silver bill. I am not opposed to the bill itself. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]
Mr. STEWART of Vermont. As there seems to be no disposition, or at least I am not advised of any disposition, to discuss the bill, I will ask for a vote.

* * * * * * *

Mr. KERR (Republican) of Iowa. I think it will accomplish a great deal. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. Culberson] very truly said that this was an unexplored field; that this was new legislation; that it was a case which demanded that the Government should declare the law, and that out of that declaration of the law would be evolved the decisions of the court, which would settle the question and determine the extent of our control over the subject. When the gentleman from Texas made that statement he had the approval, I believe, of every gentleman on this side of the House, and also a number of gentlemen on the other side.
Mr. ENLOE. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Kerr] says that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Culberson] stated that this bill was the complete exercise of the powers of the Federal Government under the Constitution to control trusts. If I remember the statement of the gentleman from Texas correctly it was that this bill was the exercise of all the constitutional power that Congress had except the power to repeal the duties which protect these trusts, and I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa a question on that point.

* * * * * * *

Mr. KERR of Iowa. But everybody knows they were in existence. As to hearing of them, we have only heard much about trusts since the Democratic party began to think that they could make political capital out of that question. [Applause on the Republican side.]
Mr. ENLOE. You heard of them when Mr. Cleveland said that they were all over this country, and when Mr. Blaine responded that they were private affairs, with which the Government had nothing to do.

YEAS—242.

Abbott,	Cowles,	Lacey,	Richardson,
Adams,	Crain,	La Follette,	Rife,
Alderson,	Crisp,	Laidlaw,	Robertson,
Allen, Mich.	Culberson, Tex.	Lane,	Rockwell,
Anderson, Kans.	Culbertson, Pa.	Lanham,	Rowell,
Anderson, Miss.	Cummings,	Lawa,	Rowland,
Arnold,	Cutcheon,	Lee,	Rusk,
Atkinson, W. Va.	Dalzell,	Lehlbach,	Russell,
Baker,	Davidson,	Lester, Ga.	Sanford,
Bankhead,	De Lano,	Lester, Va.	Sayers,
Banks,	Dockery,	Lewis,	Scull,
Barnes,	Dolliver,	Lind,	Sherman,
Bartine,	Dunnell,	Lodge,	Shively,
Beckwith,	Dunphy,	Magner,	Simonds,
Belden,	Elliott,	Maish,	Smith, Ill.
Belknap,	Ellis,	Mansur,	Smith, W. Va.
Bergen,	Enloe,	Martin, Ind.	Smyser,
Bingham,	Evans,	McAdoo,	Snider,
Blanchard,	Ewart,	McClammy,	Spinola,
Bland,	Farquhar,	McClellan,	Spooner,
Bliss,	Finley,	McComas,	Springer,
Boatner,	Fithian,	McCormick,	Stephenson,
Boothman,	Flick,	McCreary,	Stewart, Ga.
Boutelle,	Flood,	McKenna,	Stewart, Tex.
Bowden,	Forman,	McKinley,	Stewart, Vt.
Breckinridge, Ark.	Forney,	McMillin,	Stivers,
Breckinridge, Ky.	Fowler,	McRae,	Stockdale,
Brewer,	Frank,	Miles,	Stone, Ky.
Brickner,	Funston,	Mills,	Stone, Mo.
Brookshire,	Gear,	Moffitt,	Struble,
Brosius,	Geissenhainer,	Montgomery,	Stump,
Brown, J. B.	Gest,	Moore, N. H.	Sweney,
Browne, Va.	Gibson,	Moore, Tex.	Tarsney,
Brunner,	Gifford,	Morey,	Taylor, J. D.
Buchanan, N. J.	Goodnight,	Morrill,	Thomas,
Buchanan, Va.	Greenhalge,	Morrow,	Tillman,
Buckalew,	Grimes,	Morse,	Townsend, Colo.
Bullock,	Grosvenor,	Mudd,	Tracey,
Bunn,	Hall,	Niedringhaus,	Tucker,
Burrows,	Hasbrough,	Norton,	Turner, Ga.
Burton,	Hare,	Oates,	Turner, Kans.
Butterworth,	Haugen,	O'Neall, Ind.	Vandever,
Bynum,	Hayes,	O'Neil, Mass.	Vaux,
Caldwell,	Haynes,	O'Neill, Pa.	Venable,
Campbell,	Heard,	Osborne,	Walker, Mass.
Candler, Mass.	Hemphill,	Owen, Ind.	Wallace, N. Y.
Cannon,	Henderson, Ill.	Owens, Ohio	Wheeler, Ala.
Carlton,	Henderson, Iowa	Parrett,	Whiting,
Carter,	Henderson, N. C.	Paynter,	Whitthorne,
Caruth,	Herbert,	Payson,	Wickham,
Caswell,	Hermann,	Peel,	Wike,
Cheadle,	Hill,	Pennington,	Wilkinson,
Chipman,	Hitt,	Perkins,	Willcox,
Clements,	Holman,	Perry,	Williams, Ill.
Clunie,	Kelley,	Pickler,	Williams, Ohio
Cobb,	Kennedy,	Post,	Wilson, Ky.
Cogswell,	Kerr, Iowa	Pugsley,	Wilson, Mo.
Comstock,	Ketcham,	Quinn,	Wilson, W. Va.
Conger,	Kilgore,	Raines,	Wright.
Cooper, Ind.	Kinsey,	Reed, Iowa	
Cothran,	Knapp,	Reilly,	Total, 242.

NAYS—0.

NOT VOTING—85.

Allen, Miss.	Catchings,	Dargan,	Grant,
Andrew,	Cheatham,	Darlington,	Harmer,
Atkinson, Pa.	Clancy,	De Haven,	Hatch,
Barwig,	Clarke, Ala.	Dibble,	Hooker,
Bayne,	Clark, Wis.	Dingley,	Hopkins,
Biggs,	Coleman,	Dorsey,	Houk,
Blount,	Connell,	Edmunds,	Kerr, Pa.
Brower,	Cooper, Ohio.	Featherston,	Lansing,
Browne, T. M.	Covert,	Fitch,	Lawler,
Candler, Ga.	Craig,	Flower,	Martin, Tex.
Mason,	Peters,	Skinner,	Walker, Mo.
McCarthy,	Phelan,	Stahlnecker,	Wallace, Mass.
McCord,	Pierce,	Stockbridge,	Washington,
McDuffie,	Price,	Taylor, E. B.	Watson,
Milliken,	Quackenbush,	Taylor, Ill.	Wheeler, Mich.
Morgan,	Randall,	Taylor, Tenn.	Wiley,
Mutchler,	Ray,	Thompson,	Wilson, Wash.
Nute,	Reyburn,	Townsend, Pa.	Yardley,
O'Donnell,	Rogers,	Turner, N. Y.	Yoder.
O'Ferrall,	Sawyer,	Van Schaick,	
Outhwaite,	Scranton,	Waddill,	
Payne,	Seney,	Wade,	

Senate proceedings when the anti-trust act passed. No debate. No opposition. All the RECORD contains is that the conference report on the measure was submitted and "the report was concurred in." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 109, page 6208.)

TARIFF IS THE MOTHER OF TRUSTS.

If the proposition that protection "is the mother of trusts" needed testimony to prove it, I might cite innumerable witnesses selected from the greatest of Republican statesmen. The statement, however, is a maxim within itself and carries its own demonstration on its face.

Under the Democratic tariff of 1846 the rate of duty was about 25 per cent, and we had then no trusts. This tariff gave us an overflowing Treasury and the Democrats reduced in it 1857 to an average of about 20 per cent, and we still had no trusts. Mr. Blaine said "the tariff of 1857 was the lowest we ever had since 1812," in his Twenty Years in Congress. From 1846 to 1860 we had low tariffs, the free coinage of both gold and silver, with the Democrats in power and Whigs to assist them, but no trusts at any time. Mr. Havemeyer, as I shall show, says:

> There is probably not an industry that requires a protection of more than 10 per cent ad valorem * * * and,

says he,

> with a protection to an industry not exceeding 10 per cent all menace of trusts to the community would cease.

A 10 per cent tariff would cure, then, the trust evil and in proof of this we see under a 25 and 20 per cent tariff we had no trusts because we had foreign competition. "The mother of trusts is the customs tariff bill," says Mr. Havemeyer, and I may add, under the Dingley tariff the ad valorem per cent of tariff duties is 54.66, *plus the war rate, which I can not state.*

Are we surprised that trusts are giants and are plundering the people, making Presidents, controlling Congress, running Republican conventions, destroying the Constitution, and making slaves in Porto Rico and fixing to make more in the Philippines? Under our low tariffs everybody was prosperous and happy.

Mr. Blaine, in his Twenty Years in Congress, said:

> The business of the country was in a flourishing condition [under these low tariffs], and in 1857 all parties acquiesced in them.

Senator ALLISON, March 24, 1870, said:

> The tariff of 1846, though confessedly and professedly a tariff for revenue, was, as regards all the great interests of the country, as perfect a tariff as any that we ever had.

Mr. Garfield, in this House in 1878, said:

> The decade from 1850 to 1860 was one of general prosperity.

But under the civil-war tariff and succeeding Republican tariffs gigantic combines, trusts, and corporations arose and pillaged the people, just as President Jackson said in his farewell address they would do. President Cleveland and the Democrats charged their breastworks. This charge turned the Democrats out and turned in President Harrison, who abode with pleasure amongst these vultures.

President Cleveland and a Democratic Congress for the first time in thirty years took charge of the Government. They reduced the tariff to an average ad valorem per cent of 40.19 and enacted an anti-trust provision in the tariff act known as the Wilson law. This anti-trust provision, *without any change to strengthen it, was reenacted in the present Dingley law, and appears to be a dead letter under the present Administration.* It provided that imports protected, made into trust goods, should be placed on the free list when the President ascertained the fact. There is no evidence that the President wants to know such a fact or has turned his hand to enforce this law, though it is his duty under the Constitution and his oath to see that all laws are faithfully executed. We have seen that low tariffs prevent trusts, and that high tariffs are the mother of trusts, and if the present law was reduced to an average ad valorem of 10 per cent, Mr. Havemeyer says trusts will perish, or at least become harmless. Shall we do it? The Democrats say yes. The Republicans say no, and proved this by not reducing the tariff this session.

Possibly there was never a witness called to testify who spoke with more expert knowledge of his subject than did Mr. Havemeyer. He is one of the few greatest of all the beneficiaries of protective tariff, and he has invoked its aid especially in creating and building into enormous strength the next greatest of all trusts. He speaks with exact, literal, expert knowledge and from a standpoint of actual verification, indisputable demonstration.

He sums it all up in the comprehensive phrase, "Tariff is the mother of trusts."

Mr. Havemeyer, with a lavish array of argument, based upon long personal experience, says:

The mother of all trusts is the customs tariff bill. The existing bill and the preceding one have been the occasion of the formation of all the large trusts with very few exceptions, inasmuch as they provide for an inordinate protection to all the interests of the country—sugar refining excepted. Economic advantages incident to the consolidation of large interests in the same line of business are a great incentive to their formation, but these bear a very insignificant proportion to the advantages granted in the way of protection under the customs tariff.

There probably is not an industry that requires a protection of more than 10 per cent ad valorem, and it is to obtain what is provided over such percentage in the tariff that leads to the formation of what are commonly spoken of as "trusts." With a protection to an industry not exceeding 10 per cent, all menace of trusts to the community would cease.

* * * * * * *

In fact, the tariff bill clutches the people by the throat, and then the governors and the attorneys-general of the several States take action, not against the cause, but against the machinery which the people employ to rifle the public's pockets.

* * * * * * *

I repeat that all this agitation against trusts is against merely the business machinery employed to take from the public what the Government in its tariff laws says it is proper and suitable they should have. It is the Government, through its tariff laws, which plunders the people, and the trusts, etc., are merely the machinery for doing it.

* * * * * * *

The true "communism of pelf" is the customs tariff bill. It says to the people, "Here is the law we have enacted for your robbery. Do not complain of it, but do your utmost to attack and injure the machinery engaged in extracting from you what we legislate shall be taken from you.

"Keep up the clatter while the voters on the tariff bill take advantage of the noise to enact laws that cause your impoverishment and thus contribute to the greed and avarice of the few." (See Hearings before Industrial Commission, 1899.)

I here give a table showing the imports under the Wilson tariff law in 1896 and the Dingley tariff law for 1897:

	Values.	Duties.	Ad valorem.
			Per cent.
Wilson law, 1896	$387,579,729.26	$155,763,251.80	40.19
Dingley law, 1897	495,204,550.94	270,094,274.25	54.66

I submit this table in full:

[Democratic Campaign Book, 1898, page 195.]

Table of imports under the Wilson law, 1896, and the Dingley law, 1897.

Schedules.	Values.	Duties.	Ad valorem.
			Per cent.
A.—Chemicals, oils, and paints:			
1896	$19,604,097.69	$5,619,239.63	28.53
Law 1897	27,466,587.84	8,423,084.54	30.67
B.—Earths, earthenware, and glassware:			
1896	22,896,254.23	8,006,839.71	35.00
Law 1897	23,506,578.01	12,303,148.97	52.47
C.—Metals, and manufactures of:			
1896	34,626,137.81	13,196,416.20	38.11
Law 1897	35,511,208.00	17,487,482.09	49.24
D.—Wood, and manufactures of:			
1896	2,446,458.93	605,749.27	24.76
Law 1897	13,953,595.19	2,439,990.99	17.49
E.—Sugar:			
1896	73,068,811.76	29,910,703.55	40.94
Law 1897	73,092,178.70	54,207,642.94	74.16
F.—Tobacco, and manufactures of:			
1896	13,625,272.51	14,859,117.02	109.06
Law 1897	13,625,272.51	16,609,080.68	121.90
G.—Agricultural products and provisions:			
1896	34,431,829.10	7,727,614.69	22.44
Law 1897	37,963,553.89	14,587,601.31	38.42
H.—Spirits, wines, and other beverages:			
1896	11,270,965.24	6,965,648.08	61.54
Law 1897	11,856,658.95	8,160,126.73	68.83
I.—Cotton manufactures:			
1896	21,279,498.43	9,311,701.76	43.75
Law 1897	21,279,498.43	11,134,764.09	52.33
J.—Flax, hemp, and jute, and manufactures of:			
1896	29,756,631.03	12,018,082.78	40.38
Law 1897	42,880,772.03	19,672,575.82	45.18
K.—Wool, and manufactures of:			
Law 1897	82,816,564.19	71,679,686.36	86.54
L.—Silk and silk goods:			
1896	26,627,731.71	12,504,006.17	46.96
Law 1897	26,627,731.71	14,221,264.82	53.41
M.—Pulp, papers, and books:			
1896	5,509,939.55	1,242,198.92	22.18
Law 1897	5,509,939.55	1,667,096.35	30.30
N.—Sundries:			
1896	42,909,564.46	10,635,995.22	24.79
Law 1897	78,023,564.00	18,214,873.64	23.35
Total:			
1896	387,579,729.26	155,763,251.80	40.19
Law 1897	495,204,550.94	270,094,274.25	54.66

[Democratic Campaign Book, 1898, page 175.]

Statement of the articles on which the duty assessed is from 50 to over 100 per cent, by groups; from 50 to 75 per cent, from 75 to 100 per cent, and those paying 100 per cent and over.

Articles.	Per cent.
Articles paying from 50 to 75 per cent.	
Chemicals, oils, and paints:	
Alcoholic perfumery	71.22
Borax, refined	71.48
Collodion and all compounds	70.42
Coloring for brandy, wine, etc	50
Copperas, or sulphate of iron	62.50
Oil, flaxseed or linseed	53.16
Opium, crude	53.48
Baryta, manufactured	53.51
Blanc-fixe, etc	55.55
White lead	61.05
Whiting and paris white, dry	69.19
Lead, acetate of, white	87.50
Lead, acetate of, brown	62.50
Preparations, medicinal, of which alcohol is a component part	70.51
Preparations used as applications to, etc	50
Santonen, and all salts thereof, etc	67.27
Soap, fancy, perfumed	50
Soda—	
Bicarbonate of	57.70
Silicate of	54.99
Vanillin	50
Earths, earthenware, and glassware:	
China, porcelain, parian ware	60
Glass and glassware—	
Bottles and vials, flint and lime, filled—	
Holding more than 1 pint	62.50
Holding not more than 1 pint and not less than ½ pint	65.22
Bottles and vials, green and colored, filled—	
Holding more than 1 pint	66.66
Holding not more than 1 pint and not less than ½ pint	71.43
Glassware, all other, plain, green, etc	60
Articles of glass, cut, engraved, painted, etc	60
Decanters, or other vessels, etc	60
Bottles, cut, engraved, painted, etc	60
Chemical glassware	60
Porcelain or opal glassware	60
Cylinder and crown glass, polished, above 24 by 30 and not above 24 by 60 inches	63.58
Plated glass, fluted, rolled, etc., all above 24 by 60 inches	74.17
Cylinder and crown glass, polished, silvered, above 24 by 30 and not above 24 by 60 inches	51.96
Cylinder and crown glass, polished, unsilvered, when ground, obscured, etc., above 24 by 30 and not above 24 by 60 inches	59.83
Cylinder and crown glass, polished, silvered, when ground, obscured, etc., above 24 by 30 and not above 24 by 60 inches	54.67
Plate glass, cast, polished, silvered, when ground, obscured, etc., above 24 by 30 and not above 24 by 60 inches	53.05
Marble and stone:	
Marble—	
Veined marble, sawed or dressed, etc	67.54
Manufactures of marble	50
Manufactures of agate	50
Manufactures of alabaster	50
Manufactures of jet	50
Freestone, granite, etc., hewn, dressed, etc	50
Metals, and manufactures of:	
Iron or steel—	
Boiler and other plate iron, iron or steel, valued above 4 cent and not above 2 cents per pound	51.70
Sheets of iron or steel, common or black, thinner than No. 25 wire gauge	55.07
Sheets of iron or steel, galvanized, thinner than No. 20 and not thinner than No. 25 wire gauge	57.37
Sheets and plates, pickled or cleaned by acids, etc.—	
Thinner than No. 20 and not thinner than No. 25 wire gauge	62.11
Thinner than No. 25 wire gauge	70.41
Sheets and plates of iron or steel, pickled or cleaned by acid, cold rolled, smoothed, etc.—	
Thinner than No. 20 and not thinner than No. 25 wire gauge	73.80
Thinner than No. 25 wire gauge	70.43
Tin plates—	
Lighter than 63 pounds per 100 square feet	64.88
All other	59.03
Wire, round iron, or steel—	
Smaller than No. 16 wire gauge	55.29
Cutlery—	
Penknives or pocket knives, valued at more than 30 cents and not exceeding 50 cents per dozen	66.67
Scissors and shears, valued at more than 50 cents and not more than $1.75 per dozen	54.63
Table and carving knives and forks	55
Files, file blanks, rasps, and floats, 4 inches in length and under	57.87
Firearms—	
Shotguns, etc., valued at not more than $10 each	50
Shotguns, sporting, breechloading, etc	60
Pistols	60
Nails, wire, made of wrought iron or steel	60.22
Saws: Mill saws	50.49
Umbrella and parasol ribs, stretcher frames, etc	50
Miscellaneous metals and manufactures of—	
Aluminum, in leaves	74.22
Gold leaf, in packages	58.24
Lead: Sheets, pipes, shot, etc	70.66
Type metal	62.30
Zinc, old and worn out, etc	61.34
Sugar:	
Cane, above No. 16 Dutch standard	74.06
Sugar candy and confectionery	50

Statement of the articles on which the duty assessed, etc.—Continued.

Articles.	Per cent.
Articles paying from 50 to 75 per cent—Continued.	
Agricultural products and provisions:	
Horses	64.59
Barley malt	52.59
Cabbages	68.11
Raisins	57.52
Eggs	53.37
Honey	52.23
Hops	53.76
Onions	57.85
Nuts—	
Almonds shelled	70.80
Filberts and walnuts, not shelled	76.29
Peanuts, or ground beans, shelled	58.82
Poultry, dressed	55.56
Chocolate, valued at exceeding 35 cents per pound	50
Dandelion root, etc	65.08
Salt	72.20
Spirits, wines, and other beverages:	
Wines—	
Champagne, containing more than 1 pint and not more than 1 quart	51.68 / 61.80
Still wines, in casks, containing more than 14 per cent of alcohol	68.20
Vermuth, in bottles, containing each more than 1 pint and not more than 1 quart	53.21
Malt liquors, not in bottles or jugs	67.83
Cotton manufactures:	
Cotton thread—	
Not colored, etc.—	
Valued at over 40 cents per pound	55
Colored—	
Valued at over 40 cents per pound	50
On spools	50.05
Cotton cloth—	
Exceeding 50 and not exceeding 100 threads, etc.—	
Dyed, colored, etc., exceeding 6 and not exceeding 9 square yards to the pound	55.09
Exceeding 100 and not exceeding 150 threads—	
Bleached, exceeding 4 and not exceeding 6 square yards to the pound	50.01
Exceeding 150 and not exceeding 200 threads—	
Not bleached—	
Exceeding 3½ and not exceeding 4½ square yards to the pound	54.36
Exceeding 4½ and not exceeding 6 square yards to the pound	50.75
Exceeding 6 square yards to the pound	55.87
Bleached—	
Exceeding 6 square yards to the pound	50.80
Exceeding 200 threads to the square inch—	
Not bleached—	
Exceeding 2½ and not exceeding 3½ square yards to the pound	55.46
Exceeding 3½ and not exceeding 5 square yards to the pound	54.46
Exceeding 5 square yards to the pound	56.17
Bleached—	
Not exceeding 2½ square yards to the pound	51.15
Exceeding 3½ and not exceeding 5 square yards to the pound	50.68
Exceeding 5 square yards to the pound	53.65
Dyed, colored, etc.—	
Not exceeding 3½ square yards to the pound	51.21
Exceeding 3½ square yards to the pound	61.02
Sleeve linings or other cloth	67.34
Corsets	50
Wearing apparel, clothing, etc	50
Plushes, velvets, and velvetcens—	
Not bleached	74.67
Bleached	74.37
Dyed, colored, stained, etc	61.88
Corduroys and other pile fabrics—	
Not bleached	69.62
Bleached	69.62
Dyed, colored, stained, etc	65.98
Chenille curtains, table covers, etc	50
Stockings, hose, and half hose	70.46
Shirts and drawers	65
Boot, shoe, and corset lacings	50
Wicking, lamp or candle, woven, etc	50
Flax, hemp, and jute, and manufactures of:	
Gill netting, nets, webs, etc	65
Matting for floors, known as Chinese matting	50
Hemp and jute carpets	66.00
Wearing apparel—	
Collars and cuffs, cotton	50.44
Collars and cuffs, linen	55.95
Shirts and all articles of wearing apparel	50
Laces, lace window curtains, etc	60
Laces, edgings, nettings, etc	60
Handkerchiefs, hemstitched	55
Do	50
Wool and manufactures of:	
Wool—	
Class 1	66.28
Class 2: Camels' hair	51.40
Class 3: Hair of the goat, alpaca, etc	50.43
Other clothing, ready-made, and articles of wearing apparel	73.88
Cloaks, dolmans, jackets, talmas, etc	74.87
Carpets—	
Aubusson, Axminster, moquette, etc	64.41
Velvet and tapestry velvet	69.67
Treble ingrain, 3-ply, etc	69.43
Wool Dutch and 2-ply ingrain	70.55
Felt carpeting	50
Of wool, etc	50

Statement of the articles on which the duty assessed, etc.—Continued.

Articles.	Per cent.
Articles paying from 50 to 75 per cent—Continued.	
Wool and manufactures of—Continued.	
Wool—Continued.	
Carpets—Continued.	
Of cotton	50
Of flax	50
Mats, rugs, etc	60
Silks, and silk manufactures:	
Plushes on which specific duty does not amount to 50 per cent	50
Velvets and chenilles on which specific duty does not amount to 50 per cent	50
Velvets and plushes on which specific duty does not amount to 50 per cent	50
Dress and piece goods	50
Handkerchiefs	50
Laces and embroideries, etc	60
Knit goods	60
Ready-made clothing	60
Beaded silk goods	60
All other manufactures of silk	50
Ribbons	60
Buttons	50
Pulp, papers and books: Papers known commercially as copying, etc	51.28
Sundries:	
Bead, beaded, or jet trimmings	60
Hats, bonnets, and hoods, etc	50
Buttons not specially provided for	50
Dice, draughts, chessmen, chess balls, etc	50
Feathers, dressed, colored, etc.—	
Ostrich	50
All other	50
Feathers and flowers, artificial, etc	50
Quilts and other manufactures of down	50
Fans, except palm leaf	50
Hats for men's, women's, and children's wear	55
Jewelry	60
Precious stones, set	60
Gloves—	
Men's "glace" finish, schmaschen—	
Lamb or sheep—	
Not over 14 inches in length, unlined	52.79
Not over 14 inches in length, lined	53.11
Of sheep origin, with exterior grain surface removed—	
Not over 17 inches in length, unlined	57.32
Goat, kid, or other leather than of sheep origin—	
Over 14 and not over 17 inches in length, lined	71.50
Over 17 inches in length, lined	67.03
Goat, kid, or other leather than of sheep origin, with exterior grain surface removed—	
Not over 14 inches in length, unlined	59.95
Not over 14 inches in length, lined	51.76
Over 17 inches in length, lined	64.96
Men's "glace" finish—	
Schmaschen, of sheep origin—Unlined	66.58
Lamb or sheep—	
Unlined	59.29
Lined	62
Of sheep origin, with exterior surface removed—	
Unlined	52.20
Lined	56.82
Goat, kid, or other leather than of sheep origin—	
Unlined	55.82
Lined	52.97
Goat, kid, or other leather than of sheep origin, with exterior surface removed—Unlined	51.52
Pencils, slate, other	58.95
Pipes and smokers' articles—	
Common tobacco pipes, clay	51.72
Pipes and pipe bowls of other material	60
Umbrellas, parasols, and sunshades—	
Covered with material composed wholly or in part of silk, etc	50
Covered with other material	50
Articles paying 75 to 100 per cent.	
Chemicals, oils, and paints:	
Castor oil	98.15
Collodion rolled in sheets	83.97
Morphia or morphine	82.64
Opium prepared for smoking	81.86
Orange mineral	83.30
Red lead	94.10
Varnish, spirit	87.38
Litharge	91.66
Strychnine	77.23
Glass and glassware:	
Plate glass, fluted, rolled, etc., above 16 by 24 and not above 24 by 30 inches	81.13
Plated glass, cast, polished—	
Above 24 by 30 and not above 24 by 60 inches	88.39
All above 24 by 60 inches	88.89
Cylinder and crown glass, polished, silvered, all above 24 by 60 inches	79.16
Plate glass, cast, polished, unsilvered, when ground, etc., above 24 by 30 and not above 24 by 60 inches	76.46
Metals;	76.08
Bronze or dutch metal, in leaf	
Cutlery—	
Penknives or pocketknives—	
Valued at more than $1 per dozen and not exceeding $1.50 per dozen	99.87
Valued at more than $1.50 per dozen and not exceeding $3 per dozen	94.46
Valued at more than $3 per dozen	92.75
Razors and razor blades	88.08
Lead contained in silver ore	94.74

Statement of the articles on which the duty assessed, etc.—Continued.

Articles.	Per cent.
Articles paying from 75 to 100 per cent—Continued.	
Sugar—all not above No. 16 Dutch standard	75
Tobacco, leaf, not stemmed	93.61
Barley	78.95
Rice, uncleaned	83.33
Chicory root, burnt or roasted	77.74
Starch	84.32
Dextrin, burnt starch, etc	76.65
Sage	78.72
Spirits, wines, etc:	
Brandy	83.17
Vermuth, containing more than 14 per cent of alcohol	80.71
Wool, manufactures of:	
Roving, roping, and tops	78.52
Blankets, valued at more than 30 and not more than 40 cents per pound	91.38
Flannels, valued at more than 30 and not more than 40 cents per pound	95.56
Blankets, valved at more than 40 cents per pound	89.91
Dress goods, etc.—	
Valued at not over 50 cents per pound	95
Valued at more than 50 cents per pound	95
Knit wearing apparel	75
Felts, valued above $1.50 per pound	85.07
Plushes, valued at over 50 cents per pound	99.93
Webbings, goring, suspenders, braces, etc	85
Carpets—	
Saxony, Wilton, and Tournay	80.22
Brussels	83.56
Tapestry Brussels	79.42
Druggets and bockings	82.22
Silks:	
Velvets and chenilles	79.63
Other	96.19
Sundries:	
Pearl and shell buttons	78.25
Blasting caps	97.17
Articles paying 100 per cent and over.	
Acids:	
Boracic	126.89
Tannic	128.15
Compounds, alcoholic, not specially provided for	349.27
Ethers:	
Sulphuric	318.33
Fruit ethers, oils, or essences	128.90
Bottles holding not more than 1 pint	115.38
Cylinder, crown, and common window glass, unpolished:	
Above 10 by 15 and not above 16 by 24 inches	125
Above 16 by 24 and not above 24 by 30 inches	139.70
Above 24 by 30 and not above 24 by 36 inches	151.31
Above 24 by 36 inches	168.82
Plate glass, fluted, rolled, etc., above 24 by 30 and not above 24 by 60 inches	109.72
Cylinder and crown glass, when ground, etc	118.73
Cutlery—penknives or pocketknives, valued at more than 50 cents per dozen and not exceeding $1 per dozen	111.05
Silver leaf	138.88
Lead, in pigs and bars	111.11
Tobacco:	
Leaf, not stemmed	153.29
Leaf, stemmed	105.14
All other	300.57
All other manufactures of	127.39
Snuff	152.71
Cigars and cheroots	123.64
Cigarettes	147.19
Animals—mules	314.20
Currants, Zante	119.87
Rice, cleaned	133.34
Salt, in bulk	114.23
Spirits, distilled:	
From grain	216.27
From other materials	346.02
Compounds or preparations	1,200.34
Cordials, liqueurs, arracks, etc	112.05
Bay rum	272.08
Wine, vermuth	129.70
Woolens:	
Wastes, bur, roving, etc	123.80
Garnetted and carded wastes	280.29
Shoddy	209.75
Noils, carbonized	109.90
Noils, n. o. p	102.09
Rags	172.63
Yarns, valued at not more than 40 cents per pound	100
Cloths, valued at not more than 50 cents per pound	157.57
Cloth, valued at more than 50 cents per pound	109.25
All other manufactures of wool valued at not over 50 cents per pound	108.62
All manufactures of wool valued at more than 50 cents per pound	102.36
Blankets—	
More than 3 yards in length, valued at not more than 50 cents per pound	154.39
Valued at not more than 30 cents per pound	113.25 / 106.53
Flannels—	
Valued at not more than 30 cents per pound	101.60
Valued at more than 40 cents per pound	101.60
Weighing over 4 ounces per square yard valued at over 50 cents per pound	113.43
Weighing over 4 ounces per square yard valued at not over 50 cents per pound	127.18
Other clothing, ready-made, etc., valued at less than $1.50 per pound	104.99
Shawls, valued above 40 cents per pound	100.59

Statement of the articles on which the duty assessed, etc.—Continued.

Articles.	Per cent.
Articles paying 100 per cent and over—Continued.	
Woolens—Continued.	
Shawls, woolen or worsted, valued at not over 40 cents per pound	105.85
Knit fabrics—	
Valued at not over 40 cents per pound	184.75
Valued at above 40 cents per pound	117.75
Hats of wool—	
Valued at not more than 30 cents per pound	235.58
Valued at more than 30 and not more than 40 cents per pound	176.67
Valued at more than 40 cents per pound	130.65
Felts—	
Valued at not more than 30 cents per pound	379.94
Valued at more than 30 and not more than 40 cents per pound	179.34
Valued at more than 40 cents per pound	127.08
Valued at less than $1.50 per pound	107.94
Plushes, valued at not more than 50 cents per pound	154.81
Pulp, paper, and books, cards, playing	110
Firecrackers of all kinds	100

Tear down protection and the trusts will subside within the reasonable and legitimate limits set by trade competition. Tear out the dam and the river will flow evenly and unmurmuringly onward. Tear down the wall and turn in foreign imports and the trusts can not combine to fleece the people.

As early as June 6, 1868, Hon. John Sherman said:

Every advance toward a free exchange of commodities is an advance in civilization; every obstruction to a free exchange is born of the same narrow, despotic spirit which planted castles upon the Rhine to plunder peaceful commerce; every obstruction to commerce is a tax upon consumption; every facility to a free exchange cheapens commodities, increases trade and production, and promotes civilization. Nothing is worse than sectionalism within a nation, and nothing is better for the peace of nations than unrestricted freedom of commerce and intercourse with each other.

Again, in a speech in the Senate on October 15, 1889, he delivered the following terse statement, going directly and conclusively to the point:

* * * The primary object of a protective tariff is to invite the fullest competition by individuals and corporations in domestic production. If such individuals or corporations combine to advance the price of the domestic product, and to prevent the free result of open and fair competition, I would, without a moment's hesitation, reduce the duties on foreign goods competing with them in order to break down the combination. * * * Whenever this free competition is evaded or avoided by combination of individuals or corporations, the duty should be reduced and foreign competition promptly invited.

No man who has lived in this Republic has been better qualified to speak advisedly, and his deliverance upon this point, even if the proposition did not sustain itself, is entitled to more weight, possibly, than any man now living. He lays down the plain remedy for the trust evil, and now that the time is come and the danger upon us, his party turns away from it and resorts to a pretense and a subterfuge.

Again, the great financier, after a fuller investigation of the causes of the trust evil, in the Senate, on March 21, 1890 (page 2456, volume 10, S. Records), said:

If the combination is aided by our tariff laws they should be promptly changed, and, if necessary, equal competition with all the world should be invited in the *monopolized* article.

[Baltimore Sun, 1890.]

Trusts fixing the price of the necessaries of life exist only to a limited extent in England. Mr. Wilhelm Berdrow, an eminent German writer on political economy, writing in the Forum of May last upon "European trusts," says:

"As far as England is concerned, it must be admitted that, notwithstanding her great industrial activity and a competitive warfare not less than that of other states, the trust system has as yet found but tardy acceptance in that country. This is doubtless due in some degree to the thorough application of the principle of free trade; for it is well known that the largest trusts are powerless unless their interests are secured by a protective tariff, excluding from the home market the products of foreign countries."

In France to-day the conditions are similar to those existing in England prior to the beginning of free trade. An army of French workmen are now preparing to move toward Paris, and in every country where protective tariffs exist many monopolies exist, markets are unstable, strikes are common, and the whole basis of trade is upon unstable foundations.

Governor Mount, of Indiana, Republican, last fall said:

I am against trusts. * * * If it is not possible to prevent these obnoxious combinations by law, then I would suggest a more radical remedy which would surely bring the trusts to time. This is what I mean: Remove the protection from the article controlled by trusts, thereby permitting open competition, and see how quickly these trusts will come to their senses.—*Pittsburg Dispatch.*

REMOVE THE DUTIES AT ONCE TO KILL THE TRUSTS, SAYS SENATOR WASHBURN

Ex-United States Senator Washburn, a Republican, in an interview published in the New York Tribune September 11, 1899, says:

There is one thing that greatly disturbs me. The Republican party, whether justly or unjustly, is associated with trusts in the minds of the masses. As a party we have reached a crisis where we have got to call a halt. The Republican party has got to disconnect itself from trusts. It has got to legislate them. The Republicans in Congress will have to examine the subject thoroughly, and whenever they find a trust is depending *for its exorbitant profits largely on protective duties, it will be the duty of Republican Congressmen and Senators to remove the duties at once. This should be done with the duty on steel rails and tin plate.*

Mr. Bryan says:

Some have suggested the free list as a cure-all remedy for the trusts. There is no doubt that the removal of the tariff from a trust-made article would reduce the extortion, but would it necessarily destroy the trusts? If, for instance, steel rails can be sold for $15 per ton in both Europe and the United States, a tariff of $9 per ton would enable the domestic manufacturers to form a combination and raise the price of steel rails in the United States to $24 per ton. A law putting steel rails upon the free list would prevent the extortion, but if steel rails can be produced in the United States as cheaply as elsewhere, a steel-rail trust could be formed without the aid of any tariff wall; and a trust organized under those conditions would be able to control the price of the product as well as fix the rate of wages and the price of raw material.

Whenever an article can be exported in competition with foreign products a trust formed in that article can collect from the consumer the foreign price plus the cost of transportation, and we are yearly increasing our export of manufactured products. It is evident that we are constantly adding to the number of articles which trusts could control without the aid of import duties.

Tariff reform, therefore, or even free trade, would be only a partial remedy. To advance this as the only remedy or as a complete remedy would not only prove a disappointment to the opponents of monopoly, but it would probably rally the protectionists to the support of the trusts.

Extortion is, however, only one of the evils flowing from monopoly. There are other evils which, though less noticeable, are not less dangerous to our country. Mr. Havemeyer's broad defense of trust principles is therefore deserving of as much attention as his condemnation of a high tariff.

A thousand witnesses might be summoned, but can they be needed to sustain such a patent proposition, so clearly true and so clearly stated by these great financial experts?

And yet, in the face of that, the Republican party, after wasting three years of opportunity, controlling the Executive, the Senate, and the House, comes here in this last expiring moment of the session and dares to insult public intelligence with the false pretense that this is a remedy, dares to attempt to hoodwink the American people with this miserable subterfuge, conceived to deceive and to serve the purpose of a campaign pretense.

And this same Republican party, after wasting all these years of opportunity to concoct this brazen eleventh-hour deception, will have the audacity to go to Philadelphia on the 19th of June and proclaim its opposition to trusts, well knowing that it dare not injure them, well knowing that it has no remote intention of suppressing them, and well knowing that the remedy they now propose is a sham, made with deliberate purpose to betray the people and perpetuate the trusts in all their enormity and rapacious greed.

UNCHAIN THE CHAINS.

The St. Louis Republic in its issue of April 23, 1890, thus quotes Hon. Thomas G. Shearman upon this point, and I call attention to its remarkable perspicacity and lucidity:

A large variety of causes have been assigned for the observed failure of anti-trust laws to accomplish their object. The failure has been attributed to the corruption of courts, the disinclination of public officials to enforce anti-trust laws, the employment by the trusts of the best legal talent the country offers, the laws' indefiniteness arising from the difficulty of discriminating between the legitimate business corporation and the combination designed to suppress competition.

Attorney Thomas G. Shearman, of Brooklyn, points out what he believes to be the real cause:

"Combinations subversive of competition," he says, "are always founded on a monopoly of natural resources. These monopolies owe their existence to special unjust privileges conferred upon them by legislation. The foundation principle of these combinations is restriction. Every effort thus far made by legislatures to destroy these combinations has been in the form of still further restriction. Competition is tied up in chains by trust monopolies, and Congress and the legislatures try to nullify the chains by chaining the chains. That is why anti-trust laws fail.

"The tariff laws," continues Mr. Shearman, "are among these legislative restrictions. The inconsistency of any man who demands that competition shall be free when it works in his favor but shall be prohibited when it works against him is obvious. But it is not so obvious to the ordinary mind that it is just as absurd to insist upon freedom of competition within the borders of the United States while excluding competition from without. The demand for freedom of competition at home while denying freedom of competition from abroad is absurd and suicidal. The laws of nature can not be persuaded to work only halfway."

PRESIDENT M'KINLEY AND HIS PARTY.

In discussing the Mills bill, Representative William McKinley, jr., then a member of the House and now President of the United States, on Friday, May 18, 1888, in a speech which I hold in my hand, said that Congress had the power to "control" trusts formed in the United States. He discussed both foreign trusts and domestic trusts. He said that we could not crush the foreign trusts—trusts of Europe—but we could crush the home trusts, the ones now in question, that are dominating the courts of Ohio, running the legislature of that State, and that are controlling, in and out of Congress, the Republican party that has control of that trust-ridden State. I quote from Representative McKinley's speech, which I have in pamphlet form, it having been used as a campaign document at that time:

We should crush out those (trusts) at home and do nothing to encourage those (trusts) abroad who organize to prey upon the American market.

Again he says: "*We can control the former*"—that is, the home trusts; those *then* (in 1888) as *now* (1900) in existence in the United States—"but," says he, "the latter"—that is, the foreign trusts—"while robbing our own citizens, are beyond our control and out of our jurisdiction."

We can "crush," he says, the home trusts. Then why do we want an amendment to the present Constitution *that was in existence May 18, 1888, when this speech was made?* Why paralyze State rights and smother out State sovereignty reprehended by General GROSVENOR so summarily in this House December 15 last and in a published letter before Congress met? Why does the President, if we can "crush" trusts, want *this* amendment? Why does he permit *his party*, although in bad faith, *to undertake its passage?*

If the President is really an enemy of trusts, why was he silent during the entire extra session of the Fifty-fifth Congress, beginning March 15, 1897, and ending about the last of July? Why nothing on trusts in his messages to Congress during that long session when the Congress did nothing but pass the Dingley bill?

If an enemy of trusts, why did he not denounce the home-robber trust to this idle House and put it to work with a strong message on the subject of trusts?

Why did he let the distinguished Speaker, the great Republican leader, dominate the House and refuse to appoint committees so that the House of its own volition could enact anti-trust legislation?

Why did he lose all of this good time in doing absolutely nothing himself and without directing his party what to do? Why should he be a trust follower instead of a party leader? *Why did he wait until all but a year of his entire term as President of the United States had expired before he uttered a word on the trust question?* And then what did he say?

He simply said that there were some trusts in the country about which he had heard, and submitted the matter to the consideration of Congress. What Congress? A Republican Congress—trustee for the trusts! *He did not suggest even a plan*—not even an amendment to the existing law or Constitution. He suggested nothing. He did not say that we could not "crush" trusts under the present Constitution and that we wanted an amendment, *but submitted* the matter to Congress. And what has his Congress done? They reported this amendment and the Littlefield bill a few days before Congress adjourned and, I believe, after the House had set June 6 to adjourn and did adjourn June 7. The Littlefield bill reported was not *introduced* until *April 7*, 1900. The bill and amendment were reported May 16 and 15 respectively, and taken up for debate on May 31 in the House.

The proposed amendment met a righteous defeat, for the Democrats knew, as President McKinley had said in good or bad faith in 1888, that Congress *now* has the power to "crush" trusts engaged in foreign and interstate commerce and foreign corporations and corporate bodies dealing in that commerce. *So* the Democrats voted against it.

They suggested various amendments strengthening the Littlefield bill, which undertook to *strengthen* the Sherman law, the antitrust act of 1890. Nearly all of the proposed changes to that law have been made by Democrats on this side of the House, as the Littlefield bill and amendments, and the Congressional debates show.

NONENFORCEMENT OF THE ANTI-TRUST ACT OF 1890.

Again, President McKinley's Administration has *not enforced the existing law of 1890.* The official records show this. I defy successful refutation of this statement. I will prove it. There have been *only three cases filed against trusts during this Administration*, as shown by a letter from Attorney-General Griggs to me. His letter gives the style of the cases as follows:

"*United States vs. Anderson et al. Reported in 171 U. S., 604. Suit begun June 7, 1897. Finally decided October 24, 1898.*

United States vs. Coal Dealers' Association. Reported in 85 Fed. Rep., 252. Suit brought December 16, 1897. Decided January 28, 1898.

United States vs. Chesapeake and Ohio Fuel Company. Suit to restrain brought about May 1, 1899. Argued and submitted, but not decided.

Indictments were also returned against the members of the association about May —, 1899, to which demurrers were filed. These demurrers have been argued and submitted to the court, but have not been passed upon by the court."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., May 29, 1900.

SIR: Please cause me to be accurately informed of the exact date of the filing of suit in each of the following cases instituted in your Department under the Sherman Act:

United States *vs.* Coal Dealers' Association.
United States *vs.* Anderson et al.
United States vs. E. C. Knight Company.
United States *vs.* Nelson et al.
United States *vs.* Chesapeake and Ohio Fuel Company.
United States *vs.* Jellico Mountain Coal and Coke Company.
United States *vs.* Moore.
United States *vs.* Joint Traffic Association.
United States *vs.* Greenhut et al.
United States *vs.* Addystone Pipe and Steel Company.
United States *vs.* Trans-Mississippi Freight Association.
United States *vs.* Hopkins et al.
United States *vs.* Patterson et al.

Very respectfully,

JOHN W. GAINES.

The Honorable ATTORNEY-GENERAL.

At page 26 of the Report of the Attorney-General, 1899, just preceding this list of cases, the Attorney-General says:

The following list comprises the suits hitherto instituted on behalf of the Government under that act (1890) against business combinations.

I addressed this letter to Attorney-General Griggs to ascertain when each of these suits was filed, he having power under the act of 1890 to order or not to order suits to be filed. His reply is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL.
Washington, D. C., May 31, 1900.

SIR: I have compiled and hand you herewith a statement showing, as completely as I can from the records of this office, the information you ask for concerning certain suits instituted in the Department of Justice under the Sherman Act. I may explain, by way of accounting for the absence of definite dates in some of the cases, that prior to the 1st of July, 1899, no general docket was kept in this Department and no docket attorney was allowed.

Very respectfully,

JOHN W. GRIGGS, *Attorney-General.*

Hon. JOHN W. GAINES,
House of Representatives.

Information requested by Hon. John W. Gaines, M. C., on May 29, 1900, respecting the dates on which suits were brought or proceedings instituted in the following cases, under the anti-trust law:

United States *vs.* Trans-Missouri Freight Association. Reported in 53 Fed. Rep., 440; 58 Fed. Rep., 58; 166 U. S., 290. Suit instituted January 6, 1892. Finally decided March 22, 1897.

United States *vs.* E. C. Knight Company. Reported in 60 Fed. Rep., 306; 156 U. S., 1. Instituted May 2, 1892. Finally decided January 21, 1895.

United States *vs.* Greenhut et al. Reported in 50 Fed. Rep., 469. Indictment quashed May 16, 1892. In connection with this case see in re Corning, 51 Fed. Rep., 205; in re Terrell, 51 Fed. Rep., 213; in re Greene, 52 Fed. Rep., 104.

United States *vs.* Jellico Mountain Coke and Coal Company. Reported in 43 Fed. Rep., 898. Decided October 13, 1890.

United States *vs.* Nelson et al. Reported in 52 Fed. Rep., 646. Decided October 10, 1892.

United States *vs.* Patterson et al. Reported in 55 Fed. Rep., 605; 59 Fed. Rep., 280. Decided February 28, 1893, and June 1, 1893.

In re Debs, reported in 158 U. S., 564. Suit begun July 2, 1894.

United States *vs.* Joint Traffic Association. Reported in 76 Fed. Rep., 895; 45 C. C. Ap. Rep., 702; 171 U. S., 505. Instituted January 8, 1896. Finally decided October 24, 1898.

United States *vs.* Addyston Pipe and Steel Company. Reported 78 Fed. Rep., 712; 85 Fed. Rep., 271; 175 U. S., 211. Suit instituted December 10, 1896; finally decided December 4, 1899.

United States *vs.* Moore et al. Reported 85 Fed. Rep., 465. Indictments returned November 4, 1896; dismissed by court February 14, 1898.

United States *vs.* Hopkins et al. Reported 82 Fed. Rep., 529; 171 U. S., 578. Suit brought December 31, 1896; finally decided October 24, 1898.

United States *vs.* Anderson et al. Reported 171 U. S., 604. Suit begun June 7, 1897; finally decided October 24, 1898.

United States *vs.* Coal Dealers' Association. Reported 85 Fed. Rep., 252. Suit brought December 16, 1897; decided January 28, 1898.

United States *vs.* Chesapeake and Ohio Fuel Company. Suit to restrain, brought about May 1, 1899. Argued and submitted, but not decided.

Indictments were also returned against the members of the association about May, 1899, to which demurrers were filed. These demurrers have been argued and submitted to the court, but have not been passed upon by the court.

Where it has been possible from records in this Department to give the exact date of the bringing of a suit or the finding of an indictment it has been done. Where no record exists of such fact, the date when the case was decided has been given.

MAY 31, 1900.

This is the record (three case "filed") of this Administration in the face of the fact that the law is *well settled* that Congress has the power to "crush" these interstate trusts; that it *has* "prohibited" interstate trusts and foreign commerce, and regulates the means of its transportation; that thousands and thousands of trusts have been formed in recent years and months and are daily being formed under high Republican tariffs.

Comparatively speaking, there were but few trusts in this country, and they were leading trusts, when the trust act of 1890 *was passed, and up until the past three years*, or "*within the past eighteen months*," *as the Columbus, Ohio, merchants said last fall.* Knowing that this Administration was a trust-created Administration and would defend trusts, they have risen up like mushrooms all over the country and are strangling the people's rights, and yet with these thousands of trusts preying upon the people, and the people praying for the Attorney-General to *evoke his mighty power to "crush"* them, which he alone could *order done under the act of 1890*, he has violated his promises, refused to answer questions, sat back, apparently, and simply ordered three suits to be filed in three years, when hundreds could have been properly filed.

AS GOVERNOR OF OHIO, PRESIDENT MCKINLEY WAS THE FRIEND OF TRUSTS, THE RECORDS SHOW.

But this is not all of the record of the Republican party nor of Mr. McKinley as a public official.

THE RECORD OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY IN THE STATE OF OHIO, SHOWING ITS LOVE FOR TRUSTS RATHER THAN ITS HATRED FOR THEM.

President McKinley was governor of Ohio for four years—two terms—and although he dominated during this time Republican legislatures, no anti-trust laws were enacted in Ohio and no prosecutions instituted against trusts. I now prove this statement by the following recent correspondence between the Hon. Frank S. Monnett, ex-attorney-general of Ohio, and myself:

WASHINGTON, *June —, 1900.*

Hon. FRANK S. MONNETT,
Columbus, Ohio:

Was any anti-trust law enacted while McKinley was governor of Ohio?

JOHN W. GAINES.

Here is his answer:

COLUMBUS, OHIO, *June —, 1900.*

Hon. JOHN W. GAINES,
Washington, D. C.:

None, and no prosecutions instituted.

F. S. MONNETT.

Such is the history of President McKinley as governor of Ohio as given by General Monnett, a leading Republican, who so bitterly fought trusts, under the anti-trust statute passed April 12, 1898, in Ohio, at his instance and suggestion, that he was entirely ignored by the Republican party which nominated Governor Nash, and his magnificent anti-trust record was passed by the Republican convention of 1899 *without indorsement.* But the Democrats did indorse Monnett.

They said:

DEMOCRATS, AUGUST 29, 1899, RECONDEMN TRUSTS AND INDORSE GENERAL MONNETT'S RECORD AGAINST TRUSTS.

We declare that all unlawful combinations of capital are the legitimate fruits of a gold standard and other corrupt Republican legislation on questions of tariff; and we demand that all articles the prices of which are controlled by trusts be placed on the free list. We denounce the Attorney-General of the United States, appointed from the State of New Jersey, the hotbed of trusts, for his refusal to enforce the statutes of the United States against them; *and we commend the present attorney-general of Ohio* [Monnett] *for his earnest efforts to enforce the statutes of Ohio against such illegal combinations, and pledge the nominee of this convention for attorney-general to the enforcement of the statutes of the State against them.*

General Monnett wrote me a letter dated January 12, 1900, published with my speech of January 19, and can be found at page 1077, volume 33, of the RECORD, and in which he said:

Our Ohio anti-trust act was passed April 18, 1898, to take effect July 1, 1898. * * *

There was no member of the house or senate that had the hardihood to stand out against the anti-trust act, and there was only one man that was accused of dodging the vote and trying to do something against it. At least he did not vote for it, and is now holding a *Federal place.*

Both Democrats and Republicans voted for the anti-trust act of Ohio of April 18, 1898, passed under the administration of the then Governor Bushnell and at the instance of General Monnett, and the only man who was unpatriotic enough to *not vote at all* on the measure *is now holding a Federal office—a premium on a "people-be-damned" servant.*

General Monnett's letter continues:

We took the Sherman anti-trust act, *the Texas act*, and compared the various trust acts of other States, and think we got the best for our State of any that were heretofore enacted. The objectionable feature, or rather the weak part, of the act has proved to be that we can not procure the testimony of interested parties, for the reason that they claim the right of the Federal and State constitutions, on the ground that such testimony would criminate themselves.

Note well there was no "weak part" found in the Texas statute. It stood the test in the trial, Civil Court of Appeals and in the Supreme Court of the United States, and crushed an oil trust in Texas. Though patterned after the Texas act, the Ohio statute is found "weak," made by a Republican legislature, enforced or not enforced, by Republican officials, and by such nonenforcement, General Monnett in an interview of June 5, in the New York Journal, says:

The Standard Oil trust has for eight years defied the supreme court of Ohio, and yet without punishment. A Republican legislature in Ohio deliberately voted down every anti-trust resolution offered this winter at the dictation of the bosses at Washington and the trust magnates of New York.

What became of this anti-trust amendment and all the other anti-trust bills introduced in this Republican legislature, dominated by a Republican governor and United States Senator from everywhere, Marcus A. Hanna? They were defeated.

General Monnett says:

The legislature killed the Russell bill and the freight maximum bill "by almost a strict party vote." Although the Russell bill was bill No. 10, it was side tracked by the trust lobbyists and held back over the protest of some Republicans "and almost all the Democratic members."

He further says:

This was a repudiation of the party platform and the sentiment of the party.

How can the Republican party be trusted on the trust question to live up to its national platform on this subject with such a record as this at home?

RUSSELL ANTI-TRUST BILL NO. 10 HELD UP, SIDE TRACKED, AND DEFEATED OVER PROTESTS OF DEMOCRATS, ALTHOUGH REPUBLICAN PLATFORM DEMANDED THE AMENDMENTS.

Ex-Attorney-General Frank S. Monnett, of Ohio, in an interview on the 19th instant, says Ohio will be lost to the Republicans this fall.

"I do not see how the Republican party can escape punishment this fall," said he.

"The platform of the Republican party in Ohio strongly condemns the trusts and their unlawful methods. I was elected as attorney-general of Ohio on such a platform, and as the officer of the State and the representative of the party I carried out as best I could the platform of the party.

"Yet I was not supported in this by many of the leaders, and the party organs criticised me for doing just what the platform of my party pledged me to do. Newspapers of the State, about 110 of them, printed paid articles criticising my actions, and they, too, party newspapers."

PROPOSED OHIO REPUBLICAN ANTI-TRUST PLANK IN 1899.

We heartily approve the action of the seventy-third general assembly of Ohio (1898) on the passage of stringent laws now on our statute books forbidding the organization of business combinations known as trusts and combines, and declare such unlawful combines as inimical to the best interests

of the people, and we congratulate the Republican party on the fact that a Republican legislature and Republican Congress were the creators and authors of such laws, and we demand the full execution of this legislative act and pledge the enactment of such further measures as may be necessary to destroy such unlawful organizations.

The above was the resolution as at first introduced and telegraphed the day before to the Commercial-Tribune, which headed it:

The Trusts Doomed—Enactment of Laws Necessary to Destroy Unlawful Combines Pledged.

Following is as it passed:

OHIO STATE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM, JUNE 2, 1899.

We commend the action of the seventy-third general assembly of Ohio in passing the stringent law now on our statute books prohibiting the organization of "trusts," and we denounce such unlawful combinations as inimical to the interests of the people. We congratulate the people of the State upon the fact that a Republican legislature enacted this law, and we demand its rigid enforcement. We pledge our party to such further legislation as experience may determine necessary to prevent the formation and operation of such iniquitous and dangerous combinations.

TRUSTS DEFY THE OHIO COURTS.

The trusts have defied the supreme court of Ohio for eight years and are yet without punishment. In a common-law action in 1892, the Standard Oil Company was denied the right to enter into a contract with the Standard Oil trust, because it created a monopoly contrary to public policy and the common law. The case is Watson *vs.* The Standard Oil Company, 49th Ohio State, 189. This is what the *common* law enforced could and did do, and six years before the anti trust statute of Ohio of April 12, 1898. Something is wrong. The courts, the prosecuting officials, or the statute composed of the best part of the Texas statute and others, is weaker now than the common law which this statute is supposed to intensify and invigorate. Under the common law, they are restrained; under the statute law as enforced, they defy the courts and go unpunished. What is the matter? General Monnett answers my question in a recent interview in the New York Journal, in which he says:

"This is not all. The legislature which has just adjourned killed the Russell bill and the maximum freight bill, and that too by almost a strict party vote. Will not the people punish the party for such actions upon the part of its servants? The party, as such, is not in sympathy with such methods.

"Although the Russell bill was bill No. 10, it was side tracked by the trust lobbyists and held back until near the adjournment and then over the protest of some of the best men of the party, and almost all of the Democratic members, it was defeated.

"This was a repudiation of the party platform and the sentiment of the party. I can not believe that we will escape punishment, and I believe it will come this fall. Why should not the party be punished when the men who control its actions disregard the will of the people?" (General Monnett, interview in New York Journal, June 5.)

PUBLIC POLICY IN OHIO IN 1892—WHAT IS IT NOW?

I would call attention to our own supreme court holding in the Salt case—

Where, I may add, a salt monopoly, under the common-law action, was broken up—

and the public policy of Ohio—*at least, such as it used to be*—which favored competition in trade, to the end that its commodities may be afforded to the consumer as cheaply as possible, and is opposed to monopolies, which tend to advance market prices to the injury of the general public.

The public policy, then, of Ohio, that used to be otherwise, has changed—changed in favor of combines that raise prices and rob the people. What has wrought this change? The Democrats, without a variation, have supported all anti-trust legislation in Ohio. They voted for the original act of 1898 as a unit and for the amendment offered and defeated in the last legislature, just adjourned, to strengthen the "weak" places in the existing law, with a solid opposition by the Republican party, dominated by the trust kings of Washington City and New York. Can we trust such a party, State or national? Can we stand such a party four years longer? Should we stand it? Who are these trust-dominating kings?

"Seventy-five city sales agents of local wholesale houses of Columbus, Ohio, met there October 29, 1899," and passed, says the Cincinnati Enquirer, the following resolution:

During the last *eighteen months* trusts have been formed without number, until to-day we find every article of household use controlled by trusts or combinations, with a rise in price of from 50 to 150 per cent.

The resolution concludes as follows:

Whereas the Hon. MARCUS ALONZO HANNA, the political godfather of the Republican party, takes great pleasure in declaring trusts a good thing: Therefore

Resolved, That we denounce the Republican party as the mother of trusts and pledge our best efforts to defeat Hannaism at the polls on November 7, 1899.

But these patriots were defeated, trusts were victorious, and their mouthpiece, Governor Nash, was reelected, who, in his campaign for governor last year, in a speech reported in the Philadelphia North American (Republican), defended trusts, as follows:

Within the last few years many of the business men of this company have consolidated their great interests into corporations and combinations which are popularly known as trusts. The men who conduct our manufactures, trade, and commerce are generally intelligent, farseeing citizens, with patriotism equal to that of any other class of citizens. I am very loath to believe that these men would knowingly do anything that would be detrimental to the country or to their fellow-citizens.

Are we surprised, with such a governor, that all anti-trust legislation should be smothered by the legislature which he dominated?

Senator CHANDLER, in an interview July 7, 1899, said:

I am afraid the Republicans will not be as sincere and earnest in doing this work—

Legislating against trusts, State and national—

as they ought to be. The other day I saw a cartoon in which Mr. HANNA was bearing aloft a banner inscribed "No trusts," while all the leaders of trusts were pressing forward with immense money donations to the treasury of the national committee. The idea suggested must be dispelled in order to carry on a successful canvass.

Ex-United States Senator Washburne, September 10, 1899, said:

The Republican party, whether justly or unjustly, is associated with trusts in the minds of the masses. As a party, we have reached a crisis where we have got to call a halt. The Republican party has got to disconnect itself from trusts. It has got to legislate them.

Disconnect and legislate them. Did they *disconnect* or legislate in Ohio in the legislature that has just disgraced itself on that subject by adjourning without strengthening the present "weak" anti-trust law of that State? It is strange, I may say, that the Ohio law was patterned after the Texas law and yet is a dead letter. The Texas law is crushing trusts, domestic and foreign. It crushed a foreign oil corporation doing State and interstate business by excluding it from doing State trade in Texas. Why does this law fail in Ohio and succeed in Texas? It is because faithful Democratic officials and unsuspected courts and un-Hannaized juries enforce it.

The Washington Post of December 25, 1899, Christmas Day, exploits the fact that the supreme court of Ohio had acted as Santa Claus for the people of that great State by dismissing a quo warranto proceedings under the anti-trust law of Ohio in the noted case against the biscuit trust. The communication is thus headed:

Biscuit trust not ousted from Ohio.

And says:

The supreme court has dismissed the ouster suit brought against the National Biscuit Company by the attorney-general.

Not Attorney-General Monnett, if you please. He is an *ex-ray*, remember. He saw too far for the trusts, and he was beheaded, but was succeeded by an able and efficient "unknown" lawyer—the inefficient (?), unpatriotic (?), unfaithful (?), unfit (?) General Monnett had been turned down and out!

Again, Senator HANNA, in the course of the campaign in Ohio last fall, warmly advocating the trust-loving Mr. Nash in his candidacy for reelection, at different times thus showed he was the bold advocate and friend of trusts.

Trusts are good things.
There is not a trust in the United States.
What harm can these trusts do the people of this country?
It may be that the trusts will do the people harm. If they do, the Republican party will take care of that.

How, I ask? By killing all anti-trust laws, as recently done in Ohio, and the Federal law, and smothering those in Congress?

It is evolution in business. (Trusts!)
There is no such thing.
I say there are no trusts. If there are, prove it.
We know our business.

"*WE*," not wee-wee, but WE, giant "we," that was not made to be downed as long as the Republican party is in power, State and national.

The trusts have the best men in the country at their head.
I believe in their organization.
The formation of trusts is a step forward.
The combination of corporations is simply the evolution of business.
I am not defending the trusts, nor am I repudiating a single word or phrase in the Republican platform.—*Cincinnati Enquirer*, October 28, 1899.

Who *did* repudiate your platform against trusts upon which Mr. Nash was elected governor last fall? Your Republican legislature, "at the dictation of the bosses at Washington and the trust magnates of New York," by killing the "Russell bill No. 10."

The Republicans here point with pride to the history of anti-trust lawsuits in the State of Ohio and to the execution of the law in that State by Republican officials. Too much praise can not be given to General Monnett. He has been, and is still, a hero in the fight. Turn to a case reported in 60 Ohio State Reports, page —, in re Jennings (habeas corpus), and you will find one of the juridical adversities that confronted General Monnett in his efforts to convict the Buckeye Pipe Line Company, which, he says, is "one of the constituent companies of the Standard Oil Company." He had instituted a suit against it styled "State of Ohio ex rel. Monnett, attorney-general, *vs.* Buckeye Pipe Line Company."

In that case a witness refused to answer questions which General Monnett contended were relevant and pertinent and by which he sought to educe certain proof going to show this pipe line had violated the anti-trust law of Ohio. The witness refused to answer or produce certain records. The notary public (by admitted authority, as this opinion states) committed the recalcitrant to jail, but the supreme court (Republican, of course) of Ohio immediately turned him out; as the decree shows (60 Ohio State

Report), and left Monnett the laughingstock, as he is now the political victim, of the trusts and the Republican party of Ohio. General Monnett says that "there are many cases pending"—that is, I suppose, when he was attorney-general—"thereunder" (that is, under this anti-trust statute), but I can find not a single one that has found its way to the supreme court of that State as late as 60 Ohio State Report (1899); but we do know that the public press, as I have stated, says that the supreme court refused to oust the "biscuit trust" on Christmas day last.

I have already shown by General Monnett's own words that the Standard Oil trust is still in existence in the State of Ohio, and that, too, in the face of the trust laws of that State.

It is contended here that in some cases (and the 49 Ohio State Report case is alluded to by the advocates of this amendment as a case) the Standard Oil Company was "ousted from the State of Ohio." The report of the case shows it is not true. The judgment in that case was (page 189, 49 Ohio State Report):

Judgment ousting the defendant from the right to *make the agreement* set forth in the petition *and of the power to perform the same.*

Judgment for what? Depriving the defendant of the right to *make* the agreement and the power to *perform* the same. Not a judgment ousting the company nor taking from it its charter granted by the State of Ohio as shown by this report of this case. There were three questions which Justice Minshall, speaking for the court, passed on in that case, to wit (I quote the words of the court):

First question or issue:

1. Should the defendant, the Standard Oil Company, be regarded as a party in its corporate capacity to the agreement constituting the Standard Oil trust?

The court answered this question in the *affirmative.*

Second question or issue:

2. Had the company power to become a party to such an agreement?

The court answered this in the *negative*, saying that this contract was void as against public policy and the common law of that State (not the anti-trust law, because it was not passed until 1898 and this opinion was given in 1892).

The third question or issue was:

3. If so, is the right of the State to demand a forfeiture of its corporate franchises, or of the *power to make and perform such agreements*, barred by lapse of time?

The court answered the last proposition in the negative; that is, that the lapse of time had not run and that the company did not have the power to make and perform such agreements and as the judgment shows, it (the defendant) *was ousted from the right to make the agreement and of the power to perform the same.* But the court did not adjudge nor declare a *forfeiture of the corporate franchise* of the Standard Oil Company. The court found as facts in the course of its opinion:

By this agreement, indirectly, it is true, but none *the less effectually*, the defendant is controlled and managed by the Standard Oil trust, an association with its principal office in New York City, and *organized for a purpose contrary to the policy of our laws.* Its object was to establish a virtual monopoly of the business of producing petroleum, and of manufacturing, refining, and dealing in it and all its products throughout the entire country, and by which it might not merely control the production, but the price, at its pleasure. All such associations are contrary to the policy of our State, and void.

Citing the 77 Michigan case, Buhl *vs.* Richardson, General Alger's match monopoly case. This defendant company undertook, but was not allowed then (1892), to enter into this contract with the Standard Oil trust.

On page 183 the court says:

In other words, it—

The Standard Oil Company—

is to be managed in the interest of the Standard Oil trust, whose principal place of business is in New York City, irrespective of what might be its (Standard Oil Company's) duties to the people of this State, from which it derives its corporate life; and its real stockholders receive their dividends from the profits of that TRUST, and not from the *earnings of their company* * * *.

This particular agreement was annulled and prohibited, *but where is the case holding that the Standard Oil Company has been deprived of its corporate life by the State of Ohio?*

I have searched diligently the reports of the supreme court of Ohio down through Report No. 60 containing decisions of the year 1899. It goes unpunished, directly or indirectly. And so with the Standard Oil trust, a New York or foreign corporation doing a State and interstate business in Ohio. The State law if enforced, as in the Texas case, would drive it from that State. The act of 1890 by Federal procedure could destroy its interstate business. Existing in New York, doing business in Ohio, would make its business either interstate or State or both. Yet Attorney-General Griggs has refused repeatedly to institute suits against this trust.

And General Monnett says both the Standard Oil Company and this "*trust* have defied the courts of Ohio for eight years." Again, why do not the Republican governor, Mr. Roosevelt, and the Republican legislature of New York attack this trust? The supreme court of Ohio says its main office is in New York and its business contrary to public policy. Why not? Here are plain cases of the failure of State and national officers to do their "plain duty."

Here is an official adjudication in the forty-ninth Ohio case showing this trust is a monopoly, so intended and so acting, contrary to the common law of New York, Ohio, and in all the States, and to the statute law of Ohio and the Federal act of 1890. I insert here letters from Mr. Rice, of Ohio, to Attorney-General of the United States, Mr. Griggs, that are shocking to the enemies of trusts and sweet consolation to their friends. I should say that Mr. "John K. Richards, Acting Attorney-General of the United States," is an Ohio lawyer; General Griggs, a New Jersey lawyer; Mr. Rice, an Ohio Republican. Mr. Rice in a letter to Mr. LENTZ, May 30, 1900, says:

I have been a Republican all my life and supposed my party was faithful to its trust, but this correspondence with the Attorney-General and the President leads me to suspect that the Standard Oil trust and not the Republican party is running our National Government.

General Monnett says that the Russell bill No. 10 and all anti-trust bills were defeated by the Republican party at the dictation of corrupt influences from Washington and New York.

[Cincinnati Enquirer, October 28, 1899.]

THE GREAT CONTRADICTION.

The man whose aim is success, irrespective of how it is obtained, of necessity becomes a contradiction. This truth is forcibly illustrated in the career of M. A. HANNA. It is an old saying that "liars should have good memories." It is unnatural to be a liar. It is natural to tell the truth. When it is not told some reason, generally false, has intervened to make it appear the better to tell a falsehood. It is not the better. It is weakness which suggests it, and it is an exception when a train of evils do not follow the telling of a lie. It is better, therefore, to tell the truth even though the matter at issue is difficult to defend. Indeed some of his enterprises are beyond the pale of defense.

In this latter case a lie will never do. If any scheme of adventure, having for its object personal gain, is bolstered up by a falsehood the chances are ten to one that it will fail. It seems impossible to keep a straight path when the object sought is unworthy. Mr. HANNA is blindly seeking to deceive the people. His memory is bad. He contradicts himself. He may be called the "great contradiction" of the age in which he lives. It is probable that he is a "contradiction" by intent. It is so easy for him to forget anything which does not serve his purpose that it would be strange if he were not a "contradiction." One moment he claims that "trusts are good things." The next moment he declares "There is not a trust in the United States." Then he asks the question, "What harm can these 'trusts' do the people of this country?" He answers the question with a guess: "It may be that the 'trusts' will do the people harm;" and as an antidote to the possibility he suggests, "If they do, the Republican party will take care of that." Then he exclaims, "It is evolution in business. Trusts!" he exclaims, "there is no such thing." Then he declares, "The 'trusts' have the best men of the country at their head. I believe in their organization." Then he cries, "The story that I have defended 'trusts' in any of my speeches is absolutely false." Then he asks, "What harm can these 'trusts' do the people of this country?" Then he says, "I say that there are no 'trusts.' If there are, prove it."

What a wretched memory plagues Mr. HANNA. It does not seem possible that a man of Mr. HANNA'S prominence should forget his every utterance as soon as it is from his tongue. Now, from the conglomeration of ideas we think it safe to conclude that Mr. HANNA'S position as to "trusts" is clearly set forth in the following utterances, which he unquestionably made:

"We know our business." "The English Government is as good as ours." "The great commercial success of England has been due to 'trusts.'" "The 'trusts' have the best men in the country at their head. I believe in their organization." "The formation of 'trusts' is a step forward." "The combination of corporations is simply the evolution of business." "I do not know of a 'trust' in the United States." "I say there are no 'trusts.' If there are, prove it." "There is not a 'trust' in the United States." "I am not defending 'trusts,' nor am I repudiating a single word or phrase in the Republican platform." "Go outside and soak your head."

And thus we have the views of the Cleveland gentleman, who is wearing the Senatorial shoes of John Sherman.

CENTRALIZATION—A REPUBLICAN POLICY.

This amendment is *proof* of the fact, often charged, that the Republican party believes in *centralization;* that all our laws should be made at Washington by Congress; that State lines should be obliterated; instead of all power being "inherent in the people," that all power should be vested in and go out from the President and Congress; that this should be an empire instead of a Republic; that the President, who is elected under and by virtue of the Constitution of the United States and the States, should have power not only that expressly given and necessarily implied to execute the express powers, but that the President and Congress has and should have and should exercise powers over, above, and beyond the Constitution unbridled and unrestrained save and except by his and their own inner consciousness of right and wrong; that the President has and should have power to control human liberty; in other words, without any limitation under the Federal Constitution.

Toulman Smith thus defines *local self-government and centralization:*

Local self-government is that system *of* government under which the *greatest number of minds knowing the most*, and having the *fullest opportunities of knowing* it, about the *special matter* in hand, and having the *greatest interest* in its well-working, *have the management of it or control over it. Centralization* is that system of government under which the *smallest number of minds*, and those *knowing the least*, and having the *fewest opportunities* of having it, about the *special matter in hand*, and having the *smallest* interest in its well-working, have the management of it or *control* over it.

But, Mr. Chairman, as Chief Justice Marshall said: "The Government of the United States has been termed emphatically a government of laws and not of men." (Morbury *vs.* Madison,

1 Cranch, 162.) I believe that all power should be left in the people to make their laws and govern themselves that is at all practicable. The farther we get away from the people as public servants the more danger there is that we may become their oppressors and be controlled by evil instead of good influences. The best and sweetest influence of human life is that which is and should be about the fireside, and that influence becomes evil, and later corrupt, as we get away from that sacred place, either in civil or in political life. So in the same way and in the same proportion, as we get away from the people and their power to control us directly, are we liable to become their oppressors instead of their liberators.

ANDREW JACKSON OPPOSED TO A CONSOLIDATED GOVERNMENT.

This destruction of our "dual form" of government—that is, the State governments and the United States or National Government—Andrew Jackson advised against, reprehended, and condemned not only such a movement, but a consolidated form of government. He said:

It is well known that there have always been those amongst us who wish to enlarge the powers of the General Government, and experience would seem to indicate that there is a tendency on the part of this Government to overstep the boundaries marked out for it by the Constitution. Its legitimate authority is abundantly sufficient for all the purposes for which it was created, and its powers being expressly enumerated, there can be no justification for claiming anything beyond them.

Every attempt to exercise power beyond these limits should be promptly and firmly opposed, for one evil example will lead to other measures still more mischievous; and if the principle of constructive powers or supposed advantages or temporary circumstances shall ever be permitted to justify the assumption of a power not given by the Constitution, the General Government will before long absorb all the powers of legislation and you will have, in effect, but one consolidated government. *From the extent of our country, its diversified interests, different pursuits, and different habits, it is too obvious for argument that a single consolidated government would be wholly inadequate to watch over and protect its interests; and every friend of our free institutions should be always prepared to maintain unimpaired and in full vigor the rights and sovereignty of the States, and to confine the action of the General Government strictly to the sphere of its appropriate duties.*

* * * * * * *

JACKSON OPPOSED TO HIGH TAXES AND TARIFFS.

But, rely upon it, the design to collect an extravagant revenue and to burden you with taxes beyond the economical wants of the Government is not yet abandoned. The various interests which have combined together to impose a heavy tariff and to produce an overflowing Treasury are too strong and have too much at stake to surrender the contest. *The corporations and wealthy individuals who are engaged in large manufacturing establishments desire a high tariff to increase their gains. Designing politicians will support it to conciliate their favor and to obtain the means of profuse expenditure for the purpose of purchasing influence in other quarters.*

James Monroe, President of the United States of America, on the 10th of March, 1821, "appointed General Jackson governor of the Territories of East and West Florida." * * * "The Congress" (on March 3, 1821) provided "that, until the end of the first session of the next Congress," (I quote from Jackson's commission, signed by President Monroe), "unless provision be sooner made, *for the temporary* government of the Territories of East and West Florida, * * * all the military, civil, and judicial powers, exercised by the officers of the *existing government* of the same, shall be vested in such *person* and *persons*, and shall be *exercised* in such manner *as the President of the United States shall direct*, for maintaining the inhabitants of said Territory in the *free enjoyment* of their *liberty*, property, and religion: Now know ye that, reposing special trust and confidence in the *integrity, patriotism*, and *abilities* of Major Andrew Jackson, I do, in virtue of the above-recited acts, appoint him to exercise within the said ceded territory, under such circumstances as have been or may hereafter be *prescribed* to *him* by *my* (President Monroe's) *instructions*, and *by law, all* the powers and *authorities heretofore* exercised by the *governor* and captain-general and intendant of Cuba and by the governors of East and West Florida, within the said provinces respectively, *and do authorize and empower him*, the said Andrew Jackson, to *execute* and *fulfill the duties of this present appointment according to law*, and to have and to hold the same with *all its powers and privileges* until the end of the *next session of Congress*, unless provision be *sooner* made for the government of the said Territories so ceded by Spain to the United States: Provided, however, that it is the true intent and meaning of these presents that the said Andrew Jackson, or any person acting under him, or in the said Territories, shall have no power or authority to lay or collect any new or additional taxes, or to grant or confirm to any person or persons whomsoever any title or claim to land within the same. In testimony, etc."

JAMES MONROE.

By the President:
JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

All the civil, military, and judicial power exercised by the then existing officers of the then ex-Spanish government over the Floridas were given to General Jackson and such other "persons" as he or the President might name. The then existing laws, or the old laws of the Floridas, were continued by an act of Congress temporarily, and General Jackson was to enforce them (with certain changes in the laws and personnel of the officeholders). Congress extended in 1891 our revenue laws and those relating to the importation of persons of color.

JACKSON CONTENDED THE CONSTITUTION EXTENDED AS FAR AS "APPLICABLE" TO THE TERRITORY OF FLORIDA.

It is contended that Jackson was an imperialist; that the Constitution, he believed, did not extend to the Territory of Florida. But such is not true. Desiring to return to his home in Tennessee and to lay down this unprecedented amount of power placed in his hands by his commission, on October 6, 1821, in an open address, not to the slaves, nor serfs, nor aliens of Florida, but "To the citizens of the Floridas," he said:

Considerations of a personal nature and the situation of my family requiring my absence from these provinces for a short period, I make known that in the meantime the government of East Florida is placed under the charge and direction of W. G. D. Worthington, esq., secretary for the same, and that of West Florida under that of Col. George Walton, secretary thereof. Each of these gentlemen is clothed with all the powers appertaining to governors under the late government of Spain, and subject to such instructions as they may respectively receive from the President of the United States through me. They are charged faithfully to protect and maintain all the citizens and inhabitants, of whatsoever description, in the said provinces, in the peaceful enjoyment of all their rights, privileges, and immunities secured to them under the late treaty with Spain, *and under the Constitution of the United States as far as the same is applicable.* I have instructed them promptly to punish the violators of the law, and to require of all that allegiance to the Government enjoined by my proclamation issued on taking possession of the country. (21 Niles's Register.)

Under the administration of the local laws by Jackson he had committed to jail an ex-Spanish official or ex-officials, who no longer enjoyed any official prerogative after the exchange of the treaty, for refusing to turn over certain valuable public and private documents, deeds, etc., pertaining to the new Government under Jackson and to the ownership of certain citizens of Florida of certain valuable property, which latter they had long unlawfully "held up." These Spanish officials, Jackson contended, were trying to escape to Spain with these documents, which, under the treaty, they had been required to turn over "six months before," and were also inciting the people, Jackson says, to oppose his Administration.

Jackson charged also that Judge Fromentin had joined in this unpatriotic opposition to his Administration. Fromentin, a Frenchman by birth, had been appointed by President Monroe "judge of the United States for West and East Florida," authorized and empowered, his commission says, "to execute and fulfill the duties of that office, according to the *Constitution and laws of the United States;* and to have and to hold the said office, with all the powers, privileges, and emoluments to the same of right appertaining unto him, the said Eligius Fromentin, during his good behavior, and until the end of the next session of the Senate of the United States, and no longer," the date of this commission being May 18, 1821, and is signed President James Monroe.

This commission was sent by John Quincy Adams, Secretary of State, to Fromentin, at New Orleans, June 17, 1821. Bear in mind that General Jackson was not only governor, but was by Congress and his commission empowered to execute the local laws as "chancellor," and while thus doing what the *law* directed *him* to do, his jurisdiction in so doing came in conflict with what Judge Fromentin claimed was *his* jurisdiction. It occurred in this way:

"Six months" *after* it was the *duty* under the *treaty* of the *Spanish officials* to *turn over the public and private records* to Jackson, one Calava, a then ex-Spanish official (and had been for "six months"), with others, *conspired* to abscond with certain valuable public and private records pertaining to the then government and to the ownership of private property, and to inspire, as Jackson claimed, the people to oppose Jackson's administration. *Demand was made on Calava by Jackson for these papers.* Calava declined to turn them over, and, on the contrary, *gave them to his superior, another ex-Spanish official, and in this way was trying to make way to Spain with these valuable documents.*

Jackson committed Calava and others to jail for this contempt. The next day an official search was made and the papers found where Calava and others had secreted them. No property or other papers of these Spanish officials were interfered with. On the contrary, they were "preserved and sealed and watched by Jackson's officials until Calava was released next day," who confessed they were all intact. However, Fromentin issued a writ of habeas corpus directing that these Spanish officials be released. He stated *under oath* before Governor Jackson that "no petition or oath or affirmation was made for the writ; that the application was *verbal*," and that he did not know to whom it was directed, nor to whom it was given or who would execute it; that he had no marshal or anyone to execute it. Jackson, claiming that he had the exclusive jurisdiction to execute the local laws, insisted that Fromentin was in contempt of his court. He had him arrested for contempt, claiming that Fromentin had no jurisdiction save and except such as Congress had given him, to wit, the execution of the revenue and slave laws. Fromentin was immediately released—August 24, 1821.

Jackson, nowhere that I can find after diligent search, contended that the *Constitution* itself did not extend to Florida; but he insisted that this Territorial judge was not given *jurisdiction* by statute to try this case, it being only a local offense and being tried under the old Spanish laws, which had been by Congress continued temporarily (the equivalent of enacting them literally), and over which he had exclusive jurisdiction. But we do find, as I have shown, that Jackson said at a later date—that is, October 6, 1821, after he had thoroughly investigated the law, possibly—that the Constitution did apply to Florida in certain parts, which we know now is the law. The people of a territory are not entitled to a United States Senator, by the Constitution, nor to "political power," which come to them when they are made into a State of the Union. (1 Pet., 542-543.)

In the course of the debate touching upon the action of Congress as to Florida, it was contended without its being disputed, that the Constitution did extend to the Territories of the United States in certain parts, not in all; hence the Montgomery resolution was voted down. Judge Nelson at a later date in the case of Benner *vs.* Porter, after holding that the Territorial judges "are not organized under the Constitution [now doubted] nor subject to its complex distribution of the powers of government as the organic law, but are the creations exclusively of the legislative department, and subject to its supervision and control," said, "*whether or not there are provisions to that instrument* [the Constitution] *which extend to and act upon these Territorial governments, it is not now material to examine.*"

Here is a case showing that these Territorial courts are creatures of the *legislative* department of the Federal Government, and herein it would seem that the jurisdiction of Territorial courts is *controlled by the Congressional act creating the court.* But let that be as it may. I will not discuss that. The fact remains that Jackson contended that the *Constitution* extended to the Territory of Florida, but that the Congressional act did not give Fromentin jurisdiction to try this case of a local nature, which he (Jackson) said had been by Congress given exclusive jurisdiction to try.

In a later case, the Supreme Court squarely agrees with General Jackson as to the application of the Constitution to our Territories. The court said:

Every nation acquiring territory by treaty or otherwise must hold it subject to the constitution and laws of its own government. (Page 212, 3 Howard.)

This is quoted and approved as the law in the celebrated Magoon letter to the Secretary of War, of April 11, 1900, and is printed in the RECORD at page 4338, volume 33, holding that the Constitution applies by its own force to our Territories and new possessions. He also cites and approves the message of President Polk on our California acquisition, of December 5, 1848, as follows:

The inhabitants, by the transfer of their country, had become entitled to the benefits of *our laws and Constitution.*

Citing the Cross-Harrison Case (16 Howard, 164), upholding President Polk's contention—that is, that our tariff laws and the Constitution extended to California the moment the treaty was ratified, and was the law of that land, and that California became a part of the United States the moment the treaty was signed. President Polk so instructed both our land and naval commanders specifically and told them to apply our laws and the Constitution in erecting temporary government, and they did.

President Polk to Commodore Stockton, January 11, 1847:

The inhabitants of the (California) Territory are entitled to all the benefits of the Federal Constitution of the United States to the same extent as the citizens of any other part of the Union.

* * * * * * *

That instrument establishes a form of government for those who are in our limits and owe voluntary allegiance to it.

And such governments were upheld, and the Kearney code particularly in New Mexico. In Leitendorfer case, 20 How., 176–7, where the court expressly held that the Mexican laws contrary to our Constitution and laws were void and protected no rights. In Maynard *vs.* Hill (125 U. S.) it was held that it was unnecessary in the organization of the Oregon Territory to say that the Territorial legislature could enact such laws as it pleased not in conflict with the Federal Constitution. Justice Field said this was the law without such a precautionary provision.

In the 3 Howard case the Supreme Court held that—

It can not be admitted that the King of Spain could, by treaty or otherwise, impart to the United States any of his royal prerogatives, and much less can it be admitted that they have capacity to receive or power to exercise them. Every nation acquiring territory, by treaty or otherwise, must hold it subject to the constitution and laws of its own government and not according to those of the government ceding it.

Further on, at page 224, the court said—and Justice Story, I may add, was on the bench then—that:

And all constitutional laws are binding on the people in the new States and the old ones whether they consent to be bound by them or not. Every constitutional act of Congress is passed by the will of the people of the United States, expressed through their representatives, on the subject-matter of the enactment.

And when so enacted they are the law of the land by their "own force" in State or Territory. The court continued:

And when so passed it becomes the supreme law of the land and operates *by its own force* on the subject-matter in whatever State or Territory it may happen to be. The proposition, therefore, that such a law can not operate upon the subject-matter of its enactment without the express consent of the people of the new State where it may happen to be contains its own refutation and requires no further examination.

Foreign or Spanish laws, as well as customs, are incompatible with our laws, Constitution, and institutions, and these foreign laws can not be inherited or injected into our form of government. We undertook that, you see, in the case of General Jackson in Florida. We continued the old laws, though temporarily, and in executing them we came in contact with an effort to administer *our Constitution* under the Federal judge. At that time we did not have as much light on these subjects as now. There is now no excuse in contending that the Constitution does not apply to our Territories. The very last case in which the Supreme Court of the United States touched upon the power of Congress to legislate for a Territory, the Supreme Court said, that Congress might legislate as Congress "may think fit so long as it does not contravene *any* provision of the Constitution of the United States." (Hof's case, 174 U. S., 1.) Congress can not, as in this case, where "*exclusive*" and *complete jurisdiction* is given it over District of Columbia, *a Territory*, enact "any" law contravening "any" provision of the Constitution.

Now, I ask if the Constitution, by its own force, did not apply to the territory ceded by the States to the United States both before and immediately after the framing of the Constitution and its adoption, why was it that Congress and the courts held that the Constitution repealed the ordinance of 1787, enacted before the Constitution took effect, and why did Congress immediately thereafter, after the Constitution was ratified, pass a statute so changing this ordinance as to make it *fit* the *limitations and requirements of the Constitution?* How could there be a misfit or the two instruments *conflict if* the *Constitution* did not *extend* to these Territories?

The ordinance applied not to the *States*, but to the *Territories exclusively.* Hence it can not be said that the ordinance extended to the *States* and *conflicted* there with the Federal Constitution. In 10 Howard, page 90, the Supreme Court held that the people of the Territories were parties to our Constitution, and that it was the "supreme law throughout the United States," clearly showing the term United States included States and Territories. The court says:

The Constitution was, in the language of the ordinance—

That is the Ordinance of 1787—

adopted by common consent, and the people of the Territories must necessarily be regarded as parties to it and bound by it, and entitled to its benefits, as well as the people of the then existing States. It became the supreme law throughout the United States. And so far as any obligations of good faith had been previously incurred by the ordinance, they were faithfully carried into execution by the power and authority of the new Government.

In the Milliken Case, 4th Wallace, the court said:

This Constitution of ours operates in war, as well as in peace, in all places, and under all circumstances. It is a law for the rulers as well as for the people; each and every one everywhere within our political jurisdiction is bound by it.

Our courts have repeatedly held that the Constitution protects the people of our Territories in their personal and civil rights, their jury and religious privileges, and this without any dissent (114 U. S., 15; 174 U. S., 1; 3 Cranch, 159; 170 U. S., 349; 136 U. S., 42; 30 Fed. R., 115; the last case holding we can not deny them the right of habeas corpus).

JACKSON AN ANTI-IMPERIALIST.

Notwithstanding the unsettled condition of the law and public opinion on the extension of the Constitution to the Territories in 1803 and 1821, Jackson contended that the Constitution did extend to Florida, and he gave that people grand juries, juries of 12, courts, trial and appellate, justices of the peace, protected them in their property, their religion, and crushed evil doers and drove traitors from the land; and so thoroughly did this that his bitter enemy, Thomas H. Benton, in his Thirty Years in Congress, canonized the man and his Administration, so much so that my distinguished friend from Iowa (Mr. DOLLIVER), in this House, January 28, 1899, quotes Benton as follows:

Maj. Gen. Andrew Jackson, governor of the provinces of the Floridas, exercising the powers of the captain-general and intendent of the island of Cuba over the said provinces and the governors of said provinces, respectively.

In the United States, where the people are accustomed to the regular administration of justice, the summary proceedings of General Jackson appeared to be harsh and even lawless; but they were all justified by the Administration and sanctioned by the negative action of Congress. And in Florida, where they took place, and where it was seen that no wealth or power could screen the oppressor, and that governors, judges, and rich merchants were laid by the heels like common offenders and the protecting shield of law and justice thrown over the humble and helpless in this province, so long a prey to oppression and corruption, the conduct of General Jackson appeared like an emanation of divine justice, greatly exalting the American character. * * * He constantly repulsed the idea of the presence of the Constitution in the territory committed to his charge, and in that repulsion he was sustained by the Federal Executive Government at Washington and by each House of Congress, each of these authorities refusing to entertain as breaches of the Constitution the complaints forwarded against him by those who had been militarily dealt with under his government.

I have shown Jackson did not "repulse" the idea of the presence of the Constitution in Florida, and to this extent Mr. Benton is in error.

Compare this administration, this Jacksonianism in Florida, with or without the Constitution, as you please, with McKinleyism in Cuba and elsewhere, with or without Constitution, and let

us agree that we will take Jacksonianism without the Constitution rather than McKinleyism with it.

Fromentin was arraigned before Jackson August 24, 1821. Two days thereafter Fromentin wrote the Secretary of State that Jackson condemned the unlimited power that Congress had placed in his hands. Fromentin says:

Much more was said by the General (Jackson) respecting the extent of his powers and the hope that no living man should ever in future be clothed with such extraordinary authority. How fortunate it was for the poor that a man of his (Jackson's) feelings had been placed at the head of the government, etc. (State Papers, first session Seventeenth Congress, page 180.)

Other high authorities quote Jackson as condemning this imperial power, though placed in his own hands, and I quote two others as giving the words undisputed of Jackson:

I am clothed with powers which no one under a republic ought to possess, and which, I trust, will never again be given to any man. Nothing will give me more happiness than to learn that Congress in its wisdom shall have distributed them properly, and in such a manner as is consonant to our earliest and deepest impressions. Yet, as I hold these powers by the authority of an act of Congress, it becomes my duty to discharge the sacred trust imposed upon me to the best of my abilities, even though the proper exercise of the powers given might involve me in heavy personal responsibilities. It has been my misfortune to be thus circumstanced in my various relations as a public servant. Yet I never have nor ever will I shrink from the discharge of my public duties from any apprehension of personal responsibility.—(Frost, Life of Jackson, page 419, and "Monument to Memory of Andrew Jackson," by Dusenbury, 1846.)

The Statesmen's Manual, volume 1, says of Jackson in Florida:

In June, 1821, the President appointed General Jackson governor of Florida, which he accepted, and in August he took possession of the territory according to the treaty of cession. The Spanish governor, Callava, having refused to give up certain public documents deemed of importance, he was taken into custody by order of Governor Jackson and committed to prison. The documents being found under a search warrant issued by Jackson, Callava was immediately set at liberty. Jackson remained but a few months in Florida, for, disliking the situation *and disapproving the extent of power invested in him as governor*, he resigned the office and again retired to Tennessee. President Monroe offered him the appointment of minister to Mexico, which he declined in 1823.

Congress soon enacted laws relieving the situation in Florida, giving the people there local self-government as far as practicable, and to remove *all doubts that the Constitution was or was not in Florida expressly extended the Constitution thereto* to protect this people.

There is a difference in the two propositions, however. If the Constitution does go to the Territories *by its own force*, Congress *can not bring it back* even by statute. If it is *sent* there by *statute*, Congress *can bring it back by repealing the statute* and leave the people without its protection—a reprehensible contention and dangerous administration of so-called law.

The trouble is with the present Administration that it is administering law in our new possessions in a way *condemned* by Jackson, although Jackson contended the Constitution extended to Florida, while the present Administration is administering the law in these possessions outside of, over, above, and beyond the limitations of the Federal Constitution. Jackson condemned this power, even with the Constitution present. *The Administration commends it administered unbrideled, unrestrained, without any constitutional limitations attached.*

Jackson not only condemned this power, but soon surrendered it after he had restored good order in Florida, driven the traitors out, and placed all the criminals behind the bars. He bitterly opposed imperial power and a consolidated form of government. He favored the annexation of Texas, and upheld his disciple, neighbor, and friend, James K. Polk, in accomplishing that. But how was it done? *By the consent of the people of Texas. By the vote of that people at the ballot box overwhelmingly.*

But so opposed was Jackson to a consolidated government—a one-man power—to squinting at the destruction of State rights, to turning our Government from a republic into an empire, that he refused in 1845, a short while before he died, to receive as a gift from Commodore Jesse D. Elliott a sarcophagus brought home in the *Constitution* from Palestine, "believed to contain the remains of the Roman Emperor Alexander Severus."

The correspondence between General Jackson and Commodore Elliott is found at length in the beautiful old volume entitled "Monument to Jackson," recently given me by a great lover of Andrew Jackson, my friend the gentleman from New York, Mr. CUMMINGS. I believe this sarcophagus is now being preserved in the Smithsonian Institution, not, I hope, that it may ever be used by any President of these United States; but with the present tendency, I am pained to say, it may be.

I insert here the entire correspondence, but beg to state three sentences which General Jackson wrote in declining this gift:

But with the warmest sensations that can inspire a grateful heart, I must decline accepting the honor intended to be bestowed. I can not consent that my mortal body shall be laid in a repository prepared for an emperor or a king. My republican feelings and principles forbid it; the simplicity of our system of government forbids it.

Mr. Dusenbury says:

The patriotic reply of General Jackson to Commodore J. D. Elliott's letter, tendering him as his final resting place the use of the sarcophagus obtained by him at Palestine having been alluded to in several of the eulogies in this work, and it having been thought proper to insert it in this place, Commodore Elliott has kindly furnished the editor with the correspondence:

WASHINGTON CITY, *March 13, 1845.*

MY DEAR GENERAL: Last night I made something of a speech at the National Institute, and have offered for their acceptance the sarcophagus which I obtained at Palestine, brought home in the *Constitution*, and believed to contain the remains of the Roman Emperor Alexander Severus, with the suggestion that it might be tendered you for your final resting place. I pray you, General, to live on in the fear of the Lord; dying the death of a Roman soldier, an emperor's coffin awaits you.

I am, truly, your old friend,

JESSE D. ELLIOTT.

Gen. ANDREW JACKSON.

HERMITAGE, *March 27, 1845.*

DEAR SIR: Your letter of the 18th instant, together with the copy of the Proceedings of the National Institute, furnished me by their corresponding secretary, on the presentation by you of the sarcophagus for acceptance on condition it shall be preserved and in honor of my memory, have been received, and are now before me. Although laboring under great debility and affliction, from a severe attack, from which I may not recover, I raise my pen and endeavor to reply. The steadiness of my nerves may perhaps lead you to conclude my prostration of strength is not so great as here expressed. Strange as it may appear, my nerves are as steady as they were forty years gone by, whilst from debility and affliction I am gasping for breath. I have read the whole proceedings of the presentation by you of the sarcophagus, and the resolutions passed by the board of directors so honorable to my fame, with sensations and feelings more easily to be conjectured than by me expressed. The whole proceedings call for my most grateful thanks, which are hereby tendered to you, and through you to the president and directors of the National Institute. But with the warmest sensations that can inspire a grateful heart, I must decline accepting the honor intended to be bestowed. I can not consent that my mortal body shall be laid in a repository prepared for an emperor or king.

My republican feelings and principles forbid it; the simplicity of our system of government forbids it. Every monument erected to perpetuate the memory of our heroes and statesmen ought to bear evidence of the economy and simplicity of our republican institutions and of the plainness of our republican citizens, who are the sovereigns of our glorious Union and whose virtue it is to perpetuate it. True virtue can not exist where pomp and parade are the governing passions. It can only dwell with the people—the great laboring and producing classes—that form the bone and sinew of our confederacy.

For these reasons I can not accept the honor you and the president and directors of the National Institute intended to bestow. I can not permit my remains to be the first in these United States to be deposited in a sarcophagus made for an emperor or king. I again repeat, please accept for yourself and convey to the president and directors of the National Institute my most profound respects for the honor you and they intended to bestow. I have prepared a humble depository for my mortal body beside that wherein lies my beloved wife, where, without any pomp or parade, I have requested, when my God calls me to sleep with my fathers, to be laid; for both of us there to remain until the last trumpet sounds to call the dead to judgment, when we, I hope, shall rise together, clothed with that heavenly body promised to all who believe in our glorious Redeemer who died for us that we might live, and by whose atonement I hope for a blessed immortality.

I am, with great respect, your friend and fellow-citizen,

ANDREW JACKSON.

Commodore J. D. ELLIOTT, *United States Navy.*

NAVY-YARD, PHILADELPHIA, *April 8, 1845.*

GENTLEMEN: The interest which the National Institute has been pleased to take in the eventual bestowment of the remains of the honored Andrew Jackson in the sarcophagus which I brought from abroad and deposited in your institute makes it my business now to communicate to you a copy of his letter of the 27th ultimo, lately received, on that subject. With sentiments so congenial to his strict republicanism and in accordance, indeed, with the republican feelings common to ourselves, he takes the ground of repugnance to connecting his name and fame in any way with imperial associations.

We can not but honor the sentiments which have ruled his judgment in the case, for they are such as must add to the luster of his character. We subscribe to them ourselves; and while we yield to their force, we may still be permitted to continue our regard to the enduring marble as to an ancient and classic relic—a curiosity in itself, and particularly in this country, as the first of its kind seen in our Western Hemisphere. From it we would deduce the moral that while we should disclaim the pride, pomp, and circumstance of imperial pageantry as unfitting our institutions and professions, we would sedulously cherish the simpler republican principle of reposing our fame and honors in the hearts and affections of our countrymen. I have now, in conclusion, to say that as the sarcophagus was originally presented with the suggestion of using it as above mentioned, I now commit it wholly to the Institute as their own and sole property, exempt from any condition.

I am, very respectfully, yours, etc.,

JESSE DUNCAN ELLIOTT.

The PRESIDENT AND DIRECTORS OF THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE,
Washington.

GENERAL JACKSON.

[From the Floridian of October 2, 1821.]

To the Citizens of the Floridas:

The temporary organization of the government of these provinces, according to the act of Congress of the last session and to the powers conferred on me by the President of the United States, I have the satisfaction to announce is now complete. If it possesses imperfections or defects, the reflecting man will make due allowance when he considers that its duration will be but short and that it is the best that circumstances would permit, taking into view the difficulties I have had to encounter. Where the rule or law is certain I have considered it my duty to follow it strictly, but where this has not been the case I have endeavored to make the best provision in my power, believing that government of some kind was absolutely necessary. It is my sincere hope that the subject will attract the earliest attention of the

Congress of the United States, and that the inhabitants of these provinces will be relieved from the state of uncertainty and doubt which at this moment must necessarily prevail.

In the organization of the present temporary government and in its execution I have kept steadily in view the securing to the inhabitants of the Floridas all the privileges and immunities guaranteed to them by the treaty. The principal of these is the protection of their persons, property, and religion until they shall be incorporated into the Union and become entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States. In performing this important part of my functions I have endeavored to pursue the spirit of our political institutions. I have made no discrimination of persons; my house has been surrounded by no guards; no one has been kept at a distance by repulsive formalities; all have had free admittance and found a ready ear when they required my aid for the protection of their rights. The American Government, at the same time it is the freest, is perhaps the strongest in the world, because the most wealthy and most powerful in society are as weak in opposition to it as the most humble and obscure. It knows no distinction between an ex-governor and a peasant. In the course of my short administration one case has, unfortunately, occurred which required the exertion of that authority which is no respecter of persons. That the necessity should have existed has occasioned me pain and regret, and especially as it has been misunderstood by some of the inhabitants of this country, from a want of a sufficient acquaintance with the facts of the case, as well as with the character and principles of our Government. It was my duty, under the treaty, exercising the government in the Flordias, to secure to the inhabitants all the evidences of their right of property. The improper conduct of the captain-general of Habana in withholding documents or archives of this nature from an agent sent expressly to receive them, increased the necessity for vigilance on my part.

It was made known to me by satisfactory evidence that there were documents of this character in the hands of an individual here, and that these documents were necessary to establish the right of property in this country. The fact ascertained, my duty was clear and no alternative was left me. That individual was ordered to surrender them, so that in pursuance of the second article of the treaty and of my proclamation, the inhabitants might be secured in their right of property. The individual thus ordered to deliver them, instead of obeying, as he ought, the commands of the Government under which he was protected, and which could know no superior except the Congress and the President of the United States, shifted them into the hands of the person who lately administered the government of this province and who had been authorized by the captain-general of Cuba to surrender the country agreeably to the stipulations of the treaty. This person, whether from misapprehension or worse motives, considered himself not responsible for any act of his to the government of the Floridas, and appeared entirely insensible to the impropriety of not having made a delivery of these documents of his own accord. Whatever diplomatic privileges he might have been entitled to, these privileges had ceased upon the surrender of this country, and he was then not known to me or recognized as having any other rights than those of a common individual. It was not enough for him to consider himself a public agent of the kind of Spain and reside here for the purpose of transacting official business with the agents of the United States, but it was necessary that he should have made known the object and purpose of his stay; had he done so he would have been informed at once by me that my own functions having ceased as commissioner, no one but the President of the United States had any power to give him permission to remain here as a diplomatic agent, enjoying the privileges of a foreign minister. The natural consequences of his conduct are too well known and need not be detailed.

With the exception of this solitary instance, I feel the utmost confidence in saying that nothing has occurred, notwithstanding the numerous cases in which I have been called upon to interpose my authority, either in a judicial or executive capacity, to occasion anything like distrust, discontent, or want of confidence, and I cheerfully take this occasion to express my satisfaction with the peaceful, obedient, and orderly conduct of all those whose allegiance has been transferred to the United States by the cession of the country. It is true the recent occurrence connected with the one referred to has compelled me to take measures I conceived necessary for the character, dignity, and harmony of the government I administer, and which, at the same time, were the mildest the circumstances would admit. I allude to the conduct of a number of the Spanish officers remaining here after the cession, without my permission, but which would certainly not have been withheld so long as they demeaned themselves respectfully to the existing authorities and refrained from any improper interference with the measure of the government. This respect is due from foreign officers in all countries; their situation is materially different from that of other aliens, and their conduct ought therefore to be more circumspect. In the United States those are severely punished who are guilty of writing in a libelous manner of proceedings in a court of justice, for what tends to bring the judiciary into disrepute shakes the public confidence in that part of the Government that is looked upon as the most sacred depository of individual rights.

Hence in both these points of view, without noticing the singular conduct of the Spanish officers, acting as if they considered themselves a distinct and separate body—an imperium in imperio—they were guilty of great indiscretion and impropriety in publishing a most indecent libel against the judicial proceeding of the highest tribunal in the Floridas. Had I consulted my personal feelings, having entertained a favorable opinion of some of them and enmity to none, I should have been disposed to have suffered the act to sink into oblivion. But the dignity and honor of the Government forbade that conduct so outrageous should pass unnoticed. I might appeal to those very persons and ask what would be the consequences if a band of American officers should offer such an insult to the government of a Spanish province. But the inhabitants of the Floridas may rest assured that whatever may be the impropriety or imprudence of some, it will have no effect upon my feelings toward the rest—the innocent will not be confounded with the guilty, and all will continue to experience the same protection and respect for their rights which has heretofore been extended, provided they demean themselves with that propriety which becomes every good citizen and subject; and should any of them, under the influence of momentary passion or feeling, be dissatisfied with the measures I have pursued, on a return of their sober judgment I feel confident they will be compelled to approve.

Considerations of a personal nature, and the situation of my family, requiring my absence from these provinces for a short period, I make known that in the meantime the government of East Florida is placed under the charge and direction of W. G. D. Worthington, esq., secretary for the same, and that of West Florida under that of Col. George Walton, secretary thereof. Each of these gentlemen is clothed with all the powers appertaining to governors under the late government of Spain, and subject to such instructions as they may respectively receive from the President of the United States through me. They are charged faithfully to protect and maintain all the citizens and inhabitants, of whatsoever description, in the said provinces, in the peaceful enjoyment of all their rights, privileges, and immunities secured to them under the late treaty with Spain, *and under the Constitution of the United States as far as the same is applicable.* I have instructed them promptly to punish the violators of the law and to require of all that allegiance to the Government enjoined by my proclamation issued on taking possession of the country.

ANDREW JACKSON,
Governor of the Floridas, etc.

PENSACOLA, *October 6, 1821.*

LAWS PROMULGATED BY JACKSON—LAWS OF FLORIDA.

The following is published for general information, as well as to show in what manner the laws of our new territory are framed (21 Niles's Register, 89):

Ordinance No. 4.

Whereas from the extent of the ceded territories it becomes necessary to make such divisions as will promote the convenience of the inhabitants and the speedy execution of the laws: Therefore, and in virtue of authority vested in me by the Government of the United States, I do ordain—

SECTION 1. That the said provinces be divided as follows:

All the country lying between the river Perdido and Suwanee River, with all the islands therein, shall form one county, to be called Escambia.

All the country lying east of the river Suwanee, and every part of the ceded territories not designated as belonging to the former county, shall form a county to be called St. Johns.

SEC. 2. In each of said counties, and for the government thereof, there shall be established a court to be designated a county court, and to be composed of five justices of the peace, any three of whom shall form a quorum, and the eldest by appointment to be president of said court, whose jurisdiction shall extend to all civil cases originating in the said county where the matter in controversy shall exceed $20; and to all criminal cases, saving to the parties the right of appeal to the governor in all cases above the sum of $500; and that there shall be no execution for a capital offense until the warrant of the governor be first had and obtained.

SEC. 3. That the judicial proceedings in all civil cases shall be conducted, except as to the examination of witnesses, according to the course of the existing laws or the laws of Spain, and in criminal cases according to the course of common law; that is, no person shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, and in all criminal cases the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury of the county wherein the crime shall have been committed, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation, to be confronted with the witnesses against him, and have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense.

SEC. 4. There shall be a clerk appointed for each of said county courts, who shall receive for his services such compensation as the court for which he is appointed may from time to time, and in each suit, tax or allow; and there shall also be a sheriff appointed to each court to execute the process thereof, whose services shall be compensated by the court to which he is appointed in like manner as is provided for the clerk; and the said clerk and sheriff shall give bond to the presiding justice for the faithful discharge of their duties.

SEC. 5. Each county court shall hold quarterly sessions and continue the same until all the business pending therein shall be disposed of, the first session to be held at Pensacola, on the first Monday of August next, for the county of Escambia; and at St. Augustine, on the second Monday of September next, for the county of St. Johns, with power to adjourn the same from time to time.

SEC. 6. There shall not be less than 10 justices of the peace commissioned for each county, whose jurisdiction shall extend to all civil cases not exceeding $50, saving to the parties or suitors an appeal to the county court in all cases wherein the matter in dispute shall exceed the sum of $20; and shall also be authorized in all criminal cases to exact surety for good behavior and to take recognizance in cases bailable for the appearance of the accused before the county court.

SEC. 7. That the examination of all witnesses within the jurisdiction of the courts, except when their personal attendance can not be procured, shall be conducted viva voce and in open court; that the parties may conduct their suits in person or by such counsel as they may choose, provided that the said counsel or counselors shall have been duly licensed to practice in the courts of the said ceded territories by the governor.

SEC. 8. The alcaldes shall continue to exercise the powers of judges of probate, registers of wills, notaries public, of justices of the peace, and such other powers appertaining to their said offices as have not been otherwise distributed, *saving the right of appeal to the county court in all cases.*

SEC. 9. That the judges of the said county courts shall have the power to impose such taxes upon the inhabitants of their counties respectively as in their discretion may be necessary to meet and defray the expenses which may be incurred in carrying this ordinance into effect.

SEC. 10. That the said county court shall have and exercise the powers of directing, by special venire, or otherwise, the summoning of all jurors, grand as well as petit.

SEC. 11. The said courts shall have the power of creating and regulating their process and proceedings from time to time as they may deem necessary, and shall, as soon as convenient after their organization, prepare and report a free bill to the governor for his approbation.

SEC. 12. That the said courts shall have and exercise the powers beyond the limits of Pensacola and St. Augustine of granting and recalling licenses or commissions for innkeepers, retailers of liquors of every description, and keepers of billiard tables, and to require of them such surety as they may deem proper and impose such price for such license as in their opinion may be reasonable.

SEC. 13. That it shall be the duty of the said courts in regulating their process and proceedings to confine the parties strictly to the merits of their cause and to cause all useless matter, as well as unnecessary form, to be expunged from the pleadings, at the expense of the party introducing the same, so that justice may be administered in the most simple, cheap, and speedy manner.

SEC. 14. In all criminal cases the process and indictment shall be in the name of the United States, and there shall be appointed a prosecuting attorney for each of the said counties, who shall receive in each case a reasonable compensation, to be taxed by the court.

SEC. 15. That the police of the roads and bridges without the limits of Pensacola and St. Augustine shall be under the immediate direction of the said county courts, the police of the city to be exclusively confided to the mayor and aldermen.

ANDREW JACKSON,
Governor of the Floridas, etc.

By the governor:
R. K. CALL,
Acting Secretary of West Florida.
W. G. D. WORTHINGTON,
Secretary, etc., for East Florida.

The Financial Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN P. JONES,

OF NEVADA.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

Tuesday, February 13, 1900.

The Senate having under consideration the bill (H. R. 1) to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes—

Mr. JONES of Nevada said:

Mr. PRESIDENT: This bill, by whatever name known, is in effect but the final section of a great financial project of which the first section was enacted in 1869. That first section was a joint resolution of Congress entitled "An act to strengthen the public credit." It would more appropriately have been named "An act to strengthen the bank accounts of the foreign and domestic holders of United States bonds." It pledged the Government to pay in coin a debt incurred in paper money of much lower value. A second section was enacted when the bondholders determined to define, with unmistakable certainty, the description of coin in which the bonds should be paid. They were not willing to leave their equities to be determined by the courts according to the high standard of honor and honesty always prevailing among the people of the United States. By a clause inserted in the refunding act of 1870 it was provided that the bonds should be paid in coin of the standard of the date of enactment of that measure. The English language could not make plainer the fact that all bonds of the United States Government issued in pursuance of that act were payable in either gold or silver dollars of the standard of July 14, 1870. This meant either gold dollars of 25.8 grains, nine-tenths fine, or silver dollars of 412½ grains, nine-tenths fine; the Government having the option to pay in either.

Other steps in the amazingly farsighted and skillful project of the bondholders were successively taken, when in a new law affecting the working of the Mint the standard silver dollar was shrewdly omitted from the list of coins authorized to be issued, and when by the enactment of the "Revised Statutes," a codification (enacted in block), which was assumed by Congress to be an embodiment of the laws in force at the date of its enactment, a limitation was placed upon the legal-tender quality of the silver dollars already existing. This bill makes the obligations of the Government payable in gold alone.

There will be one or two other sections later. It would be somewhat premature to introduce them now. There will be a section later that in specific terms will retire all the paper money of the Government. It would not do to attempt to accomplish the entire purpose at once. It might shock the American people.

The intention is (as ever since 1869 it has been) that one of the sovereign powers of the Government of the United States, conferred by the Constitution upon Congress alone, shall be delegated to private corporations—the power to issue all that portion of our money which is to be redeemable in gold; and place the duty and responsibility of redemption not on the banks, but on the Government. The bill places in the hands of the national banks the control of the bonded debt of the country. Whenever the banks see fit they can reduce the gold reserve below the limit and force an issuance of bonds; and this process can go on indefinitely. The policy contemplates a permanent increase of the bonded debt of this country. No one can doubt this who has read our financial history for the past thirty-five years, during which the bondholders and public creditors have been leading up to the present measure. That history shows that when patriotism and plunder become synonymous terms it is easy to make converts among the beneficiaries. The legislation of that period, in all the stages of its attempt to reach the gold standard, has resulted in plundering the productive classes of the United States out of thousands of millions of dollars.

In a speech delivered here during the debate of 1893 on the repeal of the so-called Sherman law, I said:

> The repeal of the Sherman law, if accomplished, will be but one-half of the scheme of the banks. They desire to get silver first out of the way. The project is, and the determination of the banks is, that they must be permitted to have a monopoly of the issue of money. They insist that the Government shall cease the issuance of money and hand over the prerogative to them. By the Constitution the right to coin money was given to Congress. The bankers do not believe that was a wise provision on the part of the framers of the Constitution, who should have devolved this duty upon the banks.
>
> When silver is out of the way, they will acquiesce in the views of the producers of the country that more money is necessary, and will demand an issue of several hundred million dollars of bonds in order that the country may be enabled to have a sufficient volume of money to do its business and maintain some degree of prosperity.

One would not suppose that with so acute a class of men as the bond-holding coterie it would be at all necessary to advise them as to the interpretation of any law providing for the payment of their bonds. No class of people are better able to understand the meaning of plain English when engraved across the body of a bond. One would not suppose it necessary to provide supplemental enactments to relieve them from doubts (which they did not entertain) as to the kind of money in which their bonds should be paid.

By "due process of law" they transmuted lawful-money bonds (for which they paid in paper) into coin bonds. Those coin bonds are now to be transmuted into gold bonds. All men know that the public creditors could have been in no manner of doubt as to the money in which they should be paid. The laws were explicit, and the wording of the bonds was absolutely unmistakable. The statutes were of their own securing, and were worded in accordance with their wishes. The agents and trustees of the people, however—the officials intrusted with the execution of the laws—always interpreted those laws against the interests of the producing masses, and to their enormous injury, merely to gain the meretritious applause of the bond-holding and creditor classes.

When, in 1877, the Secretary of the Treasury wished to make the new bonds read "payable in gold" he was advised by the Attorney-General of the United States that the law required the bonds to be payable not in gold, but in "coin" of the standard of July 14, 1870.

The determination of the executive officers of the United States to pay in gold enormously added to the value of gold. That act was not the act of our people or of Congress, but the act of the agents and officers who had in charge the execution of the laws.

This bill, Mr. President, is vicious from the first line to the last. What a monstrous proposition it is that a self-governing country should allow any executive officer to bond the people to any amount he pleases! The demonetization of silver is alone all that creates the necessity for issuing bonds. There could never be any doubt of the Government's ability, without the issuance of bonds, to redeem in coin any of its notes.

I listened with interest to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] while he was stating the necessity for a great reserve fund of gold. Why, Mr. President, if you take a bill of the Bank of France to that bank and ask its officers for gold, will they give it to you? Not at all. They have no special fund to redeem in gold. They have maintained the two moneys at a parity, yet if a man should take a million francs of paper to the Bank of France and demand the gold he would be laughed at. They would say, "We will give you lawful money, in whatever form we choose. If you want gold we will sell it to you at a premium." Yet France has no trouble with its money, and is not enslaving the country with a constantly increasing debt. When the Baring failure took place it was observed that the Bank of England had to go to France, a so-called double-standard country, to borrow gold with which to maintain its credit; and it was not the first occasion on which it had to do so.

BIMETALLISM.

Our gold-standard friends have given us a great many definitions of bimetallism and have been careful to keep from the public mind the definition which bimetallists themselves would approve. We are told that bimetallism consists of the concurrent use of the two metals, gold and silver, in the same country; again, that bimetallism consists of the use of gold as the measure of value, with silver as money in general use. Bimetallists, however, define it to be the equal treatment of both metals—that is to say, the unrestricted coinage of both when brought to the mint. There is no other form of bimetallism. That was the bimetallism which existed from the foundation of our Government down to 1873, and that was the bimetallism which existed in France for nearly a hundred years down to 1873.

The object in having the two metals linked together by the mandate of law at a given ratio was to protect society and industry from the irregularities and accidents liable to occur in the production from the mines, so that their mutual oscillations of supply might correct each other. With the exception of the period when the American mines were first discovered no simultaneous increase of both metals has occurred since the opening of the Christian era. Whenever one of the metals has been yielding in unusual quantity the other has generally been yielding in a stationary, if not declining quantity, so that the aggregate production has shown but slight variation.

The underlying idea of bimetallism is that a rise in the value of money, or to state it in other terms, a fall in the general range of prices of commodities, is an evil of the greatest magnitude, against the occurrence of which society should take every possible precaution. There is no need to guard against a *fall* in the value of money, because throughout the entire period of history not an instance can be cited in which such a fall did not prove a benefaction to mankind.

What is claimed for bimetallism is that upon the slightest indication that one of the metals is becoming relatively scarce the pressure of the demand is removed from it and brought to bear

upon the other. The bimetallic law, therefore, operates through supply and demand, which all admit to be the only factors entering into the creation of value. It is the enormous surplus of the metals in existence which places it within the power of the law to control their relative value. The larger this surplus becomes the more exactly and permanently can the law control them.

The stocks of the two metals taken together have been very happily likened to two reservoirs, which, although supplied from independent sources, are kept at a common level by means of a connecting pipe. This "pipe," which establishes a legal relation of value between them, is the law, which, by authorizing their interchangeable use as money, maintains their value at the same level. Both being equally possessed of full legal-tender power at the established ratio, no one will give more for one metal than for the other. This is not mere theorizing. It has been subjected to the crucial test of experience.

THE EXPERIENCE OF FRANCE.

In 1803 France fixed by law the legal relation between gold and silver at 15½ to 1. For seventy years, while that law was in operation, the two metals were held together at practically that ratio, though with a preponderance sometimes of the one and sometimes of the other in circulation.

A glance at the figures of French coinage from 1803 to 1873 will exhibit the operation of the system:

Coinage in France from 1803 to 1873.

Date.	Gold.	Silver.
	Francs.	*Francs.*
1803 to 1820	865,000,000	1,091,000,000
1821 to 1847	501,000,000	2,778,000,000
1848 to 1852	448,000,000	543,000,000
1853 to 1856	1,795,000,000	162,000,000
1857 to 1866	3,516,000,000	55,000,000
1867 to 1873	878,000,000	587,000,000

From these figures it will be observed that when either of the metals became relatively scarce its place was supplied by the other. So far as the people of the bimetallic country (France) were concerned, this did not involve any disturbance of the relative values of the two metals. Whenever silver was withdrawn for shipment to countries in which silver alone was legal tender, its place was supplied in the bimetallic country by gold. Whenever gold was withdrawn from the bimetallic country for shipment to countries in which gold alone was legal tender, its place was supplied by silver. Such slight variations as occurred in exchange were caused for the most part by the demands of single-standard countries for their particular money metal.

In those cases, what by the brokers is called the "premium," such as it was, was not a premium arising from any difference in the bimetallic country in the value of the metals, but a charge made by dealers in foreign exchange for gathering together during the period of the predominance of one metal in the coinage a sufficient quantity of the other—the scarcer—metal to meet the demands to which I have referred. The charges of the money dealers were proportioned, no doubt, to the urgency of the demands from countries that did not have the double standard. England being a gold-standard country, a demand from that country would be met by French brokers with a shipment of gold. When Germany was on the silver standard a demand from Germany would be met by French brokers with a shipment of silver.

Notwithstanding all the statements we see in the so-called "sound-money" papers, and all the statements we hear from the advocates of the gold standard about the impossibility of law holding the two metals together, the facts and figures show that there never was a variation in the purchasing or debt-paying power of the two metals so long as the law of France giving unrestricted coinage to both metals at the ratio of 15½ to 1 was maintained. During that period various countries changed their monetary systems, yet that law held the two metals firm with no variation. During no part of that time were the prices of commodities in France stated in silver as distinguished from gold, or in gold as distinguished from silver. There was but one price, and the two metals were precisely the same in their purchasing and debt-paying power.

After an exhaustive search through the official records from 1820 to 1847, while silver was the metal of largest coinage in France, the utmost so-called "premium"—that is to say, the brokers' charge—on gold in Paris that the most persistent opponent of bimetallism—Sir Robert Giffen—has been able to discover is 2.1 per cent in August, 1832. This was during a period when, as will be observed by reference to the table, the coinages of France were in the proportion of nine-tenths silver to one-tenth gold. I wish it to be specially noted that while among the professional money brokers and exchange dealers there was this trifling charge or so-called premium on gold, it had no relation whatever to the people or the industries of France.

Gold was wanted by single standard gold countries, such as England, where there was a money famine; it was bought up by brokers, who made a business of exchanges, and they naturally charged for their services, as they would do if they bought or sold bonds or stocks. That so-called "premium" was such as might have arisen had the monetary standard of France been gold alone. As we all know, the fact that a country is on the gold standard does not secure it against differences of exchange either with foreign countries or within itself. I have seen material differences in the value of gold between New York and San Francisco—differences having no connection whatever with silver, but arising solely from the temporary condition of balances at the one place or the other.

If the usual or normal rate of discount at the Bank of England be 3 per cent, and an increase to 5 per cent be announced, what in reality is this but an announcement of a premium of 2 per cent on gold in the very country of the gold standard?

While the champions of the gold standard are shocked at a trifling difference of 2 per cent in countries of the double standard, though arising only in the operations of bullion dealers, and in their cases only in connection with the foreign exchanges, they have no word of condemnation for the stupendously unjust exaction to which the domestic business of every gold-standard country has for many years been subjected by a constant and progressive increase in the value of the so-called standard. They strain at the bimetallic gnat, but swallow the monometallic camel. Thousands of millions of dollars have through the silent and stealthy operation of the gold standard been filched from owners of property, by the fall of values and from laborers willing to work, who, owing to the fall of prices, have been relegated to idleness.

The demand of the people of any country is not a demand for either gold or silver as such, but a demand for money. When each metal serves equally well to exchange commodities and pay debts, nothing further can be desired. In the case of the double-standard country (France) each form of money had all the power of the other. Under such circumstances the metals should have and did have the same value so far as concerned all the purposes of the people of the bimetallic country.

As I have said, there were no two prices current in France. There was no differentiation of prices of commodities into gold prices and silver prices. All prices in all markets were alike and were stated in terms of the money of France without reference to gold, silver, or anything else. Whether the money received in payment for commodities or services was gold or silver was to the recipient a matter of entire indifference.

THE METALS HELD TOGETHER BY THE BIMETALLIC LAW OF FRANCE, NOTWITHSTANDING EXTRAORDINARY VARIATIONS IN PRODUCTION.

That the steadiness of the legal relation of the metals from 1803 to 1873 could not be due to steadiness of their relative supplies from the mines will be obvious by noting the wide variations that occurred in their relative production during that period.

From 1803 to 1820 the average yearly yield of gold from all mines of the world was $9,710,500. The yield of silver during the same period was $36,847,500. This was a proportion of 4 of silver to 1 of gold! Yet the law of France establishing the ratio of 15½ to 1 held the metals firmly together. Again, from 1821 to 1840 the average yearly yield of gold was $11,466,000; of silver, $21,964,000—2 of silver to 1 of gold. Again the French law held the metals together. On the other hand, from 1841 to 1860 the average yearly yield of gold was $85,150,000; of silver, $34,826,500—2½ of gold to 1 of silver! Still the bimetallic law held the metals together. From 1861 to 1873 the average yearly yield of gold was $117,991,850; of silver, $68,043,900—nearly 2 of gold to 1 of silver; another illustration of the power of law. These figures show extremes of yield on both sides without variance in the relative values of the metals.

There is nothing unnatural in this. Even Sir Robert Giffen (in the Contemporary Review for August, 1879) admitted that it was to be expected. He said:

> Doubtless the fluctuation in any particular metal at the time when both metals were available as money would not be very great within any reasonable period. That is one of the points of special advantage for the system of bimetallism.

And Professor Hansen, of the Berlin University, said, in 1868:

> Europe, or, rather, the whole civilized world, is indebted to French law for its escape from the perturbations in the relative prices of gold and silver threatened by the enormous arrivals from Australia and California.

ADMITTED BY THE BRITISH ROYAL COMMISSION.

On the same subject the British Royal Commission on Gold and Silver (1886) expressed itself without reserve. Part I of the final report (being the portion signed by *all* the members of the commission) contains a clear and unmistakable admission by the gold monometallists of the effect of the French law. It says:

> Now, undoubtedly, the date which forms the dividing line between an epoch of approximate fixity in the relative value of gold and silver and one of marked instability is the year when the bimetallic system which had previously been in force in the Latin Union ceased to be in full operation, and we

are irresistibly led to the conclusion that the operation of that system, established, as it was, in countries the population and commerce of which were considerable, exerted a material influence upon the relative value of the two metals.

So long as that system was in force we think that, notwithstanding the changes in the production and use of the precious metals, it kept the market price of silver approximately steady at the ratio fixed by law between them, namely, 15½ to 1.

That is the statement of the entire twelve members of the royal commission, of whom six were gold monometallists of distinction.

The royal commission continues:

Nor does it appear to us a priori unreasonable to suppose that the existence in the Latin Union of a bimetallic system with a ratio of 15½ to 1 fixed between the two metals should have been capable of keeping the market price of silver steady at approximately that ratio.

The view that it could only affect the market price to the extent to which there was a demand for it for currency purposes in the Latin Union, or to which it was actually taken to the mints of those countries is, we think, fallacious.

The fact that the owner of silver could in the last resort take it to those mints and have it converted into coin which would purchase commodities at the ratio of 15½ of silver to 1 of gold would, in our opinion, be likely to affect the price of silver in the market generally, whoever the purchaser and for whatever country it was destined. It would enable the seller to stand out for a price approximating to the legal ratio, and would tend to keep the market steady at about that point. (Final Report, Part I, sections 192 and 193.)

While the royal commission ascribed to the Latin Union as a whole the effect of maintaining the ratio, it must be remembered that the treaty creating that union was not entered into until 1865, and that *France alone* for sixty-two years prior to that time had maintained the ratio with equal force without reference to which of the metals showed the greater yield. Had not the law of 1803 been in operation during the "fifties," when the enormous stocks of gold from California and Australia were finding their way to Europe, that metal would have fallen, as in early times it more than once fell, to the ratio of 1 to 10. So that the law of one important country held the metals together, because it was a country whose industries and commerce were of sufficient magnitude and extent. To whatever extent gold fell in relation to commodities silver also fell. This condition prevailed until the French law was practically abrogated.

THE PRETENSE THAT NATURAL LAW FORBIDS REMONETIZATION OF SILVER.

Laws enacted forbidding the unrestricted coinage of silver deprived that metal of the great mint demand; that is to say, of the "market" which from time immemorial it had enjoyed. This was an effect produced wholly by legislation, and in the interest of a few privileged persons who owned public and other debts. When it is proposed, not in their interest, but in the interest of the masses, that the "market" be restored—in other words, that the mints be reopened through the only process by which that result can be effected, namely, *by legislation*—the creditor and money-lending classes hold up their hands in horror at the injustice! They declare such legislation to be an interference with "natural law." With Pecksniffian morality they have always regarded as "natural" everything that tended to make money dearer, and did not themselves hesitate to invoke the powerful arm of legislation to aid in increasing that tendency.

A law which forbids the use of an article for a certain purpose to which for thousands of years it has been dedicated they regard as "natural," while a law which removes the restriction and permits the article to be restored to that use they characterize as "artificial." Deprive either gold or silver of the legal-tender function and it becomes immediately relegated to the rank of a commodity, because deprived of the force which creates the demand for it. A demand for either metal as a commodity is a demand for but one thing. A demand for either for the purpose of bearing the money function is, in effect, a demand for all things.

For the money use, considering the world's growing demands for money, the total stock of both metals combined is not now, and, judging from the past, in all human probability never will be, other than extremely limited. Were both relegated to the commodity demand, there being already on hand a supply sufficient to meet all demands of that character for sixty years without reference to the current yield, what would be the value of either or both?

The same legislation which by force took from silver the demand (the market) which for thousands of years in the interests of society it had enjoyed enlarged the demand for gold. From that time forth, for the first time in history, there was committed to gold exclusively a function which theretofore it had merely shared in equal part with silver, the function, namely, of measuring and exchanging all commodities, property, and services in the Western world. But to the gold stock was now superadded the task of also measuring and exchanging all the silver previously used as money, which had been reduced to a commodity.

When, therefore, Germany demonetized her silver coin there was practically placed on the market a quantity of metal sufficient to supply all demand for commodity purposes for at least ten years. This largely increased the demand for, and consequently the value of, gold. In the equation existing between money and commodities one of the factors had been wrongfully removed from the money side and added to the side of commodities. It was no fear of an excessive yield of silver that induced France to close her mints to that metal. They never would have been closed to the current production. They need not have been closed to even the silver of Germany had economic considerations alone governed the policy of France. The reasons for her action were clearly political. The French people after 1870 were in no mood to take from Germany anything that Germany would offer them, and especially anything which Germany wished to discard.

If, in 1873, the United States had kept its mints open to silver we could then have received and utilized that German metal at a time when we were contemplating resumption of specie payments. Had such course been pursued, the past quarter of a century would have been the most prosperous in the history of the world.

France took very much more gold after the discoveries of 1848 than she would need to have taken in 1871, even had all the silver of Germany been sent to her mints.

The population of France at the time of the enactment of the bimetallic law was less than 28,000,000, only a little over one-third the present population of the United States. The foreign trade of France in 1800, including imports and exports, amounted to but $155,000,000. If such a population, with so slight a foreign trade, were able to maintain the equivalence of relation between the metals, who can doubt that were silver remonetized by the United States the metals could be permanently bound together on the long-established ratio?

THE RELATIONS OF THE METALS IN THE UNITED STATES.

In this country we have had a practical illustration of the varying movement of the metals when both had unrestricted access to the mints, though at different legal valuations. Upon the organization of our mint in 1792, the relation between gold and silver was fixed by law at 15 to 1. This rated silver at a figure higher than the legal rate in France, which was 15½. Gold accordingly left our country and went to France, where, under the law, it was more highly valued. We had practically no gold in circulation, therefore, until a change in the law was effected in 1834. The legal relation between the metals was then established by the United States at 16 to 1. This rated silver at less than the legal ratio of France, whereupon that metal, instead of gold, took its way to France. The coinage rate of that country being more favorable, and ours less favorable, in the first instance to gold, and in the second to silver, we were in each case deprived of the metal which by law we had valued at a rate less than that of France. We were put to no loss or inconvenience, however, because each metal was as effective as the other in all payments, and they simply exchanged places.

Who can doubt that in this matter law and fact stood toward each other in the relation of cause and effect? Did "market" value have anything to do with it? Did not the legal relation which France had established control absolutely the movements of the metals? Was there any such thing as "commodity price" or "market price?" None whatever. It was the money value in France that governed. Had the value of silver been governed by the demand for bullion in the arts and manufactures, is it for a moment to be supposed that in the long series of years during which the yield from the mines, as I have shown, varied enormously from year to year, the relation of value between the metals should have remained what the records show? It seems to me to be cumulative testimony to the efficacy of the law to fix and maintain the relative values of the metals.

Mr. President, the arguments made by the advocates of bimetallism in this body have never been met. When we have asserted the most obvious of fundamental principles, we have received only ridicule and objurgation. I am quite sure that if in a discussion of the money question I should assert that "a straight line is the shortest distance between two given points," I should be met with the convincing reply that "that is a fallacy coming from the silver trust;" and if I should assert that "things that are equal to the same thing are equal to one another," I should be met with the argument that "that is an emanation from a rotten borough." Those illustrate the species of "argument" that has been furnished in reply to the logical reasonings of the bimetallists.

In every way possible it has been attempted to belittle the importance of silver in the history of the United States. One of the points advanced in this connection is the small number of dollar pieces coined up to 1878. The fact of the coinage of few silver-dollar pieces during the early history of the country is of no more importance than the other fact, equally undeniable, that in our whole history the number of gold-dollar pieces coined has been less than twenty million, and that such pieces are not now permitted to be coined at all. The contention we make is not that a particular silver coin should be minted, but that silver should have equal access to the mints with gold.

The reason for the slight demand for silver-dollar pieces in the early history of the country was the great abundance of Spanish silver dollars for forty or fifty years after the Mint was established; and afterwards, the great abundance of Mexican silver dollars, both of which were a legal tender in the United States. But while the unnecessary expense was avoided of procuring the

coinage of a particular piece which was already well supplied, it is still true that from 1793 to 1846 there was more full-tender silver coined than there was of gold; and even from 1834 to 1846, although silver was largely undervalued by the coinage law of 1834, there was nearly as much full-tender silver coined as gold. Prior to 1834 all gold coins, domestic and foreign, had disappeared from circulation in consequence of the premium on gold, which, at the legal relation then existing of 15 to 1, ranged between 5 and 7 per cent after 1821, when the Bank of England began gold payments.

It was only after the California discoveries that gold was much used. Prior to that time the reserves of the State banks were almost wholly in silver, largely in American half dollars, which, as well as the smaller coins, were full legal tender. It is a flagrant perversion of history to deny the important part that silver played in the monetary history of the country. The silver-dollar piece was little called for, not only because it was superseded by the Spanish and Mexican dollar pieces, but because the half-dollar piece answered all the purposes of the dollar piece. It is not so much the silver-dollar piece that was or is specifically needed, but the free access of silver bullion to the mint, to be coined into standard money in any convenient form which the law might authorize—money of full debt-paying power.

Some men assert that silver was practically demonetized by the act of 1834, which undervalued it; others that it was practically demonetized by the act of 1853 authorizing subsidiary silver coin. If silver was at either of those times demonetized, it is difficult to understand the persistency of the efforts in 1873 and 1874 to secure the passage of a law to demonetize it. Watchful and persistent efforts are never undertaken to accomplish what is already accomplished. The manifest truth is that silver was demonetized in 1873–74, not because it was already demonetized, but because it was still money and stood in the way of a scheme to establish a gold standard. The essence of money being the legal-tender function (the authority of law), it is only by law that anything which is money can be demonetized, and silver was as completely a money metal in this country until 1873–74 as it had ever been. That metal stood guard over the industries of the United States, ready to save them from destruction by a gold standard.

NO LOGICAL REASON EVER GIVEN FOR DEMONETIZING SILVER.

No satisfactory reason has ever been given for the enactment of the laws of 1873–74 demonetizing silver. The principal reason advanced in the House of Representatives was that the silver dollar was 3 per cent more valuable than the gold dollar, and that therefore no silver was brought to the mint. If that were a good reason it equally applied to gold. No gold was brought to the mint. Paper money had been the only circulating medium for eleven years. It could not be urged that the business of the country was subjected to any injury by fluctuations in the relative value, compared with gold, of a metal which was not in use. Nor can it be understood how any harm could have resulted from the retention of the option of using either of the metals, for it is not disputed that such option existed. It was a most valuable option, and it seems extraordinary that so much effort should have been made to give it away without any consideration whatever to the Government or people of the United States.

The object of the framers of the law of 1873, which omitted the standard silver dollar from the list of authorized coins, could not have been to strengthen the public credit of the United States. The amount of credit which a nation or an individual can possess depends upon the strength and extent of the belief among capitalists that the borrower is able and willing to meet the exact terms of his obligations. An offer to do more would be not only absurd and illogical, but would subject the debtor to suspicion and distrust. He can not improve his credit by promising to pay a larger amount of money, nor by promising to pay in money of greater value than that of the obligation held against him. The best way to improve credit, public or private, is to perform the contract with exactness and in its entirety. The debtor who insists upon all his rights and who himself observes all his obligations has nothing to fear.

MONETARY ISSUES NO PART OF LEGITIMATE BANKING.

We have become so accustomed to the issue of notes by the national banks and the use of these notes as money that such issues are coming to be regarded as a natural and proper part of the business of banking; and, as a corollary to that, we hear it said that the Government should issue no notes, but should "go out of the banking business." The fact is that the issue of circulating notes is no part of the business of banks. As Prof. Bonamy Price says, it has been "superadded" to banking. In the discussions relating to the Bank of England no voice has been more potent than that of Lord Overstone. In the testimony which that distinguished authority gave before the select committee of the House of Commons in 1857, he was asked this question:

Do you consider the separation of the issue and banking department of the Bank of England to be founded upon the principle that the business of issue and the business of banking are in their nature distinct?

To this he replied:

Undoubtedly; it is impossible to entertain any other view of the matter.

He was then asked the question:

What, in your Lordship's view, are the main causes of the fundamental distinction between the business of issue and the business of banking?

To this Lord Overstone replied:

That question necessarily raises the great question, What is the principle upon which the management of the paper money of the country ought to be regulated?

Then he goes on to say:

First. The supply of the current coin—that is, the money of the realm—ought to be entirely separated from banking business, which is simply trading in money, borrowing at a low rate and lending at a higher rate. Second. A £5 bank note is, in fact, a token or certificate representing 5 sovereigns; and no banker or private individual ought to be allowed to issue such tokens or certificates, any more than they are permitted to issue the coins of the realm.

After stating that the circulation of paper money tends to displace coin, Lord Overstone quotes from a speech delivered by Daniel Webster, as follows:

If others may drive out the coin and fill the country with paper which does not represent coin, of what use is that exclusive power over coins and coinage which is given to Congress by the Constitution?

And Mr. Webster adds:

Wherever paper is to circulate, as subsidiary to coin, or as performing in a greater or less degree the function of coin, its regulation naturally belongs *to the hands which hold the power over the coinage.* This is an admitted maxim by all writers.

The issue department of the Bank of England Lord Overstone regarded as a department of the Government of England, and not a department of the bank proper. The issue of paper money he regarded as part of the prerogative of coinage, and he speaks of "The sole priviledge of coining money, whether copper, silver, gold, or paper." "No share of such privilege," he says, "ought to be conceded in any form to banks or private individuals," and he adds that—

All profit arising from the issue of paper certificates, that is, bank notes in place of coin * * * ought to be appropriated to the public exchequer, and ought not to be diverted to the benefit of banks or any other concerns.

In the same investigation Lord Overstone says:

Perfect freedom of competition should be established in the business of banking, correctly understood and effectually distinguished from the function of *coinage* or from that of issuing paper tokens or representatives of coins—that is, bank notes, which, in fact, is *coining under a form peculiarly susceptible of abuse.*

And he quotes from Mr. Tooke the statement—

The privilege of issuing paper money is a delegation of that which is universally considered as a privilege *residing in the State.*

The issue department of the Bank of England Lord Overstone describes to be "nothing more than a department of the State, worked mechanically and clerically by the clerks of the Bank of England, but essentially a department of the State."

Inasmuch as the bill before the Senate will in effect turn over to the national banks the duty of supplying the country with paper money, it is a question for the people of the United States to determine whether they are ready and willing to transfer to thousands of private corporations a duty which inheres in the sovereign power alone.

For my part, although not a lawyer, I believe it is wholly unconstitutional for Congress to delegate this function of sovereignty and invest it in corporations which in its exercise will be guided, not by the requirements of the public welfare, but entirely by their own selfish interests. When the prices of property and commodities are rising the banks will increase their issues, because it will then be to their interest to do so. On the other hand, when the prices are falling, they will diminish their issues, call in their loans, and bankrupt great numbers of enterprises. When Senators know that it is the quantity of money that determines the value of every man's property, I can not understand how they can consent to placing in the hands of private corporations the power of changing at will the value of the unit of money. Money should be issued in the interest of all the people. The banks would issue it or withdraw it entirely from motives of cupidity, and none other.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] admitted this fact when he stated in debate that the banks had not taken advantage of their right to issue circulating notes because it was not profitable for them to do so. Therefore we are to have a note issue whenever it is profitable for the banks, that is, when general prices are firm or rising. On the other hand, when prices are falling, when it is of the utmost importance to the masses of the people of the country that more money should be in circulation in order that prices may be held firm, the banks will refuse to issue because it is not in their interest—because they can not then make money out of it. Bank issues are never profitable until there is a tendency to rising prices. At such times the banks would put out more money than would be warranted by our distributive share of what is called "the money of the world," prices would go on rising, and the Government of the

United States would be obliged to go into debt time and time again in order to maintain the so-called gold standard.

THE VALUE OF MONEY IS DETERMINED BY THE QUANTITY OUT, IRRESPECTIVE OF THE MATERIAL.

I now come to another phase of this great question, a phase that can never be omitted from a discussion on money.

The value of money is determined not by the materials of which it is made, but by the number of units of which the monetary stock consists. All political economists of repute from the time of Locke—even from the time of Aristotle—to the present time admit this to be true. The principle is that the value of the unit of money in any country is determined by the number of units in circulation; that is to say, the value of each dollar depends on the total number of dollars out. The greater the number of dollars out, other things being equal, the less the value of each dollar. The fewer the number of dollars out, other things equal, the greater will be the value of each dollar; and in this determination of value the material on which the Government stamp is placed plays no part whatever.

In former addresses upon this subject I have cited the leading authorities, among whom stand the principal economists of the world, and I will not weary the Senate by repeating their statements *in extenso*. I have heretofore cited at length the statement of Paulus, the Roman jurisconsult, whose formulation became incorporated in the Pandects of Justinian, that—

This material (money), stamped in the corner by the State, circulates with a power that it derives *not from the substance* but from the *quantity*.

I have cited John Locke to the effect that—

The value of money in any one country is the present *quantity* of the current money in that country in proportion to the present trade.

I have quoted Hume, the historian, who stated that—

It is the total *quantity* of the money in circulation in any country which determines what portion of that quantity shall exchange for a certain portion of the goods or commodities of that country. It is the proportion between the circulating money and the commodities in the market which determines the price.

I have quoted James Mill, who, in his treatise on political economy, said that—

In whatever degree the *quantity* of money is increased or diminished, other things remaining the same, in that same proportion the value of the whole and of every part is reciprocally diminished or increased.

John Stuart Mill also lays down the maxim that—

The value of money, other things being the same, varies inversely as its *quantity*; every increase of quantity lowering the value and every diminution raising it in a ratio exactly equivalent.

And Ricardo says:

The value of money in any country is determined by the amount existing.

And he adds:

That commodities would rise or fall in price *in proportion to the increase or diminution* of money, I assume as a fact that is incontrovertible.

One of the later economists, Professor Sidgwick, professor of political economy in Cambridge University, says:

The exchange value of any particular coin will vary in exactly inverse ratio to the variations in *quantity* of the aggregate.

In the celebrated bullion report of 1810 the principle is laid down that—

An increased demand for gold and a consequent scarcity of that article will make it more valuable in proportion to all other articles; the same *quantity* of gold will purchase a greater quantity of any other article than it did before; in other words, the real price of gold, or the quantity of commodities given in exchange for it, will rise, and the money prices of all commodities will fall.

Professor Bowen, of Harvard University, states it as follows:

The general principle is that the value of money falls in exactly the same ratio in which its *quantity* is increased. If the whole money in circulation should be doubled prices would be doubled; if it was only increased one-fourth prices would rise one-fourth.

It must always be borne in mind that this principle, when stated, should be accompanied by the phrase "other things being equal." Professor Bowen expresses it in these words:

The principle, however, holds good only under the supposition that the quantity of commodities, the number of exchanges, and the number of people having occasion to effect exchanges, remain unaltered. Otherwise, if there be an increase in either of these respects, the quantity of money being unchanged, the value of that money would rise, or, if money is increasing, the increase in these other respects may neutralize, wholly or in part, the depreciation of that money.

Professor Bowen further states:

All exchange, as I have said, as a barter of merchandise for money, and the quantity of money which an article of merchandise will command in the market is termed its price. Increase that *quantity* [that is, the quantity of money] and the price of all articles inevitably rises; diminish it [that is, diminish the quantity of money] and the price as certainly falls.

Prof. Stanley Jevons, in his well-known work on Money and the Mechanism of Exchange, goes so far as to state that the value of a paper money, entirely inconvertible, is determined according to this same law of quantity. He says:

There is plenty of evidence to prove that an inconvertible paper money, if carefully limited in quantity, can retain its full value. "Such," he adds, "was the case with the Bank-of-England notes for several years after the suspension of specie payments in 1797, and such is the case with the present notes of the Bank of France"—

referring to the notes issued after the Franco-Prussian war.

In a note to Adam Smith's Wealth of Nations (Book II, chapter 2) Mr. McCulloch says:

Convertibility into gold or silver at the pleasure of the holder is not, as Dr. Smith supposes, necessary to sustain the value of such paper as has been made *legal tender*. Its value may be kept on a par with that of gold, or may be raised to any higher level by merely limiting its *quantity*.

Professor Perry says:

If for any reason gold becomes relatively more abundant in one country than in other commercial countries around it, general prices will rise in that country in consequence.

That is to say, in consequence of the increase of the *quantity* of money.

Professor Bowen carries the statement further when, in referring to our greenbacks, he states that—

The want of faith in the promise to pay, or the opinion which may be entertained respecting the probability of the notes being redeemed at some future day, more or less remote, is not the cause even of the depreciation of paper money. The extent of the depreciation depends not at all on the want of faith in the ability and disposition of the Government to pay off the notes in full in specie, or on the nearness or remoteness of the time when it is likely to do so, but solely on *the relative amount of the currency as compared with the needs of business*.—*Bowen's American Political Economy*, page 245.

In stating that the value of money depends on its quantity and that the value of each piece of money, as Mr. Mill puts it, is "in inverse ratio" to the number of pieces, it is to be understood that the value of money is nothing whatever but its general exchange power; that is to say, its general purchasing or debt-paying power. When, therefore, it is said that the value of money is increasing, what is meant is that the monetary unit will exchange for a larger proportion of other things; and when it is said that the value of money is falling, what is meant is that it will exchange for a smaller proportion of other things.

Strictly speaking, therefore, the value of gold is not to be ascertained by stating that it sells for $20.67 an ounce. The value of gold or of anything else can be determined only by ascertaining its general power in exchange; that is to say, the quantity of commodities in general which an ounce of it will command.

That the value of the money unit depends on the quantity of money actually or potentially in circulation has never been denied by any of the great writers upon political economy, although of late, it must be confessed, some of our economical philosophers have shown symptoms of perturbation, and in some cases a desire to minimize the force of this long-established principle—that, other things being equal, the value of the money unit in any country depends absolutely on the number of units. The more this principle is reflected upon and studied out to its last analysis, the more clearly will its correctness be demonstrated. The history of money in all times will illustrate its truth.

It must be manifest that the relation of money to other things is a numerical relation. If the idea of numbers is kept in mind in connection with the conception of money, the subject is much simplified. This involves, as a necessary corollary, the idea of *limitation*. Limitation is the essence of money. When the statement is made that the value of the money unit—that is to say, its purchasing power—depends altogether upon the number of units, and not at all upon the material, the objection is made that, if the idea of money value be removed from the material on which the stamp is placed, society will be subjected to some great danger—that is to say, that it comes to be understood that money can be made of an inexpensive material, depending for its value upon something other than its weight, color, or specific gravity—nothing can prevent a flood of such money from inundating industry and commerce! This objection, however, will not bear the test of investigation. The very idea of *quantity* involves and implies limitation.

Limitation means regulation, and regulation signifies the intelligent adaptation of means to ends. It is of universal application. We can hardly conceive of an agency more dangerous to human life than the great oceans that surround the continents. Yet the Hollanders have no difficulty in regulating and limiting the ocean power and compelling it to contribute to the happiness and welfare of man. Limitation, regulation, in all things is necessary. Regulation, based on increasing knowledge, is, beyond all else, that feature of our advancing civilization which distinguishes it from the merely empirical systems of the past. There is no difficulty in securing it when its beneficent effects are understood. Even liberty itself is subject to this interpretation. Liberty does not mean license. In the physical world every power which contributes to the welfare of mankind is necessarily regulated; the action of steam; the operation of the electrical currents—every force that makes for human progress or advances human development. All have come to be controlled and regulated in such manner as to contribute to the welfare of mankind.

The science of money, both in its scientific and its practical aspects, will never be understood until this natural law, the law of quantity, is thoroughly mastered and accepted. The absence of a scientific appreciation and practical observance of all that is implied in this law of quantity is not unlike in its effects to the failure of the world for many centuries to determine by the sun the position of ships on the sea. Imagine the confusion that would pervade

the world of commerce to-day were men without an intelligent theory of navigation or were they ignorant of the natural laws relating to the progress and situation of vessels upon the surface of the globe!

If quantity is not the element which gives value to money—if the value of money be indeed, as some claim, derived from the material of which it is composed, and especially if a material be better adapted for money in proportion as it is valuable—why is it that metals other than gold, of which there are many more rare and more valuable, are not selected to be the material of money?

Manifestly because the quantity—the number of units—would not be sufficient to fulfill the functions of money. When the question is examined it will be found that it is not any quality of the metal as such that is necessary or desirable. What quality in gold is relied upon as the valuable quality? Surely not its color, other articles have the same color; not its weight, other metals are as heavy; not its form, other metals may be shaped and rounded into coins resembling gold coins. Even the division of the gold unit by the number of grains is only useful in determining the quantity of money that can be obtained from a given quantity of gold. Should we double the number of grains in the gold dollar, there would be but half the number of dollars; should we put but half the number of grains into a dollar, there would be twice as many gold dollars.

"QUANTITY" AND "QUALITY."

But, it is said, that in contending for the law of quantity we ignore what is termed the more important element of *quality*. There is no quality whatever in money, except that which is imparted to it by quantity and by law. There is no money in nature. It is a function given by law, created by government; and it is that function which gives value to the material on which the government stamp is placed. The money function is the all-sufficient guaranty of the money value, the value of each unit being determined by the *number* of the units. The total purchasing power in any country at any time will be represented by whatever quantity of money may be in existence in that country at that time.

If the number of monetary units be increased, the proportion of purchasing or debt-paying power of the unit must necessarily decrease. If, on the other hand, instead of an increase in the quantity of money, some proportion of the money stock were taken away, the total purchasing power would still remain the same, but would be divided among the smaller number of units remaining, and so each unit would represent a larger purchasing power. And this is true without reference to the material upon which the stamp is placed. The value of each dollar, whether gold, silver, or paper, is determined absolutely by the whole number of dollars, assuming, of course, that the dollars have equal legal-tender power. And, strictly speaking, nothing is money unless it have full legal-tender power—full power to pay taxes and discharge debts. All forms of money not having full legal-tender power are, to the extent of their deficiency in that respect, practically counterfeit. No money should be permitted to circulate that has not full power to pay debts and taxes and discharge all obligations whatsoever.

In all the discussions that have taken place on the money question in this country and in Europe for many years I have never seen any attempt to confute the authorities I have quoted. I have never heard any Senator in this Chamber deny the truth of the principles laid down by those authorities. Is it not most singular that with reference to so important a question as this there is no attempt to prove the superiority of gold as a material of money? Like other problems that do not admit of demonstration, it is permitted to be taken for granted. There is no fact in history that demonstrates any such superiority, but, on the contrary, many facts which demonstrate that gold is an undesirable material upon which to depend for monetary purposes.

The quality which is asserted of gold, which entitles it in a preeminent sense to be the material of money, is the quality known to loose thinkers and inexact speakers as intrinsic value. Notwithstanding that the most eminent economists have shown over and over again that there is no such thing as intrinsic value, the writers and speakers of the gold-standard school constantly hold before the people the idea that the intrinsic value of gold is the element which by nature and evolution adapt it for the money use. They find this to their advantage in securing the general adoption of the idea that gold is the only true material for money.

In discussing the subject of value the Earl of Lauderdale, in his Inquiry into the Nature and Origin of Public Wealth, pertinently observes:

> The term value, whatever might have been its original sense, as it is used in common language does not express a quality inherent in any commodity. There is nothing which possesses a real, intrinsic, or invariable value. The possession of no quality, however important to the welfare of man, can confer value, for water, the most necessary of all things, seldom possesses it. Experience shows us that everything is uniformly considered as valuable which, to the possession of qualities that make it the object of the desire of man, adds the circumstance of existing in scarcity. To confer value, therefore, two things appear requisite: (1) That the commodity, as being useful or delightful to man, should be an object of his desire. (2) That it should exist in a degree of scarcity. With respect to the variations in value, of which everything valuable is susceptible, if we could for a moment suppose that any substance possessed intrinsic and fixed value, so as to render an assumed quantity of it constantly, under all circumstances, of equal value, then the degree of value of all things, ascertained by such a fixed standard, would vary according to the proportion betwixt the quantity of them and the demand for them, and every commodity would of course be subject to a variation in its value from four different circumstances:
>
> 1. It would be subject to an *increase* of its value from a diminution of its quantity.
> 2. To a *diminution* of its value from an augmentation of its quantity.
> 3. It might suffer an *augmentation* in its value from the circumstance of an *increased* demand.
> 4. Its value might be *diminished* by a *failure* of demand.

Then Lord Lauderdale continues:

> As it will, however, clearly appear that no commodity can possess fixed and intrinsic value so as to qualify it for a measure of the value of other commodities, mankind are reduced to select as a practical measure of value that which appears the least liable to any of these four sources of variation which are the sole causes of the alteration of value.

But, inasmuch as this so-called measure of value is affected by circumstances of supply and demand having relation to *itself* alone, and not to the commodities which it is intended to measure, Lord Lauderdale very properly states, "When in common language we express the value of any commodity it may vary at one period from what it is at another in consequence of eight different circumstances." That is to say:

1. From the four circumstances above stated in relation to the *commodity* of which we mean to express the value; and—now note—

2. From the same four circumstances in relation *to the commodity we have adopted as the measure of value.*

If, then, as all the authorities maintain, the value of money depends on its quantity and not on the material, why should the people of the United States go to a gold standard? When we know that there has never been too much of both metals, why should we refuse to protect ourselves against the disadvantages inevitable from reliance on the accidental yield of one metal?

THE MONEY STANDARD NOT THE MATERIAL, BUT THE QUANTITY OF MONEY.

The money standard of a country is not to be known by the *material* on which the government stamp is placed. The standard is not a physical object; it is wholly a numerical relation.

Strictly speaking, therefore, there is no silver standard, no gold standard, and no paper standard. Whatever may be the name of the material which serves the purpose of money, the standard is, and must necessarily be, quantitative. The name of the material, if a metal, has significance only in the fact that the available quantity of that metal determines and limits the number of money units that can exist. The general range of prices of property and commodities accommodates itself to that number. The term "gold standard," therefore, means only that the prices of commodities and property in general will be governed by the quantity of gold. Ricardo says:

> The only use of a standard is to regulate the quantity, and *by the quantity the value of the currency.*

The statement that a country has a *standard* of money would, from the meaning of the word "standard," appear to carry with it the idea that there is some regulation about its money. The idea would seem to be that a standard is provided in order that justice may be maintained between man and man and the equities of time contracts properly subserved. Hence, many people believe that there is really an attempt at the maintenance of justice and equity in having a "gold" standard, whereas by that standard there is an entire absence of scientific regulation of the money quantity. The term "gold standard" has no application whatever, and no relation whatever, to the increase of population or of the demand for money. The gold standard has been constantly shifting and changing until it signifies nothing. It is a standard depending on the accidental discoveries of mines. As the authorities all show, the value of all metallic money rose between 1810 and 1849 by as much as 145 per cent.

That was the increase in the value of the unit of metallic money. One dollar in 1849 had as much purchasing power as had two dollars and a half in 1809! This was owing to the closing of the mines caused by the revolutions in South America. Relief came only with the discoveries of California and Australia. For twenty years following those discoveries a fall in the value of money took place which, according to Professor Jevons, amounted to a total of about 20 per cent, or about an average of 1 per cent per annum.

The people of the United States have been informed that one of the greatest misfortunes that could occur would be a fall in the value of money. Was this fall in the value of money resulting from the discoveries of California and Australia a misfortune to the world? On the contrary, do we not find that as the new money stock distributed itself over the earth industry took on a new life, idle men were called to labor, the social and political upheavals all over the world were arrested by the great flood of prosperity produced by the yield from the new mines? During the period in which the value of the money unit was rising we note that distress and destitution multiplied in all the countries

of Christendom. In 1848, as a result of thirty years of monetary contraction, almost all the countries of Europe were in the throes of revolution.

The new monetary supply changed the entire aspect of industry and society in the middle of the nineteenth century as it had done at the beginning of the sixteenth, when the yield from the mines of the newly discovered continent began to find its way through the various countries of Europe.

The history of the world shows that for a few years after the discovery and exploitation of great new mines a gradual rise of prices takes place. Idle men find employment; the hum of industry is heard on every hand. Those are red-letter years—a few years out of an entire century. As soon, however, as the mines are worked out and general prices have reached their maximum a decline begins, and then for a long period of years industry languishes. That has been the history of society from the earliest ages to the present time. I have never entertained a doubt that the Dark Ages were brought about by the decrease of the quantity of money. The discovery of the mines of the New World gave the first streak of light. It uplifted mankind. Under the impetus of an increasing money volume the common people rose and destroyed the feudal system, and progress began. Since that time there have been only a few periods—ten or fifteen years at a time—when there have been prosperity and general content among the masses.

That the gold standard has not been one under which the money market has been able to maintain steadiness and induce confidence is manifest upon a most cursory examination of its history. During the twenty-seven years after 1847 the rate of interest charged by the Bank of England was changed 223 times, or an average rate of change of nearly once per month; and the range of fluctuation was from 2½ per cent to 10 per cent. On the other hand, it is to be observed as a significant contrast that there were but 16 changes in the rate of interest at the same bank during the one hundred and twenty-three years preceding 1816, when the gold standard was adopted; and in those 16 changes the rate of interest never fell below 4 per cent nor rose above 6 per cent.

Many of the most thoughtful minds, well informed upon financial matters, have attributed the frequent crises in the London money market to the narrow basis of gold, upon which the financial structure existed.

In testifying before a Parliamentary committee in 1828, Alexander Baring said:

> A sudden change from peace to war, a bad harvest or a panic year, arising from overtrading and other causes, immediately impose upon the Bank of England, which is the heart of all our circulation, for the purpose of protecting itself, to stop the egress of specie; sometimes even to bring large quantities into the country. These indispensable remedies are always applied with more or less of restriction of the currency and consequent distress. * * *
>
> No care or prudence can enable the great bank to avoid occasional resort to those measures of defense. * * * It is evident that the bank, wishing to reenforce the supply of specie, can do so with infinitely increased facility with the power of drawing gold and silver than if it were confined to one of the metals. * * * The greater the facility of the bank to right itself, the less frequent will be those sudden jerks and changes so fatal to credit and commerce.

THE WIDER EXTENSION OF THE GOLD STANDARD NOT A RECOMMENDATION OF IT.

The fact that the creditor interests of the world have forced the gold standard upon the governments of most of the civilized nations, instead of being an argument in favor of the adoption of that standard by the United States is the very argument which should be potent in dissuading the United States from adopting that standard. A comparatively small supply of gold might be sufficient to meet the demands of moderate populations, whereas nothing but a ceaseless flood of gold will enable the commercial nations to conduct their business and maintain the prices of commodities at a just a equitable level.

Instead of the trifling populations of a few years ago which acknowledged the gold standard we now find the bondholding and creditor classes pressing practically all civilized nations to gold. In 1870 the only gold-standard countries were Great Britain and Portugal, and of those the only effective demand came from Great Britain, the population of which was then but little over 30,000,000 people. In obedience to the behests of Great Britain and of the owners of public debts we now find all the governments of Christendom making demand for gold. The countries making demand for gold, therefore, at the present time are Great Britain, Germany, Austria-Hungary, Denmark, Norway and Sweden, Russia, Finland, Turkey, Egypt, to which there is an attempt to add Brazil, Costa Rica, Chile, Peru, British Honduras, and Japan. The coinage of silver is either suspended or is conducted only on government account in France, Belgium, Italy, Spain, and Greece; and in this category should now also be included British India.

The countries now making demand for gold comprise many hundreds of millions of people, and when to those shall be added the population of the United States it must be manifest to the most limited understanding that a flood of gold such as the world has never known, both for volume and persistency of yield, is the only thing that will save the fabric of industry from a total collapse. If it was true before, as was well said by an English economist, that "England is the peculiar seat of monetary crises, as Egypt is of the plague and India of the cholera," it is manifest that all the civilized countries of the world will now be called upon to share with Great Britain the burden of these monetary crises in a degree of intensity and with a rapidity of recurrence hitherto unexampled.

The present yield of gold is an excellent illustration of the extraordinary irregularity of its production. A material so subject to violent alternations of miserliness and prodigality can never be relied on as a "standard." Under the influence of such a so-called standard all business is reduced to gambling. Business men can not buy or sell on time payments without subjecting themselves to serious risks, and if those risks are compensated by profits, a heavy tax is imposed upon consumers. No man who enters into a contract to pay gold can feel any assurance that at the date when the contract is performed the monetary unit will possess the same value that it possessed at the date of the making of the contract. All history shows that gold, when not associated with silver in unrestricted access to the mint, has been the most unstable standard of which any example is to be found. It is hardly necessary to call attention to the fact that 25 per cent of the world's money is uncovered paper. To what a ruinous level would not the gold standard have brought the world but for this dilution of the bitter draught by the enormous volume of so-called fiat money!

THE EFFECTS OF CHECKS AND DRAFTS.

It is sometimes maintained that a compensation can be made for a shrinkage in the volume of money by an increase of such banking expedients as checks, drafts, bills of exchange, and clearing houses. These expedients are now resorted to, and, because profit is found in their use, always will be availed of to the utmost possible extent. It is manifest, therefore, that, whatever the proportion or percentage they bear to the volume of money, it can not be increased except through an increase in that volume. And it is equally manifest that when the volume of money is diminished these expedients must diminish and general prices must fall in a corresponding ratio. Money is the primary and governing force whose functions can not be superseded by any device whatever, and whose volume or existence does not depend on banking expedients, while these expedients grow out of money and could not exist without it. The farthest extent to which they can be used is already practically reached, and they can only increase, and must decrease, as the volume of money increases or diminishes.

This reasoning partially applies as to the effect of credit on prices. It would seem to be reversing the natural order of things to maintain that prices are controlled by the volume of credit instead of by the volume of money. Without entering into an elaborate discussion of this intricate question, it may be said that prices were affixed to property at the time when the invention of money superseded barter. Credit, as it is now understood, was impossible under the barter system, and must have come into existence at some period after values were measured through the medium of price. Primarily, then, prices must have been entirely controlled by the volume of money, unaffected by credit.

Credit is the explosive element in the business of modern times. If it were extended upon property at such a rating of prices as would be established through money alone, and if the relation between the volume of money and population and commerce remained steady, prices would remain steady, and the great mass of credits would rest upon a sound basis. Even under such conditions there would be speculative and unsound credits, but these would be exceptional, and the injury caused by their collapse would be local, individual, and temporary. There never can occur a universal fall of prices and a general withdrawal of credits without a preceding decrease in the volume of money.

It is contended by many that credit is based on the combined volume of property and money, and that a diminution of the volume of money need not occasion any greater withdrawal of credit than such proportion as the diminution would bear to the aggregate amount of property and money. But the amount of credit which can or will be extended upon property depends upon its price, which is supposed to represent the cash it can be sold for, and price depends upon the relation between the volume of money and other things. Property which might be ample security for a given quantity of money at one range of prices would be an inadequate security at a lower range. If all the money of the world were diminished by one-half, the amount of credits that could be safely extended upon property would be diminished in at least as great a proportion.

It is money and not property, unless the creditor shall choose to accept it, that is required for the payment of debts, and the power of property over credit is limited to its command in open market over money, which command must be greater or less as the volume of money is larger or smaller. If the amount of credit which can be safely extended upon property be not governed by the price it can be sold for, then credit must be an institution based upon

the whims and caprices of those who extend it. If credit is either increased or diminished upon property which has undergone no physical change, and without reference to its price, such increase or diminution must be ascribed to the abnormal mental condition of the money lender. This is a disease which, as it is not caused by a change in material conditions, is beyond the reach of the remedies of the political economist, and must be treated psychologically.

PRICES AND THE VOLUME OF MONEY.

It is often supposed that prices are not controlled by the volume of money, because they have neither risen nor fallen concurrently with, nor in exact proportion to, the increase or decrease of such volume. The precious metals are diffused over so vast a surface and their current production is so small in comparison with accumulated stocks that it takes considerable time for changes in their yield to so affect their volume relatively to population and business as to produce any sensible effect upon prices. The entire property interests of a country are united in maintaining, and, if possible, in advancing, the price of property and in resisting to the uttermost any decline.

A temporary maintenance of nominal prices, even in the presence of a shrinking volume of money, is especially practicable with imperishable property, such as real estate. When money begins to become scarce by reason of a shrinkage in its volume, the first effect upon real estate is found to be not a decline of its nominal price, but a diminution in the number of transactions. The stagnation is ascribed to temporary causes and a speedy recovery predicted. In order to maintain prices the terms of purchase are made easier. The amount of cash payments is reduced, and the deferred payments, secured by mortgage on the property, extended over longer periods. After a time this expedient fails, and even then nominal prices are unnaturally held up for a short period by the struggles of those who have purchased upon these extended credits, and by the tenacity of owners who refuse to sell at lower figures and mortgage their own property to protract their power to hold. The stagnation of voluntary transactions is finally followed by the activity of involuntary ones under the direction of sheriffs and by the foreclosure of mortgages.

Upon any material decline in the price of real estate a large class of investors, believing that the bottom has been reached, and desiring to profit by the reaction which they think is sure to come speedily, enter the market and temporarily check the decline. Another fall in prices sweeps them and their margins away, and a third class of dealers, now absolutely certain that bottom prices have been reached and sure that a further decline is impossible, come in as purchasers. Each succeeding purchaser fortifies his conclusion that present prices are bottom prices by comparing them with, and finding that they are no higher than, the prices of some period in the past which is arbitrarily assumed to be a standard level below which subsequent prices could never permanently go. It is overlooked that price is only the expression of a relation, and that no correct conclusions can be drawn from a comparison of the prices of two periods unless comparisons be also made of the money stock, population, and exchanges of both periods.

Contrary to all calculations, as the volume of money shrinks prices continue to fall, and these dealers encounter the fate of their predecessors. These operations repeat themselves until universal distrust prevails, and until it is found that—when money is decreasing in volume—prices have no bottom, except a receding one, and that *they are inexorably ruled by the volume of money.*

The effects of a decrease of the volume of money in a particular country arising from its abnormal outflow, or from its withdrawal from the channels of circulation through the distrust which prevails when unsound and speculative undertakings are breaking down, or when the country is convulsed by political disturbances, are the same as the effects of a general decrease in the volume of money. The result in both cases is a fall in prices. But in the first case the equilibrium is restored by a quickly returning wave of prosperity, and the evils resulting are confined to individuals and to special localities; and those dealers are fortunate who purchase in the first stages of the decline. But in the second case the cause of the fall in prices is radical, and must continue until prices go out of existence unless the decrease in the volume of money is arrested.

THE PANIC OF 1873.

The cause of our great panic in 1873—an unheard-of panic—has never been sufficiently reflected on. When our civil war closed in 1865 the farmers of the country were generally out of debt. I can recall that I thought it would be a good time to invest money when millions of men were taken out of the field of destruction and put into the field of production. I said it must bring about good times. I found, however, that prices did not ascend, as I supposed they would. Time went on. Farmers everywhere and holders of real estate commenced mortgaging their property in order to hold it, and meanwhile to pay their way. Matters so ran along until 1873, when the weakest link in the chain broke. The house of Jay Cooke & Co. and the Northern Pacific Railway failed, and there followed a general crash all over the United States.

What was the cause of this? Upon examination afterwards I found, first, that when the war closed in April, 1865, ten or twelve million people were added to the population of the United States without the addition of a dollar of money. What an enormous contraction! Cotton, tobacco, sugar, [illegible] everything produced in the South was coming to the Northern States and taking away the money that up to April, 1865, had [illegible] the business of the North alone. That same quantity of money was called upon to do the business of the whole country. Is it any wonder that the great crisis came? Is it any wonder that the industries of the country experienced a collapse?

In the whole history of the world every great and general fall of prices has been preceded by a decrease in the volume of money. There has never been a decrease in the volume of money, nor has there ever been a stationary volume of money, unless accompanied by a stationary population and commerce, which has not sooner or later resulted in a general fall of prices, and there has never been a recovery therefrom except through a preceding increase in the volume of money. After the volume of money has begun to decrease, every dollar of credit extended at the old range of prices aggravates the disaster which must come sooner or later. Stagnation and panic are nothing more nor less than the results of a struggle to make prices express truly the relation between money and all other things. Fluctuations of prices frequently arise from special causes, but they are local and temporary in their character.

Even were it possible to devise a money system so perfect that steadiness in the general level of prices would be absolutely assured, there would still occur occasional fluctuations in the prices of particular commodities, arising from a temporary glut or scarcity of such commodities in the general markets, caused by exceptionally favorable or unfavorable conditions, which might suddenly enlarge or diminish their production or vary the demand for them. Such fluctuations can not be avoided. They mark the ebb and flow of business and no more affect the general level of prices or prosperity than the ebb and flow of the tides affect the general level of the ocean. The producers of and dealers in each article should be better able than anybody else to foresee and guard against them, and have no reason to complain of them. But they may well complain when the general level of prices is disturbed by monetary legislation, which they could not foresee, are not responsible for, and whose injurious effects they could not by any degree of prudence avoid.

MONEY IS AN ORDER FOR GOODS.

In all discussions on money it is well to inquire what is money. I think it will not be disputed—certainly it will hardly be disputed in the United States—that the most distinguished political economist of the last quarter of this century is Francis A. Walker, of Massachusetts, recently deceased. His definition of money has been characterized by Professor Sidgwick, professor of political economy at Cambridge University, England, as the best definition that has ever been formulated. Now, let us see what this definition is that General Walker has given of money. He says:

> Money is to be known by its doing a certain work. Money is not gold, though gold may be money; sometimes gold is money and sometimes it is not. Money is no one thing, no group of many things having any material property in common. On the contrary anything may be money; and anything, in a given time and place, is money which then and there performs a certain function. *Always, and everywhere that which does the money work is the money thing.*

Adam Smith says:

> A guinea may be considered as a bill for a certain quantity of necessaries and conveniences upon all the tradesmen in the neighborhood.

By "bill" Adam Smith, according to the usage of this time, means an *order*, so that his statement is that a guinea is an *order* for a certain quantity of commodities. Now, is it necessary that an *order* for commodities shall be made of gold? Henry Thornton says:

> Money *of every kind* is an order for goods.

I will repeat that definition for the benefit of our gold-standard Senators: "Money *of every kind* is an order for goods."

Mr. Thornton makes no distinction here between gold money, silver money, and paper money. Whatever kind of money it is, he says it is merely *an order for goods.* Is he supported in this definition by any other political economist? Let us see. John Stuart Mill says:

> The pounds or shillings which a person receives are a sort of *ticket* or *order* which he can present for payment at any shop he pleases, and which entitle him to receive a certain value of any commodity that he makes choice.

Mr. Mill was an Englishman, and in writing this definition of pounds and shillings did not have before his mind any debased money or dishonest pounds or shillings. Yet he says in effect that gold pounds sterling are nothing whatever but an *order* for goods! Again I ask, Is it necessary that this order shall be made of gold?

McLeod, in his Elements of Banking, says:

When persons take a piece of money in exchange for services or products, they can neither eat it nor drink it nor clothe themselves with it. The only reason why they take it is because they believe they can exchange it away, whenever they please, for other things which they require.

Inasmuch as this money is something which people take merely to exchange it away, why is it necessary that it shall be gold? And so Mr. McLeod styles it *credit*, and quotes in support of that term Edmund Burke's description of gold and silver as "the two great recognized species that represent the lasting conventional *credit* of mankind."

General Walker also dwells on this peculiar feature of money, a feature which distinguishes it from all other things whatsoever, namely, that it is taken only with the intention of *parting* with it, and derives its value only from being parted with.

Money—

Says General Walker—

is that which passes freely from hand to hand throughout the community in final discharge of debts and full payment for commodities, being accepted equally without reference to the character or credit of the person who offers it, and without the intention of the person who receives it to consume it or enjoy it or apply it to any other use than, in turn, to tender it to others in discharge of debts or payments for commodities.

The only use, then, for money, according to all these authorities, is that it shall be parted with. If it is not to be retained, if it can not be enjoyed without being parted with, why is it a matter of such supreme importance that it shall be of gold?

The masses of the people the world over have never demanded gold, and in this country the people know nothing of gold. Why, then, is it that we find the bondholding and creditor classes alone, with their agents, the bankers and brokers, demanding the gold standard? Is it because gold is more uniform and steady as a so-called "standard" than silver? On the contrary, the production of silver, as statistics prove, has always been more steady and uniform than that of gold.

Prof. Shield Nicholson, who occupies the chair of political economy in the University of Edinburgh, in his new work on Political Economy, says:

Silver has proved itself, *from the point of view of stability of value*, a better standard than gold.

He quotes the statement of Ricardo, made in 1816, that—

There can be no doubt that on the whole silver is preferable to gold as a standard, and should be permanently adopted for that purpose.

Professor Nicholson continues:

A survey of the history of prices since this observation was made [by Ricardo] abundantly confirms the greater stability of silver as a measure of value.

This quotation is from a recent publication. Professor Nicholson had before him the statistics of the yield of the mines of the world up to the year 1897. He makes the deliberate statement that even up to that year a survey of the history of prices demonstrates the greater stability of silver over gold as a measure of value. He continues:

If, however, gold were linked to silver by a fixed ratio, it would obviously share in its stability.

Think of a distinguished professor of political economy in a great conservative university talking of a "fixed ratio" between gold and silver! Our gold-standard editors and orators have been telling us for many years that it is an absolute impossibility that a fixed ratio should exist between the metals.

Professor Nicholson continues:

The two metals together would possess greater stability of value than silver alone. The increasing demands caused by the growth of trade and population in new countries could be met by the annual supplies of both metals. And it must be remembered that with the increase in wealth there is a greater demand for the use of the precious metals in the arts; and, further, that the larger the mass in use, so much more is required annually to replace the wear and tear and accidental losses.—*Principles of Political Economy*, Volume II, page 161.

Silver is not to be found in the sands, or in great alluvial deposits. It is never found (as gold is) under circumstances in which a little labor can result in an extraordinary yield. Gen. W. T. Sherman (then a captain), being stationed in California in 1848, wrote from the gold diggings that common laborers, by their individual efforts, were making from $5,000 to $8,000 a month.

If an ordinary laborer, without skill or capital, could make from $5,000 to $8,000 a month at gold mining, no demonstration can be more complete as to the slight influence which cost of production exercises upon the value of the metal.

Upon this point Professor Jevons says:

The great principle of cost of production fails us because, in the case of such durable commodities as gold and silver, the accumulated stock on hand is immensely greater than the annual production or consumption.

If the principle of cost of production fails, what becomes of the theory that it is cost of production which gives to gold the value that it has as money?

In fact, the value of gold is determined not by what it costs to produce it, but by *what it costs to obtain it after it has been produced*, and that cost or value is registered by the general range of prices.

John Stuart Mill, fully agreeing with the other economists on this point of the inapplicability to the precious metals of the principle of cost of production, says:

Alterations, therefore, in the cost of production of the precious metals do not act upon the value of *money*, except just in proportion as they increase or diminish its *quantity*, which can not be said of any other commodity.

So that we are constantly brought around to the law or principle of quantity as the regulator of the value of gold money, as of every other form of money. If the value of money depends entirely on its quantity, then that value can not depend on the cost of production of the material on which the money stamp is placed; and if not on cost of production, then it can not depend *in any respect* on the material. The value of the unit of money depends on the quantity of money; the greater the number of units, other things being equal, the less the value of each unit; the fewer the number of units, other things being equal, the greater the value of each.

This principle operates absolutely, whether the money be of gold, of silver, or of paper, provided it be money of full legal-tender power, and no other sort of money should be permitted to circulate.

I present as a proposition incapable of successful contradiction that gold and silver were not fitted or adapted to be money and could not have come to be generally accepted as money until so enormous a stock of them had been accumulated that their value for commodity purposes (for purposes other than money) had been practically destroyed.

However startling this proposition may seem at first glance, it is one that will bear the test of the closest examination. The more it is reflected upon the more obvious and conclusive it will appear.

NO COMMERCIAL OR COMMODITY VALUE IN EITHER GOLD OR SILVER.

I assert, then, that there is practically no commercial value in either gold or silver. The value of those metals is derived from their use as money. Take away the entire money demand from gold or from silver, and what would they be worth? All will admit that it is demand as correlated to supply that determines the value of all things. Let us apply this principle to the matter in hand. There are probably now five thousand million dollars of gold money in the world. I am not speaking of gold in the shape of ornaments. In order to be surely within bounds, let us assume that the quantity of gold in use as money is four thousand million dollars. That is a very low estimate. It is also a very low estimate to assume that each one of these dollars is earned and demanded twenty times in three hundred and sixty-five days. If each dollar in 4,000,000,000 is demanded and earned twenty times a year, what demand does that make on the gold stock of the world? The calculation is very simple. Twenty times four thousand million would constitute a demand of *eighty thousand million* dollars a year, and there is not a doubt that this estimate is very far inside the mark.

Now, that being the money demand for gold, let us compare it with the demand for that metal for commercial or nonmonetary purposes. The annual demand for gold for commercial purposes (for jewelry, dentistry, gilding, and all other uses in the arts) is generally estimated at about $60,000,000. The monetary demand for gold being eighty thousand million dollars yearly, that demand is one hundred and thirty-three times greater than the so-called "commercial" demand; it exceeds the commercial demand by more than 13,000 per cent! Yet we are told that the demand for gold as a commodity is what creates its money value!

But in any case it is absurd to talk about the commodity value of either gold or silver. No material that has unrestricted coinage in any country has any commodity value or so-called "commercial" value. The value of silver is not a "commodity value," or derived from commodity use, but is the value that it obtains *in the country in which it has free access to the mint*. Who that wanted silver for any purpose would give for it more than he could get it for in that country by exchanging products for it? Who that had silver and wished to sell it would take for it less than he could get for it there? So it is an entire misconception, as to both metals, to speak of their supposed "commodity value."

When the relation of 15 to 1 between gold and silver was established in this country on the organization of the mint, whatever may be said as to an examination of the relations between the two metals, there can not be a doubt the purpose was to fix a relation that would be certain to result in keeping silver (the most needed coin) in the United States. Who would give a pound of gold for 15 pounds of silver in the United States when under the ratio established by law in France he could get 15½ pounds of silver in that country for one pound of gold?

When, later, our ratio was changed to 16 to 1 it was not because of any change in the relations of the metals, but because gold mines were discovered in our own country (in the Southern States), and inasmuch as gold was then a home product and its production was expected to increase rapidly, our lawmakers changed the ratio in order that it might enter into circulation

among our own people. Some persons write very learned essays about the so-called "commercial relations" and "market relations" of gold and silver, but when the question is investigated without reference to any preconceived theory and with the simple purpose of ascertaining the truth, it will be found that whatever relations have existed between them have been the direct and absolute result of statute law or of kingly decrees and mint regulations having the force of law.

Before society could safely or justly commit to any one or two materials the duty of maintaining the equity of time contracts between man and man, it was absolutely essential that there should be on hand so stupendous a stock of those materials as that the production of a single year could produce but an infinitesimal effect upon the existing stock. This seems to me to be so plain a proposition that I can not understand how any reflecting man can deny it. Day by day we see extreme variations in the price or value of almost every article in the market, but only very slow and slight changes in the purchasing or exchange power of money.

A NATIONAL NONEXPORTABLE MONEY THE BEST AND MOST USEFUL MONEY.

Professor Sidgwick, of Cambridge, in his treatise on political economy, lays down the proposition that gold is no more useful for purposes of money than paper would be, except that it is acceptable over a wider area. If this be so—if there be really no advantage in gold except that it is acceptable over a wider area—is it not well to inquire whether this wider acceptance is really an advantage? For my part, I assert that a money exclusively national, a money which would not leave the country on the breaking out of war, and which could not be withdrawn from the country whenever a fright took possession of our foreign investors, such money remaining always in the country to do the business of the country and to meet the wants of the people of the United States, would be an infinitely better money than gold. With every considerable withdrawal of money from the country contraction takes place and the prices of property and commodities fall. With every considerable influx of money from abroad a great inflation of the currency takes place. One would suppose that an intelligent and progressive people would sufficiently understand the importance of steadiness of value in money to prevent great quantities of it from coming into the country to inflate prices, and then, when contracts are entered into and time transactions based on these inflated prices, permit that money to leave our shores in great quantities, compelling a contraction of the currency and consequent fall of prices, spreading ruin and devastation throughout the country.

That is always what happens with so-called "international money," the so-called "money of the world." Now, Prof. J. E. Cairnes and all other distinguished political economists contend—and the contention will be supported by the observation and reading of every thoughtful man—that the existence of different moneys in different countries is no obstruction whatever to trade, industry, or commerce, and that the money of one country will, on absolutely equitable terms, purchase the money of every other country.

Professor Cairnes especially mentioned that the foreign trade of the United States was not unfavorably affected by the fact that during our great civil war our money was greenbacks. And Professor Jevons, speaking of the condition of Great Britain during the period of the Napoleonic wars, stated that not only did the foreign trade of the country suffer no check, but, as he expressed it, "the very foundations" of England's home industries "were being energetically laid." Yet that was a period of nonredeemable, wholly inconvertible, paper money!

If, therefore, I could have my way, and a person residing in a foreign country relying upon the intelligence, enterprise, and integrity of the people of the United States and the excellence and stability of our institutions should wish to make an investment here, I should say to him, whether an Englishman, Frenchman, or German: "With the money of your own country buy the money of ours, and make your investment, whether in Wall street or elsewhere, in the money of the United States. By this course your investment in our country will not inflate our money volume; therefore it will not tend to inflate prices to a boom point, by taking advantage of which you would be able soon to sell out at an extraordinary profit. When, however, you get tired of your investment, sell it out for money of the United States, and with that money buy the money of your own country, which you can readily do, and leave our money volume untouched. By that course your withdrawal of your investment will not create a contraction of our currency; the prices of our commodities and property will remain firm, and our industries and commerce will continue undisturbed."

That, Mr. President, is the kind of monetary system I would have. In a country of continental proportions, reaching from ocean to ocean and from the frigid to the tropical zones, a country of every variety of resources—mineral, agricultural, and manufacturing—a country within whose own boundary lines can be grown and manufactured every article that can be desired by the most civilized man, I would have a money worthy of the highest civilization. I would not have a money that could be withdrawn from our country whenever the whim, caprice, or cupidity of a "foreign investor" might dictate such withdrawal. The withdrawal of large sums of money from the United States adds grievously to the debt burden of every energetic citizen of the United States.

Mr. ALDRICH. What would you use as money?

Mr. JONES of Nevada. I should use the greatest money on the face of this earth—the paper money of the Government of the United States. And until we can have a perfect system, so long as we are to have the so-called "automatic" system of money, I would have what we have always had from the foundation of the monetary system, I would have both metals. Under that system, as all the great writers and thinkers of the past have said, money is far less liable to fluctuations in value than when based on one metal only. I say to the bondholders and great creditor classes that if in their greed and cupidity they insist on departing from the historic automatic system by demonetizing one of the metals and throwing all the monetary duties upon the other, they must not be surprised if the masses of the people who are injured by this change shall make up their minds to discard and demonetize the other metal.

If one of the metals is to be discarded for the benefit of the bond-holding and money-lending coterie, and that metal the more useful and reliable of the two, the creditor classes may well pause and consider whether there may not be some danger of the pendulum swinging the other way. Were it not for the intelligence and virtue of our people, the contest, ceasing to be a contest between the gold-quartz mill and the silver-quartz mill, might come to be a contest between the gold-quartz mill and the paper-pulp mill!

The people of the United States are accustomed, especially about election times, to being told how intelligent they are, how sound is their judgment, how pure their patriotism, how strong their sense of justice. As citizens of a self-governing Republic they are certainly intrusted with the most solemn, sacred, and responsible duties. In their keeping are placed, without hesitation or restraint, the determination of questions involving the liberties and even the lives of their fellow-beings.

Upon one subject only are they not trusted, upon one only are they feared. In their wisdom and discretion they may regulate and adjust all matters whatsoever pertaining to government, to progress, and to sovereignty, except that one subject without the proper regulation and adjustment of which the best government is impeded, progress fitful and spasmodic, and sovereignty deprived of the most valuable and beneficent of its functions.

Their wisdom, intelligence, and sense of justice may be trusted with the regulation of all matters whatsoever affecting their welfare, excepting only the regulation of the quantity of their money. As to that they are to be relegated to the "gold standard," the standard of Accident. "On the subject of money," say the creditor classes, "rather than look to the intelligence, virtue, and justice of our fellow-citizens, we will rely upon the edicts of Chance!" The creditors take care, however, by the adoption of the gold standard, to arrange matters in such fashion that for ninety years out of every one hundred the chance is in their own favor.

MONEY ESSENTIAL AT ALL TIMES, AND SHOULD BE KEPT IN THE COUNTRY.

Adam Smith compared money to a highway by which the products of labor were enabled to reach a market. There is no doubt that money performs the same function in the proprietary distribution of property that railroad trains and highways perform in its physical distribution. But would it not be deemed extraordinary if the people of this country were to place great numbers of our locomotives and cars on leviathan ships to be carried over the ocean and deposited in foreign countries, there to remain until some exigency of those countries impelled them to return them to us? Extending the simile, and regarding money as an implement, what would be thought of a proposition to ship out of our country, at a time just preceding the harvest, hundreds of shiploads of agricultural implements needed in the harvest field? Now, unlike agricultural implements, the season in which money is useful is every season of the year. There is no time at which it can be sent out of the country without loss and disadvantage to the country; no time when its outgo in any considerable quantity does not import injustice and inequity into all time contracts and deferred payments, upon which, in these times, the vast majority of business transactions are based.

Hundreds of millions of dollars of deferred obligations are always outstanding, and it seems to me to be a monstrous injustice for a people to maintain a money system by which ruinous oscillations of quantity are permitted to take place.

On the demand of a clique of "foreign investors," out go great loads of our money, and panic reigns. We see bills introduced in State legislatures and in Congress to accomplish great results as to public health—to arrest the yellow fever or the bubonic plague—yet there is a class of panic which produces more distress

and misery than all the bubonic plagues and yellow-fever epidemics have ever produced. It is said they come around automatically; that they come around of themselves once in a while. This is the philosophy with which the people are taught to be contented! It is fate, they say. Yet no one has ever seen a panic in which there was not plenty of property nor in which large holdings of such property did not pass out of the possession of the borrower into the possession of the lender—the mortgage transmuted into a deed.

Nothing was needed to stop the panic except money. That was shown by the action of the Secretary of the Treasury recently in taking money out of the Treasury and using millions upon millions to stop the panic.

The panic was not on account of any suspicion that this bill would not pass. It was known that it would; but money—money was wanted. Legal tender was what everyone was after. A sufficiency of that is what this country has been looking for during its whole history; and it had it only for a few years after 1849, when California and Australia sent out their harvests. As I have already said, those were the red-letter years in the world's history. Those were the days when the country and the world were more spiritualized than in any other period of their history. That great boon lifted people out of poverty and put them on the road to prosperity. In a few years the money of the world was nearly doubled. Millions of men that had been idle all over Christendom were called to employment. What an immeasurable blessing was that! For a man without employment might as well, so far as his country is concerned, be in the grave. Every time that a material shrinkage in the volume of money takes place and one-tenth of the people are relegated to idleness, that fact of itself constitutes a reduction of our population by one-tenth, because when men are idle they make no demand—no economic demand—for money; they can offer nothing in exchange for it.

As events have fortuitously developed, we may now be on the eve of another rise of prices. It can not, however, in my judgment, equal the rise that followed the California and Australia output. This country had then not probably over twenty-five to thirty million people, and the entire world was small in comparison with what it is now, so there would now be necessary an enormous increase in the yield of gold in order that there might result a degree of prosperity proportionate to that effected by the yield from California and Australia. That doubled, and more than doubled, within a very few years the volume of money in the world. There will be no such yield now, in proportion to population and demand, as came from California and Australia, although in my opinion the yield will be much greater than came from those countries.

But it is reasonable to expect that prices will rise a little. The prices of some articles have already risen. There are many industries that do not share in the prosperity, yet, on the whole, things are much better than they were. If the mining industry does not experience some unforeseen check, that condition may persist for ten, twelve, or fifteen years, but that is all that can be expected of it. Such is now the energy and enterprise of this people that our prices will certainly be at the maximum by that time, and then, according to the verdict of all history, there will follow a period of forty or fifty years of gradual decline, with its inevitable long-drawn-out misery of the masses of the people, and with upheavals—social, industrial, and political—the consequences of which no man may predict.

During the last Presidential campaign one of the champions of the gold standard, addressing a public audience, assured them that if only the foreign investors had confidence in the good faith of the people of the United States and could only feel assured that our dollars would always be the equivalent of gold dollars there were "thousands of millions" of dollars, he said, which those foreigners were ready to invest in the United States! Any man who could make such a statement could not have the slightest apprehension of the money question. The idea that "thousands of millions" of dollars were to be invested here at the pleasure of the foreign investor and to be withdrawn at his pleasure is an idea that no thoughtful American can entertain with any degree of satisfaction or of national pride.

The idea that all the equities of time contracts, extending up to thousands of millions of dollars among our own people, shall be dislocated or destroyed for the purpose of accommodating foreigners is a monstrous absurdity. It would be infinitely better to have a money that would flow neither in nor out than to perpetrate the daily and hourly injustice involved in such a system. So, Mr. President, I am not alarmed when told that we can not prosper in this country unless we have the money of the world. A country like the United States, of rapidly growing population and colossal industries; a country of continental proportions, destined to excel the world in enterprise, in industry, and in commerce, should have its own money, a money which would not leave the country in its hour of trial and would not constantly flow in and flow out, to the detriment of all business within our own borders.

Let me here inquire of my fellow-Senators, inasmuch as it appears we must have money that is not money (money that has to be redeemed), why the Government can not save the interest on the bonds by establishing a sacred crypt in the Treasury, in which for every installment of Government notes issued a corresponding amount of Government bonds might be deposited, to be held inviolate for the redemption of that money. If $5,000,000 is wanted to be issued, the Government can certainly issue it as well as a bank could. If there were $300,000,000 of bonds out, the interest at 3 per cent would be $9,000,000 a year. What should prevent us from keeping the bonds in that sacred crypt in the Treasury and have the same security for that money that we how have, without paying out that nine millions and surrendering to the bank the sovereign authority of the Government for the issue of money? Why should the banks have that privilege? Have we become so afraid of the banks that we are obliged, in this indirect method, to do what is sometimes termed out West to "grease" them? Why should we pay them this money? I have never met anyone who could tell me why we should pay it.

I am opposed to the Secretary of the Treasury or anybody else contemplating a continual increase of the public debt of the United States—an increase that apparently is to go on forever. We are to increase the volume of paper money, and do not propose to increase the Treasury notes or the greenbacks. If the issues of bank notes are to be increased, they can only be increased by the increase of the bonded debt of the country. I am opposed to it. I want the country to be out of debt. I do not believe a national debt to be a national blessing. It is a national curse.

The time is near at hand, if it has not already arrived, when the money of the United States, of whatever material it may be composed, will be deemed the money of the world and the best money. The people of the world will be only too glad to sell to us when they know that the money of the United States is a correct measure of the equities involved in all business transactions; that the value of our monetary unit will neither fall nor rise, but will maintain a steady relation to property and commodities.

If the American people had a national money—an American money—instead of their being troubled by the question, "Where are we going to get gold?" the question would be asked by the other countries of the world, "Where and how shall *we* get American money?" That is the money they will be obliged to have. We do not need to get theirs. We shall be out of debt to them.

The laborers in any country can be kept uninterruptedly employed only by contracts for enterprises requiring years to complete. The constant inflow and outflow of large quantities of the money of the country so affect the range of prices that equity and justice are constantly violated.

Although this bill is destined to become a law, it will not, in my belief, be long before the people of the United States will insist upon a reversal of the verdict now to be given by Congress. If not, if it shall finally appear that in order to secure unjust advantages to a small class of powerful persons, one of the metals, which for thousands of years has been dedicated to the full money function, is to be permanently rejected, to the great wrong and injury of the masses of mankind, then the advocates of the gold standard will find that the monetary discussion will enter upon a new stage. A broader, deeper, and more far-reaching discussion will be entered upon.

THE MONEY OF THE FUTURE AND OF THE HIGHEST CIVILIZATION.

The advocates of gold will have to meet the advocates of a paper money to be issued by the Government, which should possess no value on account of the intrinsic qualities of the material of which it is composed, but whose value should be extrinsic and derived from the useful functions with which the Government invested it, and whose each unit should be kept steady in value through legal limitations and regulations of the number of such units issued.

The views of the school of thinkers advocating such money are that utility, accompanied by limitation of quantity, is the basis of exchangeable value; that this utility may depend either upon such intrinsic qualities as would render the thing possessing them valuable to man in isolation as well as to man in society, or upon extrinsic, artificial qualities which society may confer upon any article, however much it may lack qualities intrinsically useful to mankind, by endowing it with the power of performing the money function; that the evident fact that this function does not inhere in and can not be conferred on any article so as to make it either valuable or useful to man in isolation, while it is essential to the very existence of society, demonstrates that money value is not derived from the useful, intrinsic qualities of the material upon which the money function may be conferred. They also call attention to the facts that the usefulness to the individual of any article depends solely upon the intrinsic qualities which it

may possess, and is not diminished by its existence in unlimited quantity, while money, on the contrary, becomes entirely useless unless its quantity be limited. They conclude from these facts that the money value of the material on which the money stamp is placed rests solely upon the artificial and extrinsic qualities conferred upon it by law; that this value is inseparable from society and grows out of its need of and demand for an instrument of exchange and valuation.

MONEY NOT WEALTH, BUT A SET OF COUNTERS.

They maintain that money is not in itself wealth, but a set of counters for computing and exchanging wealth, or, as was said by Bishop Berkeley, "*a ticket entitling to power and fitted to record and transfer this power;*" and that "*it is of little consequence what materials the tickets are made of;*" that there are certain qualities which are essential to a proper performance of the money function; that money should be steady in value, portable, divisible, distinguishable, and difficult of imitation; that of all these qualities steadiness in value is the one of greatest importance; that the highest office of money is that of measuring values, present and future, and that to perform this office equitably its each unit must possess through time a practically unfluctuating, unvarying purchasing power; that as this steadiness can be secured only through a limitation and regulation of its quantity, the power of limitation and regulation should be always present, and that to this end the material on which the money function is conferred should be producible at all times in such quantities as may be necessary and as nearly as possible without cost.

They maintain that when the money function is conferred upon gold and silver, while the requirements of portability, divisibility, distinguishability, and difficulty of imitation are tolerably met, the requirements of constant attainability and inexpensiveness are not met at all, and that the superlatively essential requirement of *steadiness in value* is so imperfectly met as to render them unfit for money, and gold much more unfit than silver, because of much more irregular yield. They claim that the money function is the noblest of all functions and invests anything upon which it is conferred with a utility far greater than is possessed by any other exchangeable article known to man; that this utility is the true and only scientific basis of money value; that the value begotten of this utility is all that is needed for money, and all that money can possibly possess, and is all, and the only kind, of value ever estimated when money, whether metallic or otherwise, is used.

IT IS THE LEGAL-TENDER FUNCTION THAT CONSTITUTES ANYTHING MONEY.

That whenever the material of money is in demand as a commodity, such demand can neither increase the money value nor disturb either the commodity or the money until it rises to the level of the money demand, when it begins to destroy the money; that this is illustrated in subsidiary coinages and in the full-tender silver coinage of France and of the United States, the bullion value of which, being below the money value, prevents the metal in the coin from being either exported or used for other than money purposes; that in that coinage it is *the legal-tender function* conferred by the sovereign authority and verified by its stamp, and not the *metal* receiving the impression, which really constitutes the money, and that this stamp of authority would be as efficient and valuable if impressed on paper, and that this was shown in the experience of our greenbacks and fractional paper currency; that while the bullion in this coinage has added nothing to the value of the money, the Government stamp has effectually deprived the world of the use of the bullion, and that the cost of the bullion is a loss to the people for which there is no compensation; that the aggregate of the money value which can exist in any country is limited and fixed automatically by conditions and environment; that it bears a sure relation to the population, wealth, and exchanges of such country as modified by the character and habits of the people, their modes of transacting business, the rapidity with which their exchanges are effected, and many other considerations; that this value exists potentially wherever there are exchanges to be made; that in order to utilize this value it is only necessary for the law to materialize it, whereupon it becomes money; that it is independent of all other values, and can not be mixed with them: that the money value can not be in any degree increased by the commodity value of a material selected for money; that the commodity value, if any exists, can make itself felt only through a destruction of the money; that so long as the commodity continues to perform the money function commodity value, instead of adding anything to the conferred money value, is entirely suspended and noneffective; that when paper money depreciates or even breaks down entirely the process is ordinarily so gradual that the losses of individual holders are inappreciable.

Let the Government say that a greenback is a dollar receivable for all dues and legal tender for all debts, public and private, and although not redeemable in gold or silver or in any other one thing, but (as all money should be) redeemable in all things for sale and in all things for hire, that dollar can be made worth $10, $20, $50 in gold as it now stands. Why? All that would need to be done would be to limit the quantity of those dollars. Suppose there were five hundred millions of greenbacks, and gold and silver should be demonetized in this country, then that sum of $500,000,000 of greenbacks would have to do all the business of the nation, all that had before been done by the combined gold, silver, and paper, how much do you suppose each dollar of those greenbacks would be worth?

I recollect that a very distinguished gentleman, formerly a Senator in this body, once said to me: "Who would take this kind of money that you describe?" "Well," I replied, "*you* would, or you would get into jail as a tramp." [Laughter.] Every man who lives in civilized life must have money; he cannot live without it. How is he to get it? He must enter into trade in competition with every other man in his line of business and compete for money; whoever bids the most and offers the best service for the smallest number of money units gets the money. That is the way the value of money is fixed. No man or set of men can fix the value of money. It is the quantity—the supply as correlated to the demand—that fixes the value, yet, I regret to say that men of splendid minds—superlatively intellectual men—whom I know in this body—I could put my hand on them—are advocating a purely accidental standard, and call it the gold standard, far more accidental than the so-called double standard. If you had two thousand millions of gold at this moment doing the business of this country, and every dollar of it should be sunk irrecoverably in the bottom of the sea, and you should issue the same amount of paper, making it full legal tender, redeemable in all things, each dollar of the paper would be worth exactly as much as each dollar of the gold. As I have said, demand and supply regulate value. If you have the same supply, no more and no less, and you have the same demand, no more and no less, you can not have a change in value; it is absolutely impossible.

REGULATION AND LIMITATION OF QUANTITY ESSENTIAL.

Mr. ALDRICH. How would you fix the proper limit of your ideal money?

Mr. JONES of Nevada. That question has been asked many times. The answer is very simple. The proper limit at the present time would be exactly the amount we now have; that amount not to be diminished and not to be increased except in obedience to well-established laws. That simply means that we should go right along as we are going now, but much better, because under a gold standard we might find gold 20, 30, 40, or 50 per cent dearer or cheaper as time went on. That is a matter of pure accident. We could keep exactly the amount of money now in circulation and with it do the business of this country, only increasing the circulation *pari passu* with the increase of population.

Mr. ALDRICH. And you would not take into consideration any increase in business or any other circumstances?

Mr. JONES of Nevada. I should increase it (as an established principle) according to population, then I should make a small increase on account of what might be destroyed or accidentally burned up, so far as ascertainable; and then, if I found the country was not holding firmly to its range of prices—and I should spend a good deal of money to ascertain how that was—appointing for the purpose a commission of the most skillful and accomplished experts—I should propose a small percentage more. I think my friend would be among the first to understand the necessity for that, and to propose it, because nobody wants inflation—that is, nobody who has any sense. Inflation and contraction end in the same pit.

All we want is honest money—not the "honest money" that the Indianapolis League tell us about—we want the honest money that means a money unchanging in value through time, with which we can make a contract for the issue of bonds for thirty years and know that those who come after us are not going to be ruined in standing by their contract.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator allow me a word?

Mr. JONES of Nevada. Certainly.

Mr. CHANDLER. I want to follow the Senator as far as I can, but not too far. [Laughter.] I should like to ask him whether he really thinks it would be a safe limitation upon the amount of national money to prevent inflation, which he says is an evil, to fix the amount in accordance with the population of the country? Would that be a safe system of national finance?

Mr. JONES of Nevada. There can be no doubt about that in my mind.

Mr. CHANDLER. But will not the desire to get a little more, from Congress to Congress, lead to an increased proportion until, after all, we shall have inflation?

Mr. JONES of Nevada. I will say to the Senator that I think the people of the United States who ran in debt during civil war, when the currency was in greenbacks, deserve the admiration of the world from the fact that they saw their money afterwards burned by the Secretary of the Treasury without for a long time taking any steps to stop it. Ten or twelve millions of people—all the inhabitants of the Southern States—had in 1865 been added to the population without the addition of a dollar of money. I do

not think that in that instance there was any evidence of a desire for inflation.

I will answer the Senator further by stating that in all the history of the world I have never heard or read of a case where the people demanded inflation. In every instance where history shows that there has been inflation it has not been caused by any demand of the common people, but it has grown out of the exigencies of government. A government fighting for its very existence will resort to such measures as are absolutely essential. The assignats and mandates of the French Revolution were issued for that reason; the paper money of our own Revolution and our greenbacks during the civil war were issued for the same reason. The life of the Government was at stake. These moneys were all issued in the most unscientific manner, because the issuers were ignorant, as many otherwise intelligent people are now ignorant, of the natural law or principle of quantity as applied to money. At some periods a very few dollars were issued, and at other periods an enormous mass was issued. Irregular and unscientific, however, as were the issues of greenbacks, we had better times than we have ever had since, because on the whole there was a sufficient quantity of money.

Mr. CHANDLER. Everybody agrees, I will say to the Senator, that an increase in the volume of money is beneficial; but it is like drinking whisky, if you drink too much you break down. How can we limit the amount of this national money?

Mr. JONES of Nevada. All on our side are against both inflation and contraction.

Mr. CHANDLER. It encourages me to move toward the Senator if he is against inflation.

Mr. JONES of Nevada. We are against inflation, because it must end disastrously. It is easy to point out the road by which it ends. When prices of commodities are rising for no cause whatever connected with their production, and the rise can only be attributed to the increasing volume of money, every unthinking person in the country wants to become possessed of property. Seeing prices rising, he wants to get an option on everything in sight, and will pay almost any interest to secure it. I remember seeing this exemplified in Los Angeles. When property was rising everybody wanted to get options; they wanted to get a chance to control property in order to take advantage of the rise in prices, but by and by they found that the prices rose faster than the money increased in volume, and very soon everything collapsed.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will not the same people who want to do this elect Representatives and Senators in Congress—if they can get at them—to come here to Washington and issue a great deal more money? It seems to me that that is the danger.

Mr. MONEY. Will the Senator allow me a moment?

Mr. JONES of Nevada. Yes, sir.

Mr. MONEY. The observation I wish to make is suggested by the question of the Senator from New Hamsphire [Mr. CHANDLER]. Does the Senator from Nevada not know that Brazil maintained for years and years an absolutely irredeemable and inconvertible limited paper currency at par without either silver or gold?

Mr. JONES of Nevada. Yes.

Mr. CHANDLER. How about the Argentine? If the Senator will allow me, I think I should be willing to go as far as they have gone in Brazil, but not quite so far as they have gone in the Argentine. I want the Senator from Nevada to tell me how we can go so far and then stop?

Mr. JONES of Nevada. The only thing needed for safety is knowledge. The people should understand the principles regulating the value of money. Many of the leading men of the country refuse to investigate our presentation of the subject; they refuse especially to investigate the law or principle of quantity; they hold up their hands against it; they run away from it; yet that is the very fundamental law of money.

There should, of course, be an exact regulation of the circulation. The thing for every statesman to do, in my judgment, is to study and discuss thoroughly this law of quantity, which is perfectly mathematical. Our people are so accustomed to the miseries of falling prices, hard times, disappointment, and distress in business, that if good times were once restored they would, in my opinion, be ready to mob any man who should talk about changing them.

Mr. CHANDLER. Any man who talked about refusing to increase the money?

Mr. JONES of Nevada. No; about changing its quantity.

Mr. CHANDLER. Not about increasing it?

Mr. JONES of Nevada. What would they want a change for?

Mr. CHANDLER. To make *better* times.

Mr. JONES of Nevada. Oh, no; there would be no danger of that. I have more confidence in the masses of the people than has the Senator. As I have said, there is no instance in history in which any inflation has arisen from a demand of the people. I believe our people understand what they want, and I believe that when once they commenced to see good times resulting from proper regulation of the quantity of money they would make no change.

THE AGGREGATE MONEY VALUE CAN BE INCREASED OR DECREASED ONLY BY AN INCREASE OR DIMINUTION OF PRODUCTIVE FORCES AND WEALTH.

When interrupted I was proceeding to state the contentions of the school of thinkers that favor the use of Government paper money of full legal-tender power, and I will continue that subject.

They assert that the money of all countries, whatever may be its material, is nothing but the sum of the integrant parts into which the money value is divided; that the value of each of these integrant parts, or units, will depend upon the number of parts into which this value is subdivided; that in case this value is subdivided through the use of the precious metals, these units, or integrant parts, are subjected to variations in their value through an increase in the number from unknown and accidental supplies from the mines, and through a decrease by the unknown number of such units which may be consumed in other uses; that while the cost of producing such units adds nothing to their money value, the uncertainty of producing them and the uncertain quantity destroyed after being produced render it impossible to regulate the number, and consequently the value of such units.

They maintain that the aggregate of the money value can only be increased or diminished by an increase or diminution of the productive forces and wealth which it measures and which govern it; that the increase or decrease of the number of the units of money can have no effect upon the aggregate of the money value, but that the number of such units simply determines the fractional part of the whole value belonging to each unit; that the money value will inhere in any material substance whatever upon which the sovereign authority may confer the money function; that whenever the law declares that paper in a certain form, upon being stamped with authoritative and distinguishing marks and devices, shall be invested with the money function, each piece of such paper so stamped becomes not a debt, nor a credit, nor a promise, dishonored or otherwise, nor a "representative" of gold or silver, nor of any one thing, but of *all* things; that it becomes the thing signified, not a sign, and to all intents and purposes lacking no quality, but possessing all, becomes money, pure, simple, and unadulterated, with a value not less real because not possessing intrinsic qualities useful for other purposes than the money value conferred in the same manner and by the same authority on gold and silver.

A MATERIAL MOST USEFUL FOR MONEY PURPOSES WHEN POSSESSING NO UTILITY FOR OTHER PURPOSES.

They claim that money can be maintained steadier and more uniform in purchasing power, and made to perform its true functions with greater exactness when composed of some material substance always attainable and not possessing utility or value for other purposes than when composed of metals difficult and uncertain of attainment and subject to other than money demands; that the commingling of money value and commodity value in one substance is an intermingling of things whose uses are inconsistent with and whose elements have no affinity for each other; that it is a confounding of barter with price, and of measure with the thing to be measured; that the uncertain, varying, and generally increasing demand for the commodity subjects the money to vicious perturbations in value, while the superior and constant demand for the *money* renders the commodity more steady in value than it would otherwise be; that the greater steadiness thus gained in the commodity value is of no importance or benefit whatever, while the resulting unsteadiness in the value of money is a transcendent injury to the world; that the commodity demand for gold and silver not only exerts a disturbing influence on the value of metallic money, but, unfortunately, always exerts it in the ruinous direction of increasing that value by diminishing the volume of money, and still more unfortunately that, as wealth and population increase, old uses increase and new uses are discovered; that to unite commodity and money in one substance is to plant in money the seeds of its own destruction; that the arts, resisting the invasion of heir legitimate domain, are constantly absorbing the coin; that such money is costly and unscientific, and only an improvement on the barter system, and retains vicious ingredients of that barbarous method of exchange; that it is as imperfect an instrument for measuring values as would be a thermometer for measuring heat if its fluid were subject to constant disturbances to an unknown extent from other influences than heat.

EVIL OF FLUCTUATIONS OF SUPPLY.

They maintain that the fluctuation in the value of metallic money caused by the encroachments of the commodity demand is sufficient of itself to condemn the use of gold and silver as money, but that when to this are added the enormous fluctuations in their supply the argument against their use becomes conclusive.

They claim that adequate metallic supplies in the future will depend, as in the past, upon the accidental discoveries of mines

and upon the policy and mining laws of the governments controlling the locality of the discoveries.

They maintain that the industry of mining, and especially gold mining, is more subject to chance and less governed by the economic laws of production than any other pursuit, and consequently bears only an accidental relation to human efforts in other fields, and that therefore the product of such industry is uneven and ill-suited for a measure of all values. They claim that the world's supply of metallic money, and consequently its value, is not only subject to the vicissitudes inherent in the business of mining, but is largely increased or diminished, as the case may be, through political complications, and through other conditions which have no necessary connection with mining.

As a signal illustration of this, they refer to the decrease of the supplies of gold and silver after 1809, caused by the revolutions in the Spanish-American colonies, and to the enormous increase of the supplies at a later period through the acquisition and occupation of California, which resulted from the success of the Democratic party in the close Presidential election of 1844, and which might otherwise have been postponed indefinitely; that of these two noted changes in the metallic supply, resulting from facts having no necessary connection with mining, the first nearly bankrupted the world, while the second stimulated industry and commerce to an extent never before known.

ESPECIALLY THE EVIL OF INADEQUACY.

They say that in addition to the evils which result in fluctuations in the supply of the precious metals is the fatal evil of inadequacy of supply which for a quarter of a century has been pressing upon the industry and commerce of the world with crushing severity. They refer to the facts that the yield of the precious metals since 1847 has been unprecedented, aggregating billions of dollars; that this entire amount, swollen by the sums liberated by suspending countries, has been permitted to flow uninterruptedly into the few countries maintaining the specie basis; that the maximum of production was reached in 1865, when there began a fall of prices lasting for more than thirty years.

It blighted civilization, retarded prosperity, and brought more unhappiness to the world than if there had been continuous war during that entire period. They insist that these facts show that, even if the precious metals were otherwise fit for money, the utter impossibility of regulating their quantity interposes an insuperable objection to a money system founded upon them.

HUMAN PROGRESS INTERMITTENT BY REASON OF VARIATIONS IN MONETARY SUPPLIES.

They maintain that by reason of the great variations in the supply of the precious metals, and the purely accidental relation which that supply has borne to the world's demand for money, the movement of the human race in wealth and civilization has been fitful and spasmodic, and not always progressive; that the business of the world in all times past has been, through fluctuations in the supply of money, now stimulated by fever and now prostrated by collapse; that industry and commerce have been alternately borne high on the flood tide of metallic production from newly discovered mining fields, and stranded on the shoals of bankruptcy by the refluent ebb; that, unfortunately, the ebbs and flows of these tides are of unequal duration; that the flux of prosperity has usually lasted but a brief period, while the reflux of adversity, with its attendant circumstances of falling prices, industrial paralysis, and destitute populations, has been painfully prolonged; that the tide of metallic production which commenced its flood in 1847 turned in 1865 to an ebb that lasted until within a very recent period; that however well metallic money may have been adapted to the circumscribed business and political and social condition of the past, the growing industry and commerce of the world can not afford to have their lusty limbs shackled by it in the future.

They maintain that as the most important function of money is to measure values and to preserve equities in time transactions, the great bulk of which are internal and between citizens of the same country, and all of which are expressed in the money of some particular country, it follows that any system of money that is common to several countries is a vicious system, in that it subjects the entire internal business of each of them to all the disasters originating in the political or financial mismanagement of foreign governments, or in the political disturbances, follies, misfortunes, or reckless speculations of the inhabitants of any one or all of such governments, as, for instance, in the case of the Baring failure.

Mr. STEWART. And the Boer war.

Mr. JONES of Nevada. And the Boer war. Under a gold standard we may expect at any time to hear of a war on some island of which we never heard before that will shake the financial foundation of this country, because it will throw our securities on the market and take our money away—money that is indispensable for our domestic exchanges; money that is essential to transact our business; more essential than any other thing whatever.

MONEY THE INSTRUMENT, NOT THE OBJECT, OF COMMERCE.

These advocates of full legal-tender Government paper money assert that money is simply the *instrument* of commerce and industry, and not their object; that a sufficiency of it is better than more and infinitely better than less; that the outflow of money from one country to another having money systems in common is a double injury; that it is an injury to the country that receives it, and a greater injury to the country that parts with it; that it tends in the one instance to produce crises through inflation, and, in the other, panics through contraction; that the invention of money is but half completed when the necessary limitations and regulation of its quantity, and consequently of its value, are remitted not only to the chances of mining, but to the vicissitudes in the business and legislation of foreign countries; that these facts and considerations, and many others which might be urged, show that metallic money is an inaccurate money, that it fills only in a moderate degree any of the requirements of a perfect system, while, in essential particulars, it so far fails to fill them as to render it unfit for an advanced civilization.

ADVANTAGES OF A PERFECTLY REGULATED SYSTEM OF MONEY.

They claim, on the other hand, that every requirement of a perfect system can be met more nearly and more certainly by a properly regulated system of paper money than by any other ever devised. Not paper money based upon gold, silver, or any other fluctuating commodity, whose measure it should be; nor upon a promise of commodities, near or remote, definite or indefinite, of governments or of banks; nor like the French assignats, based upon lands; nor like our national-bank notes, based on bonds; nor fastened to gold or silver by a chain sure to snap when the metals are wanted; nor convertible into bonds and thereby offering the bribe of interest for the withdrawal of the money from circulation; nor of any use to its owner except when parted with; nor capable of yielding profit except when employed in the production and distribution of wealth; but an absolute *money*, whose value, conferred by the sovereign authority, and regulated by a prearranged and perfected system, and not by the passions and caprices of the hour, would rest impregnably on functions essential to civilization and progress.

They claim that it would be more portable, more difficult of imitation, more easily verified, more readily divisible, and less expensive than metallic money; that as quantity controls the value of money, the all-important quality of steadiness in value could be better assured through a system which subjects that quantity to absolute control than through the metallic system, which remits the regulation of quantity to accidents and vicissitudes, industrial and political, sometimes through the resumption or suspension of the yield of the mines, and sometimes through the resumption or suspension of specie payments in any and every country; that as paper money is producible substantially without labor and without expense, its exclusive use would be an addition to the public wealth equal to the entire cost of furnishing and keeping up the supply of the necessary quantity of metallic money; that in order to make it secure and possess the highest degree of utility, paper money should be issued exclusively by the Government, to the exclusion of all other kinds of money; that it should be regulated in value through an equitable adjustment of quantity, by virtue of laws which should take effect only upon the occurrence of conditions precedent not dependent upon legislation, such as an increase of population; that it should be reciprocally receivable by Government and people and between the people themselves; that its each unit should be convertible, not at any specific time or place, nor into any specific quantity of any particular product of human industry, such as gold or silver, but at *all* times and in *all* places where the sovereign power gives it the right to circulate, and to the full extent of the value determined as above, and into any and all of the products of human industry, including those metals.

They claim that every argument against investing with the money function a material not possessing qualities useful for non-monetary purposes is, when analyzed—I call the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] to this statement—an impeachment of the integrity and capacity of the people and of their fitness for self-government, and a claim that the regulation of the most important institution of civilization can be more safely remitted to the edicts of chance than to the guidance of human wisdom.

REASONS FOR FAILURE TO ESTABLISH SUCH A SYSTEM HERETOFORE.

That the failure in times past to establish satisfactory systems of paper money no more proves that such systems are impossible than the innumerable abortive attempts throughout the ages to establish individual liberty proved that *political freedom* was impossible; that if the French assignats broke down, so also did the French Republic, and mainly for the similar reasons, that the French people did not then fully comprehend the true nature of either liberty or money; that the same degree of virtue and enlightenment necessary for the establishment of the one is necessary

for the establishment of the other; that the failures of efforts under revolutionary or despotic governments to establish paper-money systems have no significance whatever; that no such effort has ever been made under free institutions firmly established, without which perfection in the money, or any other system which affects the general welfare, is impossible.

That the failures of one age often become the established successes of the next; that every progressive movement of mankind has been tedious and toilsome and has been accomplished only through trial, suffering, and the disappointment of repeated failures; that every step of this progress has been impeded by a sinister conservatism which glorifies everything, even stupidity and tyranny, if hoary with age, and always seeks to rivet the needs of the present to the decaying and imperfect systems of the past and to deny to the human race the hopes and possibilities of the future.

That there have been the same evolutions of progress in money as in all other things; that in the rude original of society no kind of money was possible; that the first trade was by barter, after which some one or more commodities attainable in the vicinage, and in general use and demand, were selected as the common media through which all exchanges were filtered; that the use for that purpose of various metals by weight followed next, and at a succeeding stage gold, silver, and copper by weight, and after this their use in the form of coins.

That in most countries coined money has been sometimes supplemented and sometimes superseded by promises to pay coin, which were always broken when coin was demanded; that the next step in many countries has been a coinage maintained above its bullion value through limitation of quantity and the stamp of authority, as in subsidiary silver coinages, and at the present time in the entire silver coinage in the States of the Latin Union and the United States; and that since the success of this last step in preserving, through limitation of quantity, a steadiness of money value above and wholly independent of commodity value has been assured, it would be presumptuous to affirm that the same means may not furnish, without any commodity value whatever, a better and steadier money than the world has ever seen, and that such money will not become the money of the future.

They do not overlook the objections heretofore made on the part of many thoughtful persons to the issuance of full legal-tender paper money by the Government, but they claim that those objections have been founded on overissues, the result of ignorance on the part of statesmen as to the factors of value in money, and especially the disregard of the natural law of *quantity*, on which the whole science of money is founded, political economists of repute admitting that when sufficiently limited in quantity such money has always maintained its value at the par of gold.

But they claim that in the present enlightened age the true function of money is better understood than at any former period; that with all the experience of the past to warn and guide, false systems may be avoided and a true system established; that such countries as have free, stable, and constitutional governments and advanced systems of jurisprudence, and which furnish universal opportunities for education, and whose citizens are, by the practice of liberty, accustomed to self-imposed burdens and restraints, can be intrusted with the regulation of the volume and value of "fiat" money with a full assurance that it will be regulated with wisdom and equity, and they maintain that it is the only kind of money whose value can be scientifically regulated.

The statement of the great financial authority, Ricardo, must commend itself to every reflecting mind. He says:

> A regulated paper currency is so great an improvement in commerce that I should greatly regret if prejudice should induce us to return to a system of less utility. The introduction of the precious metals for the purposes of money may, with truth, be considered as one of the most important steps toward the improvement of commerce and the arts of civilized life. But it is no less true that with the advancement of knowledge and science we discover that it would be another improvement to banish them again from the employment to which, during a less enlightened period, they had been so advantageously applied.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I must be permitted to say that the world has never known the degree of progress of which mankind is capable under the influence of a sufficient and *regularly increasing* quantity of money. It never will be known to what degree of excellence and achievement the human race may attain until the monetary volume shall keep even step and pace with the world's monetary wants. The physical, intellectual, and spiritual development of mankind depends upon an unfailing sufficiency of the money quantity.

But so long as the world determines to adhere to the metals it is essential to the welfare of society and industry that both shall be utilized to the fullest extent in order that the inevitable oscillations in the yield of one shall be supplemented by the correcting oscillations in the yield of the other. There never has been too much of both; and in view of the tendency of industry and commerce to unexampled development and expansion, it is, in my judgment, exceedingly to be regretted that the United States are to be deprived of the benefits to be derived from the utilization of both metals as full legal-tender money. In my judgment it will not be many years before the people of this country will reverse the verdict of Congress and insist upon a measure of legislation that will not deliberately reject the bounties of nature, but will again make available for purposes of money the metal that has always been and must long continue to be the money of the masses of mankind.

The Late Daniel Ermentrout.

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN WESLEY GAINES,
OF TENNESSEE,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Saturday, February 3, 1900.

The House having under consideration the following resolutions:

"IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *February 3, 1900.*

"*Resolved*, That the House has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. DANIEL ERMENTROUT, late a member of the House of Representatives from the State of Pennsylvania.

"*Resolved*, That the business of the House be now suspended that opportunity may be given for fitting tribute to his memory.

"*Resolved*, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy of the same to the family of the deceased.

"*Resolved*, That as an additional mark of respect the House, at the conclusion of these memorial proceedings, do adjourn"—

Mr. GAINES said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I shall detain the House but a few moments. I have no prepared speech, but shall speak of DANIEL ERMENTROUT, whose memory we hold dear, as I knew him in this body and socially. My acquaintance begun at the Fifty-fifth Congress convened in extra session. But a few moments after it was announced from the Clerk's desk in the organization of the House that I represented the Nashville district I saw him first. Immediately upon this announcement being made I saw him, to me a total stranger, leave his seat and walk deliberately around to where I now stand, giving me his hand and saying: "DANIEL ERMENTROUT, from the good county of Berks, which," said he, "always goes Democratic. Yes, sir; always stands for the party." And if I mistake not, he said that "that county had not gone Republican for the last thirty years."

He immediately began to inquire of some old friends in Nashville and was characteristically solicitous about them. From that time until we parted, when the extra session adjourned sine die, my association with him was frequent and of the very pleasantest nature. I so much enjoyed his companionship, and, indeed, so much appreciated the friendly, warm-hearted bearing toward me, that when I invited a party of members of Congress, at the request of my people in Nashville, to attend our Centennial, he was among the first whom I invited, and he, with his charming wife, composed two of that party of sixty.

He was an outburst of sunshine wherever he went. I remember our party went out to Murfreesboro to the home of my distinguished colleague [Mr. RICHARDSON], and there, with others, he was called upon to make a speech. He made the best speech of the occasion, and I remember in discussing the subject then before that meeting—for we were invited out by the charming people of Murfreesboro to look over the historic battlefield of Stones River—the question of making it a military park was raised.

I believe a measure of that kind is now pending before Congress, and I remember distinctly that Mr. ERMENTROUT said that he favored it, that he would support it; but he said, "I want a condition coupled with it. We must take care of the ashes of the brave Confederates who also sleep on this memorable battlefield. If not, I will not support the measure. They and their children are paying the taxes. They bear the burdens, and they and their dead should receive some of the benefits bestowed by a generous Government. We are all one people and we all love the same flag."

During our two days' trip to Nashville he was a champion of the cause of pleasure making, adding always refinement and zest to each and every occasion, he was the joy of the party. He was happy all the time. He could tell a good joke, was a good historian, and had a rich store of memories, and particularly, as he always said, of "the good county of Berks." He was entertaining to the old and the young alike, always refreshing.

Reaching Nashville, DANIEL ERMENTROUT, if not the guest of some charming circle of new acquaintances, if left alone a short while, soon had a crowd about him. I can see him now talking to the little "darkies," as he called them, telling them jokes,

adding oftentimes, as he thought, a charm to the "yarn," as he called his jokes, by saying, "I am a Yankee Democrat."

Mr. Speaker, "kind hearts are more than coronets." He made no distinctions in kind attentions. He was the center of attraction wherever he went, whether in a circle of distinguished ladies and gentlemen or with the very humblest of the immense throngs that visited our noted centennial. He was liked by all. He loved to make everybody enjoy life, as he often said.

I remember the succeeding day we took our party to the Hermitage, where rests the sacred dust of Jackson, the hero of every fight, civic, military, or political. DANIEL ERMENTROUT was the first man to alight from the train; he was the first man in the conveyance; the first man to leave the conveyance; the first man to reach the mansion, and the first man to reach the sacred tomb of Jackson and his wife. I remember how he dwelt about that historic sepulchre; how he was touched by the epitaph over the grave of Mrs. Andrew Jackson, written by Jackson himself, which reads as follows:

Here lie the remains of Mrs. Rachel Jackson, wife of President Jackson, who died the 22d of December, 1828, aged 61 years. Her face was fair, her person pleasing, her temper amiable, her heart kind. She delighted in relieving the wants of her fellow-creatures, and cultivated that divine pleasure by the most liberal and unpretending methods; to the poor she was a benefactor; to the rich an example; to the wretched a comforter; to the prosperous an ornament; her piety went hand in hand with her benevolence, and she thanked her Creator for being permitted to do good. A being so gentle and so virtuous slander might wound, but could not dishonor; even death, when he bore her from the arms of her husband, could but transport her to the bosom of her God.

He read this beautiful epitaph over and over again, as I have seen, Mr. Speaker, often the case. I remember distinctly what he said at the conclusion of this reading: "He was a faithful husband, a faithful friend, and a faithful public servant on all occasions." And then, turning to one of the officers of the Ladies' Hermitage Association, with his hat off in the hot sun and with the graciousness of a Chesterfield, he said:

I congratulate the Ladies' Hermitage Association that they have such a spot as this to love, to visit, and preserve.

Mr. Speaker, when I learned of the death of DANIEL ERMENTROUT I was indeed shocked and distressed. I felt that I had lost a warm friend. That the "good county of Berks" had lost an illustrious and useful son, one who had stood by her in a most loyal and patriotic manner in public office, and who had been an ornament to society, who had reared a beautiful family, who did honor to that county and his State. And, Mr. Speaker, when I look over the biographical sketch of this very remarkable man I feel that there are few people in this country who have been honored by others as much as he was. I am not surprised that he was loyal to them. Let me read, Mr. Speaker, from a short history of his life:

He was born at Reading, Berks County, Pa., January 24, 1837, and has continued to reside there since; was educated in the public and classical schools of his native city, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, and Elmwood Institute, Norristown, Pa.; studied law and was admitted to practice in the courts of Berks County in August, 1859; was elected district attorney of Berks County for three years in 1862; was solicitor for the city of Reading 1867-1870; was elected to the State senate of Pennsylvania in 1873 for a term of three years, and reelected in 1876 for four years; was a member of the board of school control of Reading for many years; was appointed in October, 1877, by Governor Hartranft—

Governor Hartranft was a Republican, but he saw DANIEL ERMENTROUT was the man for the place, and appointed him—

a member of the Pennsylvania statuary commission; was several times chairman of the Democratic county committee of Berks; delegate to various State and national conventions; was in 1880 elected as a Democrat to represent Berks County, then constituting the Eighth Congressional district of Pennsylvania, in the Forty-seventh Congress, and successively in the Forty-eighth, Forty-ninth, and Fiftieth Congresses, his services ending March 4, 1889; served on the House committees on Accounts, Banking and Currency, Military Affairs, Post-Office and Post-Roads, and was chairman of Committee on Election of President and Vice-President; was elected in 1896 as a Democrat to represent Berks and Lehigh counties, constituting the Ninth Congressional district of Pennsylvania, in the Fifty-fifth Congress.

Mr. Speaker, here is an unbroken chain of honors that were conferred on this distinguished son of Pennsylvania by his people. It is very often said, Mr. Speaker, that a man is not without honor save in his own country, but here certainly is an exception, a man who was not only honored at home, but loved beyond the limits of his State. He left a happy impress on his fellows in Congress. He came here and won my own heart, and it is to me a pleasant yet sad duty to bear testimony to the charming characteristics of his lovely individuality, and to say that wherever he went, whether North or South, East or West, he won the heart of everyone, and seemed to make it a business invariably to make people happy, to turn the cutting edge of anguish, and if not able to bring them to his high standard of taking life easy, to hurry the clouds by and beyond. The undertaking was natural and pleasing to him.

Mr. Speaker—

No radiant pearl which crested fortune wears,
No gem that twinkling hangs from beauty's ears,
Not the bright stars which night's blue arch adorn,
Nor the rising sun that gilds the vernal morn,
Shine with such luster as the tear that flows
Down virtue's manly cheek for other's woes.

The Late Denis M. Hurley.

REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH MEYER,
OF LOUISIANA,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, June 1, 1900.

The House having under consideration the following resolutions:

"Whereas the late Hon. DENIS M. HURLEY, member of the Fifty-fifth Congress from the Second district of the State of New York, died on the 25th day of February, 1899, immediately preceding the final adjournment of the Fifty-fifth Congress; and

"Whereas the pressure of public business in the few days then remaining of the Fifty-fifth Congress prevented a day being set apart for the customary tributes to the memory of the said deceased:

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives be permitted to print in the RECORD appropriate remarks in eulogy of the said Hon. DENIS M. HURLEY, deceased"—

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not rise for the purpose of speaking in detail of the varied and useful career of DENIS M. HURLEY, to whose memory we are now paying this tribute. That duty has been well performed by those from whom it more appropriately comes than from myself, but a long association with the deceased in this House, and an observation of his public career will surely justify in me a brief word expressive of my respect and sympathy for his elevated sturdy character and useful service.

Mr. HURLEY sat in this House for about four years, the choice of a great constituency from the important city of Brooklyn. Serving with him as a colleague on the Committee on Naval Affairs, and in frequent social intercourse, I had constant opportunity to observe and study his admirable traits of character and his devotion to duty. He was a man endowed with a quiet but steady enthusiasm, and brought to the performance of his duties an admirable courage, perfect conviction, and conceded purity of motive, and even those who differed from him most widely in his political beliefs, recognized his sincerity, and respected him as a worthy and most honorable antagonist.

I believe that Mr. HURLEY enjoyed the sincere respect of every member of the House, and he more than deserved it. He was not a man of artifice or tricks. He had no cunning. He was not a demagogue or timeserver. He spoke always what he believed to be the truth. He followed unostentatiously but firmly what he believed to be the path of duty. No line of ambition, no sordid motive, no popular clamor or misconception could have led him to swerve from the right as he understood it. He was a punctual, a faithful, a laborious public servant. In an epoch when many public men are accused, whether rightfully or wrongfully, no one ever whispered a syllable against his personal integrity. His life was one of republican simplicity, true to his antecedents and traditions; homely, if you please, but clean, honest, and brave.

If the high standard of fidelity and duty that Mr. HURLEY recognized could be made the law and life of our representative men, the effect upon every branch of the public service would be to quicken us all to a new and higher patriotism and to inspire a stronger hope in our institutions. He has left a noble model for us to follow. Those who specially mourn his loss in this hour of bereavement can not but feel that he has well and bravely filled his part, both as a useful citizen in the industrial walks of life and on a great theater of public action; and that not only his good works do follow him, but the lesson of a high example.

INDEX

TO THE

APPENDIX TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Acquisition of Territory
Remarks on, by
Mr. Bartholdt 43, 44.
Mr. Boutell of Illinois 34.
Mr. Long 194.
Mr. Sparkman 172.

Agricultural Appropriation Bill
Remarks on, by
Mr. Haugen 242.
Mr. Spalding 192.

Agricultural Prosperity
Remarks by Mr. Grosvenor on 351, 437.

Alaska
Remarks by Mr. Salmon on government for 318.

Aldrich vs. Robbins
Remarks on contested election case of, by
Mr. Glynn 115.
Mr. Robbins 89.

Allison, *William B.* (*a Senator from Iowa*)
Remarks by, on
Bland, Richard P: death of 223.

American National Red Cross
Remarks by Mr. Scudder on 439.

Anglo-American Alliance
Remarks by Mr. Little on 286.

Anti-Imperialistic League
Platform of 164.

Appropriations
Remarks on statement of, by
Mr. Bell 519.
Mr. Livingston 459.

Armor Plate
Remarks by Mr. Barber on manufacture of 240.

Army
List of appointees as major-generals and brigadier-generals in 297.
Statement giving number of colored men in 439.

Army Appropriation Bill
Remarks on, by
Mr. Ridgely 174, 613.
Mr. Sparkman 172.

Babcock, *Joseph W.* (*a Representative from Wisconsin*)
Remarks by, on
McKinley Administration 566.

Bank of United States
Remarks by Mr. Noonan on 189.

Barber, *Laird H.* (*a Representative from Pennsylvania*)
Remarks by, on
Armor plate 240.
Navy appropriation bill 239.

Barney, *Samuel S.* (*a Representative from Wisconsin*)
Remarks by, on
Oleomargarine 559.

Bartholdt, *Richard* (*a Representative from Missouri*)
Remarks by, on
Acquisition of territory 43, 44.
Missouri election law 41, 44.

Bartlett, *Charles L.* (*a Representative from Georgia*)
Remarks by, on
Colonies and colonization 456, 457.
Georgia election law 571.
Porto Rico tariff 452.

Beer Tax
Remarks on reduction of, by
Mr. Ryan of New York 521.
Mr. Wilson of New York 208, 209.
Memorial from brewers for reduction of 209.

Beet Sugar
Remarks by Mr. Haugen on production of 243.

Bell, *John C.* (*a Representative from Colorado*)
Remarks by, on
Appropriations 519.
Porto Rico tariff 33.

Benton, *Thomas H.*
Remarks by Mr. Elkins on reception by Congress of statue of 666.

Berry, *Albert S.* (*a Representative from Kentucky*)
Remarks by, on
Military Academy appropriation bill 307.
Shipping subsidy 307.

Beveridge, *Albert J.* (*a Senator from Indiana*)
Remarks by, on
Morton, Oliver P: statue of 682.
Philippine Islands 110, 112.
Porto Rico government 279.

Bimetallism
Remarks by Mr. Shafroth on 319.

Bingham, *Henry H.* (*a Representative from Pennsylvania*)
Remarks by, on
Post-Office appropriation bill 229.
Railway postal clerks 230.

Blair, *Francis P.*
Remarks by Mr. Elkins on reception by Congress of statue of 667.

Bland, *Richard P.* (*a Representative from Missouri*)
Eulogies in House on 179, 222, 223, 264, 265.
Eulogy in Senate on 223.

Boutell, *Henry S.* (*a Representative from Illinois*)
Remarks by, on
Acquisition of territory 34.
Philippine Islands 34.

Boutwell, *George S.*
Address on imperialism at Masonic Hall, Washington, D. C., by 165.

Brewer, *Justice*
Address on imperialism before Liberal Club of Buffalo by 311.

Brick, *Abram L.* (*a Representative from Indiana*)
Remarks by, on
Porto Rico tariff 204.

Brosius, *Marriott* (*a Representative from Pennsylvania*)
Remarks by, on
Financial law 236.

Brownlow, *Walter P. (a Representative from Tennessee)*
Remarks by, on
Roberts, Brigham H: exclusion of 23.

Bryan, *William J.*
Address on suppression of trusts by 522.
Addresses on imperialism by 76, 180, 450, 652.

Chanler, *William Astor (a Representative from New York)*
Remarks by, on
Porto Rico tariff 128.

China
Statement of cotton industry in 456.

Civil Service
Statement giving number of colored persons in 439.

Clay, *Alexander S. (a Senator from Georgia)*
Remarks by, on
Philippine Islands 106.

Clayton, *Bertram T. (a Representative from New York)*
Remarks by, on
Nicaragua Canal 258.

Clayton, *Henry D. (a Representative from Alabama)*
Remarks by, on
District of Columbia code 652.
Nicaragua Canal 368.
Trusts 326.

Coal Production
Statement of 349.

Cochran, *Charles F. (a Representative from Missouri)*
Remarks by, on
Philippine Islands and Porto Rico 46.

Cœur d'Alene. *See* IDAHO.

Colonies and Colonization
Remarks on, by
Mr. Bartlett 456, 457.
Mr. Dick 398, 423, 424, 425.

Colored Citizens
Remarks on colored men in military and civil service by
Mr. Grosvenor 439.
Mr. Small 632.

Consular Service
Remarks by Mr. Grosvenor on 257.

Cotton Production
Statement of 350, 351, 456.

Cowherd, *William S. (a Representative from Missouri)*
Remarks by, on
Nicaragua Canal 305.

Cox *Nicholas N. (a Representative from Tennessee)*
Remarks by, on
Administration policy 202.
Army appropriation bill 202.
Philippine Islands 202.

Cromer, *George W. (a Representative from Indiana)*
Remarks by, on
Rural free delivery 241.

Cuba
Letter from George F. Hoar to Boston Journal on independence of 168.

Cummings, *Amos J. (a Representative from New York)*
Remarks by, on
Second-class mail matter 129.
Trusts 522.

Currency Law
Remarks on operation of, by
Mr. Brosius 230.
Mr. Dick 385, 413, 415.
Mr. Jones of Nevada 702.
Mr. McCleary 3.
Mr. Noonan 188, 189, 190.
Mr. Overstreet 16.
Mr. Quarles of Virginia 20.
Letter from William Sulzer on 174.

Cusack, *Thomas (a Representative from Illinois)*
Remarks by, on
Porto Rico tariff 54.
South African Republic 55.

Dahle, *Herman B. (a Representative from Wisconsin)*
Remarks by, on
Oleomargarine 657.

Daly, *William D. (a Representative from New Jersey)*
Remarks by, on
Porto Rico tariff 123.
Secretary of Treasury 20.

Danford, *Lorenzo (a Representative from Ohio)*
Eulogies in House on 27, 53, 451, 615.

Davidson, *James H. (a Representative from Wisconsin)*
Remarks by, on
Oleomargarine 515.
Rural free delivery 260.

De Armond, *David A. (a Representative from Missouri)*
Remarks by, on
Bland, Richard P: death of 223, 265.
Epes, Sydney P: death of 142.
Ermentrout, Daniel: death of 41.
Porto Rico tariff 94.

Deficiency Appropriation Bill
Remarks by Mr. Griffith on 300.

De Graffenreid, *R. C. (a Representative from Texas)*
Remarks by, on
Epes, Sydney P: death of 180.

Department of Agriculture
Remarks by Mr. Dick on work of 381.

Dick, *Charles (a Representative from Ohio)*
Remarks by, on
Colonies and colonization 388, 423, 424, 425.
Commerce with new possessions 426, 427.
Currency law 385, 413, 415.
Department of Agriculture 381.
Dingley tariff 413.
Expansion policy 430.
Foreign relations 421.
Free coinage 385.
German vote 392.
Gold production 418, 419.
Gold standard 418, 420.
Gold standard in Japan 420.
Imports of tropical products 390.
National finances 413.
Navy Department 412.
New Mexico insurrection 391.
Pacific Railroad settlements 416.
Pension legislation 376.
Philippine Islands 429.
Prices of manufactures 390.
Prosperity of labor 404.
Rural free delivery 384.
Silver production 418.
South African war 422.
Sugar production 410.
Tariff of Europe 408.
Trusts 396.
Trusts in England 397.
War Department 411.
War-revenue bill 415.

Dingley Tariff Bill
Remarks by Mr. Dick on operation of 413.

Eddy, *Frank M. (a Representative from Minnesota)*
Remarks by, on
Porto Rico tariff 55.

Elkins, *Stephen B. (a Senator from West Virginia)*
Remarks by, on
Benton and Blair statues 666.

Epes, *Sydney P. (a Representative from Virginia)*
Eulogies in House on 133, 142, 180, 492.

Ermentrout, *Daniel (a Representative from Pennsylvania)*
Eulogies in House on 41, 716.

Eulogies
On Richard P. Bland 179, 222, 223, 264, 265.
On Lorenzo Danford 27, 53, 451, 615.
On Sydney P. Epes 133, 142, 180, 492.
On Daniel Ermentrout 41, 716.
On William L. Greene 21.
On Garret A. Hobart 26, 27, 28, 81.
On Denis M. Hurley 667, 717.

Expansion. *See* IMPERIALISM.
Remarks by Mr. Dick on policy of 430.
Remarks by Mr. Shattuc on Democratic policy of 585.

Farming Statistics
Statements giving 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 437, 520.

Financial Law. *See* CURRENCY LAW.

Fitzgerald, *John F. (a Representative from Massachusetts)*
Remarks by, on
District of Columbia schools 659.
Porto Rico tariff 460.

Fitzgerald, *John J. (a Representative from New York)*
Remarks by, on
Indian schools 50, 51, 550.

Foreign Relations
Remarks by Mr. Dick on 421.

Foreign Trade
Remarks by Mr. Noonan on 189.

Fowler, *Charles Newell (a Representative from New Jersey)*
Remarks by, on
Political subjects 527.
Trusts 531.

Free Coinage
Remarks by Mr. Dick on 385.

Free Homesteads
Remarks by Mr. Gamble on 266.

Gaines, *John Wesley (a Representative from Tennessee)*
Remarks by, on
Ermentrout, Daniel: death of 716.
Imperialism 697.
Porto Rico tariff 75.
Trusts 277, 684.

Gamble, *Robert J. (a Representative from South Dakota)*
Remarks by, on
Free homesteads 266.

Gardner, *John J. (a Representative from New Jersey)*
Remarks by, on
Hobart, Garret A: death of 26.

Georgia Election Law
Remarks by Mr. Bartlett on 571.

German Vote
Remarks by Mr. Dick on 392.

Glynn, *Martin H. (a Representative from New York)*
Remarks by, on
Aldrich *vs.* Robbins: contested election 115.
Hobart, Garret A: death of 28
Pension legislation 273.

Gold and Silver Standard Countries
Table showing commerce, finances, and circulating medium of 386, 387.

Gold Production
Remarks on, by
Mr. Dick 418, 419.
Mr. Shafroth 321, 322, 323.
Mr. Wm. Alden Smith 612.
Statistics of 418, 419, 420.

Gold Standard
Remarks by Mr. Dick on 418, 420.
Remarks by Mr. Wm. Alden Smith on commerce with gold-standard countries 612.

Gordon, *Robert B. (a Representative from Ohio)*
Remarks by, on
Danford, Lorenzo: death of 27.

Gookin, *Frederick W.*
Liberty catechism by 166.

Government by Injunction
Remarks by Mr. Lentz on 463.

Grant, *Ulysses S.*
Remarks by Mr. Grosvenor on acceptance by Congress of statue of 458.

Greene, *Henry D. (a Representative from Pennsylvania)*
Remarks by, on
Oleomargarine 557.

Greene, *William L. (a Representative from Nebraska)*
Eulogy in House on 21.

Griffith, *Francis M. (a Representative from Indiana)*
Remarks by, on
Deficiency appropriation bill 309.
Porto Rico government 202, 311.
Reduction of taxation 309.

Grosvenor, *Charles H. (a Representative from Ohio)*
Remarks by, on
Agricultural prosperity 437.
Bland, Richard P: death of 264.
Colored men in military and civil service 439.
Consular service 257.
Danford, Lorenzo: death of 53.
Farming statistics 351, 437.
Grant, Ulysses S: statue of 458.
Hobart, Garret A: death of 81.
Industrial statistics 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350.
Labor and Porto Rican question 113.
Manufacturing industries 346.
Porto Rico tariff 73, 113.
Protection and prosperity 334, 346, 351.
Shipping subsidy 576.
State ownership of railroads 431.

Hamilton, *Edward L. (a Representative from Michigan)*
Remarks by, on
Importation of farm products 520.

Haugen, *Gilbert N. (a Representative from Iowa)*
Remarks by, on
Agricultural appropriation bill 242.
Porto Rico tariff 243.
Sugar-beet industry 243.

Hawaiian Islands
Remarks by Mr. Newlands on government for 200.

Hepburn, *William P. (a Representative from Iowa)*
Remarks by, on
Nicaragua Canal 393.

Hill, *Ebenezer J. (a Representative from Connecticut)*
Remarks by, on
Porto Rico tariff 175.

Hoar, *George F. (a Senator from Massachusetts)*
Letter to Boston Journal on Cuba and Philippine Islands from 163.

Hobart, *Garret A. (Vice-President)*
Eulogies in House on 26, 27, 28, 81.

Homestead Entries
Table giving number and area from 1862 to 1898 of 344.

Hurley, *Denis M. (a Representative from New York)*
Eulogies in House on 667, 717.

Idaho
Remarks by Mr. Lentz on conduct of Army officers in Coeur d'Alene district of 464, 669.

Imperialism. *See* EXPANSION.
Remarks on, by
Mr. Gaines 697.
Mr. Kitchin 573.
Mr. Lentz 181.
Address by George S. Boutwell on 165.
Address by Justice Brewer on 311.
Addresses by William J. Bryan on 76, 180, 450, 652.
Addresses by Carl Schurz on 154, 158, 647.

Imports and Exports
Tables showing value of 336, 337, 341, 342, 348, 349, 691, 692, 693.

Indian Schools
Remarks by Mr. Fitzgerald of New York on 50, 51, 550.

Industrial Statistics.
Statements giving 324, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 556.

Iron and Steel
Statement showing production of 350, 556.

Jackson, *Andrew*
Letters relative to government of Florida from 698, 699, 700, 701.
Letter declining gift of sarcophagus from 700.

Japan
Report on adoption of gold standard in 420.
Statement of cotton industry in 456.

Jett, *Thomas M. (a Representative from Illinois)*
Remarks by, on
Pension legislation 296.
Porto Rico tariff 71.
Trusts 444, 546.

Jones, *John P. (a Senator from Nevada)*
Remarks by, on
Currency and gold standard 702.

Jones, *William A. (a Representative from Virginia)*
Remarks by, on
Bland, Richard P: death of 222.
Epes, Sydney P: death of 133.
Philippine Islands 234.
Porto Rico government 232.

Jones, *W. L. (a Representative from Washington)*
Remarks by, on
Porto Rico tariff 86.

King, *William H. (a Representative from Utah)*
Remarks by, on
Trusts 618.

Kitchin, *William W. (a Representative from North Carolina)*
Remarks by, on
Imperialism 573.
North Carolina suffrage amendment 297.

Kluttz, *Theodore F. (a Representative from North Carolina)*
Remarks by, on
Trusts 526.

Labor
Remarks on prosperity of, by
Mr. Dick, 404.
Mr. Grosvenor, 113.
Tables showing increase in wages of 406, 556.

Labor Organizations
Table showing membership of 405, 406, 407.

Lassiter, *Francis R. (a Representative from Virginia)*
Remarks by, on
Epes, Sydney P: death of 492.
Trusts 561.

Lawrence, *George P. (a Representative from Massachusetts)*
Remarks by, on
National banks 509.
Trusts 509.

Lentz, *John J. (a Representative from Ohio)*
Remarks by, on
Army appropriation bill 181.
Cœur d'Alene labor troubles 464, 669.
Danford, Lorenzo: death of 451.
General and Adjutant-General of Army 668.
Government by injunction 463.
Imperialism 181.
Military Academy appropriation bill 668.
Philippine Islands 183.
Trusts 638.

Life-Saving Service
Remarks by Mr. Scudder on pay of surfmen employed in 562.

Little, *John S. (a Representative from Arkansas)*
Remarks by, on
Anglo-American alliance 286.

Littlefield, *Chas. E. (a Representative from Maine)*
Remarks by, on
Porto Rico tariff 57.
Trusts 601.

Livingston, *Leonidas F. (a Representative from Georgia)*
Remarks by, on
Appropriations 459.

Long, *Chester I. (a Representative from Kansas)*
Remarks by, on
Acquisition of territory 194.

McCall, *Samuel W. (a Representative from Massachusetts)*
Remarks by, on
Roberts, Brigham H: expulsion of 25.

McCleary, *James T. (a Representative from Minnesota)*
Remarks by, on
Currency and go'd standard 3.
Porto Rico tariff 125, 660.

McDowell, *John A. (a Representative from Ohio)*
Remarks by, on
E'ection of Senators by people 220.
Rural free delivery 221.

Maddox, *John W. (a Representative from Georgia)*
Remarks by, on
Porto Rico tariff 84.

Mahon, *Thaddeus M. (a Representative from Pennsylvania)*
Remarks by, on
Pennsylvania war claims 143.

Mann, *James R. (a Representative from Illinois)*
Remarks by, on
Porto Rico tariff 197.

Manufactures
Remarks by Mr. Dick on prices of 390.

May, *Mitchell (a Representative from New York)*
Remarks by, on
Trusts 505.

Medicines
Remarks by Mr. Wilson of New York on tax on 208.

Meyer, *Adolph (a Representative from Louisiana)*
Remarks by, on
Hurley, Denis M: death of 717.

Miers, *Robert W. (a Representative from Indiana)*
Remarks by, on
Porto Rico tariff 255.
Trusts 255.

Military Academy Appropriation Bill
Remarks by Mr. Lentz on 668.

Missouri Election Law
Remarks by Mr. Bartholdt on 41, 44.

Money
Statement showing stocks of money in thirteen principal countries in 1873 and 1899 418.

Monnett, *F. S.*
Letter on trusts in Ohio from 641.

Morton, *Oliver P.*
Remarks by Mr. Beveridge on reception by Congress of statue of 682.

Mudd, *Sydney E. (a Representative from Maryland)*
Remarks by, on
Naval Academy buildings 616.

Muller, *Nicholas* (*a Representative from New York*)
Remarks by, on
Election of Senators by people 199.
New York Harbor navigation 556.

Naphen, *Henry F.* (*a Representative from Massachusetts*)
Remarks by, on
Philippine Islands 369.
Trusts 594.

National Banks
Remarks on, by
Mr. Lawrence 509.
Mr. Noonan 190, 191.
Statistics relative to 236, 237, 238, 239, 345.

Naval Academy
Remarks by Mr. Mudd on new buildings for 616.

Navy Department
Remarks by Mr. Dick on work of 412.

Nevada
Remarks by Mr. Stewart of Nevada on war claim of 596.

Newlands, *Francis G.* (*a Representative from Nevada*)
Remarks by, on
Porto Rico government 274.
Territory of Hawaii 200.
Trusts 674.

New Mexico
Remarks by Mr. Dick on insurrection of 1847 in 391.

New Possessions
Remarks by Mr. Dick on trade with 389, 390, 426, 427.
Statement of exports to 390.

New York Harbor
Remarks by Mr. Muller on navigation of 556.

Nicaragua Canal
Remarks on construction of, by
Mr. Clayton of Alabama 368.
Mr. Clayton of New York 268.
Mr. Cowherd 306.
Mr. Hepburn 393.
Mr. Noonan 590.
Mr. Ryan of New York 270.
Mr. Shackleford 312.
Mr. Shafroth 262.
Mr. Sparkman 252.
Mr. Thropp 672.
Mr. Underwood 272.

Noonan, *Edward T.* (*a Representative from Illinois*)
Remarks by, on
Bank of United States 189.
Currency and gold standard 188, 189, 190.
Foreign trade 189.
National banks 190, 191.
Nicaragua Canal 590.
State banks 189.

North Carolina Election Law
Remarks on, by
Mr. Kitchin 297.
Mr. Small 630.

Norton, *James A.* (*a Representative from Ohio*)
Remarks by, on
Porto Rico tariff 77.

Oleomargarine
Remarks on control and sale of, by
Mr. Barney 550.
Mr. Dahle 557.
Mr. Davidson 515.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania 557.
Statements showing production and sale of 516, 517, 558.

Olmsted, *Marlin E.* (*a Representative from Pennsylvania*)
Remarks by, on
Pennsylvania industries 555.
Trusts 555.

Overstreet, *Jesse* (*a Representative from Indiana*)
Remarks by, on
Currency and gold standard 16.

Pacific Railroads
Remarks by Mr. Dick on settlement with 416.

Parker, *Richard Wayne* (*a Representative from New Jersey*)
Remarks by, on
Porto Rico tariff 128.

Pennsylvania
Remarks by Mr. Mahon on war claim of 143.
Remarks by Mr. Olmsted on industrial conditions in 555.

Pensions
Remarks on subject of, by
Mr. Dick 376.
Mr. Glynn 273.
Mr. Jett 296.
Mr. Sulzer 535.
Mr. Sulloway 365.

Philippine Islands
Remarks on policy relative to, by
Mr. Beveridge 110, 112.
Mr. Boutell of Illinois 34.
Mr. Clay 106.
Mr. Cochran of Missouri 46.
Mr. Cox 262.
Mr. Dick 429.
Mr. Jones of Virginia 234.
Mr. Kitchin 574.
Mr. Lentz 182.
Mr. Naphen 369.
Mr. Williams of Mississippi 151, 168, 169.
Arraignment of President's policy relative to 169.
Letter from George F. Hoar to Boston Journal on independence of 163.
Statement showing trade in 1893 of 427.

Porto Rico
Remarks on tariff and government for, by
Mr. Bartlett 452.
Mr. Bell 33.
Mr. Beveridge 279.
Mr. Brick 204.
Mr. Chanler 128.
Mr. Cochran of Missouri 46.
Mr. Cusack 54.
Mr. Daly of New Jersey 123.
Mr. De Armond 94.
Mr. Eddy 55.
Mr. Fitzgerald of Massachusetts 400.
Mr. Gaines 75.
Mr. Griffith 202, 311.
Mr. Grosvenor 73, 113.
Mr. Bangen 243.
Mr. Hill 175.
Mr. Jett 71.
Mr. Jones of Virginia 232.
Mr. Jones of Washington 86.
Mr. Kitchin 574.
Mr. Littlefield 57.
Mr. McCleary 125, 660.
Mr. Maddox 84.
Mr. Mann 197.
Mr. Miers of Indiana 255.
Mr. Newlands 274.
Mr. Norton of Ohio 77.
Mr. Packer of New Jersey 128.
Mr. Quarles of Virginia 99.
Mr. Ruppert 218.
Mr. Ryan of New York 103.
Mr. Scudder 82.
Mr. Steele 31.
Mr. Swanson 611.
Mr. Tongue 211.
Mr. Underwood 142.
Mr. Wilson of New York 207.

Postal Laws
Remarks by Mr. Cummings on second-class mail matter 129.

Post-Office Appropriation Bill
Remarks by Mr. Bingham on 229.

Protection Policy
Remarks by Mr. Grosvenor on 334, 346, 351.

Public Lands
Statement of sales of 343.

Quarles, *J. M.* (*a Representative from Virginia*)
Remarks by, on
Currency and gold standard 20.
Porto Rico tariff 99.
Rural free delivery 19.
Secretary of Treasury 21.
Trusts 20.

Railroads
Remarks by Mr. Grosvenor on State ownership of 431.
Tables giving number of railroads and employees of 343.

Receipts and Expenditures
Table showing amounts from 1791 to 1900 337.

Rice, George
Letter on trusts from 642, 644, 645, 646.

Ridgely, *E. R.* (*a Representative from Kansas*)
Remarks by, on
Army appropriation bill 174, 618.
Trusts 359.

Robbins, *Gaston A.* (*a Representative from Alabama*)
Remarks by, on
Aldrich *vs.* Robbins: contested election 89.

Roberts, *Brigham H.* (*a Representative-elect from Utah*)
Remarks on resolution declaring vacant seat of, by
Mr. Brownlow 23.
Mr. McCall 25.
Mr. Smith of Kentucky 40.

Robinson, *James M.* (*a Representative from Indiana*)
Remarks by, on
Territory of Hawaii 180.

Ruppert, *Jacob, jr.* (*a Representative from New York*)
Remarks by, on
Porto Rico tariff 218.

Rural Free Delivery
Remarks on, by
Mr. Cromer 241.
Mr. Davidson 260.
Mr. Dick 384.
Mr. McDowell 221.
Mr. Quarles of Virginia 19.
Mr. Smith of Michigan 225.
Mr. Stokes 245.
Mr. Zenor 227.

Ryan, *William H.* (*a Representative from New York*)
Remarks by, on
Beer tax 521.
Nicaragua Canal and Hay-Pauncefote treaty 270.
Porto Rico tariff 103.
Seneca Nation of New York Indians 275.
Trusts 521.

Salmon, *Joshua S.* (*a Representative from New Jersey*)
Remarks by, on
Alaska civil government 318.
Hobart, Garret A: death of 27.
Territorial government 318.

Savings Banks
Table giving number of banks and deposits in 344, 528.

Schurz, *Carl*
Address at Philadelphia anti-imperialistic meeting by 154.
Address at Chicago anti-imperialistic conference by 158.
Speech on imperialism at Cooper Institute, New York City, by 647.

Scudder, *Townsend* (*a Representative from New York*)
Remarks by, on
American National Red Cross 489.
Life-Saving Service 562.
Porto Rico tariff 82.
Trusts 504.

Secretary of Treasury
Remarks on deposits of public moneys in New York banks by, by
Mr. Daly of New Jersey 20.
Mr. Quarles of Virginia 21.

Senators
Remarks on election by people of, by
Mr. McDowell 220.
Mr. Muller 199.
Mr. Small 314.

Seneca Nation Indians
Remarks by Mr. Ryan of New York on 275.

Shackleford, *Dorsey W.* (*a Representative from Missouri*)
Remarks by, on
Nicaragua Canal 312.

Shafroth, *John F.* (*a Representative from Colorado*)
Remarks by, on
Bimetallism 319.
Gold and silver production 321, 322, 323.
Industrial statistics 324.
Monroe doctrine and Nicaragua Canal 263.
Silver coinage 320, 322, 323, 325, 326.

Shattuc, *William B.* (*a Representative from Ohio*)
Remarks by, on
Democratic expansion policy 585.

Shipping Subsidy
Remarks on, by
Mr. Berry of Kentucky 307.
Mr. Grosvenor 576.
Article by Arthur Sewall on 582.
Letter from Alexander R. Smith on 576.
List of organizations in favor of 581.
Report adopted by Republican Club of New York City in favor of 582.

Silver Coinage
Remarks on, by
Mr. Dick 385.
Mr. Shafroth 320, 322, 323, 325, 326.

Silver Production
Remarks on, by
Mr. Dick 418.
Mr. Shafroth 321, 322, 323.

Small, *John H.* (*a Representative from North Carolina*)
Remarks by, on
Colored men in military and civil service 632.
Election of Senators by people 314.
North Carolina suffrage 630.

Smith, *Alexander R.*
Letter to C. H. Grosvenor on shipping subsidy bill from 576.

Smith, *David H.* (*a Representative from Kentucky*)
Remarks by, on
Roberts, Brigham H: expulsion of 40.

Smith, *Henry C.* (*a Representative from Michigan*)
Remarks by, on
Rural free delivery 225.
University of Michigan 286.
Military Academy appropriation bill 286.

Smith, *Wm. Alden* (*a Representative from Michigan*)
Remarks by, on
Commerce with gold-standard countries 612.
Gold production 612.

South African Republic
Remarks by Mr. Cusack on 55.

South African War
Remarks by Mr. Dick on 422.

South Carolina
Remarks by Mr. Tillman on negro suffrage in 134.

Southard, *James Harding* (*a Representative from Ohio*)
Remarks by, on
Danford, Lorenzo: death of 615.

Spalding, *Burleigh F.* (*a Representative from North Dakota*)
Remarks by, on
Agricultural appropriation bill 193.
Political subjects 193, 194.

Sparkman, *Stephen M.* (*a Representative from Florida*)
Remarks by, on
Acquisition of territory 172.
Army appropriation bill 172.
Nicaragua Canal 252.

Stark, *William L.* (*a Representative from Nebraska*)
Remarks by, on
Greene, William L: death of 21.

State Banks
Remarks by Mr. Noonan on 189.

Steele, *George W.* (*a Representative from Indiana*)
Remarks by, on
Porto Rico tariff 31.

Stewart, *William M.* (*a Senator from Nevada*)
Remarks by, on
Nevada war claim 596.

Stokes, *J. William* (*a Representative from South Carolina*)
Remarks by, on
Rural free delivery 245.

Subsidy. *See* SHIPPING SUBSIDY.

Sugar
Remarks by Mr. Dick on production of 410, 411.

Sulloway, *Cyrus A.* (*a Representative from New Hampshire*)
Remarks by, on
Pension legislation 365.

Sultan of Sulu
Copy of agreement with 186.

Sulzer, *William* (*a Representative from New York*)
Remarks by, on
Bland, Richard P: death of 179.
Military Academy appropriation bill 532.
Pensions 535.
Political subjects 532.
Letter on currency and gold standard law from 174.

Swanson, *Claude A.* (*a Representative from Virginia*)
Remarks by, on
Porto Rico government 611.

Tariff and Revenue
Table showing amounts from 1790 to 1900 338, 339, 340.

Tariffs of Europe
Remarks by Mr. Dick on 408.

Territorial Government
Remarks by Mr. Salmon on 318.

Thropp, *Joseph E.* (*a Representative from Pennsylvania*)
Remarks by, on
Nicaragua Canal 672.

Tillman, *Benjamin R.* (*a Senator from South Carolina*)
Speech before South Carolina constitutional convention, November 1, 1895 134.
Remarks by, on
Negro suffrage in South Carolina 134.

Tongue, *Thomas H.* (*a Representative from Oregon*)
Remarks by, on
Porto Rico tariff 211.

Trusts
Remarks on suppression of, by
Mr. Clayton of Alabama 326.
Mr. Cummings 522.
Mr. Dick 396, 397.
Mr. Fowler 531.

Trusts—Continued.
Remarks on suppression of, by
Mr. Gaines 277, 684.
Mr. Jett 444, 546.
Mr. King 618.
Mr. Kluttz 526.
Mr. Lassiter 561.
Mr. Lawrence 509.
Mr. Lentz 638.
Mr. Littlefield 601.
Mr. May 505.
Mr. Miers of Indiana 255.
Mr. Naphen 504.
Mr. Newlands 674.
Mr. Olmsted 555.
Mr. Quarles of Virginia 20.
Mr. Ridgely 359.
Mr. Ryan of New York 521.
Mr. Scudder 504.
Mr. Williams of Mississippi 432.
Mr. Zenor 493.
Address by William J. Bryan on suppression of 522.
Letter from George Rice on 642, 644, 645, 646.
Letter from F. S. Monnett on trusts in Ohio 641.
List of trusts in England 397, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404.
List of trusts in United States 257, 327, 432, 444, 447, 448, 449, 499, 548, 677.

Underwood, *Oscar W.* (*a Representative from Alabama*)
Remarks by, on
Nicaragua canal 272.
Porto Rica tariff 142.

University of Michigan
Remarks by Mr. Smith of Michigan on 286.

War Department
Remarks by Mr. Dick on work of 411.

War of Rebellion
Statement showing probable total number of survivors of 366.

War-Revenue Law
Remarks by Mr. Dick on 415.
Statement showing amount of internal revenue collected to March 31, 1900, under 416.

Western Union Telegraph Company
Statement of mileage, offices, and traffic of 343.

Williams, *John S.* (*a Representative from Mississippi*)
Remarks by, on
Philippine Islands 151, 168, 169.
Trusts and combines in United States 432.

Wilson, *Frank E.* (*a Representative from New York*)
Remarks by, on
Porto Rico tariff 207.
Tax on beer 208, 209.
Tax on medicines 208.

Wool
Statistics relative to 354, 355.

Zenor, *William T.* (*a Representative from Indiana*)
Remarks by, on
Rural free delivery 227.
Trusts 493.

O